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ABSTRACT

Special educators in Japan and Australia, as in other countries, confront everyday challenges in teaching children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD) in their classrooms. The unique needs of individual children with ASD add to the complexity of specialist teaching in small classes of children for high needs. Special educators in both countries teach these children life skills that are foundational needs for successful social inclusion. They also engage in professional development to improve their teaching. However, there is little research about what these special educators actually do to teach children with ASD in their classrooms.

The focus of this descriptive two-case inquiry was extensive term-long fieldwork in a qualitative cross-cultural case study comprising two single cases of three special educators in Japan and Australia. These special educators were interviewed three times across a term about their everyday practice, group teaching for children with ASD, and valued outcomes of their group instruction, respectively. Direct observations of class lessons and professional meetings, ongoing teacher reflections about weekly progress, document reviews, and interviews with other stakeholders accompanied the three semistructured interviews across a term. Researcher reflections throughout fieldwork also documented methodological adjustments to information gathering and data coding for analysis in each case. While some cross-cultural adjustments were anticipated, others emerged during the inquiry process.

The findings revealed broad similarities in thematic relationships for each research question and between questions. Tables of findings were used in this inquiry to highlight ecologically recognisable categories of themes emerging from the data in each case and to show points of contrast between cases. These special educators recognised the needs of children with ASD and used some similar communicative strategies for addressing these needs. They worked to balance individual and group needs in teaching a lesson to the class. They prepared various instructional strategies for responding to individual needs while maintaining group instruction. Although the Japanese and Australian special educators employed somewhat similar strategies consistent with the social and ecological conditions of school-based education of children with special needs in a small class, they used peer-mediated and adult-mediated support differently when teaching children with ASD in a class. Moreover, schoolwide approaches present in each school, while different in kind, enabled the special educators to improve group instruction in
Abstract

relation to curriculum study, educational theory, and effective strategies specifically for children with ASD (i.e., evidence-based practice).

Figures were used throughout this inquiry to document progress through conceptualisation, methodology, findings, and points for discussion. Contemporary ideas about work and practice in regular education were used to develop four diagrams unpacking aspects of the complexity of special educators’ work and practice. These ideas included layers of influence on teaching (political, professional, and personal); dynamic instructional interactions in classrooms (viz., teacher–children–content interactions); say–do–relate aspects of teachers’ action research; and a flexible construction of teacher practice from ideas and experiences.

Synthesis of case-based findings with these diagrams suggested several points. First, models constructed to represent various perspectives on regular education can be applied to special educational teaching. Second, special educators can present lessons to a group in different but coherent ways of working. Third, the social and interpersonal skills valued in a culture can direct teacher capacity to encourage those skills in children with ASD. Fourth, the awareness that functional operation of specialist teaching practices can differ in other cultures may facilitate sharing of practices that help in the education of a child with ASD, but there are challenges ahead. These points contribute to further knowledge of the complex nature of teacher work and practice of special educators working with children with ASD in classroom settings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>Applied Behaviour Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C–H</td>
<td>Class–Home (e.g., communication book and newsletters; Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>Developmental, Individual Difference, Relationship-Based Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Education Adjustment Profile, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Queensland Department of Education, Training and Employment (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Goal Attainment Scale (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Intellectual Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individual Educational Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLA</td>
<td>Key Learning Area (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXT</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISE</td>
<td>National Institute of Special Needs Education (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk</td>
<td>Observation Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Positive Behaviour Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECS</td>
<td>Picture Exchange Communication System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Pivotal Response Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCARF</td>
<td>Queensland Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Framework (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCT</td>
<td>Queensland College of Teachers (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSA</td>
<td>Queensland Studies Authority (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Situational Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEU</td>
<td>Special Needs Education Unit (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Social Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACCH</td>
<td>Treatment and Education of Autistic and Communication related handicapped Children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF KEY JAPANESE TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anpanman</td>
<td>A name of one character from a cartoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikinman</td>
<td>A name of one character from a cartoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bamen</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child’s sugata</td>
<td>An holistic image of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyoka</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imeiji</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiheishou</td>
<td>Autism spectrum disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jittai</td>
<td>Actual condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kodomo/kodomotachi</td>
<td>Child/children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokoro</td>
<td>Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakama/tomodachi</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandman</td>
<td>A name of one character from a cartoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seitan (seikatsu-tangen-gakushu)</td>
<td>Life-skills unit of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shakaisei</td>
<td>Social nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND

As qualitative cross-cultural researchers have recently argued, an understanding of practice becomes visible when perspectives are compared across cultures (see, for example, Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). This inquiry compared the work and practice of special educators in Japan and Australia. For this reason, it is important to understand the researcher’s background.

I grew up in Kyoto prefecture, a traditional city, in Japan. During the completion of my undergraduate teaching degree in Japan, I had the opportunity to experience a 1-year exchange study at Griffith University in Australia. I arrived in Australia and started my study a week after finishing my practicum in a Japanese special education unit. My head was crowded with fresh memories of a teacher struggling with the “behaviours” of children with ASD. I found that the Australian special education undergraduate program included a course of positive behaviour support (PBS) which was more practical and explicit, compared to the one I had undertaken in Japan. The exchange experience also gave me insight into a different way of teaching children with ASD. It made me want to learn more about the educational practice and also to explore the reasons behind the systemic differences for teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia.

After going back to Japan, I completed my undergraduate dissertation, “Inclusive Movement in Australia”; at the time, inclusive education was relatively new to the Japanese education. Because the thesis was only based on literature, I felt the need to examine more about teaching these children in Australian schools. I decided, therefore, to study a Master of Education in Australia and complete a dissertation that explored the work and practice of special educators with these children. This study made me aware that culture influenced how special educators viewed using “groups” in their teaching. I observed more cultural differences when I undertook a postgraduate course in PBS, worked in a Queensland state school, and supported children with ASD in a private Early Childhood Education Centre. Together, these studies and work experiences encouraged me to conduct this PhD project focusing on a comparison of how special educators teach children with ASD in Japanese and Australian classrooms.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Special educators in Australia and Japan have taught small class groups of children with developmental disabilities across primary or elementary schooling years for many years. Mature routines established for special needs classes with children with intellectual disabilities (ID) have been required to accommodate children with an additional diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder (ASD) because the majority of children with autism also had ID. This thesis reports a descriptive inquiry in the two countries into what special educators do when teaching these children in small classes and into how they work with others to improve their teaching.

Matson and Nebel-Schwalm (2007) argued that, because of highly overlapping conditions in ASD and ID, it is difficult or unprofitable to consider one of these conditions alone. The rapid international growth of government funding for specific interventions and treatments (Singh, Illes, Lazzeroni, & Hallmayer, 2009) has accompanied increasing acceptance of ASD as a category of eligibility for special needs placement. Well-funded research, particularly in the United States of America (USA), has catalogued interventions that meet scientific criteria of systematic review of quality indicators, rigorous experimental design, and successful student outcomes (Mazzotti, Rowe, & Test, 2013). While the educational needs of these children for social-communicative supports and for help with other highly individual needs have gradually become better understood, they have continued to pose unique instructional challenges in a classroom with other children.

The working practice of special educators with their small classes has received little direct scrutiny by educational researchers, and the historically rapid and ongoing changes in educational provision for children with ASD have only added to this substantial gap in knowledge. On the one hand, the perceived benefits of social networking with typically developing peers have continued to promote inclusive placement in a regular school setting (Webster & Carter, 2013). On the other hand, the high costs of the intensive resourcing for the early diagnosis and education of these children, which is peaking at the present time, have suggested progressive rationalisation of extra educational services (Australian Advisory Board on Autism Spectrum Disorders, 2013). Looking forward to the 2020s, educational provision for many of these children will involve differentiated instruction in larger classes with regular classroom teachers, probably with specialist advisors, but some of these children may continue to access placement in specialist settings.
An emerging topic has involved the relative value of teaching these children how to conduct social interactions within a classroom rather than using practices with specific experimental support. Burns and Ysseldyke (2009) expressed concern that there has been little investigation of the everyday activities of specialist teachers in their classrooms; they queried the actual extent to which they employ research-informed interventions for children with ASD recommended in the literature (Mazzotti, Rowe, et al., 2013). Two programs of research that have explored the potential value of programs with social benefits for children with ASD have been group-based instruction in naturalistic social settings (Greenspan & Wieder, 2006; Koegel, Koegel, & Camarata, 2010) and collaborative planning of teaching (Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009; Lewis, Perry, & Friedkin, 2009).

The idea of teaching children with ASD in natural or group environments (Brunner & Seung, 2009) emerged in tandem with the increasing attention to the social-relational aspect as well as the cognitive aspect of classroom instruction in the general educational literature (Hall, 2013; McAfee, 2002). Some of the more prominent American examples and exponents of this interest in whether and how young children with ASD can learn in their social context have been naturalistic behaviour analysis (e.g., Koegel, Singh, Koegel, Hollingsworth, & Bradshaw, 2013; Koegel & Koegel, 2006; Koegel, Koegel, Vernon, & Brookman-Frazee, 2010), developmental and social-relational programming (Greenspan & Wieder, 2006; Ingersoll, Dvortcsak, Whalen, & Sikora, 2005), and social skills training (Bellini, Peters, Benner, & Hopf, 2007; Bohlander, Orlich, & Varley, 2012). The extended learning goals and flexible group settings associated with these kinds of naturalistic interventions have tended to involve long-term commitment to show treatment effectiveness. Key researchers in this area (e.g., Greenspan & Wieder, 2006; Ingersoll, 2010; Koegel, Koegel, Vernon, et al., 2010) claimed that the relatively low level of empirical evidence and related investigative focus on qualitative methodologies in this line of research have unfairly downplayed its relevance to the education of these children.

However, the prevailing paradigm for teaching children with ASD has continued to be intensive one-to-one intervention using highly structured routines in controlled settings, arising out of the long-established research tradition of applied behaviour analysis (ABA). Various reviews providing synthesis and metaanalysis of ASD treatments have concluded that the systematic ABA or related behaviour interventions are the most effective thus far documented for children with ASD (e.g., Odom, Boyd, Hall, & Hume, 2010; Odom et al., 2003; Prior, Roberts, Rodger, Williams, & Sutherland, 2011; Simpson, 2005). Debate about cataloguing of effective interventions has been focused on the best way to standardise the efficacy of various interventions across different studies (Odom, 2009). Clear and quantitative measurements that concentrate on visible changes in observable phenomena have been considered as a major indicator of research quality in the field (Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010). According to the Research and Training Center on Early Childhood Development funded by the U.S. Department of
Education, the definition of evidence-based practices (EBPs) is “practices that are informed by research, in which the characteristics and consequences of environmental variables are empirically established and the relationship directly informs what a practitioner can do to produce a desired outcome” (Dunst, Trivette, & Cutspec, 2002, p. 3).

Odom (2009) recognised that specific practices, identified by researchers in ideal and scientifically controlled conditions, may encounter contextual considerations when used in real social settings. That is, EBPs based on these static conditions may adapt poorly to classrooms in which a special educator is working with several other children as well as a child with ASD and is also working with other adults in the school and classroom. Other contextual factors that may affect practice adoption have included the larger-scale valuing of group settings where children with disabilities can work with other children associated with the philosophy of inclusive education for children with ASD (Carter et al., 2009) and the smaller-scale within-classroom devaluing of the use of empirically based intensive EBPs aimed at one child in the class associated with the practical economies of teaching a whole class. For the most part, special educators have been left to their own professional means to formulate ways to teach children with ASD in a group of other children with high educational needs and to work with staff and family to improve their teaching.

The nature of teacher work has been canvassed widely and in many areas of the education literature in relation to the notion of research-to-practice gaps. Recent speculation that the concept of practice has been taken for granted in the literature on well-studied constructs of educational change and learning has highlighted the possibility of unexamined assumptions, elisions, conflations, and silences in teachers’ received views about their practice (Hager, Lee, & Reich, 2012). In the educational literature on ASD, at least two different levels of meaning have been ascribed to the concept of practice. First, at the level of specific activity, discrete practices are associated with catalogues of EBPs recommended for children with ASD (e.g., the definition provided by Dunst et al., 2002, p. 3). Second, at a level broader than implementation of specific practices, general principles serve to guide teacher judgement about desirable action for a specific classroom. This broader meaning of EBPs was outlined by the American National Autism Center (2009, p. 14):

Evidence-based practice involves the integration of research findings with (a) professional judgement and data-based clinical decision-making, (b) values and preferences of families, and (c) assessing and improving the capacity of the system to implement the intervention with a high degree of accuracy.

A more profound and complicated analysis of teacher practice has been provided by action researchers, Stephen Kemmis and colleagues. Recently, Kemmis, Edwards-Groves, Wilkinson, and Hardy (2012) called for more examination of how teachers’ use of specific practices in classrooms relate to one another. They termed this subfield of educational research as the ecologies of practice. This notion extended Kemmis’ (2009) tripartite characterisation of teaching into what teachers think and talk about their practice, what they do, and under what
conditions of teaching they relate to and, thus, give value to others and to things and circumstances around them. Kemmis (2009) recognised that what teachers say about their work and what they value may not translate into what they actually do in their classrooms. He concluded that the inevitable bundling together of these three aspects of teaching was inherently unstable and volatile; not only could new theory, new experience, or changes in any aspect of practice transform teaching but also old traditions of doing, for example, could overwhelm stated beliefs or hold hostage particular classroom relationships.

Sayings, doings and relatings….emerge and develop in relation to one another. Understandings may form intentions, but practice does not simply enact intentions—the doing is always something more than and different from what was intended. Nor does practice alone form understandings—thinking and saying are also discursively formed, in the common stream of a shared language used by interlocutors who stand in some particular kind of relationship with one another. (Kemmis, 2009, p. 465)

Moreover, Kemmis (2009) traced these three elements of teaching to general theorising about social science, specifically to the language, work, and power underpinning the structure of social life and from thence, to a philosophy of living properly and well: Wise and prudent teachers, like practitioners in any field, would live well by “(1) thinking and speaking well and clearly, avoiding irrationality and falsehood; (2) acting well in the world, avoiding harm, waste and excess; and (3) relating well to others, avoiding injustice and exclusion” (Kemmis, 2009, p. 465). Thus, language expressed teachers’ understandings, work expressed their practices, and relationships of power expressed their conditions, circumstances, or situations of practice (Kemmis, 2009).

Kemmis (2009) argued that larger, longer collective histories of thought and action as well as theoretical knowledge, made available in the traditions of thought and traditions of living in the field of education, inform what wise and prudent teachers actually say, do, and value. One example of a collective history, different from Western teaching traditions, has been a process in regular Japanese education that affects relationships among students and relationships among teachers.

As an ongoing process of interpersonal relations that places primary concern on mutual assistance and on consideration of the involvement and well-being of fellow classmates, cooperative teaching and learning is basically the Japanese way of interacting (connectedness), and, as such is an ever-present mode of operations in Japanese classrooms. (Sato, 2004, p. 81)

Part of the complexity of teacher work in regular education has been the potential tensions and conflict between teachers’ obligation to faithfully implement specified practices informed by research, tradition, or both, in any classroom and their professional freedom to decide and choose actions judged appropriate to one particular class (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006). Classroom-oriented research has sought to achieve child outcomes that are directly linked to the instructions delivered in their natural environments (Kroeger, Burton, & Preston, 2009; Panerai et al., 2009). This rise of within-classroom (i.e., group-based) research has emphasised the work of teachers in those classrooms rather than out-of-context practice per se. For example, Opfer and Pedder (2011) commented that educational researchers wanting to influence professional development need to consider how teachers learn to do their work in their unique teaching
context. Some classroom-based research for teachers has been focused on teacher tools for self-improvement such as engaging in action research in their classroom (i.e., practice-changing practice; Kemmis, 2009, p. 464) and engaging in reflection about classroom learning (i.e., reflective practice; e.g., Barnett & O'Mahony, 2006; Larrivee, 2008; Reynolds, 2011).

Several conceptualisations of teacher work have encouraged educational researchers to become more aware of the social nature of teacher work in general and practitioners to become more aware of the active role of the teacher in theorising classroom activities. For example, Noffke (1997) identified three components of teacher work (personal, professional, and political), which indicated that political influences outside the classroom and personal influences inside the individual teacher are interlinked with the professional aspect of teaching in a school. Ball and Forzani (2009) depicted classroom teaching as an instructional triangle comprising a teacher, child learners, and learning content and emphasised the social and flexible nature of the teachers’ dynamic interactions with the child group and the learning tasks. Earlier, ten Have (2004) argued that social science researchers trying to understand how the practitioner is working need to understand how practitioners combine social theory obtained from philosophical worldviews and evidence obtained from lived experience.

More loosely, an ongoing thread of argument about the culturally situated nature of teaching has raised speculation about the contextual assumptions underlying traditions of teaching (Ball & Forzani, 2007; Dall’Alba, 2009; Kemmis, 2009; Noffke, 1997). That is, a received interpretation of teaching by a teacher working within a society has not taken into account the contribution of culture to that teaching tradition but has supposed that the teaching reflects the needs of the class and the children in that class. Qualitative cross-cultural researchers have argued recently that the cultural lens on educational assumptions becomes visible from the perspective of another culture (e.g., Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Okawa (2008) described a culture as a lens, with which individuals are able to perceive and interpret their world and to make sense of meaning about their lives and world. Kariya (2011) pointed out that researchers with non-English speaking background are crucial in contemporary education to create cross-linguistic and cross-cultural opportunities for dialogue and therefore to reveal aspects of practice unknown to the host culture.

However, the addition of culture to analysis of the complexity of teaching adds another heterogeneous construct to an already complex construct. Jarvis (2009) argued that the paradox of the group–individual is captured in the two dominant cultures in learning (i.e., East and West, respectively) and that to understand learning in each culture requires understanding how the person learns to be a member in society. Beyond the basic premise that everyone is an individual person and every society is made up of its members, an abiding problem has been that “culture is hard to conceptualize and definitions abound” (Rinne, Steel, & Fairweather, 2012, p. 92). With respect to manmade societal constructs, people as members of their societies have acquired complex whole capabilities and used historically transmitted patterns of meanings.
embodied in symbols to communicate and perpetuate their knowledge about and attitudes towards life (Rinne et al., 2012).

Although everyone is an individual person and a member of a society, another core issue for conceptualising culture has been the varying balance of these relationships and the relative power of the individual and society. One persistent line of argument has addressed the effects of culture on the values underlying work and the functioning of work organisations (Hofstede, 1980, 2001; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Hofstede (1980) offered empirically based terminologies to describe different cultures along multiple dimensions, and there has been some reliable measurement of cultural valuing of individualism (e.g., Australia) and collectivism (e.g., Japan), but the measures on this most prominent dimension have been subjected to theoretical and measurement controversies and continuing ambiguity around the matter (Rinne et al., 2012).

The mediation of current global prevalence of ASD based on literature review was 6.2 per 1,000; however, the range among studies within countries varies (Elsabbagh et al., 2012). These prevalence rates of ASD have risen in Australia (Williams, MacDermott, Ridley, Glasson, & Wray, 2008), the USA (e.g., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009), and Asia (Sun & Allison, 2010). Moreover, numbers of factors (e.g., changes in diagnostic criteria over time, new assessment instruments, inaccurate diagnosis, use of different research methodologies, cultural differences, and increases in ASD awareness) were considered to contribute to the variation of rates, increasing rates, and, therefore, limitations of accurate reporting of rates (Matson & Kozlowski, 2011). In Asian countries such as Japan, China, and Taiwan, the average reported prevalence of ASD dramatically increased in the last three decades (Sun & Allison, 2010). The use of different instruments in different countries and at different times limited exact comparisons among the Asian countries (Sun & Allison, 2010). Especially in Japan, however, the estimated prevalence rose higher in the more recent surveys using the internationally adopted sets of diagnostic criteria (viz., the European-preferred system of International Classification of Diseases: ICD and the USA-preferred system of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual: DSM).

There have been some interests in the cultural response of special educators in advanced economies to meet the need for special educational services for children with ASD. Daley (2002) noted the limited research on children with ASD in non-Western countries. Wakabayashi et al. (2007) collected Japanese data on the high-functioning end of the spectrum. Although the existence of interventions developed in non-English speaking countries was acknowledged in classification of EBPs, the initial frame of reference for scientifically based interventions was Western. Despite a sprinkling of commentary in English on Japanese ways of teaching children with ASD (e.g., Howlin, 1998; Sallows, 2000; Sheehy, 2004; Simpson & Myles, 2008), the possibility that understanding and treatments may have cultural and political dimensions has left considerable mystery around Japanese interventions.
In one apparently short and straightforward study, Kikkawa (2007; also see Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a) encountered a Western cultural lens on Australian ways of understanding and teaching children with ASD. She experienced unexpected challenges in obtaining and analysing text data from focus group interviews in Japan and Australia with special educators who were teaching one or more children in a small group of children with ID. A focus group in each country comprised specialist-qualified teachers of three age-graded classes in a special needs unit attached to a primary school. Within each unit, these teachers willingly expressed their views amongst themselves during a 90-minute session. The semistructured interview serially addressed questions about description of a child with ASD, effects on their teaching, changes in their teaching over time, positive and negative feelings about teaching these children, and the influence of teacher training and government policy. Kikkawa (2007) conducted a full trial with a pilot group of Australian special educators, before she facilitated the formal focus group session in each country.

It became clear that the Australian and Japanese teaching was culturally situated. Content analysis revealed three common themes in what these special educators said in response to the questions, but there were distinctive differences in the interpretation of themes. The Australian special educators spoke systematically, explicitly, and concretely about the diagnosis of ASD and their instruction focusing on individual children in their classrooms. They displayed a consistent professional application of skills-based practices recommended in the Western literature to achieve goals specific to the needs of a child with ASD. They used diagnostic data to guide intervention planning. The Japanese special educators found the questions discomforting to discuss directly. In general, they spoke abstractly and holistically about understanding the individual child with ASD and assessing the child’s present condition to develop teaching strategies for the child. They spoke about working with the child in the class rather than working from the language of ASD diagnosis and treatment.

Asking the Japanese special educators about teaching a child with ASD turned out to be obscure in several respects. Answers to the sequence of questions and content analysis of talk that were straightforward for the Australian teachers did not proceed smoothly with the Japanese focus group. The questions were not self-evident to the Japanese special educators, and their responses, while understandable to the Japanese teacher-facilitator, did not translate concretely and explicitly easily into English. The Japanese facilitator could interpret the talk of the Japanese teachers and explain the reasonable commentary in that context to Australian members of the research team. Strategies for managing challenges in coding and interpreting the meaning underlying Japanese text required multilayered stages (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a).

The brevity of the focus group conversation and the lack of observational data to confirm what teachers in each focus group said left unresolved the communal values in teaching class groups and working with other special educators in the unit. Observation of regular classroom teachers in Japanese schools suggested that they view the classroom not only as a
setting for their teaching but also as a direct means for teaching through peers’ mutual interactions during lessons (Matoba & Sarkar Arani, 2006; Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2006). What the special educators in the previous study (Kikkawa, 2007) said appeared to express what they did, believed, and valued in their teaching, but direct observation of special needs teaching is needed to align teacher talk about their classroom interactions.

**Study Focus and Significance**

This study describes the everyday teaching of Japanese and Australian special educators working with children with a dual diagnosis of ASD/ID in a class of children with ID. The term, inquiry, is used deliberately in this study to signify the open lens on this descriptive study. A descriptive inquiry into classroom teaching for children with ASD in lessons over a term in natural working conditions of small classes can enrich understanding of teacher work with their classes. Challenges encountered in previous discussions among Japanese special educators (Kikkawa, 2007; Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a) point to the need to keep research questions simple and to open up the inquiry to what special educators do and value as well as what they say, in order to step away from a bias to an Australian-Western cultural lens on teacher work.

A two-case method of inquiry can explore the teaching of these children within and between cultures and, by describing teaching in two cultural contexts side by side, can make clear and visible those aspects of teaching these children that are either universal or culture specific. The focus group interviews with Japanese and Australian special educators (Kikkawa, 2007; Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a) suggested that gaps in the everyday work of special educators may appear between (a) Japanese and Australian teaching for children with ASD, (b) systematic ABA building of individual children’s skills and naturalistic, relationship-oriented, and peer-supported ways of teaching lessons and interacting with the class, and (c) professional learning and self-improvement in classroom teaching through collaboration among special education teachers. A more comprehensive inquiry into these classroom practitioners can be used to further clarify these related suggestions.

There are several sound reasons for this two-case inquiry linked to the routine, specialised, and professional characterisation of teacher work identified by Kemmis (2009). First, it provides a description of the everyday routine realities of what English-language teachers actually do in Australian classrooms and the actual match with EBPs for children with ASD recommended in the English-language literature (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). Second, it contributes to classroom research on specialised teaching of a small natural group towards long-term goals (Greenspan & Wieder, 2006; Koegel, Koegel, & Camarata, 2010); a related topic on long-term social interaction is professional development in planning curriculum units of work and lessons through teacher collaboration in Japan (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; Isoda, Stephens, Ohara, & Miyakawa, 2007; Oshima et al., 2006; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999), Australia (Carter et al., 2009), and the USA (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009). Finally, it enriches the public
English-language documentation of the professional practice of Japanese special educators, which has been in short supply.

**Research Questions**

This two-case inquiry seeks to describe the complex and dynamic work performed by special educators in a simple and open manner. One simple question about this work was parsed, for convenience, into three related questions. The language of the questions was expressed as openly as possible to compile an adequate accounting of each case while anticipating adjustments to conceptual and methodological fit appropriate to the participants in each case.

The definitional reach of “work” comprising the descriptive reach of this inquiry was crystallised into key terms of work dealing progressively with routine work conditions, specialised instruction, and professional relationships valued in the goals and outcomes of teaching. A simple definition of “work” and “working” was obtained by inspection of the extensive Microsoft Word thesaurus entries for these terms. Descriptors typically started with the more physical and concrete entries such as employment conditions (e.g., hours of work); they then extended to operational and functional topics relating to work practice (e.g., units of work for the class and related pedagogy); and eventually they progressed towards topics involving performing and effecting actions that are successful in some expected and valued way (e.g., relationships relevant to teachers’ perceptions of successful instruction).

Hence, this simple parsing of three levels of description of the work of these special educators provides a statement of three research questions (RQs 1-3) for this inquiry about (a) work in everyday routines, (b) group instruction in formal lessons and other interactions with their class, and (c) valued outcomes of this work.

- What makes up the daily practice of special education teachers working with children with ASD? (RQ1)
- How do special education teachers use group instruction to teach children with ASD? (RQ2)
- What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction? (RQ3)

These RQs about teacher work with a child with ASD within a small class frame this inquiry throughout literature review, methodology, case study analysis and findings, and discussions. In this inquiry, a broad focus on teacher instruction with the class as a group is maintained across (a) everyday schedules and work timetables, (b) work in lessons and across cycles of lesson planning, and (c) perceived value of teaching.

The aim of RQ1 is to describe everyday working practice of special educators in Japan and Australia observed and described across a teaching day and across weeks of teaching. From day to day, work routines include physical time-and-space organisation and curriculum management. From week to week, moreover, work routines include the teaching cycle of
plan–implement–reflect–revise lessons. These data show the use of recommended interventions for a child with ASD in special education classes throughout a day and help to situate the teaching of specific lessons to the whole class.

The aim of RQ2 is to describe normal working processes of group instruction for primary age children with ASD in Japan and Australia. Specialist teaching of the whole class may include the kind, extent, and reasons for formal lessons. In particular, teaching of units of work on life-skills learning that are core curriculum for special needs classes may be expected to provide a common thread within which to explore the ways in which Japanese and Australian special educators engage with their respective class as a whole group from lesson to lesson over a term of life-skills study. These data help to describe the unfolding process of social interactions in whole-class instruction and locate the child with ASD in group instruction.

The aim of RQ3 is to describe the special educators’ professional assessment and monitoring of teaching outcomes across lessons and over time. Valued subjective and objective outcomes of group instruction may involve improvements in the child with ASD, the teacher, and the school related to participation in class lessons and other interactions. These data show the emergence of forces that influence the teacher’s relationships with child, instruction, and school.

Terminology

Some terms need to be phrased in open-ended, broad, simple, and descriptive language relevant to the two cases, as some of these educational terms may have different meanings in Japanese and Australian settings (Kikkawa, 2007). Certain educational terms (e.g., lesson and collaboration) have particular meaning in the Japanese case. They are addressed in the description of the Japanese case findings in Chapter 4 and listed in “Key Japanese Terms” (p. viii) to that chapter.

Phrasing of key terms is simplified to help avoid technical arguments that may narrow the focus of inquiry in the two cases and facilitate multimethod cross-cultural inquiry. Practical language helps to capture what the special education teachers are actually doing and thinking about in the two cases. Key terms comprise the pervasive developmental disorder of ASD, children rather than students, the special education classroom teacher, daily practice, peer interaction activity versus group instruction, lesson, and Western countries.

*Autism spectrum disorder (ASD).* The term, ASD, refers to a range of developmental disorders, with early onset in infancy and early childhood and pervasive effects on development and access to educational opportunities. The spectrum referred to the variations with child age, severity of condition, and unique individual characteristics. During the course of this inquiry, diagnostic classification systems allowed a broader range of features and subgroups across a spectrum. Impairments in social and communication domains, restricted repetitive and
stereotyped patterns of behaviours, interests, and activities, and abnormal sensory functioning were the main features (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). The restated diagnostic criteria in DSMV (McPartland, Reichow, & Volkmar, 2012) have firmly identified social-communicative and ritual-repetitive categories as core features. Formal diagnosis as the basis for special placement was well-established in Australian education about 10 years earlier than in Japan (Kikkawa, 2007). In this inquiry, the singular acronym ASD is used rather than the more heterogeneous spectrum of ASD to refer to the literature (with exceptions spelled out), and the ASD is comorbid with the disorder of ID in this inquiry. The majority of children with autism have ID; however, this inquiry uses the generic term of ASD.

A fairly commonly shared international view of the disorder was based on the presence of social, communication, behavioural, and sensory impairments (e.g., Dodd, 2005; Murray, 2012). With respect to Western education, a concern about social and communication impairments that interfere with communication skills and cognitive development has been expressed (Luyster, Kadlec, Carter, & Tager-Flusberg, 2008), but there have been no specific research on the concern. Moreover, teachers were concerned about rapid responses to problem behaviours that disturb group instruction and learning experiences in the classroom (Hemmeter, Ostrosky, & Corso, 2012). Hobson (2013) also reported that all children with autism had problems in interacting with others although they indicated a great variation of individual needs.

Another view of disability as a social phenomenon that is established in a cultural context suggested different meanings for functional impairment (Devlieger, 1999). For example, Goggin and Newell (2003) argued that impairment owes its meaning to the culture and makes disability apparent in that culture. Brown and Rogers (2003) also argued that the larger society and its cultural values determine what is important about disability. Researchers have reported some evidence of cultural specificity in the particular social-related skills and abilities of most societal concern (e.g., Chen & French, 2008; Lewis, Koyasu, et al., 2009; Matson, Tureck, Turygin, Beighley, & Rieske, 2012; Matson et al., 2011). Lewis, Koyasu, et al. (2009), who examined the role of social interactions in developing self-control and social understandings between Asian (e.g., Japan, China, and Korea) and Western cultures (e.g., USA and United Kingdom, UK), argued that links among variables in one culture cannot be taken as universal. More specifically for children with ASD, Matson et al. (2011) argued that differences in parents’ expectations of their child’s developmental behaviours affect their views of certain behaviours or core ASD-symptoms (e.g., nonverbal communication/socialisation, verbal communication, and restricted interest) as normal or abnormal.

*Child or children.* These general terms are used to refer to the students with disabilities (SWD in the general disability literature) with whom participating teachers are working across a wide age range (i.e., four to twelve years old). These terms are relevant to the socio-emotional curriculum emphasised in early childhood education in the English-language literature, which may be linked to teaching social-related skills to young children with ASD through the primary
school years. Kikkawa (2007) found a variety of terms including children, kids, and people being used by Australian teachers when they talked about teaching pupils with ASD, whereas Japanese special educators most frequently referred to kodomotachi or children. This language appeared to be a direct expression of their child-focused understanding of their teaching (Kemmis, 2009). Other terms of peers, students, and other related terms will be used as appropriate in this inquiry. The term, students with disabilities (SWD), is used in relation to students with special needs in the special education literature.

*Special education classroom teacher.* This term is employed to define specialist teachers who spend most of their day with a class including at least one child with ASD. This terminology was helpful in searching for an Australian site, where primary schools in the state of Queensland were transitioning from separate small classes for special needs children including one or two children with ASD to larger inclusive classes with specialist teacher consultation. Some special education units were converting to use for individual instruction for literacy and numeracy, and units were being used as residual settings for children with very mixed needs atypical of ID/ASD units. In Japan, special education units in primary schools are maintained by some prefectures (i.e., government of state or region of a whole country) for teaching small ID/ASD classes. In addition to public schools, some research schools attached to their host national universities also provide full-time placement of special education units.

*Daily practice.* In this inquiry, daily practice refers to naturally occurring teaching throughout a day. Routines of everyday work involve what the special educators do and how they work with children with ASD in a class throughout a day. Various activities and duties occupying a special educator may be scheduled explicitly or not.

*Group activity.* Group activity refers to activity that children do together with one or more peers. This term is concerned with the actual use of peer-oriented activity to teach children with ASD in a group setting. Encouragement of direct and mutual interaction with peers has been noted in Japanese regular education and suggested in special education (Kikkawa, 2007). Special educators in Japan appeared to encourage children to engage in direct and mutual interaction with each other whereas those in Australia appeared to encourage class practice of individuals’ social skills (Kikkawa, 2007). The engagement of a child with ASD in group activity can be observed in this inquiry.

*Group instruction.* This phrase refers to teaching several children at the same time and is chosen as the general term (Noonan, 2006) to address classroom teaching. It includes whole class group activities and small group activities for teaching a group lesson. For example, teacher-directed instruction can mean that a teacher stands in front of the whole class and gives instructions to the whole class, while the class sit at their desks and listen and respond to the teacher’s instruction.

*Lesson.* A general definition of a lesson as a set or identified period of time with specific learning goals was introduced to distinguish it from a pedagogical perspective on
integrated learning. This distinction was somewhat relevant to curriculum developments in Australia. Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009) reported that Japanese and American teachers have different views of a lesson (i.e., more holistic or concrete; see details in the section of Group Instruction in Chapter 2).

Western countries. Although Australia and Japan are both parts of the Asia–Pacific Rim, Australian education has followed the trends in teaching children with ASD dominated by the USA and also influenced by the UK. In this inquiry, Australia is regarded as a country that aligns with Western trends in the English-language literature. Despite Japanese exposure to the USA approach to education after World War II, its education system has continued to espouse its own cultural values.

Structure of the Thesis

Tables and figures are used freely and purposefully to visualise elements of working practice and to unpack the complexity of their relationships (Buckley & Waring, 2013) through six chapters. Chapter numbers are employed for their captions for readers’ convenience. This introductory chapter outlined the background and rationale for the inquiry. Chapter 2 discusses the relevant literature framed within each research question. Chapter 3 outlines a qualitative cross-cultural case study employed in this inquiry and addresses methodological issues arising through this inquiry and solutions provided to these issues.

Chapter 4 presents analysis and case findings of the Japanese case study, while Chapter 5 reports analysis and findings of the Australian case study. Although the framework for gathering data and analysing findings in the two cases was similar, the processes used in fitting methods and findings to the research questions were slightly different. Chapter 6 then outlines the synthesis of shared and case-specific aspects of teaching across the two cases and considers practical strengths of teaching across the two cases, relates findings to the relevant literature outlined in Chapter 2, and addresses the value of intercultural lens on specialist teaching of a group of special needs and methodological limitations of this research. The next chapter outlines the relevant literature.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter outlines the literature relating to each of the three research foci: Daily practice, group instruction, and valued outcomes for teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia. First, the overview of this chapter illustrates the interconnectedness and cultural constructions of the three research topics. Each topic is then considered separately in turn to structure the approach used throughout this inquiry.

Overview

In this chapter, consideration is given to the everyday routines of special educators in small classes, their specialised instruction of a group of children with disabilities with high needs for life-skills lessons, and the outcomes of group instruction valued by special educators professionally licensed to practise in this setting. In Japan and Australia, the three research questions about the classroom teaching of special educators working with children with intellectual disabilities (ID) are related to various perspectives on teacher work. These perspectives included but were not restricted to (a) the Kemmis (2009) description of the work of teachers as routinised, specialised, and professional, with (b) the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases of lesson development cycles in teacher work and (c) the personal, professional, and political aspects of teacher work (Noffke, 1997).

Tables and figures have been used extensively in this chapter. Early figures mapped some key notions about teacher work that help to illustrate aspects of the complexity of the teaching of special educators with small classes and, thus, to build on the initial overview in Chapter 1 (see RQ1). Tables have been used to show: structural similarities in Japanese and Australian educational policy, procedures and programming, and curriculum frameworks for the schooling years; the Japanese lesson study cycle and its loose connectedness to the Kemmis (2009) and Noffke (1997) ideas about teacher work; and the range of approaches and strategies of classroom intervention canvassed for children with ASD (see RQ2). Figures are used to illustrate both the levels of influence on teacher accountability for their work (see RQ3) and the filtering of personal, professional, and political aspects of teacher work down through the three research questions and their contribution to the overall complexity of inquiring into working practice for a special educator with a small class.
The fairly recent addition of children with ASD to classes for children with ID has exposed Japanese and Australian special educators to new experience with these children and new theory about teaching these children and new classroom dynamics with children with ASD in their small classes. More specifically, the policy on autism as a separate category of educational need was enacted by Education Queensland in 1993 but not until in 2007 in Japan (MEXT, 2006b). Many children with ASD were enrolled in special education classrooms designed for ID because ASD has co-occurred frequently with ID (Matson & Nebel-Schwalm, 2007). In many of the uncertain situations that special educators have encountered in working with a child with ASD in their small classes of children with disabilities, they may have repeated, reoriented, or actively reshaped established traditions (Kemmis, 2009), within the traditions of thought and traditions of living relevant to specialist teaching of children with disabilities in small classrooms and within the collective teaching traditions in each country.

Special educators, therefore, have been using governmental prescription to create a life-skills curriculum for children with ID to meet the social and communicative needs of children with ASD in their classrooms. For example, in Japanese special education for children with ID, the teaching has been focused on children learning from everyday experience rather than from content-based instruction in discrete subjects (e.g., mathematics and science) and providing creative and innovative lessons around children’s learning needs (Japanese National Institute of Special Needs Education; NISE, 2006). Groups of special educators have organised lesson study activities under these flexible work conditions. Similarly, Australian special education has also involved adjustment of a regular curriculum and some expectation of collegial consultation. It may have been taken for granted that the lessons that special educators prepare and deliver to their small classes meet the children’s needs.

The conditions of working practice as teachers of a small group of children with extra educational needs in the modern economies of Japan and Australia have fashioned some tensions in balancing, for example, intensive individual instruction and group instruction, research-based ideas about teaching children with ASD and practice-based experience and feedback about teaching in group lessons, and individualistic and cooperative values. On one hand, special educators have been able to call upon a body of Western research and review of evidence-based interventions to respond to the atypical interactions of a child with ASD; on the other hand, they have been able to call on the tradition of regular classroom teaching of larger groups of children in their work practices with small classes of children with special needs. These tensions are expected to run through the research questions in this descriptive inquiry and through research-question related issues of: (a) teachers planning a day and their personal knowledge of teaching days; (b) teaching a lesson and their specialist theorising about their lessons to the whole class; and (c) reflecting on lesson success and their professional accountability for that success.
The present inquiry addresses the everyday realities occupying special educators at this time. It largely predates the profound rationale for Australian teachers, as individuals or groups, transforming their practice through action research that has occupied Kemmis (2009) but taps into the established Japanese way of using lesson study to transform their practice through action research (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009). The Kemmis (2009) view of teacher work as an overall approach to group teaching constructed from, more or less, coherent overlapping of teachers’ combination of their strategic thinking, acting, and relating can be applied to special educators who are working in everyday routines, teaching lessons to the class group, and interacting with children in their class, their colleagues, their school, and other circumstances that shape their practice.

In this chapter, reviewing of policy documents and the literature about daily practice, group instruction, and valued outcomes suggests that there are aspects common both to the Japanese and Australian teacher work and practice. In the first section of this chapter, reviewing daily practice indicates that, in accord with government provisions for special education, traditional teacher roles shape the activities and duties of special educators; they work throughout the day to complete these teaching related tasks; and they support children with ASD across a day. In the second section, considering the literature on group instruction indicates that teachers in both countries are engaged not only in a traditional teaching cycle of plan–implement–evaluate to deliver classroom teaching but also in a research-informed set of approaches and strategies to classroom interaction while implementing group instruction. In the third section, reviewing valued outcomes indicates that the teacher-valued success in working with children with ASD is aligned with both the national and school curriculum and that their engagement in everyday work and practice provides them with professional development as special educators.

**Daily Practice**

It has been generally recognised that the daily routines of teacher work involve not only teaching a class but also various activities relating to that classroom teaching. Generations of regular teachers have built traditions of work upon a cycle of teaching activities (i.e., plan, implement, evaluate, and revise lessons) and have gradually acquired higher levels of self-aware knowledge of teaching theory over and above technical lesson skills (e.g., Larrivee, 2008). To a greater or lesser extent, they have also worked with colleagues and with others in the education system across these activities inside and outside their classrooms.

In this first section, a macro view of educational theory and tradition considers changing policy and ideas about teaching, the teaching profession, and educational research on teaching. An analysis of contextual layers of influences on teacher work reviews culturally situated influences on Japanese teaching. Current education in Japan and Australia and the cultural and
historical traditions affecting education for children with ASD in Japanese national education and Australian education, particularly for the state education of Queensland, are noted.

**Influences on teacher work and practice**

Various educational commentators have proposed that teachers bring to their work not only the evidence of their lived experience but also their own theorising to interpret their daily realities (e.g., Dall'Alba, 2009; Kemmis, 2009; ten Have, 2004). In critiques of some educational research by these commentators, it has been argued that theory of practice based on educational research outside the classroom needs to accept that practitioners engage in making and remaking their own work rather than simply implementing others’ theory. Teachers have been “required to take any new issues into account before those issues can be fully grasped, while continuing to make judgements, acting on the basis of those judgements, and facing the consequences of their actions” (Dall'Alba, 2009, p. 4). This active role has been interpreted to mean that teachers can use their thoughts and experiences to improve their classroom activities (e.g., Kemmis, 1997; Kemmis, 2009; Kemmis & Smith, 2008; Kemmis & Weeks, 1998). This notion of teacher reflection about their work has appeared in various forms (e.g., lesson study in Japan; action research by a teacher and a school in Australia and the USA).

Figure 2.1 illustrates three interconnected personal, professional, and political components of teacher work, its knowledge base, and the form and process of teacher professional development (Noffke, 1997). A premise that any and all elements identified in models of teacher work influence other elements has been a common denominator of the different but not incompatible ways in which this model and various other models have carved up the construct of teacher work. This modelling was designed to help teachers to understand and improve the overlapping influences on their work. With the increasing visibility of the educational profession in both research and practice, a mix of combined personal, professional, and political components have supplied teachers’ everyday experience to their personal knowledge base for teaching and professional development (Noffke, 1997).

*Figure 2.1. Three overlapping dimensions of teacher work (based on Noffke’s idea, 1997).*
From the Noffke model, it appears that the personal component of everyday practice has involved more than a teacher’s individualised response to stress or creative style of managing work conditions. It has also involved their own accumulated knowledge base about teaching and their exposure to and active interpretation of professional and political influences and their reciprocal influences on teacher work. For example, teachers have strengthened their understanding of their workplace through professional collaborations with inschool colleagues and with university researchers (Beamish & Bryer, 2012; Holden, 2002). Team work has helped teachers cope with external political influences that require ongoing practitioner updates (e.g., respond to current debates, new policy, or changes in curriculum) and that place extra pressure on teacher work in classrooms. Outside experts such as university professors have sometimes brought professionally relevant knowledge into the school environment.

A clear picture of the meaning of the phrase, culturally situated practice (Ball & Forzani, 2007; Dall’Alba, 2009; Kemmis, 2009; Noffke, 1997) has often been veiled by the cultural specificity of the work context. For example, Stigler and Hiebert (1999) pointed out the unstudied and taken-for-granted influences of cultural conventions on teacher work. They noted that cultural values and conventions usually assumed in Japan, the USA, and Germany have situated the development of educational traditions experienced and practised in their own countries.

Figure 2.2 presents seven levels of situated research and policy involving various political, professional, and personal components (Noffke, 1997) that may bear on a special educator’s work in teaching a child with ASD along with other children with special needs. A layered analysis of sociocultural conditions of daily work realities that affect teaching in each school and by each teacher was based on the well-known ecological model provided by Bronfenbrenner (Bronfenbrenner, 1995, 1999). Consideration of each level, from global to individual, showed the many kinds of influence on the teaching of children with ASD. Examples were taken from Japan, especially when its education system is known to deviate from the research-informed Western catalogue of interventions and treatments for children with ASD (Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010; Odom et al., 2005; Simpson et al., 2005).

At Level 7, international trends in research have often created international movements in education. As noted in Chapter 1, several studies have reported rapid growth in the prevalence of young children with ASD around the globe. The increasing number of children with ASD presenting for schooling with this diagnosis has influenced international efforts to provide children with ASD with appropriate education and service provision and to study, catalogue, and rank many treatments or interventions for children with ASD. The best disseminated resourcing of these efforts in the USA and the UK has affected the lower layers for many countries including Australia and Japan. However, the timing of diagnostic based eligibility for placement occurred later in Japan than in Australia (Kikkawa, 2007). The Japanese history of educational classification of developmental disabilities is outlined later.
Figure 2.2. Levels of influence impacting everyday work of teachers.

At Level 6, culture has also affected choice of treatments. Some Japanese researchers studied Western recommended practices (e.g., Koita & Sonoyama, 2004; Koita, Sonoyama, & Takeuchi, 2003; Sasaki, 2000; Yokoyama, Naoi, & Yamamoto, 2006). However, the initial Japanese attitude towards the skills-based approaches remained negative (Shimizu & Tamamura, 1997; Ujimori, 2002). It appears that cultural preference influenced the national direction of education and research on education. Most recently, one book of positive behaviour support published in 2003 (Crone & Horner) has been translated by Japanese researchers (Noro, Mitachi, Ohkubo, & Sato, 2013). One of the translators commented in his personal blog that their long-time commitment of translation made this book content more relevant to the Japanese education that is now more focused on inclusive education (Ohkubo, 2013). It also suggests that cultural preference takes time to shift from one to another.

At Level 5, political and financial reality has also affected the direction of research and education. National policies have framed education systems that determine who teachers serve in their schools and have guided national curriculum on what or how the teachers teach their students. For example, the Japanese national system has typically controlled prefecture departments of education, and teacher education in national universities for special education has shaped skills and knowledge for preservice teachers. In Japan, as in Australian and the USA, there has been variation in the range of teacher training programs for special educators: While Barnhill, Polloway, and Sumutka (2011) spelled out the composition of Western teacher training emphasising skills-based curriculum for special education support for children with
ASD, university programs in the USA and Australia have offered a range of approaches, while many teachers working in special education have not even obtained formal qualifications in this field (Zhang, Wang, Losinski, & Katsiyannis, 2014).

At Level 4, the local Japanese government or department has then audited the schools and employed and allocated teachers to public schools. Whereas special educators in Japan typically gained experience in elementary schools before being allocated to a specialist setting, Australian teachers with specialist qualifications typically went straight into special needs settings (Kikkawa, 2007). However, no formal qualification in special education is required to teach children with special needs in Japan (Hirose & Sasamori, 2009). Since the USA federal legislation of No Child Behind Act promoted more inclusive education in the USA (Level 6 event), Australian education has also become inclusive. During the present inquiry, state and regional education policy makers in Queensland were in the process of reallocating some resources of special educators from work in specialist units in primary school to inclusion consultancy and co-teaching in the regular classroom.

At Level 3, the professional roles and positions of educators within their community have affected teacher work. In an early comparison of Japanese and American regular education, Sato and McLaughlin (1992) suggested that teachers’ role and responsibilities are products of the cultures in which they are embedded. They stated that a Japanese traditional emphasis on educating the “whole person” (Cummings, 1980; Holloway, 1988; Stevenson, 1991) extends teachers’ responsibilities outside school boundaries. Japanese expectations of teachers have driven work commitment outside school hours (Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2006) and outside school walls (Kikkawa, 2007). The Japanese ideal for education has broadly defined routine teacher responsibilities for the physical, mental, moral, and social development of children, such that teacher work can have all-encompassing effects on their personal lives (Kikkawa, 2007).

At Level 2, each school has established its own culture and educational aims (constructed in line with national and state policies or curriculum) and its own climate of human relationships among colleagues or between teachers and administration. Collaboration has traditionally been used in Japanese regular and special education settings (Matoba & Sarkar Arani, 2006; Matoba, Shibata, & Sarkar Arani, 2007). Co-planning of curriculum has been embedded also in Australian inclusive curriculum (Education Queensland, 2008b).

Finally, at Level 1, individual teachers have delivered teaching to children in classes, based on their own knowledge and beliefs as well as their professional development and experience and their policies and resourcing characteristic of their political context. Their beliefs have been constructed through their experiences within their contexts. In this sense, this analysis confirmed the complex interplay of contextual contributors across situations that have guided who, what, when, and how individual teachers teach their children with ASD.

One study of the daily teaching of American special educators was conducted by Vannest and Hagan-Burke (2010). They observed teacher use of time and analysed the kinds of
activities in which teachers engage across the school day. They characterised these educators’
time use as “full of activity” (p. 138), which indicates their busy teaching days. They also
reported that their time use is complex because these educators engaged in multiple activities at
the same time (e.g., academic instruction, nonacademic instruction, and instructional support are
possibly combined to represent “teaching time”). This complexity made the teaching day of
individual teachers unique.

Both Australia and Japan have needed to reframe school education and teacher
education to accommodate children with disabilities and extended educational needs. As a
requirement for quality of education for children with ASD, curriculum has been reviewed and
refocused on key learnings. The following subsections outline cultural and historical
perspectives on education for each country.

**Cultural and historical perspectives on Japanese special education**

Special education for students with disabilities and, more specifically for children with ASD,
has undergone major changes in recent decades. In broad terms, the rate of students and children
targeted for special education was estimated at 20 percent in the UK and 10-16 percent in the
USA whereas it was 1.4 percent in Japan (Shimizu, 2003). Until recently, children with ASD
were excluded from Japanese special education service (2007) and welfare systems (2005)
unless they had other diagnosed disabilities (i.e., intellectual, vision, hearing, and physical) or
other health impairments. For a long transitional period, they were classified within a category
of emotional disorder in education but not welfare and health.

Early follow-up surveying of Japanese children with ASD showed social adaptation
among children with higher intelligence (e.g., Kobayashi, Murata, & Yoshinaga, 1992). Special
education services were not available in regular classrooms (Tsuge, 2001). Many children at the
high-functioning end of the autism spectrum were placed in regular classrooms without
appropriate support (Ministry of Education; now Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports,
Science, and Technology; MEXT, 2002b).

Education in school settings for children with disabilities had been focussed on the
development of ways to teach children with severe ID. Special educational provision for
children with ASD in Japan had involved either (a) a special school especially for children with
ID, (b) a special classroom located within a regular school and designed for children with ID or
emotional disorders, or (c) a tsukyu classroom (i.e., resource room in which children are
enrolled and receive instruction in both special and regular classrooms) in neighbourhood
schools. While each prefecture (i.e., regional educational department) was responsible for
special schools, the teacher board in each municipality (i.e., city, town, and village) was
responsible for a special classroom or resource room.

Education for children with ASD has been provided either at jyoucho-shougaiji-gakkyu
(i.e., special classrooms for children with emotional disorders) or at chiteki-shougaiji-gakkyu
(i.e., those for children with ID). The first special classroom for children with emotional disorders, established in an elementary school in Tokyo in 1969, targeted children with ASD within a government category of jyoucho-shougai or emotional disturbance in the educational field (Jinno, 2008). According to Ohminami (2007), the political term of jyoucho-shougai was first used for a special short-term facility established by the Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare (now Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare) for children with emotional disorder in 1961. A 1967 national survey and report about emotional and physical disabilities in students and children also had a significant influence on Japanese understanding of ASD (Nomura, 1987; Shimizu, 1987). The reason for including ASD in this category was stated in a Ministry of Education publication (Jinno, 2008, p. 153):

Jyoucho-shougai is translated into emotional disturbance in English that can be translated back to jyoucho-no-konran, midare or emotional disturbance, confusion … The term of emotional disturbance could be used for “a phenomena or fact” … That is, it could be called jyoucho shougai if there is a child who has a lack of emotion or cannot have emotional interactions with others … Jiheishou [i.e., ASD] is matched to jyoucho-shougai because jiheishou has the most featuring difficulties in establishing human relationships, especially emotional bond.

The modern view of developmental disability has moved forward in Japanese education and welfare. Specifically, Hattatsu-shougai-sha-shien-hou (Law to Support Persons with Developmental Disabilities; LSPDD) stipulated that ASD is one developmental disability that usually becomes apparent at an early age including autism, Asperger’s syndromes and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD), learning disabilities/disorders (LD), attention-deficit hyperactivity disorders (ADHD), and other similar “cerebral dysfunctions” (Section 1 of Article 2; Japanese Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, 2004). Prior to the enforcement of this law, there was no governmental documentation about classification of developmental disabilities including ASD. The LSPDD was the first official documentation in Japan to define the diagnosis of these developmental disabilities and to clearly mention the necessary support for a person with those disabilities, including early diagnosis and intervention.

Following this legislation, a report by the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare (2005) shaped the support for early diagnosis and intervention for developmental disabilities in infants and children and also structured the support for training professionals to work with children with ASD. This significant movement in the welfare framework of disabilities also affected the Japanese educational framework. After a national survey of children with higher educational needs in regular classrooms (MEXT, 2002b), the Ministry proposed a new idea about education for children with disabilities. The new MEXT noncategorical disability framework of special education, focusing on individual needs rather than diagnoses (i.e., Special Needs Education), was translated first as “Special Support Education” on the MEXT website but was replaced officially by “Special Needs Education.”

Japan also made significant changes in regular educational policies and regulations in response to the apparently growing prevalence of children with special needs in regular education over the last decade. The Revised Basic Act on Education, made to meet the demand
for change since the Law was enforced in 1947, was submitted to the Japanese Congress and issued in 2006 (MEXT, 2006c). Moreover, a revolutionary Revised School Education Law to promote Special Needs Education was also issued in 2005 and enforced in 2007 (MEXT, 2006b). Its major change was the naming of schools or classrooms for students or children with any disabilities. The old law stipulated disability-specialised schools or classrooms depending on the category of disabilities (e.g., vision, hearing, intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, and health impairments). The new law stipulated “Schools for Special Needs Education” without reference to categories. This change has made it possible to support the education for children with developmental disability including ASD by law.

Moreover, the Japanese Regulation of Operating School Education Law recategorised ASD to an independent category separate from an umbrella category of emotional disorder (MEXT, 2006b). Education had finally adopted usage in other fields (i.e., medicine and welfare) that already distinguished between ASD and emotional disorder. Differences in causes and educational requirements of children with ASD became officially recognised in legal documents; education in resource rooms started to separate the category of children with ASD from those with emotional disorder as well as adding new categories of learning disabilities and ADHD. However, it has remained the case that education for most children with dual diagnosis of ASD and ID is still provided in special schools or classrooms for ID (Hirose & Sasamori, 2009).

Cultural and historical perspectives on Australian special education

Federal legislation including the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 and Disability Standards for Education 2005 provided a national framework that applies to all schools in Australia (Cumming, 2011). This framework ensures that children with disabilities can access education on the same basis as other children and required that schools make reasonable adjustments for equal opportunities for these children with disabilities. As the label “special education” was replaced in many state education jurisdictions in Australia, the Queensland education system also adopted more inclusive policy initiatives. Federal efforts to introduce the standards have been ongoing (Australian Department of Education Employment and Workplace Relations, 2012).

Postings on the Education Queensland website declared that special education programs and special education services provide support to children with disabilities including ASD from Prep to Year 12 and assist classroom teachers in developing and implementing individualised education programs for each child (http://education.qld.gov.au/schools/disability/index.html). Moreover, an Educational Adjustment Profile (EAP) was developed to identify and respond to educational needs of children who meet criteria for six EAP disability categories: ASD, hearing impairment, intellectual disability, physical impairment, speech-language impairment, and vision impairment. This program was being introduced into regular state schools during the
period of the current inquiry. Moreover, some Queensland schools used a schoolwide positive behaviour support (PBS) framework that emphasised data-based decision making and evidence-based teacher practices (Education Queensland, 2013c).

**Implications for daily practice**

Cross-cultural observations of classrooms recognised the social activity in teaching (Stigler & Hiebert, 1998, 1999). Recent classroom-oriented research in education has directly linked child outcomes to the teaching in their natural environments (Kroeger et al., 2009; Panerai et al., 2009). The interest in instruction in this approach to classroom research required educational researchers to be more aware of the social nature of teacher work in general.

Figure 2.3 presents the three components of teacher work described by the Australian educational methodologist, Kemmis (2009). He argued that educational researchers need to collect data on all of the do–say–relate expressions to understand teacher work and that a precondition for teachers to improve their teaching practice was teacher awareness of the interconnectedness of their language, their actions, and their relationships. For example, curriculum expressed in words could prompt different actions, perhaps because a school–community mismatch in power affects classroom interactions. Although teachers’ thinking about and understanding of what they want to achieve created intentions to act in a particular way, there have been anecdotal reports that classroom teaching has not enacted the intention or original planning exactly. For example, “curriculum intent” for classroom learning in Queensland P-12 Curriculum Framework (Education Queensland, 2008b) has generated some gaps in enacted curriculum affected by, for example, relationships among children or their current abilities may differ from initial intentions.

*Figure 2.3. Gaps between intended and enacted curriculum in teacher work (based on Kemmis’s ideas, 2009).*
Figure 2.4 illustrates the Ball and Forzani (2007) “instructional dynamic” of multiple interactions that involve “active processes of interpretation that constitute teaching and learning” (p. 530). The arrows between teacher–peer–content elements (i.e., anchor points) in the simple figure show the potential dynamics of mutual adjustments within classroom instruction. Teachers were said to have the flexibility to interact with children, interpret subject content and their children (e.g., current ability or interests, relationships), and deliver a lesson based on their interpretation to the children in their lessons. Children were said to reciprocally interpret the teacher, subject content and their classmates, and make their response to the lesson. What was happening at any anchor point of the triangle was interdependent with other points such as (a) the specific children interacting in specific learning environments with each other, their tasks, and their teacher; (b) the specific teaching materials, curriculum, and policy settings; and (c) the specific instructional methods of specifically trained teachers.

Teachers have often encountered difficulties in assessing individual children because teachers serving a group of children in their classrooms, rather than one child, have been dealing with extra dynamic demands. For example, an individual child’s progress in understanding of the topic or problem needed to be assessed in order to decide the next steps according to that child’s development and knowledge (Ball & Forzani, 2007, 2009; Letts, 2013). Although Ball and Forzani (2007, 2009) did not explicitly consider cross-cultural application, the flexibility of the model accommodated socially situated instruction in classroom, school, and broader educational environments. The conceptual recognition of socially and culturally situated classroom interactions acknowledged potential contextual influences on child learning, teaching, and assessment of curriculum including gaps between curriculum intent and enactment.
Figure 2.5 presents a visualisation of Japanese lesson study that shows some parallels to the Ball and Forzani model. In “a user’s guide to Japanese lesson study” introducing the concept of Japanese lesson study to the American mathematics education community, Curcio (2002) also identified three areas of teaching or learning (i.e., teacher, children, and content) and directed American practitioners to focus on these areas when they observe and discuss teaching. This guide also highlighted a focus of this Japanese lesson study about improving teaching, rather than about perfecting a single lesson, thorough group implementation because observers can make valuable suggestions and provide insights into complex relationships among children, teacher, mathematic content, and classroom experience (Curcio, 2002, p. 8). Many other American and some Australian researchers have continued to use a lesson study model to study classroom activities and curriculum learning in regular education (e.g., Kriewaldt, 2012; Tolle, 2010). However, there has been no documentation published in the English language about what Japanese special educators actually do in a cycle of lesson study (to be discussed later).

![Diagram of teaching a group in Japanese lesson study](from Curcio, 2002, p. 8)

**Figure 2.5.** Scheme of teaching a group in Japanese lesson study (from Curcio, 2002, p. 8).

Figure 2.6 shows that focus groups of special educators in Japan and Australia appeared to start in different directions when they talked among themselves about their working practice with a child with ASD in their special needs classes in a primary school unit. Kikkawa (2007) reported three themes of teacher roles, disability framework, and classroom strategies emerging from separate content analyses. In both the Japanese and Australian focus groups, teachers had a clear sense of themselves as special educators, of the child with autism in their classes, and of their methods of teaching those children. While these themes were reasonable and likely foci for teacher talk, they were imbued with different perceptions embedded in their cultural situations and, thus, appeared to cohere into different approaches to their work.

Kikkawa (2007) also noted different ways of integrating ideas and data that infused the three shared themes, which seemed to fit within the ten Have (2004) model of teacher-constructed balancing of theory and experience in different classroom contexts (see also, Ragin, 1994; Ragin & Amoroso, 2011). While the Australians first used their ideas from ASD-specific information (e.g., diagnostic information and the EBP literature) to guide their work with the child with ASD in their classes, the Japanese seemed to use their direct experiences of
interacting with this child as their guide, which seemed consistent with established principles of regular Japanese education (e.g., Matoba & Sarkar Arani, 2006).

![Diagram of ideas and evidence]

Figure 2.6. Application of ideas—experience balance of practitioner construction of work (adapted from ten Have, 2004, p. 3; see also, Ragin, 1994, p. 57) to special educators talking about their working practice for a child with ASD.

Comparative differences in textual interplay between ideas about teaching based on ASD theory and data on child learning based on direct experience appeared to be consistent with an active balance between received theory and direct experience by practitioners across social sciences (ten Have, 2004; see also, Kemmis, 2009). That is, as presented in Figure 2.6, the Australians and Japanese appeared to work in different directions to construct a meaningful balance between theory and experience. Self-reported use of skills-based and traditional interpersonal ideas about teaching seemed to cross-over with self-reported use of summative and formative data collection about learning and their complementary use of evidence to affirm and revise these ideas. Further clarification of this interpretation requires more direct observation.

**Group Instruction in Special Education Classrooms**

While there has been considerable attention to the teaching of lessons in regular classrooms in Japan and in the West, it is not clear how special educators deliver group instruction and, at the same time, provide individual support for children with ASD. Teachers in special education
classes have had other children to teach at the same time as they are teaching a child with ASD. The recognition that communication and social skills are building blocks for many children with ASD to achieving quality of life (Hall, 2009, 2013; McAfee, 2002) has opened up group instruction in the classroom context as a topic for research on teaching these children. Curriculum structuring has been spelled out for special educators in Course of Studies in Japan and in the P-12 Curriculum Framework in Queensland and policies and related lesson planning processes (viz., Japanese lesson study in Japan and positive behaviour support for co-planning in Australia). However, teaching of children with ASD in a group requires more information about the specialist pedagogy and assessment involved in teaching of this curriculum and the contribution of social skills to teaching these lessons to the whole class as a group.

It has been argued that natural social environments may foster skills fundamental in social and emotional interaction and preparation for community life (Greenspan & Wieder, 2006). Friendship and good social relationships have been found essential for all children’s quality of life (e.g., Ladd, Herald, & Andrews, 2006). They have also helped children with ASD to avoid loneliness and to make a reasonable adult adjustment (e.g., Bauminger & Kasari, 2001; Bauminger, Shulamn, & Agam, 2003).

Table 2.1 shows a body of classroom observational research that provided a specific model for segmentation of regular classroom teaching into ecological activities (Carter & Doyle, 2006). Components of teacher work were identified in terms of concrete features of the daily routine (time and milieu), lessons for the whole class (focus of lessons and goals for the group), and programs of teacher and student action (Doyle, 2006). Examples for each segment would be applicable to observation of small special needs classes.

Table 2.1

| Classroom Ecological Elements Shared by Japanese and Australian Special Educators (Doyle, 2006) |
| --- | --- |
| Classroom segments | Identified ecologies relevant to this inquiry |
| **Time:** When the action was taken | The first semester of the school year; group lessons |
| **Milieu:** Where the action was taken | Special education classroom accommodating children with dual diagnosis of ASD and ID |
| Who took the action | Special education classroom teachers |
| What was used for the action | Learning materials |
| **Program of action:** How to act | (Main focus of this research) |
| **Focus:** Lesson content | Curriculum such as unit plans and lessons for life-skills development |
| Group concern | Instructional goals and relationships |

Table 2.2 summarises highlights of fundamental information relating to education in Japan and Australia. This table shows that there are structural similarities in the main features of the two educational systems despite differences to functional expression. For example,
government policy on years of schooling and annual time frame, national curriculum across school years and for disability, and school policy on mission and assessment all provided structural conditions for teacher work that apply to special needs classrooms.

Table 2.2
Summary of Structures and Framework Relating to Education in Japan and Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia (Queensland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused documents</td>
<td>Course of Study for Elementary Schools (established in 2008 and enacted in 2011); Fundamental Law on Education; School Education Law</td>
<td>P-12 curriculum framework for Queensland State Schools (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted ages of primary school</td>
<td>Every child who has reached 6 years of age before 1st April in the school year they are enrolled.</td>
<td>Every child who has reached 6 years of age before 30th June in the school year they are enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of compulsory schooling</td>
<td>Kindergarten (not compulsory); elementary school (6 years); secondary school (3 years); high school (3 years, not compulsory): Total years of compulsory schooling = 9 years</td>
<td>Preparatory year (not compulsory); primary school (7 years); secondary school (5 years, compulsory up to Year 10): Total years of compulsory schooling = 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year</td>
<td>Elementary school: Some schools use semesters (2 terms), and others use 3 terms.</td>
<td>Primary school: 2 semesters comprises 4 terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of schools/Education aims</td>
<td>Education aims for the full development of personality and strives to nurture the citizens, sound in mind and body, who are imbued with the qualities necessary for those who form a peaceful and democratic state and society.</td>
<td>To equip young people with the capabilities they will need to contribute to a cohesive society, a strong economy, and a healthy environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key learning areas (regular education)</td>
<td>Subjects: Japanese Language, Social Science (Year 3-6), Arithmetic, Science (Year 3-6), Living Environment Studies (Year 1-2), Music, Arts and Handcraft, Home Economics (Year 5-6), and Physical Education. Others: Moral Education, Foreign Language Activities (Year 5-6), Period for Integrated Studies (Year 3-6), and Special Activities.</td>
<td>Scope and Sequence (Year 1-9): English, Health and Physical Education, Languages Other Than English, Mathematics, Science, Studies of Society and Environment, Technology, and The Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report</td>
<td>A 3-point scale was used for reporting. Until 2002, the scale was graded by the rank of the child’s ability in the classroom. From 2002, the scale was graded with considerations of academic abilities and learning foundation skills. Two or three times yearly.</td>
<td>A 5-point scale was used for reporting in Year 1-10 and in Year 11 and 12 for those children studying QSA subjects. A 5-point scale (Achievement Rating) used to indicate progress is guided by standards, which are an indication of the quality of the learning. Twice-yearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curriculum/programs</td>
<td>Jyugyo kenkyu or Japanese lesson study</td>
<td>Pedagogy-Assessment loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td>Curriculum is developed separately from general education. However, the fundamental curriculum content is the same unless requiring modifications for each child.</td>
<td>Guideline indicates how to implement P-12 Curriculum Framework for children with disabilities in their classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years for compulsory education and annual school time frame differed. For Japan, elementary education was for 6 years, and the school year started in April and ended in March. For Australia, primary education was for 7 years, and the school year started in January and ended in December. Educational aims appeared to differ (i.e., personality-focused in Japan versus ability-focused in Australia). Both education systems identified important learning areas throughout the compulsory school years and allocated combined learning areas especially for early years of elementary or primary education. Moreover, curriculum development through collaborative group work has been established in both systems (Japanese lesson study versus Australian pedagogy–assessment loop).

Teaching lessons

This subsection presents an overview of the curriculum documents, key learning areas, and school curriculum development in Japan and Australia and the teacher’s flexible role in enacting curriculum in special needs classes. Although little research has been conducted to establish how qualified special educators use their knowledge and skills to work with these children in their classrooms, they have had access to a variety of comprehensive approaches to intervention and more focussed intervention strategies. A final topic of this subsection concerns cultural differences in regular classroom teaching in Japan and Australia and their implications for small special needs classes.

New sets of curriculum developed in both countries have highlighted authentic learning for all children. In Japanese education, the notion of Zest for Life re-emphasised the traditional focus on whole-person education (Holloway, 1988; Lewis, 1995a, 1995b) and a balance of three elements in individual children (i.e., academic abilities, richness in humanity, and health and physical strengths). Similarly, new Australian national approach addressed balanced abilities and capacities for children (Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2008, p. 1):

Schools play a vital role in promoting the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development and wellbeing of young Australians, and in ensuring the nation’s ongoing economic prosperity and social cohesion.

Figure 2.7 outlines key learning areas for regular education in primary and early childhood settings as well as adjustments for children with disabilities in Japan and Australia in use at the time of conducting this inquiry. It indicates that both countries have established national standards for regular education across years and content disciplines and have identified instructional and assessment modifications to foundation skills and capacities. It also shows that support for individual children with disabilities has been assisted with individualised programming: an Individual Teaching Plan (ITP) in Japan or Individual Education Plan (IEP) in Australia.
EAP, ILP, and Curriculum provision to students with disability were introduced into Queensland schools prior to field research but were not yet formally implemented by the schools at the time of field research.

Figure 2.7. Parallels in the curriculum framework in Japan and Australia (Queensland).
The Japanese Course of Study stated clear objectives and content aims for each age group of Year 1-2, Year 3-4, and year 5-6 (MEXT, 2008b). These nationwide standards have been used to develop school curriculum and textbooks. Brief explanations of the learning courses also allowed teachers to develop a range of approaches to lesson planning and encouraged teacher group learning through Japanese lesson study. The curriculum comprised nine subjects and four other learning areas. These curricular guidelines were expected to be modified for children with special needs. Another set of curricula gave consideration to special needs education. It contained not only the contents of Japanese Course of Study for regular education but also Learning Activities for Independence and greater focus on Living Environment Studies. Learning through experiences and close connection to development of children’ independence were specified across all learning areas (MEXT, 2009b).

Similarly, Australian Commonwealth and Queensland State governments provided teachers with clear scope-and-sequence frameworks for each learning area for each age group (Education Queensland, 2008a). In addition, reasonable adjustments for students with special needs were outlined in a separate document, and teachers received curriculum flexibility to respond to individual learning needs (Education Queensland, 2009, 2013a, 2013b). More recently, Education Queensland has also published a guideline specifically for educators of students with ASD in collaboration with ASD-specific organisations including Autism Queensland and the aeiou Foundation (Education Queensland, 2012) to inform online resource for, during, and after transition. This information was focused on four key areas: (a) support students with ASD throughout day-to-day routines, (b) allow them to have curriculum access, (c) modify learning environments for them, and (d) support them for continuing success after transition. Furthermore, over 400 Queensland state primary schools have adopted the schoolwide positive behaviour support (PBS) framework, introduced in Queensland in 2005, for their behaviour management systems (Education Queensland, 2013c).

The teachers’ role in Australian curriculum development has undergone review in alignment with development of a national framework for learning. For example, “curriculum” was conceptualised as “curriculum as praxis” (Letts, 2013, p. 186) and as “a particular kind of action … that is morally-committed, and oriented and informed by tradition in a field” (Kemmis & Smith, 2008, p. 4). This pedagogical view of curriculum was distinguished from syllabus documents by the idea that “curriculum is everything” that is lived or experienced by learners either within or outside classrooms (Letts, 2013, p. 190). According to Letts, management of the holistic experiences of learners in comprehensible and doable ways required educators and researchers to use categories or components so that they can understand the whole of curriculum. These specific components of teaching were consistent with various contemporary ideas outlined in the section of daily practice. This pedagogical view of curriculum appeared to be similar to the Japanese term of “lesson study” that is defined not simply as technical.
competence in lesson plan design but rather as a system for building and sharing knowledge among teachers.

The term of ‘lesson study’ is a translation of the Japanese words *Jyugyō* (instruction, lessons, or lesson) and *kenkyū* (research or study). Although the English word ‘lesson’ typically focuses on a single, discrete block of teaching that can be captured on paper (as when a teacher points to a document and says here’s the lesson), the Japanese word *Jyugyō* refers to live interaction between children and teacher that may occur over an extended time period (lessons or instruction). (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 143)

In both countries, individual schools and their teachers were assigned responsibility to innovate curriculum development, and there have been ongoing efforts to establish national or state frameworks and resources to support the schools and teachers. The Australian curriculum framework across three dimensions including learning areas, general capabilities, and cross-curriculum priorities (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012) has been introduced. Education Queensland has continued to develop relevant resources to support schools and teachers in curriculum development.

Similarly, according to MEXT (2009a), an essential aspect for curriculum development was allocation of hours to implementation within the regular school schedule. MEXT (2008b) specified the time allocation for each learning area in their Course of Study, and schools were required to allocate their school lesson plans according to this rule. Therefore, school curriculum management comprised an education plan to organise their whole curriculum content in relation to time allocation and to accomplish educational objectives of each learning area, in order to comply with all policies relating to national curriculum (e.g., Basic Act on Education, School Education Law). In line with government policy and national curriculum, schools have been required to comply with the Japanese Course of Study for both regular education and special needs education and with the broad outline of educational objectives for each grade group (Years 1-2, Years 3-4, and Years 5-6) and for each learning area. For more integrated curriculum such as the Period of Integrated Studies, there has been more flexibility in time frame to implement lessons and to allow school originality and uniqueness. Overall, the educational aims and content outlined in the Japanese Course of Study has allowed considerable scope for each school and teacher to plan and implement unique lessons.

Models of curriculum development in Japan and Australia, which have shown many similarities, have also displayed some functional differences. The next subsection reviews Japanese lesson study, its contribution to curriculum development in regular education, and English-language applications of lesson study. In Japan, there have been questions about the collaborative use of lesson study in special education, whereas, in Australia, there have been questions about the focus on ability-based lesson goals and teaching a child with ASD in an inclusive setting.
Japanese lesson study

Participation in the model of teacher-led and collaborative Japanese lesson study has been an implicitly recognised part of regular teacher work in Japanese elementary schools (e.g., Isoda et al., 2007; Lewis, 2000; Lewis & Tsuchida, 1997, 1998; Matoba & Sarkar Arani, 2005, 2006; Sarkar Arani, 2004; Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2005, 2006). Lesson study evolved as a process for creating deep and grounded reflection about the complex activities of teaching by individual teachers working as a team (Fernandez & Chokshi, 2002). One of the main purposes of Japanese lesson study has been articulation of the content of policy and curriculum into classroom teaching (Chokshi & Fernandez, 2004; Fernandez, 2002; Lewis, Perry, Hurd, & O'Connell, 2006). Teachers frequently used collaborative meetings to share their ideas and understandings and even engaged in constructive critique from their colleagues. Discussions at these meetings revealed their beliefs and thoughts as well as their understanding of current policy and curriculum.

Lesson study was based on the practical idea that teachers observe another teacher’s classroom lesson and hold a group discussion to improve that lesson. Collaborative development of instruction by a team working on a specific lesson in a unit of curriculum consisted of three parts: (a) research relevant teaching materials, (b) collaborative planning of a lesson though teaching by one team member and observing and collecting data during this teaching by all other members of the team working on a specific lesson in a unit of curriculum, and (c) a postlesson discussion with all team members. Lesson study evolved as a mode of collaboration beyond the wall of a school and classroom. It was teacher-directed practice, but the members of a lesson study group included not only teachers inside or outside of the school(s) studying a lesson but also other professionals (e.g., university supervisors and researchers) there to share their knowledge or experience into the lessons and provide inspiration.

Lesson study has provided a dominant form of professional development in Japanese schools. Professional development at the elementary school level has involved a systematic and nationwide effort linked to specific school goals (Crockett, 2007). The Japanese government has used lesson studies to check the adequacy of incoming reforms through kenkyu-shiteikou (i.e., research schools), which received small grants to investigate new directions in curriculum and instruction. These investigations have helped educators and policy makers to share their views about how the particular instruction captures or misses the vision behind the policy.

Lesson study also has reflected the culture of the school community. Sakai and Ishikawa (2009) examined group conversation of lesson studies in two schools in a prefecture and found that each lesson study group had distinctive characteristics. They argued that the culture of the particular learning community (i.e., school) guided what lesson study members focused on during group discussion about the targeted lesson, because discussions among all participants in the lesson study meeting create their shared vision or stance about their own
respective learning materials, children, and instruction plans. Therefore, what educators discussed in the meeting was thought to mature them as educators and, subsequently, to develop lessons and school community (Sakai & Ishikawa, 2009). A review of Japanese lesson study showed that lesson study has a long history as professional culture in Japanese education and highlighted “kaizen or continuous improvement” through systematic support from inside and outside the school as learning community (Sarkar Arani, Fukaya, & Lassegard, 2010).

The system and practice of lesson study was not extensively theorised or studied in Japan during its long history. Isoda et al. (2007) stated that features of this traditional practice were probably unquestioned. However, there has been a rapid growth of the English language literature about lesson study in Japanese schools, of American efforts to practise and analyse lesson study and teachers’ approaches to curriculum development in their country with the assistance of educators with Japanese experience, and of theory development by Japanese educators to propose models of lesson study. Theorising inside and outside Japan has been focused on explaining the connection between teacher, children, and subject contents (Ball & Forzani, 2007; Curcio, 2002; Tolle, 2010).

Through lesson study, American educators came into contact with a new way of thinking about teachers’ curriculum development, their professionalism and accountability, and the nature of the connection between teacher research and classroom practice (Chokshi & Fernandez, 2004). For example, Fullan (2001) noted that, in comparison to Japanese teachers engaged in Japanese lesson studies, American teachers did not have habits of learning from others’ practice with continuous improvement of their knowledge and practice. International researchers and practitioners included not only those in the USA (e.g., Lewis, 2002, 2006; Lewis, Perry, Hurd, et al., 2006; Lewis, Perry, & Murata, 2006; Perry, Lewis, & Akiba, 2002; Puchner & Taylor, 2006; Puchner, Taylor, O’Donnell, & Fick, 2008) but also in many other countries including Australia (Kriewaldt, 2012; White, 2007), UK (Dudley, 2012), China (Lee, 2008; Pang & Marton, 2003; Yang & Ricks, 2012), Indonesia (Saito, Harun, Kuboki, & Tachibana, 2006), South Africa (Hattori, 2007), and Mexico (Wiburg & Brown, 2007). Some researchers in East Asia also claimed that they had been using their original practice similar to Japanese lesson study (Ling, Chik, & Pang, 2006; Pang, 2006; Yang & Ricks, 2012).

Some cultural barriers were encountered when American researchers introduced Japanese lesson study in their local schools. Time was a major concern for American educators. Lesson study was time-consuming: Japanese teachers stayed till late after school, and postdiscussion of lesson study took usually 2 to 5 hours (Isoda et al., 2007). Other concerns were American teachers’ anxiety about publicly teaching lessons for their peers (Chokshi & Fernandez, 2004). Moreover, Fernandez, Cannon, and Chokshi (2003) specified difficulties in implementing effective and collaborative discussions for lesson study.

In particular, the Japanese teachers emphasized four critical aspects of good research: the development of meaningful and testable hypotheses, the use of appropriate means for exploring these hypotheses, the reliance on evidence to judge the success of research endeavors, and the
interest in generalizing research findings to other applicable contexts. However, the American teachers had much difficulty adopting and maintaining this researcher lens while conducting lesson study (p. 173).

American researchers Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009), in particular, contributed to conceptualise lesson study for teachers to use it for their teaching. Their three models relative to lesson study in regular education helped unpack its cyclic process, sequence of activities, and pathways of instructional outcomes. First, Figure 2.8 illustrates a four-step cycle comprising activities focused on targeted classroom lessons with sets of long-term goals and short-term goals. Within the cycle, teachers interpreted curriculum content, child understanding, and teaching instructions (e.g., Ball & Forzani, 2007) to develop further lesson plans. Lesson study was described as not only in-school training but also a fixture in the school’s practices, structures, and identity (Lewis, Perry, Hurd, et al., 2006).

Figure 2.8. An American view of the Japanese lesson study cycle (from Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 143).

Figure 2.9 shows some parallels between Western conceptualisation of action research as a metapractice of “practice-changing practice” (viz., Kemmis, 2009, p. 464) and Japanese lesson study, as teachers’ inquiry into their lessons. The overlap of these models suggests that group discussions of the Japanese lesson study help teachers spell out the gap between curriculum intent (i.e., their interpretations of related documentations and learning goals and planning) and enacted curriculum (i.e., what was observed during the lesson). Moreover, Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009) argued that a cycle of lesson study shares common components (i.e., personal, professional, political) with action research that amplifies the Noffke (1997) components of teacher work.
Chapter 2

Teacher seek to improve their knowledge and effectiveness (the personal component of framework), by engaging in collaborative knowledge accumulation and theory-building (the professional component) thereby supporting changes in the goals and culture of instruction (the political component).

(Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 142)

Figure 2.9. Overlapping elements of action research (Kemmis, 2009) and lesson study (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009).

Second, Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009) provided a clear example of a sequence of maths lesson activities identified across a cycle of lesson study from a regular education team in several American schools (see Figure 2.10). Figure 2.10 highlights the active role of teachers in observing a research lesson taught by a colleague and several trials of improving one holistic learning goal (i.e., students’ problem-solving skills) through mathematic activities. However, how special education teachers use lesson study for working with children with ASD in special needs classes and how they address a holistic learning goal for those children with ASD has not been analysed in the English-language literature.

Another critical aspect of Japanese lesson study was the teacher’s ethnographic field notes, zaseki jyugyouan, about each child in a classroom. Teachers used these notes to understand mutual relationships or connections among children in classroom activities (Matoba & Sarkar Arani, 2006). Teachers constructed their understandings of children through observations during several lessons and across different subject domains. Teachers appeared to find these field notes and lesson study journaling helpful to clarify and revise their assumptions about the unique abilities of their children and their learning, and then they tried to make better use of peer groups for active interaction and learning during each lesson.
Before lesson study: Standardised assessments reveal that students have difficulty with the number sense standard. Teachers have no shared or systematic approach for helping students learn how to do multi-step math problems.

Teachers identify different curriculum and assessment materials for problem solving.

Through discussion, teachers select particular materials to adapt for their lesson study work.

Teachers try student math task themselves; [teachers] anticipate student responses.

Teachers observe and collect data on how students respond in real classrooms.

Teachers discuss data collected.

Teachers discuss appropriate instructional responses to observations and data on student problem solving.

After lesson study: Teachers have learned about, use, and report continued intention to use a shared, systematic approach for helping students learn how to do multi-step math problems.

Figure 2.10. Sequence of activities of one Mathematic lesson study group (from Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 146).

Third, Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009) illustrated how lesson study helped teachers’ instructions for Mathematics. Figure 2.11 shows the teachers’ engagement in ongoing teaching-learning activity across lesson study (i.e., visible features of lesson study in Figure 2.11) improves instructions through this professional development experience (i.e., pathways in Figure 2.11). Lewis (2011) pointed at the different focus during lesson study implementation between American teachers and Japanese teachers in order to improve instructions. American teachers spent more time in planning lessons individually to align their lessons with curriculum, while Japanese teachers progressively reflected carefully on every aspect of teaching-learning activity (Sarkar Arani & Fukaya, 2009; Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2006) and spent more time in observation and discussion. Across a cycle of lesson study, regular teachers developed their instructional knowledge and skills and improved their classroom instruction.

Figure 2.11. How does lesson study improve instruction? (from Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 148).
Figure 2.11 also shows that the components of lesson study could be aligned with the Noffke components, although the overlapping Noffke components raised directional questions. Through a variety of pathways, regular teachers engaged in a variety of professional activities (Noffke, 1997) consistent with knowledge accumulation and theory–practice linkage (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 142). The visible features of lesson study were apparently consistent with political goals and culture of instruction, and the instructional improvement with the personal knowledge and effectiveness of the teachers. However, in another interpretation, the teachers’ personally established knowledge base about lesson study might drive professional pathways and lead to politically valued outcomes.

Figure 2.12 indicates the separate pathways through Japanese lesson study developed in special and regular education. Lesson study in regular education has been focused mostly on subject content and teaching instructions to address national educational emphasis (e.g., problem-solving skills). However, the growing literature of lesson study in regular education has not been duplicated for special education teachers working with different aims and a different curriculum (i.e., life-skills). Some Japanese researchers at the research centre linked to MEXT have started investigating how two systems (regular and special) can be integrated in their schools and how teachers support children with high incident disabilities in regular education. They have established a framework for supporting these children by (a) reorganising special needs education schools as a local centre of schools for special needs education, (b) maintaining at least one special support coordinator at each regular education school, and (c) establishing guidelines for these teachers. However, Japanese regular education teachers have been struggling with the practice gaps between their reality and government demands, and there has been little attention to the research gap about Japanese special education teachers’ use of lesson study in the focus of their teaching, their concerns about teaching a child with ASD within a group of children with ID, and the role of schoolwide lesson study to help integrate teaching in regular and special needs classes.

Figure 2.12. Japanese lesson study in in regular and special needs education.
**Australian curriculum development**

Curriculum development and lesson planning central to Australian education has been expanded to cover special education. For example, the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) progressively established a framework for each key learning area. Education Queensland also established an inclusive education framework and curriculum guidelines for children with disabilities in 2008. Curriculum for all children with disabilities at primary, secondary, and special schools was drawn from the P-12 Curriculum Frameworks.

Curriculum expectations and accountabilities have undergone major changes since the 2001 version of the P-12 frameworks (Education Queensland, 2008b). Changes included (a) the implementation of the Preparatory year (Prep); (b) the move from outcomes-based education to Queensland Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Framework (QCARF) Essential Learning and Standards in Year 1-9; (c) the changed position of Year 10 as the foundation year of the Senior Phase of Learning; (d) the introduction of the Queensland Certificate of Education; and (e) reporting to parents using a common 5-point scale (p. ii).

The P-12 framework introduced new principles for teaching, learning, and assessment that appeared fairly consistent with those of Japanese lesson study. First, the fundamental belief in inclusive education was that all children can learn if provided with sufficient support. Encouragement of professional development of regular teachers was similar to that of traditional Japanese lesson study. Second, children’s current knowledge and skills were the starting point for learning. Monitoring of child performance and assessment of classroom ecologies around the children also appeared somehow comparable to the focus of lesson planning in Japanese lesson study on child observation and also similar to EBP notions of functional assessment. Third, close assessment across aspects of instruction (e.g., curriculum intent, pedagogy, assessment, reporting) allowed teachers to produce child-centered lessons in which these children can connect classroom learning to their own experience and motivations (Ben-Yosef, 2003).

Some differences between the Australian and Japanese model of curriculum development appeared to be constructed from their respective cultural components (Noffke, 1997). Both models were focused on children, but the Australian model seemed to concentrate on increasing abilities or skills. In contrast, the Japanese model emphasised interpersonal relationship or goodness of group in Japanese cultures, in line with professional and political influences (Kikkawa, 2007). Japanese teachers were encouraged to focus on child mutual relationship in lesson planning (Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2006) and to work together in curriculum development, consistent with a long history of Japanese collaborative curriculum development (i.e., Japanese lesson study).
Chapter 2

Approaches and strategies for teaching children with ASD

Teacher work with evidence-based approaches and strategies for teaching children with ASD has been relatively neglected in the light of the substantial body of research and metaanalytic review has been directed at intervention and treatment. Detailed analysis of the available evidence base crystallised the preferential recommendation of the applied behaviour analysis (ABA) type of interventions (e.g., Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010; Rogers & Vismara, 2008; Schreiber, 2011; Simpson et al., 2005; Simpson & Myles, 2008; Smith, 2010). The classification schemes used in successive reviews have offered some variation in accommodating interpersonal interventions in natural settings and group-based treatments, although their status as EBPs has continued to be uncompetitive with the longstanding and prolific accumulation of ABA data from small experiments.

Simpson (2005) identified a continuum of available empirical evidence from scientifically based practice, promising practice, limited supporting information, to not recommended. Five categories of interventions and treatments comprised (a) interpersonal relationship, (b) skills-based, (c) cognitive, (d) physical/biological/neurological, and (e) other (Simpson, 2005; Simpson et al., 2005). While interventions that share elements from ABA (e.g., skills-based or cognitive) were marked as scientifically based practice or promising practice, others were rated as limited or not recommended.

More recent review of comprehensive treatment models for these children added “fidelity” (i.e., implementation measurement) and “replication” into its EBP criteria. This work confirmed the primacy of ABA practices that are static and scientific (Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010). Because these skills-based practices were more targeted and systematic, the categories of fidelity and replication strengthened the continued preference for skills-based practices. These practices were able to be implemented with a manualised program.

Odom and his colleagues (2010) distinguished two classifications of EBPs (i.e., focused intervention practice and comprehensive treatment model). According to these reviewers, a focused intervention practice was designed to produce specific behavioural or developmental outcomes for individual children with ASD. In contrast, a comprehensive treatment model, often focused on learning or development for the core deficits of ASD (e.g., social skills and communication), comprised a set of practices with multiple components to achieve broader learning and development improvement (Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010).

Brunner and Seung (2009) specifically reviewed research published between 2002 and 2007 on communication-based treatments for children with ASD. The reviewers identified seven treatment categories of ABA, naturalistic behavioural, developmental, classroom-based, video modelling, social skills, and augmentative and alternative communication and summarised the similarities and differences among the sets of practices. As with the two Odom, Boyd, et al. (2010) classes, these seven categories formed two major groups: (a) approach as a set of practices and (b) focused intervention practices and strategies.
Figure 2.13 integrates ideas from cataloguing the literature related to EBPs (Simpson et al., 2005), comprehensive treatment models (Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010), and, more specifically, communication-based treatments (Brunner & Seung, 2009). It illustrates a range of four comprehensive approaches and six focused intervention strategies. The distinctive features among these treatments and interventions gradually changed across a semicircle (i.e., representing approach) as well as a rectangle (i.e., representing focused intervention strategies). On the semicircle, the approaches fanned out from ABA to a naturalistic behavioural approach, to a developmental approach, and then to interpersonal relationship approach, as the nature of these treatments shifted in four ways: (a) from skills-based and behaviour focused, to function focused and interpersonal relationship based; (b) from quantitative to qualitative measurement; (c) from less parent involvement to more parent involvement; and (d) from strong empirical support to exploratory support.

Figure 2.13 did not identify classroom-based interventions as a single comprehensive treatment category. Brunner and Seung (2009) identified classroom-based interventions as a category to highlight naturalistic and group instruction and also to respond to inclusive education as a central issue in education for children with ASD. However, special and inclusive education classes have used classroom-based interventions from one or another of the four main approaches to intervention, whether ABA, naturalistic behavioural, developmental, and interpersonal relationship (Ryan, Hughes, Katsiyannis, McDaniel, & Sprinkle, 2011). Hence, it was not included in Figure 2.13 as a single comprehensive treatment category.

ABA has been recognised as an essential and scientifically valid method in the research-based literature (e.g., Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010; Rogers & Vismara, 2008; Simpson et al., 2005; Simpson & Myles, 2008; Smith, 2010). However, Simpson (2001) noted possible ABA weaknesses from reliance on adult-prompting and differential reinforcements (e.g., discrete trial training). That is, because children with ASD learned their skills and behaviours within highly controlled settings with exaggerated support, it was suggested that prompt-dependent children might not generalise skills or behaviours learned through the intervention into more natural settings, might experience difficulties in using their new skills or behaviours in natural interactional flow, and might have less motivation to use this type of intervention (Simpson, 2001).

A review of social skills intervention in relation to ABA indicated that the absence of positive social relations early in life affects their future adult lives in various ways (Strain & Schwartz, 2001). The effects included decreasing likelihood of employment, independent living, or life expectancy and severe mental health problems. Other studies have also increasingly examined emotional risks of individuals with ASD such as anxiety, depression, and stress (e.g., Baron, Groden, Groden, & Lipsitt, 2006).
Figure 2.13. Approaches and focused intervention strategies for communication and social skills (based on the ideas of Brunner and Seung, 2009).
Naturalistic behavioural approaches shared similar elements to ABA in that they also clearly targeted socially valuable skills and behaviours but did not involve any prompt dependence and lack of motivation (Brunner & Seung, 2009). One Western naturalistic behaviour approach—Pivotal Responses Treatment (PRT)—was developed initially for young children to teach communication related-skills (e.g., joint attention, symbolic play, turn taking, requesting, spontaneous verbalizations), and to motivate children to communicate spontaneously in a natural environment and with naturalistic instructional techniques (Koegel & Koegel, 2006). Simpson et al. (2005) classified PRT as empirically supported practice. Moreover, Koegel, Koegel, and Camarata (2010) pointed to the relatively greater difficulty of obtaining evidence demonstrating PRT effectiveness. They argued that because of its extended goals of long-term intervention, evidence was often unavailable, and obtaining the evidence challenged the lower metaanalytic rankings of the naturalistic and group-based practices from Western and Eastern origins.

Developmental approaches such as Floortime (Greenspan & Wieder, 2006) also shared some elements with the naturalistic behavioural approach. It differed from that approach in (a) its focus on social communicative function rather than on specific skills or behaviours, (b) its philosophical understandings of children’s communicative attempts, and (c) its more limited empirical support (Brunner & Seung, 2009). Developmental and social-relational approaches emphasised strong and positive adult–child interactions to improve language and communication skills for living in a typical environment instead of improving the specific skills or behaviours targeted in both ABA and naturalistic behavioural approach. Its most significant feature, compared to the other two approaches, was that educators view all communicative attempts by the child as purposeful, whether or not they seem to be intentional or conventional (Ingersoll, 2010; Ingersoll et al., 2005). Although Simpson et al. (2005) did not classify this interpersonal relationship approach as scientifically proven, Brunner and Seung (2009) upgraded its evaluation as more evidence became available.

Figure 2.13 included developmental and interpersonal relationship approaches as separate but related categories of approach. Fuzzy boundaries between approaches have appeared in cataloguing reviews. For example, Simpson (2005) located Floortime into his interpersonal relationship category, whereas Brunner and Seung (2009) did not use the category of interpersonal relationship and located Floortime within his developmental category, because it appeared to provide a useful contrast to ABA and naturalistic behaviour approaches. Floortime might be located on the boundary between development and interpersonal relationships in Figure 2.13. If the naturalistic behaviour approach designed treatments more focused on function development of children with ASD, the positioning of Floortime might share more features with the developmental approach. In addition, more parent involvement appeared to be essential for interpersonal relationship approaches.
This insertion of the developmental category of approach into Figure 2.13 indicated the broader and more flexible range of approaches and strategies for children with ASD that may connect EBPs to more social, flexible, and contextualised interventions (Ball & Forzani, 2007; Dall’Alba, 2009; Kemmis, 2009; Noffke, 1997). It has appeared to be the case that classroom teachers take their personal choices of instructional strategies from the broader and more flexible range of approaches, according to their educational beliefs and aims aligned to their classroom contexts. In addition, Kikkawa (2007) found that although the Japanese and Australian teachers shared some strategies (e.g., prompting, visual cues, praise, routines), their talk implied a possibility of their different use and purpose for using the strategies. For example, the Japanese teachers used these strategies to facilitate peer interactions, while the Australian teachers used them to reduce inappropriate behaviours.

Figure 2.13 presents a range of examples of focused intervention strategies separately from the general approaches (i.e., sets of practices). These strategies were arranged to show a shift from strategies with a strong cognitive focus with less social tension to less cognitive focus with a strong social tension. Video modelling, social skills, and augmentative and alternative communication were employed in classrooms and used to improve communication and social skills in children with ASD (Brunner & Seung, 2009). Improving social and communication skills and adaptive behaviours has been one of the elements necessary for educational programs for children with ASD (Christodulu & Berical, 2009). Deficits in these skills and behaviours damaged social relationships and long-term academic performance (Welsh, Park, Widaman, & O’Neil, 2001) and were, therefore, precursors to later behaviour problems. Some reviewers have concluded that many of those strategies (e.g., social skills interventions) were minimally effective at schools (Bellini et al., 2007). However, some studies showed that strategies were more effective for children with ASD in combination with various approaches (Cotugno, 2009; Lopata, Thomeer, Volker, & Nida, 2006).

Strategies addressed to augmentative and alternative communication, such as the Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS; Bondy & Frost, 1994, 2001) and other strategies such as use of sign language to facilitate vocalisation of children with ASD (Spencer, Petersen, & Gillam, 2008; Tincani, 2004), have been important methods for nonverbal children with ASD to obtain functional communication skills (Preston & Carter, 2009). A review of PECS indicated that it became “an increasingly popular low-technology means for teaching an alternative form of communication to individuals” (Sulzer-Azaroff, Hoffman, Horton, Bondy, & Frost, 2009, p. 98). Metaanalyses of EBPs also recommended PECS highly (Brunner & Seung, 2009; Simpson et al., 2005). Although Brunner and Seung (2009) specified a category of augmentative and alternative communication in their review, PECS and other strategies may be regarded as focused intervention strategies rather than one comprehensive communication. Therefore, it was also added to a category of focused interventions strategies in Figure 2.13.
Social skills training (e.g., modelling, coaching, social scripts, or written cueing) has been used in classrooms to teach critical skills for social and emotional functioning (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). Some metaanalyses recommending social skills training to achieve the most beneficial outcomes for these children have identified important factors: (a) increasing the dosage of social skills interventions, (b) instructing the children in their natural settings, (c) matching the strategy with a child’s type of skill deficit, and (d) ensuring intervention fidelity (Bellini et al., 2007; Harris, 2010). They have remained classified as unproven in listings of EBP s (Alwell & Cobb, 2009), and assessment of its effectiveness has continued to be debated (Carter, 2010).

Moreover, Krasny, Williams, Provencal, and Ozonoff (2003) listed the important principles of effective social skills training in a group setting for American children with ASD, rather than specifying a particular strategy. These principles included (a) making the abstract concrete, (b) providing structure and predictability, (c) providing scaffolded language support, (d) providing multiple and varied learning opportunities, (e) including “other” for focused activities, (f) fostering self-awareness and self-esteems, (g) selecting relevant goals, (h) programing learning experiences in a sequential and progressive manner, and (i) providing opportunities for generating skills in ongoing practice (Krasny et al., 2003, p. 111). They proposed that teachers apply these principles when teaching social skills to children with ASD in a group setting, and that they align their teaching to the unique needs of children with ASD, because typical classroom routines and activities required naturalistic strategies (Stanton-Chapman & Snell, 2011). For example, the naturalistic and cost-effective strategy of praise has been studied outside specific approaches (Musti-Rao & Haydon, 2011; Pisacreta, Tincani, Connell, & Axelrod, 2011; Simonsen, MacSuga, Fallon, & Sugai, 2012).

Social stories and other conversational scripts or cartoons have been used to help teach appropriate communication or social skills (e.g., Gray, 1994; Mirenda, 2003; More, 2012; Test, Richter, Knight, & Spooner, 2011). Video modelling, which might reduce social tension for children with ASD, has been empirically supported (Brunner & Seung, 2009; Odom et al., 2003; Odom, Collet-Klingenberg, & Rogers, 2010). As the role of peer interactions in developing social and communication skills of children with ASD has been highlighted in the literature (Carter, Sisco, Chung, & Stanton-Chapman, 2010; Hughes et al., 2013; McGrath & Nobel, 2010; Sturaro, van Lier, Cuijpers, & Koot, 2011), social skills interventions such as peer-modelling and peer-mediated interventions have obtained more empirical support (e.g., McConnell, 2002; Odom et al., 2003; Odom, Collet-Klingenberg, et al., 2010; Rogers, 2000; Scattone, 2007).

Some cognitive-based social skills methods, when used alone, were not empirically supported in two major reviews (Brunner & Seung, 2009; Simpson et al., 2005). These social skills interventions were less likely to have sufficient evidence, because they were often based on single-subject studies. However, Brunner and Seung (2009) argued that “studies of social
skills training are exploratory but do suggest considerable promise, particularly when coupled with behavioural components” (p. 25). Some studies of interventions combining cognitive and behavioural components for social skills for children with ASD have reported empirical evidence of effectiveness (Cotugno, 2009; Lopata et al., 2006). Ryan et al. (2011), who provided a list of five interventions popular among teachers working with children with ASD including Treatment and Education of Autistic and Communication related handicapped Children (TEACCH), PECS, and social stories in addition to ABA and DIR/Floortime, suggested more broad benefits of using these interventions for teachers. For example, they regarded the DIR as a framework to understand the developmental profiles of a child (Ryan et al., 2011).

Although research efforts in social skills interventions for improving social and communication skills are increasing, classroom-based use of social skills interventions has attracted limited and exploratory evidence in Western settings. Social skills interventions that required complex, longitudinal, and intensive classroom activity (Strain & Hoyson, 2000) were likely to encounter difficulties in dealing with a social interaction challenge or problem behaviour that was complicated, dynamic, culturally influenced, and contextually based. Brunner and Seung (2009) commented that the limited research in classrooms made it difficult to determine the efficacy of approaches focused on social and communication skills.

Burns and Ysseldyke (2009) also noted that, despite clear evidence that ABA has a large effect and that social skills training has a small effect, teachers were likely to engage in social skills training as much as behavioural interventions. They argued that the research to practice gap may be caused by either (a) a lack of empirical support for approaches used specifically by teachers in classrooms or (b) a direct link to difficulties in implementing EBPs in the classrooms (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). Barriers to teacher use of EBPs in classrooms have included lack of time to search, lack of resources, and lack of confidence in making independent decisions (Kretlow & Blatz, 2011). The perceived teacher-friendliness and contextual relevance of many of these social skills or instructional approaches might have encouraged teachers to give credence to social skills training. However, the reasons why special education teachers frequently used social skills training and the nature of their social skills practice in their classrooms have remained unclear.

Konrad, Helf, and Joseph (2011) suggested that, in addition to selecting effective evidence-based strategies, teachers need to review their planning, implementation, and evaluation in order to increase instructional efficiency for children with disabilities (see also, Japanese lesson study in regular education). Harjusola-Webb and Robbins (2011) listed eight effective prompting strategies to help younger children with ASD communicate. These strategies were naturalistic and interactive techniques that teachers can use in classroom settings. They included (a) commenting and labelling the objects or events at the moment and modelling appropriate communication, (b) imitating a child’s action, (c) expanding or adding level of the
child’s communicating sophistication, (d) providing positive feedback and praise, (e) asking questions and providing choices, (f) responding, (g) following the child’s lead and joint attention, and (h) providing a turn taking and time delay (p. 104).

**Group instruction in Japan and Australia**

Some English-language research has shown that peers can model socially appropriate behaviour (i.e., peer modelling), teach or encourage peers with ASD (i.e., peer instruction and peer mediation), and develop social relationships among peers in their everyday classroom environments. Some studies have suggested that group teaching may help children with ASD learn appropriate social and communication skills through peer interactions (e.g., Bohlander et al., 2012; Krasny et al., 2003; Leaf, Dotson, Oppenheim-Leaf, Sherman, & Sheldon, 2012; White, Keonig, & Scahill, 2007). However, this type of training has not been classified yet as EBPs (Simpson & Myles, 2008). It has been recognised that it is logistically difficult to obtain appropriate evidence from long-term observations of interventions among peers (Koenig, De Los Reyes, Cicchetti, Scahill, & Klin, 2009).

Figure 2.14 illustrates the use of groups for teaching in Japan and Australia (Kikkawa, 2007). Special education teachers in both countries have worked with children with ASD in classrooms (i.e., group settings), and these small classes have allowed opportunities for regular interactions with peers greater than in the larger regular class. Bellini et al. (2007) reported that social skills interventions are more effective when implemented in a child’s typical classroom rather than in pull-out settings for personal tutoring with a teacher or teacher aide. Within the classroom, however, the choices of approach and strategy, available to special educators operating within their traditions and theory, have allowed peers to have various roles (e.g., practice partners and direct interaction) in teaching the whole class and in teaching the child with ASD within the class.

**Figure 2.14.** Alternative approaches to group instruction in Japan and Australia.

A critical cultural analysis of social emotional learning reviewed emotion in Japanese and American regular schools and classrooms (Hoffman, 2000a, 2000b). Hoffman (2000a, 2000b) argued that the Japanese and American contexts presented teachers with different assumptions about individuality and group. Ideas about individuality that were regarded as
something that people are born with in an American context were considered as something that people can achieve through their effort in the Japanese context. Hoffman (2009) defined the essence of group life in Japanese classrooms as an unabashed discourse on positive emotions including unity, happiness, cheerfulness, enjoyment, and enthusiasm, while defining those in American classrooms as a discourse of following rules, setting up behaviour contracts, or organising activities.

To define a child’s problem as one of individual self-control (as in the American example) rather than one of “not feeling sufficiently attached to the classroom community” (as in the Japanese example) fundamentally changes the kind of response that is made to the situation. Thus, in the U.S. an individual problem requires an individual solution (time-out or removal from class—further enforcing the separation of the individual from the group). In Japan, “acting out” is never an individual problem: it means the child needs more emotional connection to the class and teacher, not less, making techniques of teacher-imposed segregation rare. Instead, teachers redouble efforts to connect the child to the class, perhaps by giving the child extra attention, privileges, or using other kinds of supportive emotional encouragement (Lewis, 1995; Peak, 1991).

Western researchers have also tried to develop effective classroom-based behaviour intervention systems based on measurement. For example, Direct Behaviour Rating was designed to produce functional assessment of children in classrooms (e.g., Hagermoser Sanetti, Chafouleas, Christ, & Gritter, 2009; Riley-Tillman, Methe, & Weegar, 2009). In contrast, Japanese teachers tended to seek a deep understanding of each child’s feelings and thoughts in tune with fundamental tenets of Japanese educational philosophy, represented by the Basic Act on Education in Japan (MEXT, 2006c).

There have been various efforts to explore cultural differences in Eastern and Western education for different emphases on social-moral and cognitive-skill aspects of individualism and collectivism (e.g., Cheng, 1998; Crystal, Kakinuma, Debell, Azuma, & Miyashita, 2008; Nesdale & Naito, 2005; Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). A comparative study, analysing cultural differences in regular teacher practice between Eastern and Western countries, contrasted an East Asian emphasis on collectivism, social focus, and synthesis with a Western emphasis on individualism, physical focus, and analysis (Cheng, 1998). Crystal et al. (2008) pointed to the values of self-reliance and autonomy in “individualistic” or “independent” societies of English-speaking nations (e.g., the USA or Australia). East Asian societies such as Japan, seen being “collectivistic” or “interdependent”, have encouraged cooperative reliance and dependence upon others.

Generally, modern Japanese education has been based on what is good for the nation, and, historically, Japanese collectivism has identified people with their in-groups and stressed the interests of groups rather than individuals (Lewis, 1995a; Nesdale & Naito, 2005; Peak, 1991). Japanese Fundamental Education Law, which was established in 1947 and modified in 2006, has continued to emphasise relationships, adaptability, and interpersonal ability in whole-person education (MEXT, 2006c). This historical development of Japanese educational policy has fostered a deeply grounded philosophy that the group is essential for development of children (Shimizu & Tamamura, 1997; Ujimori, 2002). Japanese educators have continued to
believe that they must use this philosophy to structure their approach to special education. For example, Nakatsuoka (2005) insisted that, from the perspective of Japanese educational practitioners, Japanese special educators must have their own philosophy of autism based on their culturally-based understanding of internal moral mechanisms. Kikkawa and Bryer (2013a; see also, Kikkawa, 2007) found that Japanese special educators did avoid labelling children in their classrooms, whether ASD, ADHD, or other disability diagnoses, in line with this educational philosophy.

Additionally, a substantive difference in Japanese and Western teachers’ way of teaching children with ASD may have arisen from the ways in which they have used a diagnosis and its information. The role of diagnosis was observed in the experience of an American teacher (Heflin & Alaimo, 2007). Ms Harris, knowing that a new child in her class had this diagnosis, enabled her to start to set up her classroom and establish the environment according to her knowledge of the key instructional components of any classrooms for children with ASD. These components included arranging the physical environment, establishing a schedule, using visual supports, providing systematic instruction, accommodating sensory needs, and promoting engagement.

Figure 2.15 shows four Japanese lesson learning forms used to address cross-area teaching in contrast to other special needs teaching used for specific learning areas (Sakamoto, 2008). The Japanese Course of Study for children with ID specified different learning contents (i.e., categories of study) and different teaching forms. The four learning forms were (a) life-skills unit, seikatsu-tangen-gakushū (seitan, hereafter); (b) instruction in routine daily life skills across a day; (c) play; and (d) prevocational learning (NISE, 2006).

Of these forms, the seitan has been used widely by special educators of children with ID in special education settings in Japan (NISE, 2006, 2010). In this approach to teaching, group activities have been repeated with modifications added over a period of one whole unit (i.e., a series of featured lessons), and with a focus on everyday life skills (e.g., daily life skills, independency, and autonomy) and social matters (e.g., peer relationships, group efforts, and group belonging) that were closely linked to the children’s everyday living. This connection of children’s learning to their life-experience has appeared to parallel Western recognition that children’s cultural and out-of-school literacies help to create inclusive environments and meaningful educational experiences (Ben-Yosef, 2003).

According to the teacher guide for using this seitan (NISE, 2006), special educators were expected to use their “lesson skills” to create a “good” lesson, designed around the specific children (i.e., individual and group needs). To achieve this good lesson, it was recommended that these special educators use lesson study to transfer tacit knowledge (i.e., an abstract view of the ideal lesson) into shared information (i.e., a visualisation of classroom interactions and events) through group discussions with teacher colleagues (Kimura, 2006; Ōta, 2006). This skill to create a good lesson appeared also in the English-language literature. For example, Puchner
and Taylor (2006) argued that in lesson study, “the content of the lessons themselves may be less important than the socio-emotional and cognitive impact of the collaborative process” (p. 931). In the Japanese literature on the *seitan*, the lesson skill to create a good lesson has been a primary specialist expectation of teachers in the Japanese special education sector, especially for children with ID (Ōta, 2005, 2006). Although the process of curriculum development for Japanese special needs instruction has been documented and disseminated within the country in government manuals and professional teaching conferences, there has been no English-language description of how these special educators in Japan engage in this lesson creation.
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*Figure 2.15. Category of learning content and forms of teaching for a child with ASD/ID in Japanese special needs education settings (extracted and translated from Sakamoto, 2008, p. 52).*

**Valued Outcomes from Group Instruction**

In the third section of this chapter, a simple and natural extension was the issue of what value special educators placed on their group instruction. It was found that teachers’ decisions about what is important to learn or how learning is best accomplished and assessed have been strongly influenced by value, which has been identified as one of the critical elements of culture (Banks, 2006). For example, a special educator might value the kind of life-skills lessons that typically
feature in their curriculum as a means to help the child with ASD to relate well to other children and be included in the class and school. As with the first two research questions, however, there has been little investigation of the way that special educators have judged their success in teaching a child with ASD, especially in lessons to the whole class and their use of pedagogy and assessment in enacting their intent. Various aspects of these outcomes of teaching have been framed in terms of relating well to others and to the circumstances in which they teach those lessons (Kemmis, 2009). However, in the literature and in practice, the combined effects of professional, political, and personal factors influencing the intended and actual outcomes of group lessons, teachers’ ideas about relating well to others, and the social skills visibly preferred in their teaching remain an open topic.

To the extent that conditions of work affect special educators’ relationships in teaching group lessons (Kemmis, 2009), various forces outside the classroom may act on outcomes of group lessons valued by the special educators. In particular, extensive international coverage in the recent literature of issues outside classrooms has ranged across issues such as school self-evaluation, teacher accountability, and licencing to work as a teacher (Luke, Green, & Kelly, 2010). Rapidly changing political and professional conditions affecting teaching have contributed to international innovation in school-based curriculum development, but the impact of these ideas for changes has not been fully realised in regular classrooms. The applicability of these external issues to special educators as well as to regular classroom teachers has been less fully addressed. One example has been standards-based instruction to students with disabilities, where special educators have been exhorted by external decision makers to find ways to implement standards in their lessons and to engage in professional development activities to build new capability. Within the special needs classroom, the professional traditions of special educators have made them considerably better placed to assess and monitor classroom teaching in the press for teacher accountability and quality.

It has been noted that parental perceptions of important social skills and competencies vary across cultures. Two recent studies in particular showed that parents of children with ASD in different cultures appeared to value different social skills (Matson et al., 2011; Matson, Worley, et al., 2012). For example, differences in symptom expressions among countries were reported in nonverbal communication or socialization, verbal communication, and insistence of sameness and restricted interests. The most recent literature review on culture and ASD also showed that a family’s cultural background directly influenced their acceptance of an autism diagnosis and decision making about treatment (Ennis-Cole, Durodoye, & Harris, 2013). For example, although the importance of early intervention for children with ASD has been widely accepted in developed countries, some parents from minority backgrounds may view delays in language and social skills as a temporary phenomenon and may not seek help. In the special education literature, there has been broad agreement with the idea of family involvement in
decision-making about individualised adjustments in the classroom (e.g., ITPs in Japan; IEPs in Australia). However, there has been little direct focus on special educators’ cultural preferences.

The accountability and standards movement around the world has been a powerful force for content standards for instruction and learning of all children, as addressed in the previous sections of Overviews and Group Instruction. In the USA, the federal government and its states used the No Child Left Behind legislation (United States Act of Congress, 2001) to specify quality education for all children and school accountability for child achievements (Houston, 2009). Moreover, the American educational policy has specified that teachers or schools use “scientifically proven practices” or EBPs and set high standards for the quality of the teachers and paraprofessionals who teach children with ASD (Yell, Drasgow, & Lowrey, 2005). For two decades, all states have required preservice teachers to meet state-based licensure standards and procedures prior to entering the teaching profession. Because EBP was emphasised in federal law, states started to articulate the knowledge of EBP to be assessed on licensure tests for prospective special education teachers (Stotsky, 2009).

At the time of this inquiry, in Queensland, as in the USA, the policy message for teachers has been to teach children with disabilities, including ASD, within the regular education framework, under the umbrella of standards (P-12 Curriculum Framework, 2008b) and to individualise instruction (Curriculum Guidelines for Students with Disabilities, 2009). Ways of delivering curriculum provision or ways of doings outlined in the P-12 curriculum, assessment, and reporting framework included (a) differentiation, (b) focused teaching, (c) providing a different year level curriculum, and (d) individual learning plans (Education Queensland, 2013a).

In addition, issues have been highlighted in a use of more generic interventions proven for teaching children with ID when working with children with ASD. University programs for preservice teacher education have been aligned with Australian national reviews of EBP for children with ASD that have been continuously developed (e.g., Carter et al., 2011; Prior et al., 2011; Roberts, Mazzucchelli, Taylor, & Reid, 2003; Roberts, 2004; Roberts & Prior, 2006). In the latest review, Prior et al. (2011) pointed out that many interventions used by practitioners are more generic or target for children with ID and that these generic interventions “should not be considered an appropriate intervention for a child with ASD” unless they “meet principles for good practice in autism unless evidence for efficacy for ASD has been demonstrated” (p. 74).

Japanese educational reforms also stressed teachers’ contractual, professional, and moral accountabilities (Hooghart, 2006). MEXT (2005a, p. 4) indicated the need to improve teacher quality in Japanese schools and listed six actions required to foster trusted and high-quality teachers. The list comprised action to (a) steadily improve and enhance teacher training at the undergraduate level, (b) make use of professional graduate schools for teacher training, (c) adopt a teacher certification renewal system, (d) improve and refine hiring process; enhance inservice training, (e) improve and enhance teacher evaluation, by creating the position of
“Super Teacher” for excellent teachers, and (f) actively tap into a variety of human resources, such as retirees and business people; tap into people from the private sector to serve as assistant principals as well as principals. The effect of these changing conditions for special educators has perhaps elaborated on professional standards.

Standards for establishing elementary schools were not enacted as a separate set of ministerial ordinance in Japan and involved only brief items in Gakkou kyouikuhou shikou kisoku or Regulation for Operating School Education Law. In 2002, Shougakkou secci kiiyun or Standards for Establishment of Elementary Schools was revised and clarified fundamental and essential standards for quality for Japanese elementary schools. In 2007, these regulations started to have the effect of requiring schools to conduct self-evaluation of their educational activities and operation and to report the results to the public (MEXT, 2002a). A Guideline for School Evaluation (MEXT, 2006a) recommended third-party evaluation of schools conducted by professionals, who are not directly related to the school (e.g., university professors, educational researchers, and other experienced academics).

However, MEXT (2006a, 2008a) recognised that many schools had yet to implement the evaluation process or use inconsistent processes across schools. To encourage schools to perform effective evaluation, MEXT presented a plan–do–check–act model of school evaluation (i.e., PDCA cycle) to encourage schools to become more focused on school development. Teachers responded to this national policy demand with intensive and advanced use of Japanese lesson study, and this schoolwide approach helped schools to frame annual activities as a whole school.

Similarly, Australian teachers have been expected to participate in a “pedagogy–assessment loop” and an inclusive model of schoolwide assessment (Education Queensland, 2008b, p. 11). The model was somewhat similar to the Japanese model of school evaluation cycle (i.e., plan–do–check–act in the PDCA cycle) or that of the American lesson study cycle. Queensland Schools were expected to monitor, assess, and identify the current situation of child achievements carefully, so that they could plan more intensive support for children with special needs if necessary.

Ongoing professional development has been vital for teachers working for children with ASD, as research has been continuously moving forward. Professional development has been recognised as a vehicle of teaching in schools, and teachers have tried to maximise lesson impact through lesson planning in the West and Japan (Kihara, 2004). Kihara (2004) insisted that a collaborative process is essential for the ongoing improvement of classroom education, because experienced teachers are more able than novice teachers to look at lessons deeply and multidimensionally. Enlightened professional development has been considered as the “tie that binds the evidence-based practice to positive and desirable outcomes” from the perspective of practitioners or teachers (Odom, 2009, p. 57).
Figure 2.16 combines various aspects of educational collaboration around group teaching from various literature and illustrates an ideal model of collaborative partnerships that may relate to teaching children with ASD. The increasingly public nature of the professional relationship between a special educator and other adults in the education system have been intended to improve the outcomes of group lessons and other aspects of classroom activity. In the literature, there has been coverage of various level of collaborative partnership, for example, between university professors of special and regular education in the USA (Mayrowetz, 2009), and between teacher and professor, and among all school members (administration staff and teachers), between special and general education teachers, and among teachers in specific subject domain in Japan (Matoba et al., 2007). These collaborative ideas have realigned and expanded the role of each member of a school learning community. Although these collaborative relationships are emerging in literature, it has remained unclear how special educators work together and how other stakeholders are aligned with these educators.

An American researcher in the area of Mathematics, Mayrowetz (2009), argued that preservice education must be designed with better coordination between professors in special education and mathematics education programs, in order to provide standards-based instruction to children with disabilities. Investigation of policy convergence in elementary mathematic classroom showed, however, that the instruction of mathematic teachers in regular education is
inconsistent with policy messages (Mayrowetz, 2009). Hence, such findings have pointed to classroom challenges in making real-world instruction in each learning domain reflect both universal standards and individualised programming for children with disabilities.

Matoba et al. (2007) observed that the process of Japanese school change, through a three-year school–university partnership between Nagoya University and the Tokai City Board of Education, indicated positive outcomes: The process created an effective environment for teachers to learn from each other and develop more learning-centred education. Through lesson studies and collaborative school-based research activities, the outcomes included significant improvements in child achievements, child evaluations of their schools and teachers, supportive environments for teachers, and teacher attitudes toward their teaching roles. This study also showed that lesson studies based on positive and collaborative school–university partnerships could build a culture of learning among teachers within their teaching cycles involving planning, implementing, reflecting, and developing to deliver support for learning-centred education for children.

This Japanese innovation towards school–university partnerships in school-based research was aimed at enriching classroom practices, teacher professional development, and child learning. These innovations have been encouraged by the enactment of Kokuritsu Daigaku Hojin-ho, or the National University Corporations Law in April 2003. Matoba et al. (2007, p. 58) described the traditional relationship between university professors and school teachers:

Traditionally, Japanese school structure and policy has flexibility and authority for principals and staff to invite experts from universities to do collaborative research, to bring theory into practice and to support teachers in their development of practical knowledge, these kinds of relationships and collaborative research activities are most dependent upon the individual connections between researchers and teachers than partnerships and collaboration between institutions.

In the more innovative partnerships, however, many universities made efforts towards being more open and responsive to society, specifically in their collaboration with schools and Boards of Education. That is, the school–university partnerships were designed to establish openness of local schools towards the community, and they encouraged teachers to work collaboratively with university researchers to support systematic and critical thinking (Matoba et al., 2007). In the partnership model, it was expected that members of both institutions (i.e., academic researchers and local school teachers) would engage in a process of learning and sharing new ideas from school practice.

Although the educational literature has highlighted the importance of collaborations, the amount of time that the teachers actually spend in collaborating with others appeared to be limited in the West. Lewis (2011) conducted lesson study with American teachers and used two pyramids to illustrate how much Japanese and American teachers spent on each activity of lesson study related activities. Figure 2.17 shows that the Japanese teachers spent more on group plan, reflection, and discussion, whereas the American teachers spent more on individual curriculum study and plan, although both teacher groups followed the same lesson study model
Chapter 2 (see Figure 2.8). It indicates that the American teachers were more focused on individual skills development through curriculum study and plan rather than group inquiry into classroom learning. Although this study provided insight into Japanese and American regular education teachers’ culturally preferred way of using lesson study activities, there is no study about how Japanese and Australian special educators worked across their lesson study or curriculum development.

Relationships among research questions

This literature review has outlined some of the rich and generative perspectives on teacher work and some of the fairly rapid changes in educational provision for children with ASD. With respect to the work of special educators, there has been little inquiry into their everyday routines, their specialised instruction in group lessons, and the values they place on these lessons relative to their cultural context and the philosophical and research-informed conditions affecting work with a child with ASD in a small class. These educational realities need to be described better to enhance understanding so that special educators can consciously inform their teaching of a child with ASD in a small class.

Two figures are used to illustrate some of the insights into that work that may inform the three research questions in the present inquiry. Figure 2.18 demonstrates the parallels between these three research questions and the three phases of the Japanese lesson study model developed by Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009; see Figure 2.11). The methodological design of this inquiry may draw on the alignment between each of the research questions with each phase of lesson study.
Figure 2.18. Research questions in relation to the model of lesson study developed by Lewis, Perry, et al. (2009, p. 148).

Finally, Figure 2.19 aligns the three research questions with four contemporary models of teacher work. The model of multilayered influences on teacher work (see Figure 2.1; Noffke, 1997) appears at the wide base of the cone. The forward position of the professional component of teacher work emphasises the special educator’s primary and practical concern with teaching the whole class but recognises the complex interplay between professional, personal, and political components of teacher work. These components are thought to affect daily practice (RQ1), and then, together, affect group instruction (RQ2) and valued outcomes (RQ3). It appears likely that the teaching models of (a) the integration of thinking, doing, and relating into group instruction (see Figure 2.3; Kemmis, 2009), (b) the instructional dynamics of classroom teaching (see Figure 2.4; Ball & Forzani, 2007), (c) the cycle of lesson planning processes (see Figure 2.8; Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009), and (d) the use of social theory and evidence for curriculum development (see Figure 2.6; ten Have, 2004), shown to the right side of RQ1, also affect RQ2 and RQ3. This figure also helps to identify aspects of the methodological design of this inquiry.
Chapter 2

The shaded parts are findings from literature reviews or document reviews. The lighter parts are focused on data collection.

RQ1: Daily Practice
- Teaching groups of children with ASD
  - Cultural assumptions about group and individuality applying to class lessons
  - Curriculum (Course of Studies/P-12) & Lesson planning
  - Curriculum and curriculum development
  - Collaboration: Lesson study and co-planning as alternative methods for teacher collaboration

RQ2: Group Instruction
- How do teachers view “teacher work”?
- What is daily routine of teachers?
- How do teachers teach individual children within a group and the group as whole?
- How do teachers work as a team for teaching?

RQ3: Valued Outcomes
- Assessment and monitoring for children outcomes, group instruction, and school improvement
- What child outcomes do teachers look at?
- What outcomes are recorded?
- How do the teachers view instructional improvements and school improvements?

Current changes in:
- Policy
- Ideas about teaching, teacher profession, and educational research

Political
- Current changes in:
  - Policy
  - Ideas about teaching, teacher profession, and educational research

Personal

Professional

Figure 2.19. Structure of research questions in relation to the literature review and data collection.
Conclusion

This chapter outlined the relevant literature about three research questions and introduced diagrams that are used for study design, data analysis, and discussion. The section of Daily Practice provided starting points for understanding the everyday work of special educators and for viewing the teaching of children with ASD. It outlined layers of influences on teacher work and reviews culturally situated teaching. It also gave an overview of similarities and differences in current Japanese and Australian education.

The section of Group Instruction highlighted the role of self-improvement in professional development and the use of teacher collaboration for teaching a lesson. Curriculum (Course of Studies in Japan and P-12 Curriculum Framework in Queensland) and related policies and lesson planning processes (Japanese lesson study in Japan and positive behaviour support for co-planning in Australia) were outlined to present their similar and different aspects. In this section, the EBP literature was reviewed, class teaching for children with ASD was located within the current English-language literature framework of a range of interventions and treatments, and a Japanese and Australian way of working with a class group of children with ID/ASD was explored.

The section of Valued Relationships provided an inspection of the relationships and social powers that structure them. It showed that these relationships comprised the conditions of teaching and illuminated values and preferences that concern special educators’ ways of working within their respective environments. Teachers and schools in both countries have been required more accountability for child outcomes, and issues of assessment and measurements of child outcomes have been highlighted. In this section, examinations of important pathways of improving teaching children with ASD were highlighted. The next chapter will outline the relevance of the methodological design of this inquiry.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, methodological aspects of this research are discussed. First, it provides a methodological overview to highlight a complexity of this inquiry. Second, it outlines the rationale for the overall case study design. The third section details research tools initially designed for this inquiry, followed by the process of refining these tools for each case study. This section also details the methods, procedures, and instruments used for the two planned phases of situational analysis (Phase 1) and field research (Phase 2), with Phase 1 in progress before, during, and after Phase 2. It then outlines a cross-cultural inquiry to extract cross-case and case-specific findings.

Overview

This case study was designed as a qualitative cross-cultural inquiry in special education in order to produce evidence about how special education classroom teachers work with children with ASD within a special class of children with intellectual disabilities (ID). The three research questions were addressed to practical descriptions about how special educators in two cultural contexts (viz., Japan and Australia) spend their days and teach lessons to and interact with these children in their respective classes and, also, about what educational outcomes they expect the children to achieve from these lessons and interactions (see Table 3.1). Hence, this case study was conceived as a straightforward inquiry into the actions and activities of these special educators that encompassed what they do, say, and value as teachers (Kemmis, 2009) within sociohistorical expectations about the work of these teachers operating in their respective educational systems.

Table 3.1
*Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily practice</td>
<td>What makes up the daily practice of special education teachers working with children with ASD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group instruction</td>
<td>How do special education teachers use “group instruction” to teach children with ASD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued outcomes</td>
<td>What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to conduct an authentic inquiry into everyday phenomena in teaching, the research design employed multimethod and multisource data collection to assemble detailed descriptions of teacher practice in the two case school sites (Creswell, 2012). Multiple activities and methods were used to cross-check teachers’ talk, actions, and written words. Moreover, a situational analysis of each site, involving interviews with key stakeholders, was conducted to consider systemic influences outside of individual classroom contexts that act inward on how the teachers work. In addition, piloting of research activities was undertaken to assure relevance to the teaching context, and teachers and site advisers (i.e., a university professor who was a professional school supervisor of the participating teachers in Japan and a school principal in Australia) often participated in designing research materials and instructions and in negotiating aspects of inquiry design. Finally, from the beginning to end of this inquiry (i.e., research design and data collection and analysis), the researcher maintained ongoing personal reflections about her research experiences (e.g., activities, thoughts, decisions, and feelings) to accompany field notes, track methodological details, and record important events affecting the inquiry.

Table 3.2 summarises research activities, inquiring about teaching children with ASD, planned for both Japanese and Australian sites across two phases of school field research and situational analysis with ongoing cross-case reflections. To investigate a teacher’s day (i.e., RQ1), activities involved interviewing various key stakeholders about their expectations of special educators working with children with ASD, formally interviewing each teacher once in depth about a teaching day at the beginning of field research, and observing all teachers’ whole day once during the field research. To investigate teaching group lessons to a class (i.e., RQ2), activities involved observing lessons regularly through a period of 9 weeks in Japan and 7 weeks in Australia, formally interviewing each teacher about lessons once in depth around the midperiod of field research, asking for their reflections on lessons and planning activities after each week of teaching in the period, and undertaking other supplementary activities such as probing teacher’s thinking about a lesson’s Key Moments (i.e., critical events or happenings concerning teaching children with ASD). To investigate valued outcomes (i.e., RQ3), the activities involved a final formal interview in depth, observations of children’s interactions with their teachers during several lessons, and consideration of ancillary information from other sources accumulated through the inquiry.

The primary focus of this inquiry was the field research with the special educators over an extended period of time comprising early weeks of each school’s year, after the teachers completed their initial lesson planning. It was considered that this prospective approach to the accumulation of data from complementary methods contributed to authentic description. This field research involved interviewing individual special educators about their teaching, observing them in their classrooms and professional meetings, and reviewing relevant system, school, and teaching documentation about the children, class lessons, curricula, and other educational materials. While the children did not participate actively, some observations of children’s
interactions within their classrooms were made to describe this reciprocal aspect of teacher–child engagement and achievements, especially in lessons to whole class groups.

Everyday variations in the complex classroom environment involved a change of plan for a day or a class session. Participating teachers negotiated alternative arrangements for a scheduled research activity that typically involved physical changes in timing of events, locations, and number of sessions. To the extent that these practical vagaries of teaching affected operational organisation of data collection and analysis of the research questions, this inquiry needed to accommodate some minor effects on findings and their interpretation.

Table 3.2
Summary of Data Collection Activities Planned for Both Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing. Cross-case reflective activity from the beginning to end of inquiry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reflection log: Recording the researcher’s personal reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1. Situational analysis phase planned from the beginning to end of each case study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational analysis document review: Mapping layered contexts around teacher practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semistructured interviews with “ecological” representatives of each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2. School field research phase planned for up to 9 weeks at the beginning of the school year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interview: Collecting teacher talk about their work and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Three semistructured interviews focusing on each research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Reflection interviews about each week and designated lesson at the end of the teaching week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Reflection interviews about the Key Moment of video-recorded lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation: Collecting data on teaching aspects of everyday practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Classroom lesson observations focusing on classroom interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Teaching day observations focusing on activities and duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Teacher meeting observation focusing on lesson study process (Japan only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching document review: Collecting teaching documents about everyday work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural sensitivities encountered in the course of this inquiry affected the conceptual organisation of activities planned to address the research questions, and these issues arose in the Japanese and Australian case sites. Over time, it became apparent that methodological adjustments and modifications to improve an activity’s goodness of fit within the respective contexts were more intricate than practical issues of flexibility in data collection and analysis. Qualitative researchers studying teacher practice in different nations have recently begun to acknowledge the effects of strong social and cultural frontiers on their studies (e.g., Gómez & Kuronen, 2011; Yang, 2011). Gómez and Kuronen (2011), for example, linked these unexpected challenges to “cultural differences, semantic similarities hiding differences, differences of conceptualization, and language” (p. 687). They suggested that dealing with these challenges, rather than treating these frontiers as barriers to research, may open possibilities to understand actors’ conceptual framework in a social and cultural context different from that of a researcher.

A process of data analysis for two cases that began earlier in the inquiry continued after the end of fieldwork, because the researcher was actively engaged in cross-cultural effects to
deal with cultural sensitivities and to explore indications of hidden findings in her reflections. To the extent that methodological responses to these cultural sensitivities became an active dimension of the research design, data collection and analysis became somewhat less straightforward than an opportunity to inspect and contrast the practice of special educators. To the extent that teaching is social practice based in its sociohistorical context (Noffke, 1997), the embedding of research activities in the cultural contexts of Japan and Australia permeated and affected the outcomes of this inquiry. These effects not only complicated aspects of data collection and analysis but also enriched findings and their interpretation. Therefore, this chapter also outlines the decision-making challenges and solutions involved in designing activities, developing instruments and other materials, managing the layers of data collection, and analysing the cases throughout this inquiry.

Extra piloting activities, for example, were conducted to understand case-contexts and help prepare case-sensitive procedures and instruments prior to fieldwork. Moreover, these procedures and instruments required further definition progressively with participating teachers and site advisers. Multiple processes of translation and transinterpretation between the two languages (i.e., Japanese and English) were required to develop culturally meaningful interview questions. “Language as a carrier of cultural meanings” (Gómez & Kuronen, 2011, p. 692) complicated cross-cultural communication about interview questions, which required reframing of themes whose meanings were discovered to differ across the two cases. For each case, site advisers helped refine the set of questions for each teacher group to fit into their respective local context. Participating teachers also contributed to this process as they engaged in piloting activities, weekly-based reflections during field research, or both. Likewise, a multilayered reflection (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a) was employed to produce translated transcriptions of the Japanese interview texts meaningful to the English speaking readers and to scrutinise culturally specific meanings in Japanese terms. Moreover, to enable these two cases involving different data sets to be compared and contrasted, structural features of classroom ecology shared between the two cases (Doyle, 2006) were identified and employed to create a common framework (see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2) for mapping these different data sets. These features of everyday reality common to these classrooms included a small group of children and a special educator, space and time, dimensions of the class curriculum, and teaching and learning activities. Application of this structural framework to these data sets allowed the researcher to conduct multiple cross-checking activities to extract case-specific findings for each research question.

**Overall Case Study Design**

The three main methodological features of the present inquiry were (a) qualitative description of everyday phenomena in teaching a class, (b) cross-cultural contextualisation of teaching in Japan and Australia, and (c) two-site case study of special educators working with children with
ASD within a small class. This section first discusses the definitions of these three methodological features and their rationales for use in the present inquiry. It also provides an overview of case study design.

First, this inquiry of everyday phenomena in teaching children with ASD adopted a mainly qualitative approach. For quantitative research, culture has been considered secondary (Silverman, 2006) to the main concern for measurement of specific variables and identification of structural hierarchies. In contrast, qualitative inquiry has been identified as an effective approach for examining cultural issues (Brown & Rogers, 2003) and for exploring “local contexts, explanations, interpretations of individuals, unique aspects, and cultural nuances” (Gómez & Kuronen, 2011, p. 694). The present qualitative inquiry has been focused on a “big picture” of teaching in each case and its “social and cultural construction...[of]...variables” contributing to the complex nature of teaching children with ASD (Silverman, 2006, p. 29). That is, the educational phenomena of research interest were “not at the moment ‘countable’, whether for practical and/or for theoretical reasons” (ten Have, 2004, p. 4).

Second, this qualitative investigation of strengths of and reasons for particular ways of teaching these children in Japan and Australia adopted a cross-cultural approach. In particular, Daley (2002) emphasised the need for cross-cultural research on ASD to promote culturally appropriate practice for children with ASD (see Chapter 1). This method has been developed to reveal culturally specific aspects of phenomena relative to universal and culturally shared aspects (e.g., Callingham, 2012; Dronkers, 2010; Gómez & Kuronen, 2011; Lewis, Koyasu, et al., 2009; Matson et al., 2011; Matson, Worley, et al., 2012; Ojima & von Below, 2010; Park, 2010). In recent discussions about cross-cultural research, there has been considerable interest in qualitative cross-cultural inquiry “to find ‘absences’ [and invisible routines], phenomena that are systematically excluded [from local practitioners’ common sense thinking about typical work and practice] or so self-evident in one setting that they can be recognized only in comparison with another setting” (Gómez & Kuronen, 2011, p. 694). Similarly, Rodríguez, Rodríguez, and Mojica (2012, p. 267) proposed that the “frontier” or crossing point between two cultures defines an inside and an outside to a cultural phenomenon under investigation and that dialogues between different points of view make possible advances in social science (see also, the model of social science research proposed by ten Have, 2004, to reveal relative contextual preferences for theories and evidence about a given phenomenon).

Third, within the qualitative and cross-cultural approach to studying how special educators work with children with ASD across a school day, teach lessons to a whole class as a group, and value certain aspects of their students’ learning and other outcomes, the adoption of a case study approach permitted indepth description of these phenomena. This method has been routinely considered an appropriate methodology to explore multiple variables that are too complex for survey and experimental approaches (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). Specifically, Stake (2006) proposed multicase study research to observe the performance of the same phenomenon...
in different and multilayered environments and examine the complexity of “phenomena” interacting with background conditions. He also acknowledged the relevance of multicasestudy research to investigate cross-national phenomena that involve “the public, the authorities, and the professions” (Stake, 2006, p. x). Stake (2006) cited, as his particular example of an occasion for multicasestudy, “treatment of children with autism” (p. ix) as a set of phenomena embedded in culture. The present inquiry provided such an occasion.

Figure 3.1 illustrates the methodological framework of this inquiry. Researcher’s reflections accompanied collection of data with these methods. In the right column, the sequence of methods clustered the contextual activities (e.g., collecting school and teacher documents) that tended to start before the teacher-focused activities (e.g., the series of interviews and observations of what special educators say, do and, value about teaching children with ASD). However, the first individual teacher interview occurred early in each site in order to capture established routines and scheduling before the inquiry became a substantive contribution to each case.

In the central column, the sequence of data collection progressed from contexts outside the classroom, daily class context of activities, teaching of specific daily lessons to the class, to teachers’ talk about lessons. Just as situational analysis was used to inform field research as the primary focus of this inquiry of teaching, so the noninterview activities (observations and document review) were used to inform the teacher talk, which was the primary focus of this inquiry about teaching group lessons. Hence, teachers’ direct input about what they do could be cross-checked against observational data about what they actually do. Because the talk of Japanese teachers was found previously to be abstract (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a), more observable data sets were needed to provide more objective and concrete information for reality checks. Other collected data were used to examine teacher everyday work and practice with and against teacher self-report in order to improve understanding of their classroom instructional dynamics: how the teachers interpreted, planned, and enacted teaching curriculum with adjustment for the children with ASD (Ball & Forzani, 2007). Importantly, a term-long period of fieldwork helped to counter any effects of the researcher’s presence. Although the participating teachers, children, and other stakeholders might alter their usual behaviours in earlier weeks, it was assumed that, with more time and repeated contacts, they would resume their usual behaviours as they become used to the presence of the researcher in their classrooms (Berg & Lune, 2012).

In the left column, the sequence of perspectives on teaching was designed to progress from external stakeholder perspectives on teaching, to paper-based and observed perspectives on lessons in teacher work and practice, to a teacher’s own perspective (lens) on lessons and interactions with children, and to the researcher’s intercultural perspectives on teaching at these two sites. In this sequence, the researcher’s logs were intended to provide a reflective tool to simultaneously inspect and compare activities and events from both sites.
Figure 3.1. Methodological features and layered methods across data collection and analysis for each case study and for cross-cultural case study.

Importantly, a cross-cultural inquiry was ongoing from the beginning to the end of this cross-cultural case study because the researcher actively engaged in reflections about her difficulties arising from case differences and about her cross-case interpretations of shared aspects of the inquiry (i.e., research questions). Intercultural sensitivity has been proposed to be essential to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences (Hammer, Bennet, & Wiseman, 2003). Throughout the cross-cultural inquiry, the Japanese case study was viewed with an Australian point of view, while the Australian case study was examined with a Japanese point of view. As addressed throughout the last section, during gathering data, reflections recorded in the researcher’s personal logs contained her analytic points of views on case-specific aspects of teacher work and practice through exchanging methods between two cases.
and dealing with the participants’ concerns when they encountered something different from what they believed to be normal.

**Research Tools**

**Original schedule**

Situational analysis was designed to take into account the external environment surrounding the daily work of participating teachers, to identify important ecological features of their classrooms and schools, and to reveal, if possible, underlying contextually formed purposes for what these teachers do. This phase was included to obtain information about possible environmental factors, both internal and external influences to individual teachers at their respective sites. The basis for this method was broadly known theoretical views about human interaction in context (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, Dewey, and Vygotsky) and a specific application of an ecological perspective to educational analysis (Annan, 2005). The complexities involved in teaching children with disabilities have been mapped systematically with this method (e.g., Annan, 2005; Arthur, Beecher, Death, Dockett, & Farmer, 2008; Blakeley-Smith, Carr, Cale, & Owen-DeSchryver, 2009; Bowler, Annan, & Mentis, 2007; Print, 1993). A wide range of document review and individual interviews with key stakeholders were involved in this phase.

In the field research phase, investigation of the three research questions was informed by collection of “teacher talk” about their practice, direct and repeated observation of teacher practice and work, and complementary review of their documentation of their everyday activities (see Figure 3.1). Multiple methods included in these schedules encompassed (a) a series of three semistructured interviews with individual teachers about each of the three research questions and a series of brief weekly follow-up reflection interviews about their week’s work, its Key Moments in interacting with children and teaching lessons, and informal and formal interactions with others; (b) an ongoing series of direct observations of each teacher’s teaching days and classroom lessons and professional meetings of various kinds with various teaching colleagues; and (c) ongoing review of teaching documentation related to everyday work, lessons with the class, and expected educational outcomes. Participating teachers negotiated, as needed, variations to these agreed schedules for these three types of activities.

Table 3.3 shows the research activities originally scheduled over 11 weeks early in a school year for each participating teacher in Japan and Australia. This schedule was developed after the Japanese piloting period. Three semistructured individual interviews (Interviews A, B, & C) for each teacher were developed to ask questions aligned with the three research questions (see Table 3.1): Interview A about RQ1 in a Preparation Week, Interview B about RQ2 in a mid-Observation Week (ObWk), and Interview B about RQ3 in a post-ObWk. Times for weekly lesson observations were planned with the participating teachers to avoid timetabling...
clashes. Moreover, a time for observing a teaching day was planned with each teacher around a midweek of the field research. In addition, observations of teacher meetings were planned to fit into the existing school schedule. The teachers informed the researcher when meetings were being held. In this original planning, reflection interviews were planned for every Friday after lesson observations were conducted for that week.

Table 3.3
Original Schedule of Research Activity for Each Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ObWk</th>
<th>Semistructured interview (30-45 mins)</th>
<th>Reflection interview (10-20 mins)</th>
<th>Teaching day observation (One whole day)</th>
<th>Lesson observation (15-90 mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>√-Interview A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>√-Interview B</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>√-Interview C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video (MP4)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio (MP3)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present inquiry, audiovisual observational data about teachers’ naturalistic interactions (e.g., teacher instructions, verbal and nonverbal engagement with the children with ASD in a group setting, discussions with other teachers during teacher meetings) were considered likely to be a helpful resource in checking coding reliability and testing possible explanations of findings (Health, 2004). Video, in particular, has been recognised as a useful tool to examine the complexity of human interaction (Health, 2004) and as an emerging topic in qualitative research focusing on social interaction in natural settings (e.g., Knoblauch, 2012). Moreover, audiovisual data of lesson observations, in particular, were planned to use to create video-clip examples of Key Moments in lessons (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012a) for visual stimulus recall (Sherin, Linsenmeier, & van Es, 2009). The process and aims of using this method are detailed later.

Table 3.3 also shows some basic recording technologies employed in data collection for later analysis (e.g., MP3 and MP4 recorders). Video recordings were planned to use mostly with teacher participants for semistructured interviews, lesson and teacher meeting observations and with situational analysis participants for their interviews in both sites. Only audio recording was planned to use during reflection interviews, because it was considered that teachers were too busy to wait for the extra time needed to set up the video technology for the frequent interactions. It was intended to use field notes only for teaching day observations, except during the time scheduled for the lesson observation when the equipment for audio and visual
recordings could be set up. It was considered that these recordings during teacher observations may cause ethical issues as teachers move around the school and interact with other children, teachers, parents, and others who had not given formal consent.

**Initial teacher interview topics**

Table 3.4 shows the two different types of interviews used to collect teacher talk: (a) three semistructured interviews across the weeks (Interviews A, B, & C) and (b) weekly reflective follow-up interviews (reflection interviews). Participating teachers were invited, in these more and less structured interviews, to share information about day-to-day practice, perceptions about group instruction, and professional judgements about useful outcomes from that instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Format of the Question</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semistructured interviews</td>
<td>Semi-focused questions framed by each research question</td>
<td>The teachers’ personal thoughts and experiences regarding each research question. Three sets of interview questions were designed respectively for each research question. (30 minutes x 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection interviews</td>
<td>More open-ended questions</td>
<td>The teachers’ personal thoughts and experiences as well as feelings that they had during the previous week/s. Teacher reflection on their practice for teaching children with ASD, work with others, and making their professional decisions was the focus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special educators have professional authority in classroom programming and its management of curriculum, relationships, pedagogy, and inclass assessment but not in other aspects of special education related to government policy and school procedures (Arthur et al., 2008; Mazzotti, Test, & Wood, 2013). It appeared that teachers may view some aspects of their work as routine and often have not been able to articulate all aspects of their practice (Gómez & Kuronen, 2011). Insofar as interviews helped to reveal teachers’ unfolding ways of knowing about what they do, they were connected to the qualitative traditions of narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1987, 1988, 1990, 2006), use of selected details of experiences from stream of consciousness (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2007), and meaning-making stories (Seidman, 2006; Silverman, 2006; Webster & Mertova, 2007).

*Semistructured interviews* involved standardised questions and allowed additional probing for more clarification of a teacher’s talk to collect interview-relevant thoughts and experiences (Barriball & While, 1994) This method has been widely used to explore experiences and their meanings of these experiences when little is known about a topic of interest (Adams, 2010). Each of these semistructured interviews focused on one research question and was framed with three main questions to structure the teachers’ talk:
Interview A about daily practice:
(a) classroom activities and other duties throughout a teaching day;
(b) time spent on these activities and duties; and
(c) support for the nominated child with ASD throughout the day as well as collegial work with other school staff in general.

Interview B about group instruction:
(a) adjusting activities in planning and teaching and collegial support for planning;
(b) teaching and supporting strategies for the nominated child with ASD during group lesson and collegial support for improving a lesson; and
(c) the meaning of group instruction to the teacher.

Interview C about valued outcomes:
(a) valued outcomes for the child with ASD;
(b) valued outcomes for the teacher; and
(c) valued outcomes for the school.

Reflection interviews provided a teacher’s own descriptions of work and practice for ASD phenomena in the context of teaching a small group. In contrast to semistructured interviews, these interviews used more open-ended questions but disallowed extra probing questions (see Table 3.4). The teacher’s interests, relationships, and structures within which they worked were aligned to capture their instructional experience (i.e., human-centred approach; Webster & Mertova, 2007). Inspection of a teacher’s ideas about observed events or interactive phenomena have also been used to clarify any mismatch with the interviewer’s interpretation. Teacher interests and concerns guided brief spontaneous comments in a human-centred method of interviewing that was used to identify critical events and key moments through their impact on teachers (Webster & Mertova, 2007). Moreover, this method was considered useful to explore how the teachers work in everyday teaching adjustments (see Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2; Kemmis, 2009). Three main questions were developed for reflection interviews:
(a) overall reflection on the last week (i.e., the week started from the day after the previous reflection interview to the day of the present reflection interview);
(b) reflection specifically on the group lessons; and
(c) any collegial activities or advice during the last week.

In addition, during reflection interviews, it was planned to ask the teachers to view the video-clip examples created from selected parts of video-recoding of their lessons and describe the lesson moment (or scene). The video-clip examples were designed as stimulated recall materials, which has been recognised as a valuable tool to explore the situated nature of behaviours (Jenkins, Bloor, Fischer, Berney, & Neale, 2010). Video-recording of one’s own teaching practice has been recognised as an emerging tool that helps teachers to improve their practices. In Japanese lesson study practices, many teachers video-record their own lessons and
reflect on the video by themselves and in a lesson study group. Some schools in the USA have started using this method to provide windows into student thinking, the depth of thinking shown, and the clarity of the thinking (e.g., Sherin et al., 2009). This method was considered to provide a subjective researcher–participant comparability of the targeted moment (Rice, Robone, & Smith, 2010) and allow the researcher to facilitate, particularly, the Japanese teachers to talk about more concrete contexts (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012a).

**Observation topics**

Three types of observational activities informed three research questions: (a) teaching day observations focused on a teacher’s activities and routines across a typical teaching day (RQ1); (b) classroom lesson observations focused on how a teacher interacted with the children and taught group lessons (RQ2) and how teaching changed across a term (RQ3); and (c) teacher meeting observations focused on teachers’ collaborations about teaching their children (RQ2) and about individually valued outcomes of teaching (RQ3) discussed in meetings. Lesson observations related to RQ2 were the main focus of inquiry. Findings about the other research questions provided additional information about (a) teaching of group lessons relative to the broader context of the teacher’s day, (b) the teacher’s views of desired and achieved children’s outcomes from lessons, and (c) how a teacher monitored child achievements from lessons and changed their teaching in subsequent lessons.

Observational activities aligned with contemporary ethnography included field notes, ethically approved video recordings, and supplemental materials. In a broad sense, these activities were used to gather information about teachers’ actions in concrete (Gobo, 2011) and natural (Angrosino, 2005) settings within their everyday contexts (Griffin & Bengry-Howell, 2008) across an extensive period of time. *Field notes* was planned for all three types of observations to collect key events related to research questions (Griffin & Bengry-Howell, 2008) and to identify unpredicted happenings possibly influencing human interactions during the observation from the researcher’s point of view. Focused notes on the classroom were organised around the three research questions connecting with Silverman’s suggestion that the observers must have specific foci when they take field notes (2006). The critical events before observations (e.g., one child did not come back to class after a bleak time) and during observations (e.g., school principal visited the classroom) were noted, associated with other contextual information that may influence the teachers’ decision making. Moreover, field notes have been used to describe and deconstruct the “culture of an organisation”: that is, how these teachers worked with others as part of school organisation (Eberle & Maeder, 2011, p. 65). Critical events or influential interactions among the school staff noted during the observations and across the week (e.g., one senior teacher visited the Japanese unit) were also recorded for later analysis.
Case-Sensitive Research Methods

The enactment of the interviews and other aspects of research design were intended as straightforward into everyday practice but required a more layered process of developing and defining research activities and instruments. For example, the interview questions were originally planned to go through a translation-back-translation process: (a) the questions for both cases were initially developed based on the literature review in English for the ethical application, (b) these initial English questions were translated into Japanese by the researcher, (c) the Japanese translated questions were retranslated into English by Japanese–English bilingual doctoral students of one Australian university, and (d) cross-language translation reliability was confirmed by comparing the initial English questions with the retranslated English questions. And then, these questions were tested through preliminary piloting activities prior to implementation of field research at the site schools. However, these questions continuously required further refinement with local participants during each field research to take into account local contexts.

Preliminary piloting activities

Piloting activities were undertaken in order to improve the researcher’s understanding of Japanese and Australian school environments for developing initial research schedules for each site (see details in Appendices A and B). Prior to the implementation of the case study in each country, piloting was conducted in two units attached to two schools in Japan (i.e., national elementary) and two schools in Australia (i.e., one special education unit attached to a state primary school and one special school). Interview questions were piloted in both countries during these periods. Video recording was also tested in Preparation Week with the participating teachers in Japan and during piloting activities with the pilot special school in Australia. Through these processes, key adjustments for interview questions and preferable procedures were identified for each site. Further adjustments were then made progressively during Phases 1 and 2 in each site.

Japan. During piloting activities, after being given a presentation of the research proposal, potential participating teachers were invited to share their thoughts about appropriate interview questions and procedures and to identify their concerns about this inquiry. Teachers at two potential schools comprised three teachers from one school that became the active site (i.e., JT1, JT2, and head of unit, who was working as a classroom teacher in one of the special education classrooms at the time) and four teachers from another school. Teachers at both schools reported a preference for being interviewed by broad questions with examples. This preference was also noted in previous focus group discussions with Japanese teachers (Kikkawa, 2007; Kikkawa, Bryer, & Beamish, 2013). In response to the request, semistructured interviews included collaborative activities or visual probes, and reflection interviews used video-clip
examples that were created from recordings of lessons and posed a broad question (e.g., "Please describe what is happening in the video clips").

**Australia.** Piloting activities involved the testing of procedures to observe lessons with two potential participating teachers (i.e., one in a special education unit and one in another Queensland state special school) and trials of semistructured and reflection interviews with one teacher (i.e., special school). Through this process, classroom contexts were found to require considerations of presence of other adults during a lesson (e.g., extra consent forms for these classroom participants). Teacher meeting observations for lesson development were also found irrelevant to the Australian context. Moreover, activities and probes were found to be disturbing to free talk in the Australian interviews and, therefore, were minimised. For example, during the second semistructured interviews, the Japanese teachers were asked about general views of a group lesson first and then asked about specific instructions for individual children with ASD, while the Australian teachers were asked directly about their specific instructions for those with ASD because they were able to articulate what they actually do in shared terms used in the EBP literature (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a).

### Ongoing process of refining interview questions

Figure 3.2 illustrates the ongoing mirror-image construction of defining interview questions employed for both teacher and situational analysis participants in both cases (see Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012b). It indicates that the interview questions were designed first for the Japanese school context through a cross-cultural process of translation and transinterpretation and then drafted for the Australian school context from the questions used for the Japanese school through the mirror-imaging process. Moreover, it shows that “meaning-making, collaborative inquiry” (e.g., Piliouras & Evangelou, 2012, p. 330) was used to negotiate interview questions relevant to their respective contexts and to conceptualise work and practice in each school’s cultural setting (viz., a process of action research learning within and between schools). To make interviewing topics comparable in both cases, the key words (i.e., thematic categories) in each cultural context (Ryen, 2002) were used to characterise the same phenomena and, thus, to frame teachers’ talk and its cross-cultural comparability (Barriball & While, 1994).

Similarly, the research schedule was also modified throughout the inquiry. The original schedule (see Table 3.3) was presented at the beginning of fieldwork in Japan and then adjusted throughout the Japanese fieldwork. The original schedule was then revised to fit in the Australian school year framework (i.e., terms were organised with different numbers of weeks in each site) and then modified after the Australian piloting and during fieldwork period.
At both sites, there were ongoing adjustments to this original schedule and further individual adjustments for each participant in both sites during the field research. For example, differences in the school time frame affected the total duration of field research. The Japanese school had a longer teaching period without long holidays in the first term (a total of 17 weeks), while the Australian school had the shorter teaching periods separated by two-week holidays in their first and second terms (a total of 20 weeks excluding holidays). In addition, the time required to find an appropriate site for the Australian case delayed the start of the field research to the second term of their first semester. Moreover, adjustments to lesson observations were more consistently required in the Australian site: its greater variety of group lessons across a week and more unpredictable happenings and irregular changes (e.g., child or teacher sickness, family issues, irregular changes of the lessons or classroom schedule) contrasted with the Japanese site. Furthermore, teacher meeting observations applied only in the Japanese case; the Australian teachers engaged in independent lesson planning and did not conduct joint teacher meetings about lesson planning.

Furthermore, the use of video-clip examples to stimulate teachers’ reflection interviews on lessons was also planned to use with the Australian teachers. However, this method of using video-clip examples was acceptable only in the Japanese site with its culture of collaborative observation and critique of teaching; it was not acceptable in the Australian site. More specifically, this tool was withdrawn because the teachers expressed their discomfort and
unwillingness to engage in this method. In relation to this change, reflection interviews in the Australian case study were rescheduled, soon after the lesson observations, to help the teachers reflect on fresh memory and on identified Key Moments.

**Multimethod Data Collection**

This section detailed procedures of collecting data through the methods illustrated in Figure 3.. Table 3.5 shows the cross-site timetable for data collection in each country across a school year. Various piloting activities, addressed earlier, were conducted at the end of the school year prior to the inquiry in both countries and were extended in Australia as part of site selection process. Each case study commenced with situational analysis (i.e., Phase 1) at the beginning of the 2010 Japanese school year (i.e., April 1st 2010–March 31st 2011) and the 2011 Australian school year (i.e., January 1st 2011–December 31st 2011). Field research (i.e., Phase 2), including Preparation Week, ObWks, and post-ObWk, ran 11 weeks in Japan and 9 weeks in Australia, while situational analysis continued throughout each school year.

Table 3.5  
Cross-Site Timetables for Japanese and Australian Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, it outlines the preliminary process of finding site schools and participants in each country and describes challenges arising from system differences during this process. It also addresses ethical considerations in conducting this inquiry and, specifically, conditional variations in ethical procedure for each site. Moreover, it addresses the detailed methods, procedures, and materials used for each case with case-specific adjustments, in order to highlight relevant decision making.

**Site schools and participants**

Two different cultural groups were chosen to scrutinise the teaching practice of special education classroom teachers working with children with ASD (viz., Japan and Australia). One Japanese site was selected first, and then one Australian site was chosen. Each site was required to meet preselection criteria prior to the implementation of the fieldwork (i.e., the class includes at least one child with a formal diagnosis of ASD), and three classes were selected for each site. Table 3.6 shows the three key criteria identified for site selection: (a) children with ASD in full-time special education placement; (b) school with an existing connection to a university through preservice practicum of special education university students; and (c) school-produced
documentation about its operations available online. National and contextual differences in the respective system for special education placement of children with ASD added considerable time and effort to finding comparable sites in the two countries (Appendix C). For example, special education units in this state of Australia were no longer offering full-time placement for children with ASD enrolled in regular education schools. As a result, the contextual differences between two sites included the classes’ location relative to its host building (i.e., elementary versus special school).

Table 3.6
Contextual Differences between Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time special education placement</td>
<td>Special needs education unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional connection to university</td>
<td>The elementary school attached to a national university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-documentation available online</td>
<td>Lesson study reports, school emphasis, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School progress reports, school emphasis, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both sites, the primary diagnosis for children in these classes was intellectual disability (ID), and therefore, all children with ASD attending the site had dual diagnosis with ID. In this respect, the cross-cultural inquiry at these sites was investigating about how special educators worked with children with ASD, who also had other impairments. Matson and Nebel-Schwalm (2007) noted that ASD is commonly studied in association with ID and highlighted the issue of this comorbidity in prioritising intervention goals (i.e., which diagnosis can be looked at as primary or secondary disorder). They stated that “comorbid is the ‘other disorder’ which co-occurs with the condition of most interest to the parent or professional” (p. 348) and suggested a way of determining the primary disorder based on the degree to which disorder (i.e., ASD and ID in this inquiry) affects a child’s daily routine. In this sense, investigating special education classrooms involving children with dual diagnosis of ASD and ID would provide examples of what symptoms associated with children’s disorders were targeted by special educators during their teaching and of how they address their needs.

The Japanese site was chosen because of the close alignment of prefecture emphasis on interpersonal and social abilities, schoolwide lesson study approach and an established connection between the researcher and her external supervisor who was a professor of the host university (see details in Appendix C). Prior to this decision, two other schools were contacted and found unsuitable for this inquiry after examining their placement and teaching emphases. One national school, for example, allocated children with ASD into three classes according to children’s abilities rather than age groups, while one public school did not have full-time placement for children with ASD in its special education unit. Table 3.7 shows the number of children with ASD enrolled in each participating class of special needs education unit (SNEU, hereafter) in the Japanese site relative to the specific age group and total numbers of children in
Formal diagnosis of ASD for the children enrolled in the Japanese classes was confirmed by the Japanese external supervisor prior to the researcher’s direct approach to the school. According to the Basic Act on Education (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology: MEXT, 2006c), children enter elementary schools on their first April 1st after they reach their sixth birthday. The three classes in this SNEU were organised for children’s ages: SNEU1 (Years 1-2, Ages 6-8), SNEU2 (Years 3-4, Ages 8-10), and SNEU3 (Years 5-6, Ages 10-12). All of the SNEU teachers agreed to participate in this fieldwork.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Code</th>
<th>Age group of children</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of children with ASD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>6-8 years old (Year 1-2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>8-10 years old (Year 3-4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEU3</td>
<td>10-12 years old (Year 5-6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Australian site was selected as the most comparable to the Japanese site. Three other schools were invited and preliminarily investigated, particularly about children’s placement, prior to finalising the Australian site. For example, a special education unit attached to its state primary school was the first contact and was found unsuitable to the inquiry because all children with ASD spent a majority of time in their mainstream classrooms and had only individual instruction in the unit. Notably, a gap between a formal diagnosis and teachers’ recognition of ASD-related symptoms discovered, in the second special school that the researcher contacted, delayed finalising an appropriate Australian site. That is, a number of teachers of this potential participating school showed interests in this inquiry, but the checking of records after preparatory weeks to gather basic information in this school indicated informal diagnosis for many children assumed to have ASD (see details in Appendix C).

Table 3.8 shows the number of children with ASD enrolled in each participating class of the Australian site relative to the age group and total number of children. There were several potential classes in the Australian site, which was also structured into age groups, but the age variations differed for each class with consideration of the children’s needs, academic levels, or both. Therefore, the age-groups of participating classes involved overlapping distributions: Prep (Ages 4-6), Junior (Ages 7-10), and Junior/Middle (Ages 7-12). Prep was included in the Australian site; although the age group was not within the range of the Japanese site, it appeared that Prep practices might be similar to the Japanese elementary practice based on life-skills unit (Ozawa, 2006), particularly in Year 1-2, with its social focus and use of free play found in the English literature on early childhood education, rather than on primary education.

For this inquiry, special education classroom teachers were the primary participants. Administration staff and extra adults working in classrooms were other key stakeholders in common for both sites, while major outside school specialist advisors for each site were different. In Japan, administration staff comprised a school principal, vice principal, deputy vice
principal, and head of the unit, one extra adult who worked across the participating classrooms (i.e., SNEU support teacher), and one university professor who gave advice to the teachers. In contrast, the Australian administration staff comprised a school principal and deputy principal, one extra adult working in each participating classroom (i.e., three teacher aides), and a speech therapist who was available to the teachers for professional advice. Each participating teacher and other stakeholder completed a Background Information Sheet (Appendix D) about their age, present role, relevant experiences and qualifications, and email addresses (optional if they want a report) during fieldwork.

Table 3.8
The Ages and Numbers of Children with/without ASD in the Australian Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class code</th>
<th>Age group of children</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of children with ASD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>4-6 years old (Prep)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9-10 years old (Junior)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Middle</td>
<td>7-11 years old (Junior/Middle)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethics**

This inquiry was approved by the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (GUHREC). The committee reviewed participant information packages (i.e., consent form and information sheet) and research instruments (i.e., original interview questions, teacher’s reflection sheet). Aspects of the procedures outlined by GUHREC, however, were found to be unwelcome to the Japanese school and required negotiations to find a site-specific balance between the procedures of GUHREC and the school. That is, the school had traditional procedures for the teachers and the host university professors and students to implement research activities within the school. Specifically, modifications were made to obtain formal consent from parents of the children enrolled in the participating teachers’ classes: (a) school announcement made by the researcher to greet the children and teachers of the whole school and (b) a group meeting held with the parents, head of SNEU, and the researcher (see the detailed procedures in both settings in Appendix C).

All original materials for the inquiry were prepared in English first, to be reviewed by the GUHREC, and then translated into Japanese for further adjustments of instruments and implementation of the Japanese case study. After informing about the proposed inquiry, formal consent for each case study was obtained from (a) the participating teachers; (b) the parents of all children of their classes; and (c) other potential participants who either attended the classrooms during observations or actively participated in situational analysis interviews (Appendix E). Additionally, for the piloting activities, another set of consent forms was used for (a) pilot participating teachers and (b) parents of the children enrolled in their classes (Appendices A and B).
Prior to obtaining consent from the site school, the Japanese school administrators expressed a concern about the researcher staying at the classrooms without active interaction with the children and requested that she build a positive relationship with the children at the unit because they believed that negative interaction affected the children’s learning. Therefore, scheduling was adjusted so that she could spend time interacting with the participating class (i.e., helping and playing) across the teaching day as a volunteer teacher aide whenever she conducted observations with them. The researcher wore either business suits or sportswear respectively in order to distinguish between the time as an observer and as a teacher aide. This role provided extra opportunities to understand everyday practice in combination with reflection logs, build relationships with the teachers and children, and facilitate teachers’ engagement in research activities. The researcher then acted as a volunteer teacher aide in the Australian school, but the Australian teachers did not consider dress codes necessary.

**Researcher’s reflection logs**

The researcher’s personal reflections were designed to provide an alternative source of “living” information about ongoing classroom and school practice (i.e., reflection log). Recording of overall impressions at the end of a field day had been recommended as a way to inform the kind of data and contextual information (Gallagher, 1997; Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). Active logs were used to (a) monitor adjustments to research design, (b) track emerging site divergence in their methodological paths, and (c) deal with case-specific findings about lesson planning, teaching, and teacher collaboration. Immediate reflections included continuous note-taking during data collection and analysis to log the nature and sequence of methodological decisions. Such notes served as permanent reminders about methodological difficulties faced by the researcher, concerns reported by the teachers during the data collection, and vagueness of the Japanese texts or mismatches between Japanese and Australian English language revealed through qualitative data preparation (see details in the section of data analysis). These difficulties, concerns, and linguistic mismatches often pointed to cultural differences (i.e., national, institutional, and personal domain) in planning methods and instruments and in translating Japanese texts into Australian English.

**Situational analysis document review**

Documents related to school implementation and curriculum were obtained from the internet and relevant people (e.g., the Japanese head of the unit, the Australian school principal, and other administrators) in order to identify important influences on teacher practice in each school. Paper-based and electronic materials associated with administration and curricular programming in schools, for example, provided a source of information about teacher work and described the documentation of institutional history and practice. These records were used to link the findings from interviews and direct observations to underpinning cultural values indicated in the
documents. The list of key documentation involved in situational analysis can be found in Appendix F1.

**Situational analysis interviews**

Interviews took approximately 30 minutes for each person. Because identifications of key school stakeholders required some grounded experiences with the teacher participants, dates, times, and locations were negotiated directly with each person after the mid-ObWk. Each session took place in school stakeholders in a quiet place in the school or with the Japanese professor at his university office (see, the timeline for these interviews in Appendix F2). Interview questions were given to these participants prior to their sessions (Appendix F3).

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics of situational analysis interviews: Support for children with ASD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside classroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (i.e., support teacher in Japan and teacher aides in Australia):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Present role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present relationship with all special education teachers (Japan) or your classroom teacher (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future perspectives on (Japan) or recent changes (Australia) in your role and support for the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School speech therapist (Australia only):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Present role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present relationships with classroom teachers at your school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recent changes in your role and support for the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside classroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of SNEU (Japan only):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Present role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present expectation for the special education teachers at your school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future perspectives on your role and support for the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration staff (Japan and Australia):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Present role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present expectation for special education teachers at your school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future perspectives on (Japan) or recent changes (Australia) in your role and support for the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University professors (Japan only):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Present role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present expectation for special education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future perspectives on your role and support for the children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9 shows the summary of topics used for interview questions asked for each situational analysis participant. Three topics for each interview were focused on support for children with ASD in their relevant contexts; therefore, the interview questions differed slightly between the sites, among situational analysis participants, or both. For example, although the first question used the same topic (i.e., present role regarding support for the children with ASD), the second question for the outside classroom stakeholders (e.g., school administration staff, head of unit, and university professors) was about their expectation for special education classroom teachers; in contrast, one for the staff working closely with the teachers and children...
at classrooms (e.g., support teacher, teacher aide, and speech therapist) was about their relationships with the special education classroom teachers. Moreover, the third question in Japan was about their general future perspectives while it was about specific changes that they have recently noticed in Australia because inclusion was a new topic in the Japanese context, but has been developed and practised in a broad Australian context (see samples of interview prompt sheets in Appendix F4).

**Individual teacher interviews**

Each participant was given the interview questions usually a week prior to the session and a copy of the interview sheet at the session. The detailed information about and materials used for these interviews are available in Appendix G. The interviews were held in one of the teachers’ classrooms after school in Japan. These interviews were then held in a staff meeting room during noncontact hour or in their own classrooms after school in Australia. Each interview session started with an introduction about the interviewing procedures and questions. In a typical Australian procedure, the main themes of all interview questions were explained to the interviewee at the beginning of the interview. However, this procedure was found inappropriate for the Japanese participants, because the form of discussion in Japanese language addressed the main points at the end. Therefore, the interviewing procedures were adjusted for the Japanese teachers to skip the introduction of all questions; otherwise these teachers may have been confused about what questions they need to answer after all questions were introduced.

Furthermore, each interview involved site-specific phrasing of the main questions (see Table 3.10 and Table 3.11). Numbers of “probe materials” (Stake, 2006, p. 31) were also designed to provide visual stimulus or contextual situations to the teacher participants for each interview.

*Semistructured interviews* lasted for approximately 30 minutes and employed various probing materials. To see whether these teachers worked differently at the various stages of planning, implementing (and adjusting), and evaluating a lesson, the introductive statement of each interview was aligned with these stages (e.g., “I understand that you just submitted your initial plan” or “you may try to adjust your plan and teaching across the weeks”). Moreover, each *reflection interview* lasted for approximately 13-minutes average with the Japanese teachers and for 16-minutes average with the Australian teachers. The session was slightly longer with the Australian teachers because multiple lessons were observed for them during the week, and they were required to reflect on each lesson in the same time. The length also varied according to the events of the week (i.e., how many critical events happened in the week and the lessons).

**Procedures and case-specific adjustments for Interview A**

At the beginning of the session, the teachers were asked to nominate one or two children with ASD for the inquiry and then were engaged in interviewing about daily practice. The class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Semistructured Interview Questions Used in Japan and Australia**

### Interview-A (Daily practice):
*Materials included class timetables; list of teacher activities; blank day timesheet; transparent sheet; and colour pens.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) What are you actually doing throughout a typical day?</td>
<td>(a) What are you actually doing throughout a typical day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) What activities do you spend most and least time on?</td>
<td>(b) What activities do you spend most and least time on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) How are you interacting with a specific child with ASD during these daily activities, and how are you working with other school staff?</td>
<td>(c) How are you supporting a specific child with ASD during these daily activities, and how are you working with other school staff?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interview-B (Group instruction):
*Materials included lesson or unit plans; blank lesson timesheet; and colour pens.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) What have you adjusted and what will you adjust in your lesson planning to support a specific child with ASD during your seinan lesson? Also how have you worked with other teachers to improve the lesson?</td>
<td>(a) How do you and will you adjust your planning to support a specific child with ASD while also teaching other children? Also, do you collaborate with other people for this planning? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) What are you actually doing to support the child with ASD during the seinan lesson? Please identify at which moments of the lesson you are most concerned about the child.</td>
<td>(b) How do you adjust your teaching for the child with ASD when teaching the class that includes other children? Do you collaborate with other people to improve teaching? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) What does “group” or “class” mean to you as a teacher?</td>
<td>(c) What do specific terms mean to you as a teacher in relation to “group”? (e.g., class, lesson, group instruction, group activity, collaboration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interview-C (Valued outcomes):
*Materials included lesson or unit plans; other documents about the child; and lists of collaborative activities and interactions the teachers had with others, recorded during the field research.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) How did your group lessons help a specific child with ASD? What did the child with ASD achieve from the lessons or how was the child’s sugato changed across the unit?</td>
<td>(a) What outcomes do you value when you teach a specific child with ASD with his/her classmates during this term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How did your experiences of lesson study help you? What did you achieve or improve from these experiences of working with other teachers in a team?</td>
<td>(b) What outcomes do you value from working with other teachers or other people across this term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) What did your SNEU and school achieve from all lesson study related experiences?</td>
<td>(c) How do these outcomes align with the values of your school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The specific child’s name was indicated in the interviews; A Japanese term means a holistic view of a child.
timetable was placed on the table as a visual aide during the interview to help the teachers talk about their teaching day and unfold a day. The researcher and teachers then collaborated on filling in a *blank day timesheet* about a typical day to highlight the normal operation of routines and any variations. Moreover, a *list of teacher activities* developed by American researchers (Vannest & Hagan-Burke, 2010) was provided at the end of the first question to inquire whether the teachers wanted to add some activities that they did not mention earlier. After talking about how the teachers spend their time on these activities, a transparent sheet was placed on the completed day timeline sheet and permanent colour pens were handed to the teachers. The teacher was then asked to circle the activities (or occasions) during which they were most concerned about supporting the nominated child and to provide examples of their support.

Between the two teacher groups, the phrasing was different for the third question: “Interacting with” in Japan and “supporting” in Australia, because the Japanese teachers had difficulties in talking about “supporting strategies” and focused “interaction” in the previous study (Kikkawa, 2007).

**Procedures and case-specific adjustments for Interview B**

Lesson unit plans were presented to help the teachers to reflect on their own practice with their professional judgements, and a *blank lesson timesheet* was used to create a sample of a typical lesson procedure. Different teaching emphases in Japan and Australia were highlighted in phrasing the questions:

(a) The first and second questions used “during a group lesson” in Japan, but “while also teaching other children” in Australia, in order to remind the Australian teachers to talk about teaching the nominated child “in group settings”;

(b) The first and third question used “if-question” about staff collaboration in Australia because lesson study was not in their practice; and

(c) The third question asked the Australian teachers about the meaning of specific terms (e.g., class, lesson, group instruction, group activity, and collaboration), instead broad meanings of group were used to help the Australian teachers articulate their points of view.

In addition, interview procedures differed in each case. For example, extra prompting techniques, similar to those used in the Interview A, were employed to encourage the Japanese teachers to articulate a general view of class lesson first and then specific support for the nominated children; but not for the Australian teachers who were able to articulate supporting strategies directly in the timeline sheet. Moreover, while it was the researcher who wrote on the *blank lesson timesheet* for the Japanese teachers, it was the Australian teachers who actually filled in the sheet. This arrangement was made after the researcher found that the Australian teachers appeared to feel uncomfortable or anxious with the researcher guiding the session in the previous interviews (i.e., Interview A and earlier reflection interviews). In fact, the Australian teachers were more engaged in these interviews than in previous interviews.
Procedures and case-specific adjustments for Interview C

Relevant information for the child (e.g., lesson unit plans and individual curriculum) was prepared at the table for supporting the teachers. A list of collaboration activities and interactions that the teachers had with others was also provided at the second question about valuing for the teachers in order to remind them of what they had engaged in across the fieldwork period. Each list was developed based on reflection interviews, observations, and stakeholders’ input. Three points of phrasing questions were highlighted in this interview:

(a) All questions did not use the terms of “outcomes”, “evaluation”, and “value” but employed longer descriptive phrases to help the Japanese teachers to articulate the focused topics (e.g., “What did the child with ASD achieve from the lesson? In which episodes do you recognise that the child with ASD changed?”);

(b) The first question avoided using the term, “group” in Australia because it was one concern coming from the teachers during the fieldwork that peer interactions were not the primary focus for the Australian teachers (i.e., “from group lessons” in Japan and “when teaching the child with ASD with his/her classmates” in Australia); and

(c) The third question was focused on outcome for the school from schoolwide lesson study practice in Japan (i.e., “What did your SNEU/school achieve from all lesson study related experiences?”) but on alignment of the teachers’ practice and the school values in Australia (i.e., “How do these outcomes align with the values of your school?”), because the lesson study practice was featured only in the Japanese site.

Procedures and case-specific adjustments for reflection interviews

Table 3.11 shows the summary of reflection interview questions used for each site. The specific foci of the second and third topics differed in both groups. For example, the second interview topic of group lessons focused only on the lessons observed on the day for the Australian teachers, while it focused on a series of group lessons (i.e., seitan life-skills lessons) for the Japanese teachers during the previous week. Also, one question about valued outcomes for the child with ASD was added to the Japanese teachers’ reflection interview from ObWk6. The site adviser (i.e., university professor) suggested adding this exploratory question prior to the third semistructured interview focusing on outcomes, because the Japanese teachers’ talk in their earlier interviewing sessions (i.e., Interviews A & B, and earlier reflection interviews) appeared to be uncertain about the meaning of a concept of “evaluation” or “assessment.”

Moreover, the topics of lessons and collaborations were found conceptually mismatched between the researcher and the Australian teachers. Because these teachers expressed confusion and anxiety, a group meeting involving the teacher participants, school principal, and one of the Australian thesis supervisors was held in ObWk4 in order to clarify the teachers’ concerns. For example, they expressed concern about using the term, lesson, to ask them about their learning session. In particular, one teacher believed that lesson means a teacher-delivered
Table 3.11

Summary of Topics in Reflection Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection on the week/s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) How was your last week? Was it busier</td>
<td>(a) How was your last week? Was it busier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than usual? Did you have any special events</td>
<td>usual? Did you have any special events or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or other differences from the week before?</td>
<td>other differences from the week before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How was the child with ASD during this</td>
<td>(b) How was the child with ASD during this week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection on the group lessons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) How were the <em>seitan</em> lessons this week?</td>
<td>(a) How was the lesson/s that I observed today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the important moments during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lesson in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How was the child with ASD during the</td>
<td>(b) How was the child with ASD during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>seitan</em> lessons?</td>
<td>lesson/s? What worked for her/him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) What was your main goal/objective for</td>
<td>(c) What was your main goal/objective for her/him in this week? How does it line up with your unit planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her/him in this week? How does it line up</td>
<td>(d) From last week to now, did you discover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your unit planning?</td>
<td>anything that changed how you taught the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lesson that I observed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Did you discover anything new about</td>
<td>(e) Did you change anything in your planning for her/him, compared to the lesson last week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her/him?</td>
<td>(f) What would you like to change in the lesson for next week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) What did the child achieve from the</td>
<td>(g) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lessons?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection on teacher/staff collaboration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Materials included a list progressively</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>updated across the weeks to record the</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>teachers’ collegial</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>activities and support</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) How did you work with other teachers</td>
<td>(a) In general, during the last week, how did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during this week in relation to improving</td>
<td>you interact with other people (e.g., formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your lesson or support for the child?</td>
<td>meetings, chats, activities, events)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How was the last lesson study meeting?</td>
<td>(b) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Did you receive any useful information</td>
<td>(c) Did you have any information, advice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from others/meetings?</td>
<td>feedback, or support from them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Did you give any support to other</td>
<td>(d) Did you give any information, advice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers?</td>
<td>feedback, or support to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection on the recording of their</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lessons</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Materials included video-clip examples</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>created from the selected parts of the</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>recording of the lessons</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Please describe the “scene” in the</td>
<td>(a) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video (e.g., What is happening, what are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you doing, and why are you doing so?)</td>
<td>(b) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Have you changed anything in your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lessons since the lesson you watched now?</td>
<td>(b) N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific child’s name was indicated in the interview; *Only before Observation Week 6; *Only from Observation Week 6; *Only when they have a lesson study meeting prior to the reflection interview. Japan only; *Video-clips were employed only in Japan, although reflection interviews were conducted in both sites.
learning session, which was not linked to what she was doing with her class. Similarly, these teachers were uncomfortable when being asked about collegial activities or support (i.e., collaboration), particularly among teachers. During the meeting, the Australian principal explained that the Australian teachers were expected to work independently to deliver a learning curriculum with an EBP approach. To respond to these concerns, extra defining phrases were added to the reflection sheet for the Australian teachers: “A lesson is a set/identified period of time with specific learning goals” and “collaboration with other people (other teachers, teacher aides, other staff, therapists, parents, and others).” The arrangements helped the teachers to talk about their practice broadly in relation to these topics.

Examples of Key Moments created from audiovisual data of lesson observations comprised selected moments relevant to research questions or site-featured practices. The selection process of Key Moments involved the researcher (a) taking field notes during observing a lesson, (b) chatting with the teachers as they completed their reflection sheet after direct lesson observation to find moments when or where “something interesting was happening” (Sherin et al., 2009), and (c) creating video-clip examples by reviewing the audiovisual observation data before a teacher’s next scheduled reflection interview. The total number of video-clip examples used for each Japanese teacher varied according to the individual differences of their approaches (e.g., JT2 and JT3 used more structured lessons; see the detailed timeline in Appendix G5d).

Addition of one extra interview session

Table 3.12 summarises the questions used with two Australian teachers (i.e., AT2 & AT3) for this interview. This interview was added to the original schedule after preliminary analysis of both Japanese and Australian cases and aimed to explore how the Australian teachers viewed one specific practice used in Japan. In this interview that took place in December 2011 and lasted approximately 25 minutes, these teachers were asked to reflect on the unit plan based on ideas in the Japanese life-skills unit, which the researcher developed specifically for their class contexts as probe materials (see Appendix G6).

Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Question</th>
<th>What do you think about the unit plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompts</td>
<td>(a) Is it doable? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) What modifications do you want to make if you implement the life-skill learning unit in your class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Would you like to make any other comments in relation to the unit plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct observations

This section outlines the observational methods and procedures used in each site. Table 3.13 showed the materials and procedures involved in each of three observational activities. All materials can be found in Appendix H.

Table 3.13  
Types of Observational Activities: Focuses and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of observation</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teaching day observations            | *Teaching Day Observation Field Note* focusing on teachers’ activities and duties, classroom and school organisation, and critical events during the day;  
|                                      | *Researcher’s Reflection Log* focusing on the researcher’s overall reflection and summaries of field note. | Each teacher was observed across one teaching day across the period of observation. Field notes were taken to record elements of daily practice of the teachers (e.g., teacher activities). |
| Classroom lesson observations        | *Lesson Observation Field Note* focusing on critical events during the lesson;  
|                                      | *Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet* focusing teachers’ subjective reflection at the end of the lesson;  
|                                      | *Researcher’s reflection log* focusing the researcher’s overall reflection and summaries of field notes. | Targeted group lessons were observed weekly, and the teachers were asked to rate their lesson outcomes immediately after the lesson and identify Key Moments during the lesson. All lessons were video-recorded in addition to field notes. |
| Teacher meeting observations         | *Teacher Meeting Observation Field Note* focusing on topics of the meetings and critical events during the meetings;  
|                                      | *Researcher’s reflection log* focusing on the researcher’s overall reflection and summaries of field notes. | Teacher conversations during teacher meetings relating to lesson development were recorded when the meetings occurred in their natural schedule. This activity was only applied to the Japanese school. |

Procedures for teaching day observations

Direct observation of a teaching day in both countries started with the teacher coming to the school around 7:30 am, excepting AT3 around 8:40 am and ended with all children going home around 3:30 pm in Japan and 3:00 pm in Australia, excepting AT3 around 3:45 pm. Usually, the next day, the teachers were asked about the time they went home and about any further activities and duties after the children went home. *Teaching Day Observation Field Note* focusing on teachers’ activities and duties across their typical days, the embedding of group instructions (i.e., teaching a child with ASD in a peer group) during these teaching days, and occurrence of teachers’ interactions with whom, when, and why during the days, was used to obtain an overview of teachers’ daily practice across a teaching day. How the teachers spent their time with the children was monitored by recording contextual information, teacher activities (i.e., antecedent, teacher behaviour and interaction with class, consequence), and observer’s reflection in each column (see Appendix H2). Each sheet had six rows of 5-minute intervals to help the observer take notes every five minute.
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Procedures for lesson observations

Lesson observations focused on classroom instruction dynamics (Ball & Forzani, 2007). The dynamics included (a) the targeted child’s engagement; (b) classroom interaction between the teacher and the child and between the child and peers; and (c) lesson content and context. The observer used Direct Lesson Observation Field Note to record critical events happening, important contextual information which may influence classroom interactions, and her impression of the lesson during the lesson observation (see Appendix H3a). It helped in the writing of the researcher’s postobservation reflection and identify Key Moments for reflection interviews. Each participating teacher was also asked to complete a Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet asking their overall impression about the targeted children’s engagement and teacher–child interaction (see Appendix H3b). The teacher’s responses were based on a 5-point scale indicating (a) level of child (activity) engagement and frequency of repetitive behaviour of the child and (b) frequency of teacher–child interaction and quality of teacher–child interaction. This method was to test gaps between the impression of the teachers and the researcher’s observations of what is happening in classroom practice, which was reviewed during lesson observation videos. The allocated time for this teacher reflection was an opportunity to request for the teacher to identify Key Moments of the lesson.

Each of the Japanese teachers participated in a total of nine lesson observations in addition to one lesson observation during the Lesson Study Conference, while the Australian teachers participated in five to seven lesson observations. Because two lessons at the Lesson Study Conference (i.e., JT2 and JT3) were held at the same time, the researcher was not able to make direct observations of both teachers, although all of these lessons were video-recorded by the researcher (for JT1 and JT3) and by one student of the host university (for JT2). Therefore, these observations were used to contrast teachers’ talk in reflection interviews about the lessons and meetings during the Lesson Study Conference with the audiovisual data, but were not included in the formal analysis.

The researcher started and stopped recording the classroom interactions when the class had the group greeting at the beginning and end of the class lesson in the Japanese site, and some variations were recorded when irregular events occurred (e.g., the teacher skipped the group greeting). In contrast, in the Australian site, unclear transitions between sessions required the researcher to start recording prior to the starting time of each session. Durations of lesson observations varied according to their daily schedule in both settings. In general, the teachers of younger children had shorter session periods than those for older children: The average of one lesson duration was from approximately 30 minutes (AT2), 40 minutes (JT1 and JT2), to 70 minutes (JT3 and AT3). Although the average for AT1 was not obtained due to unclear transitions, one of her typical sessions combining two learning foci (i.e., lesson) was approximately 30 minutes.
Procedures for meeting observations

Meeting observations focused on how the Japanese teachers talked about their lesson plans and feedback in lesson study meetings. A total of six meetings related to lesson study were observed from the beginning to the end of fieldwork: two meetings prior to lesson study conference (i.e., held in ObWk6), three meetings during the conference, and one meeting after the conference. Two meetings involving public visitors were formally structured within 60 minutes and relied only on field notes (see Appendix H4), while other meetings also employed audiovisual recordings, which varied from 60 to 200 minutes depending on their discussions. Field notes of topics of the meeting conversations and the critical events that might influence the teachers’ decision making were used to develop extra prompts for reflection interviews that followed the meeting observations.

Teaching document review

To supplement the situational analysis document review, the teaching document review was included because professionals in many cultures and contemporary social settings maintain self-documenting practices and undertake continuous record-keeping tasks (Atkinson & Coffey, 2011; Silverman, 2004). Review of teacher-specific documentation was used to examine teachers’ professional paperwork and written reflections. Many potential forms of documentation included diaries, individual education plans for children, lesson or unit plans, journal records, and Class–Home Communication Books and other informative materials for the parents. For example, individual education plans and lesson or unit plans have provided summaries of a teacher’s most focused aspects of learning and teaching (Plonczak, 2008). Teaching documents were progressively gathered across each fieldwork period. Some follow-up documents were also collected later in the same academic school year (see Appendix I1 for the list of all documentation involved). Weekly documentation checklists (Appendix I2) were developed and used to remind the teachers at their reflection interviews of providing the researcher with new documentation that they produced during the week.

Thematic Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis is inductive as a researcher makes sense of collected data based on her or his understandings of specific contexts, participants, and events and identifies “themes about the central phenomenon” (Creswell, 2012, p. 237). In this cross-cultural inquiry, various data sets gathered through multiple methods were analysed carefully to interpret their meanings in relation to three research questions through a thematic analysis (see Table 3.1). The researcher’s reflections on data analysis, which were similar to those on data collection, helped to compare between these two cases for extracting similarities and differences of their teaching practice and to find conceptual disconnection between the Japanese and Australian perspectives on teaching.
Figure 3.3 shows six analytic stages informing this cross-cultural inquiry. As its colour
gradient indicates, the researcher’s interpretations of case-specific findings became clear
throughout these stages. This section outlines this multistage analysis involving (a) preliminary
analysis including researcher’s reflections during field research, data preparation, and
classification of shared ecologies; (b) data coding for semistructured interviews; (c) cross-
checking among data sets; (d) case reporting of key findings; (e) cross-case analysis of for
cross-case and case-specific findings; and (f) cross-case reporting of findings across research
questions. Given that cross-cultural perspectives were embedded in all stages, Stages 1-4 were
for analysing a single case in contrast to Stages 5-6 that were for synthesising the two cases.

To assist management and analysis of complex data sets, three software packages (i.e.,
NVivo, Leximancer, and Microsoft Excel) were employed in this inquiry. First, NVivo was
used as the main tool in this inquiry. NVivo is a computer-assisted qualitative analysis software
(QSR International, 2010a, 2010b), which has been used increasingly in qualitative research
(e.g., Bazeley & Jackson, 2013; Bryman, 2008; Byrne, 2009; Flick, 2009; Sorensen, 2008). It
was able to accommodate and analyse case findings from its different data sources in one place.
All textual, audio, and visual data gathered from each case were imported in one NVivo project.
Second, Leximancer was used for particular purposes in this inquiry: reliability check on
manual coding for semistructured interviews and inspection of relationships among important
themes emerging from interview texts (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). Leximancer is a software for
objective computer-assisted analysis, which also has been used by qualitative researchers (e.g.,
Main, 2007; Penn-Edwards, 2010; Royer, Bumbieris, Kittel-Wegner, & Hine, 2007). Third,
Microsoft Excel was used to produce graphic data of summaries for featured findings (Barton &
Reichow, 2012) in addition to diagrams created in Microsoft Word.
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**Preliminary analysis**

Stage 1 involved three activities. First, the researcher’s ongoing investigation into each case started at the beginning of this inquiry. Second, data gathered for each case were organised and prepared for further analysis. Third, the aspects of classroom ecologies, (or classroom segments in Doyle, 2006) shared between the Japanese and Australian classrooms, were identified as important structural categories of teacher work and practice, and these aspects created a framework with which to systematise these massive and unique data sets.

*Fieldwork*

The preliminary analysis started with the researcher’s reflection logs when she prepared her fieldwork and continued during her entire time at each school. Given that all findings were “context-bound”, a careful single case analysis was important to scrutinise “site-specific experiences” (Stake, 2006, p. 41). The reflection logs helped the researcher understand the unique entity of teacher work and practice for children with ASD situated in each school context. A cross-cultural inquiry started from the beginning and continued to end of this inquiry because the researcher attempted to make sense of her every inquiry experience during the time. Potential situational influences on findings were noted; and, therefore, case-specific findings from each data set expressed in different languages and concepts were obtained across cases. The aspects shared between two cases were used to construct a bridge crossing between the Japanese and Australian cases for a more systematised comparison and contraction of these cases. As a consequence, the strengths of practice in each case became apparent.

*Qualitative data preparation*

All digital data sources (e.g., MP3, MP4, and PDF) and all scanned hard-copy sources were saved in the researcher’s personal computer and imported into NVivo for further analysis. NCapture, a web browser extension, was useful to analyse school web pages because it allowed the researcher to import and analyse online contents directly within a NVivo project (QSR International, 2012). Examples of the codes used to report findings from different data sources can be found in Appendix J3.

The texts of semistructured and reflection interviews, as primary data, needed to be transcribed for further analysis. Both cases involved transcribing digital data into texts (either Japanese or Australian English) and text cleaning. Meaningful texts particularly from the Japanese case, as they were translated into English, required not only translation-back-translation activities to check textual equivalence (Hambleton & Kanjee, 1993; Leung, 2013) but also cross-cultural interpretation activities to highlight textual meanings which appeared unclear to the English speaking readers (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). Table 3.14 shows different kinds of text data produced across this text preparation. Although the processes were mainly focused for the Japanese case, bidirectional Japanese–English meaning-making facilitated cross-
cultural exchanges and revealed mismatches between Japanese and Australian perspectives on the conversation topics relating to teaching children with ASD.

Table 3.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Terms Related to Translation and Transinterpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw text data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed text data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was essential to clarify the detailed procedure of making translated texts of the Japanese data. Because data from interviews were culturally situated, pragmatic transcripts were needed for cross-cultural analysis to transfer interpretations of data into a report. Wong and Poon (2010), who experimented with a set of three texts of the same content translated by three different translators from Cantonese into English, argued that the translation process needed to be visible because “translation is not a neutral technique of replacing words of one language with words of another language” (p. 152) but a social practice involving interpretations of assigning meaning to the exchanged words between two different social and cultural contexts. In particular, Japanese oral communication has been defined as vague and indirect (Haugh, 2003), and Japanese cultural situations were often different from Australian natives’ assumptions (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). Although the interview texts of both cases included contextual information (e.g., nonverbal communication such as “pausing for four seconds” and “laughing”), the Japanese interview texts required further situational information (e.g., a meaning of some case-specific words including names of their lessons) for readers from different cultural backgrounds (i.e., Australian natives) to understand what was happening within the transcripts.

Figure 3.4 showed the two steps involved for cross-cultural processed text data for the Japanese interviews after transcribing digital data: translation-back-translation and cross-cultural interrogation. First, the original transcripts in Japanese went through three substeps of translation-back-translation: They were translated into English by the observer (i.e., the researcher), and the translated transcripts were translated back into Japanese by volunteers who had appropriate fluency in both languages (i.e., English and Japanese). The validity and reliability of translations was then checked by the researcher comparing the original raw texts and translation-back texts, line by line, for three semistructured interviews and two reflection interviews. Some adjustments to texts were required and noted during these activities.
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Researchers transcribed digital data (Raw text data)
(a) Researchers translated the raw text data into English (Unprocessed English text data)
(b) Japanese-English bilinguals translated the unprocessed English text data into Japanese (Translation-back text data)
(c) Researchers checked translation validity and adjusted the unprocessed English text data

Step 1. Translation-back-translation

(a) Australian English native speakers proof-read and highlighted unclear sentences
(b) Researchers engaged in cross-cultural interrogations with the proof-readers
(c) Researchers produced a terminology list for cultural meaningful terms and phases
(d) Researchers produced cross-cultural processed text data

Step 2. Cross-cultural interrogation

Figure 3.4. A process of producing cross-cultural processed text data (Japan only).

The 97.2% average of text comparability between original and translation-back text data of Japanese interviews, obtained from NVivo by coding the parts of the original texts that appeared to differ from those of the reviewers’ translation-back texts, indicates a profound reliability of the researcher’s original translation. The parts coded in NVivo showed mostly terminology mismatches between the researcher and the reviewers (e.g., schoolwide teacher meeting, goodness of group, daily discoveries), and these terms were noted for later analysis. Moreover, this process also highlighted abstract expressions used by the Japanese teachers. For example, Figure 3.5 shows comment examples of one Japanese reviewer in a Word document using a “Review” function: The transcription text from one reflection interview of Mr Banba (JT2) on one video-clip example was unclear to the reviewer although she could guess what the teacher was talking about from her own knowledge. The text was then revised from using “video clip” to “video letter”, while extra explanation of his talk was added when reporting this episode in a finding chapter.

Figure 3.5. Example of comments from one Japanese volunteer: “SN7” means that the seventh comment made by the reviewer SN (i.e., her identical code for this inquiry) in a specific interview text (i.e., one of Mr Banba’s reflection interviews in this example).

Moreover, the translated transcripts were used for a cross-cultural interrogation between the Japanese observer and Australian natives, comprising four substeps to confirm cultural...
meanings of the talk, particularly for the Japanese teachers. Stake (2006) suggested that, for confirmation and assurance between realities and impressions, the observer and reviewer (in this case, Australian native) can role-play another point of view to challenge the meaning of a critical event or dialogue. First, Australian English native volunteers (e.g., two preservice teachers in Australian universities, one policy officer, and one teacher of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) engaged in proof-reading and highlighting parts that were unclear to them, and the researcher negotiated the meanings of the highlighted parts with these proof-readers. Important terms or phrases, identified as having cultural meaning hidden in the interview texts, were then listed with their summarised meanings. After these steps, the text data of the Japanese semistructured and reflection interviews were finalised.

One example shows the kind of texts from the researcher’s reflections recorded immediately after one cross-cultural interrogation session. This example indicates that the concept of whole-person education embedded in the Japanese texts was not articulated until the Australian reviewer pointed it out. In fact, the Japanese reviewers did not say that the term of “children’s actual condition” was unclear to them. A number of other terms that may involve case-specific meanings were identified through these researcher–reviewer exchanges on the texts (e.g., social nature, goodness of group, lesson scene, sense of being a member of the class, images of ideal children, embodying ideal lessons). Other examples of cross-cultural interrogation notes from the Australian reviewers have been provided in Appendix J2.

A Japanese word of “kodomo no jittai” was initially translated as “children’s actual condition” in English. It was not clear to the Volunteer A1 (i.e., one Australian preservice teacher). When I explained to her, I realised that “kodomo no jittai” is a very broad concept: It could be related to child’s abilities, interest, and needs; what the child wants to learn during the lesson; what the child wants to have/use during the activity; how the child likes the peer; what mutual relationship the child has in the class; and other aspects. The Japanese teachers changed the lesson according to what the teacher understands about the child regarding all of those aspects.

The finalised meaningful interview transcripts were used for subjective analysis with NVivo software (QSR International, 2010a, 2010b) to report detailed findings. In addition, another set of all teachers’ semistructured interview texts, the plain text version containing only interviewing conversations and excluding all contextual information from the finalised transcriptions, was produced for both cases. These plain transcriptions were used to implement objective analysis with Leximancer software (Smith, 2009). Otherwise, Leximancer taking every single word of the texts into account would misinterpret the overview of the conversations. From the fieldwork to this preparation, a terminology list of culturally meaningful or specific words was developed for each case as interview questions were designed (see Figure 3.2) and as the Japanese interview texts were translated into English through cross-cultural translation and transinterpretation (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a).

Classification of shared ecologies

A framework for synthesising the findings of the two single case analyses was needed to facilitate qualitative comparisons and contrasts between teacher work and practice. In these two
contextually different cases, “studying the same process...[helps] to find different routes because each system self-organizes depending on its interactions and dynamics” (Rodríguez et al., 2012, p. 269). In other words, cross-cultural inquiry needs to frame data within shared aspects of a study (Gómez & Kuronen, 2011), in order to systematise the data and narrow the focus of analysis to the three research questions.

Every aspect of their work (e.g., timetabling, environments, and staffing) is different from one of the Japanese teachers. (Reflection logs during Australian fieldwork in ObWk1)

This comment was recorded by the researcher at the end of the first ObWk with the Australian teachers. It shows that what she focused on at the time were details of observable differences between the two cases. In fact, finding the most suitable site for the Australian case was challenging because of the contextual differences in their school systems. At the earlier stage of this inquiry, these most visible differences obstructed a cross-cultural inquiry into research topics. To concentrate on the research topics, the common features of classroom teaching among these special educators were inspected within classroom segments (Doyle, 2006; see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2) and aligned with the respective research questions. Table 3.15 shows the ecological feature-categories identified for this inquiry: classroom ecological features (e.g., working through a day, instructing a child with ASD in a peer group, interacting with others), key processes (e.g., planning, implementing, and evaluating a group lesson), and outcomes for key actors (e.g., a child with ASD, teachers themselves, the SNEU/school) of teacher work and practice.

Table 3.15
*Shared Ecologies Identified for Cross-Cultural Case Study Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Inquiry</th>
<th>Identified Ecologies (ecological categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: Daily practice</td>
<td>a. Working through a typical teaching day &lt;br&gt;b. Working with a child with ASD through a day &lt;br&gt;c. Interacting with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: Group instruction</td>
<td>a. Planning a group lesson with educational values &lt;br&gt;b. Implementing a group lesson with educational values &lt;br&gt;c. Evaluating a group lesson with educational values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3: Valued outcomes</td>
<td>a. Valuing the child with ASD &lt;br&gt;b. Valuing the teachers &lt;br&gt;c. Valuing the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories were identified through reviewing the relevant literature and found to be present during thematic analysis of interview data (Stage 2). They were used to code interview texts first in order to inspect the overview and cross-category relationships during thematic analysis (e.g., overlapping among categories) and then to cluster all relevant data within each case for each category (Stages 3 and 4). This approach was needed because it shifted the focus away from most visible case differences (e.g., timetables of a day, school structures, staffing) to extract expressive findings about how the teachers work differently in terms of these categories.
Data coding and thematic analysis

Thematic analysis of teachers’ semistructured interview texts in both cases was used to identify, analyse, and report important themes, which “captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response…within [the] data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). Table 3.16 summarises the seven steps of this analysis. It used NVivo as the main approach to manual coding to identify important themes (i.e., parent nodes in NVivo) and subthemes (child nodes in NVivo) for each of the ecologies identified in this inquiry (Table 3.15). This inductive process incorporated the contextualising backdrops of the event in producing deep understandings of teachers’ talk or interaction. Through this analysis, the researcher was able to consider how teachers’ talk is aligned with research questions by reorganising the transcribed texts for “the concepts of story, character, focalization, and plot” (Holley & Colyar, 2009, p. 685).

Table 3.16
Thematic Analysis Steps of Interview Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.</td>
<td><strong>Understanding text information.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Read through each interview text data as a whole with a focus (i.e., daily practice for Interview A, group instruction for Interview B, and valued outcomes for Interview C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Take personal memos (e.g., key concepts and ideas in the texts, the researcher’s thoughts) directly in each text by using “Balloons” function of Microsoft Word and save it as “Step 1” document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Copy and paste all memos into a new Word document and save it as “Step 2” document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.</td>
<td><strong>Grouping information.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summarise memos by grouping, shuffling, merging, combining, and deleting in the Step 2 document for each participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3.</td>
<td><strong>Identifying a thematic category (i.e., initial code) for the grouped information.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflect on summary memos of each teacher and identify codes for each teacher group in relation to the ecological categories (i.e., revising Step 2 document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4.</td>
<td><strong>Regrouping information.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Read through the grouped text organised for each code, reduce overlap, and reduce codes by combining (i.e., the final version of Step 2 document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use NVivo to group segments of interview texts according to the reduced codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.</td>
<td><strong>Identifying themes for the identified ecologies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflect carefully on the segments of interview texts organised in Step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collapse the reduced codes of Step 4 into thematic categories (i.e., themes, subthemes) by regrouping the segments and giving a label to each group of segments as theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop tables summarising code examples for Steps 1-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.</td>
<td><strong>Reorganising coding system in NVivo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create parent nodes for the themes identified in Step 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Code interview texts into the parent nodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7.</td>
<td><strong>Identifying subthemes within the parent node.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Read though the text segments grouped in the parent nodes in Step 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recategorise these segments into child nodes of subthemes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After reading through each interview text of each teacher, note-taking memos were used to develop a preliminary understanding of the text data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). These memos were based on the researcher’s reflections, which included not only the key concepts or ideas of what the teachers said but also the rationales behind their talk. Key themes and subthemes for each ecology (Table 3.15) were initially developed by classifying these memos from Step 1 to 5 (see Appendix K). The key themes were then used as parent nodes to code interview texts within NVivo (Step 6; see details in Appendix L). The segments coded for each parent nodes were read through again to identify hierarchical layers of patterns (i.e., child nodes) within the parent nodes (Step 7).

Cross-checking activities

Stage 3 involved a number of cross-checking activities. First, important relationships among the themes were examined across all text data (e.g., valued outcomes were embedded across three research questions) and possible explanations of the case-specific findings were identified (e.g., teachers’ teaching preferences determined how they approach the children with ASD in a group). All data sources were then inspected with these themes and mapped into the shared framework (see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2) in order to find more concrete examples of each theme.

Leximancer and NVivo assisted content analysis

Table 3.17 summarises data sources used for two activities involved in inspecting the manual coding results of thematic analysis of semistructured interview texts: Leximancer and NVivo assisted content analysis. First, Leximancer content analysis was implemented to obtain an objective overview of the text in the teachers’ semistructured interview. This computer-processed analysis provided a check of the reliability of the researcher’s manual analysis and revealed additional findings to the manual analysis (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). The analysis was a substitute for traditional procedures of third party reliability check on the coding (i.e., coding comparison between the researcher and another person), because quality of coding for the Japanese text required a deep understanding of these teachers’ background to interpret text meanings. The reliability check on the Leximancer analysis was obtained by repeating the same procedures three times to establish the stability of the analysis (see Appendix M).

The Leximancer was also useful to produce a visualised summary of important concepts and themes and their relationships. For example, Figure 3.6 shows a Knowledge Pathway (i.e., a function of visualising the relationships among selected concepts in a concept map) indicating how JT2 (Mr Banba) talked about one child with ASD (JA3) in relation to activity engagement. His talk shows JT2’s focus on peer interactions between JA3 and JA4 in terms of JA3’s engagement in group activities, which was consistent to thematic analysis of semistructured interviews.
Table 3.17
Summary of Content Analysis with Leximancer and NVivo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Analysis Activity</th>
<th>Checking of:</th>
<th>Examine Thematic Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1 Themes</td>
<td>RQ2 Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leximancer assisted analysis</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVivo assisted analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SA Interview texts: Situational analysis interview texts; †SA Documents: Situational analysis documents; ‡T Documents: Teaching related documents.

![Leximancer concept map created with all Japanese semistructured interviewing texts together shows the Knowledge Pathway from “JA3” to “engage.”](image)

Second, the use of NVivo for content analysis produced a systematic summary of the data set as a whole and sought to integrate quantitative elements into an overview of the data (Wilkinson, 2004). The segments of all textual information (i.e., semistructured interview texts, reflection interview texts, situational analysis interview texts, situational analysis document, and teaching document) were categorised into the themes identified during thematic analysis. This categorised information was then explored manually and subjectively to highlight patterns within and across the data sets, interpret inherent connectedness of these patterns, and evaluate relevance and significance of the patterns in relation to the three research questions. For example, the consistent appearance of topics related to education values for children with ASD (e.g., an average of 42.7% in the teachers’ reflection interviews) highlighted through this process indicates that educational values led how the teacher groups plan, implement, and
evaluate their teaching for children with ASD in a group. The teachers talked about educational values when talking about planning, implementing, and evaluating their teaching strategies.

**Mapping of examples**

Tabular summary and video analysis were employed in order to map featured examples for the themes identified from the thematic analysis. Table 3.18 shows the summary of data sources used for each activity for each case. Tabular summary was focused more on teaching activities and provided an overall understanding of the teachers’ typical day and other duties (RQ1), their decisions about adjusting teaching practice and collegial activities with other people (RQ2), and school based documents about educational emphasis (RQ3).

Table 3.18  
**Summary of Activities for Mapping Examples: Tabular Summaries and Video Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for mapping examples</th>
<th>Finding examples for the themes of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabular Summary of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Typical days</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teaching document</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Professional decision-making</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Professional interaction</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Situational analysis document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video Analysis of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Key Moments (teaching strategies)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Key Moments (child outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Topics in meeting observations (Videos/field notes)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, video analysis was used to demonstrate teachers’ orientation to actions of others (e.g., children, other teachers, and teacher aides) and to provide evidence to verify findings of thematic analysis on interview texts and its explanations (Health, 2011). It provided visual examples of featured teaching strategies (RQ2) and of what these teachers valued most for the child with ASD (RQ3), in addition to group implementation of lesson development in Japan (RQ2 and RQ3). Because human interaction during a lesson or meeting is dynamic and complex, time segments, not transcriptions of each video were analysed. Teachers’ group meetings, for example, involved much brainstorming of ideas for a specific topic, and periods of silence were counted as parts of time segments. Before conducting video analysis, therefore, each video of lesson observations or meeting observations was divided into 15-second or 1-minute intervals within NVivo to be able to code the time segments (see detailed processes in Appendix L). The time was shorter in lesson observation videos because it was the primary concern of this inquiry and required closer analysis of more complex classroom interactions.

Video analysis of lesson observations focusing on teaching strategies and child outcomes was implemented to refine *Key Moments* of the classroom interactions, which were selected based on thematic analysis of semistructured interviews and reflection interviews for each case. Although some *Key Moments* had already been used for producing video-clip
examples for the Japanese teachers’ reflection interviews, all videos of lesson observations for each case were viewed and coded with the themes and subthemes identified in thematic analysis. Then, selections of the *Key Moments* were finalised during this activity. The *Key Moments* were then transcribed and/or translated (see examples of *Key Moments* in Appendices O12 and P7).

A classroom observation matrix, created with transcribing function in NVivo, was used to investigate *teaching strategies* for interacting with and instructing the child with ASD during group lessons and *child outcomes* across the weeks (see Figure 3.7). The matrix comprised (a) 15-seconds intervals, (b) timespan, (c) content of transcriptions, (d) lesson context, (e) actions of the teacher, (f) actions of support teacher or teacher aides, (g) actions of child A, and (h) actions of child B. Figure 3.7 shows one example of observation data entries for one Australian teacher (AT1). Because she has only one child with ASD in her class, the column of child B was set as invisible. This matrix was useful to take notes about complex human interactions and actions in the classrooms and to find the frequency and level of child’s actions (e.g., interactions and engagement) by using filter function (see the definitions of these actions and video analysis protocol in Appendix L2).

![Figure 3.7. Examples of classroom observation matrix in NVivo.](image)

Because activity engagement and peer interaction are important aspects of group instruction for young children with ASD, these categories were the initial foci for analysing child outcomes for each case. After thematic analysis to clarify what the teachers focused on during their lessons, the child’s engagement of interaction with other children (i.e., peer prompts) was counted during reviewing the videos to provide a descriptive overview of improvements in Japan. *Child Interaction Checklist* was developed after the thematic analysis of the Japanese teacher interviews to measure the level (i.e., active and passive interaction) and frequency of the child’s interactions (modified from Kishida & Kemp, 2006, 2009; Kishida, Kemp, & Carter, 2008). In contrast, peer interactions were not a focus of video analysis for the Australian case where these outcomes were not applicable.

In addition, video analysis on teacher meetings was focused on topics in group discussions for the Japanese case. Whereas field notes obtained during two meetings involving
public visitors were reviewed to identify the different focuses of meetings from those of other meetings, the video analysis of the other four meetings was supplemental to thematic analysis of semistructured interviews and followed its procedures. That is, (a) four meetings were transcribed; (b) the transcribed texts were reviewed with note-taking; (c) these notes were categorised into initial themes and subthemes regarding meeting topics; (d) a set of four whole transcripts of each meeting was coded into the themes (i.e., parent nodes); and (e) the text segments coded in the parent nodes were read through and layered hierarchically to highlight patterns (i.e., child nodes). The results from the thematic analysis of teacher meetings provided the examples of how the Japanese special educators improve their lessons as a team (RQ2) and highlighted the rationales of teachers’ decision making about their practice during the group discussions (RQ3). The details of this analysis protocol can be found in Appendix L3.

Case study reporting

Reports of each case study in this inquiry required details about the steps used for deciding what to address as key findings. Each research question drew upon different data sources and sets to reconstruct stories around teacher work and practice for children with ASD. Issues related to theoretical contributions in qualitative research have emerged in the recent literature (e.g., Corley & Gioia, 2011; Huy, 2012). Huy (2012), for example, indicated that many qualitative research articles rejected by their journal reviewers contained insufficient explanations about the processes in data collection, analysis, and decision making about data selection to represent a key finding. Therefore, each section presented data sets used for addressing the question and outlined the process of analysing them before discussing key findings. Combination of different data sets and analysis made it possible to look at the research questions from multiple perspectives and to develop summaries and models from the analysing process.

In each case report, the most representative examples from the thematic analysis of teachers’ talk provided the teachers’ views of three aspects of their work and practice for teaching children with ASD (i.e., research questions). Snapshot stories from observation data and document review then showed whether what they said during their interviews was present in their classrooms. The researchers’ reflection logs added extra information about case-specific findings and provided rationales for the findings that were not mentioned directly during the teachers’ interviews. Tables and diagrams based on case study analysis were designed to show overall summaries and illustrate thematic relationships.

Each case study report in following Chapters 4 and 5 respectively addressed the three research questions in three sections. The structure of each report was similar in order to make two cases comparative. Each section presented data sets used for addressing the three research questions and outlined the process of analysing them before presenting key findings. The first section described daily practice of the Japanese and Australian special educators from three perspectives: (a) the stakeholders’ points of view about the teacher’s role in addition to
demographic background information about the participating teachers and their classroom contexts; (b) the teachers’ typical day; and (c) the teachers’ views about needs of children with ASD. The second section addressed the teachers’ approach to their group instruction with a particular focus on the Japanese unit of life-skills lessons or the various Australian units of work. It described their practice and strategies for teaching children with ASD during group lessons, presented their detailed plans for group lessons, and illustrated featured emphases of their practice (i.e., group-oriented in Japan and task-oriented practice in Australia). The third section contextualised educational values in three layers (i.e., preferred outcomes for a child with ASD, professional development for the teachers, and system development for the school).

**Cross-case analysis**

After drafting each case study report, descriptive findings of each case were examined through looking at two cases in a plural direction within shared categories. Then these single case reports were revised to synthesise findings by deleting or adding examples or explanation. The result of synthesised findings are summarised at the final section of Chapters 4 and 5.

Cross-case analysis aims to find which aspects of teacher work and practice crossed the cases and which did not. It helps extract similarities and differences of the Japanese and Australian cases within the research questions. For this purpose, data coded in NVivo during Stages 2 and 3 were inspected through matrix and group queries by using the ecological framework established in Stage 1. The segments coded in each ecology were then broken down into more detailed categories (e.g., lesson forms, lesson focus, and teacher role during a lesson; further details are presented as tabular summaries in Chapter 6). The detailed protocol of this cross-case analysis can be found in Appendix L4.

**Cross-case reporting**

In this final stage of inquiry, the researcher looked at the connection between the three research questions in order to address the overarching focus of this inquiry: key aspects of teacher work and practice for teaching children with ASD in a group setting. For this purpose, the relationships between categories used in cross-case analysis were investigated in order to outline the connections among the three research questions. Similar to the case reporting of each group, tabular summaries and diagrams were developed to show these complex relationships.

Moreover, findings of cross-case analysis were considered again in relation to the relevant literature outlined in Chapter 2. Key existing theoretical ideas and framework were revised by checking the emerging findings of this inquiry. They were also articulated with practical examples from the descriptive inquiry into “what special educators actually do.” Finally, methodological aspects that the researcher noted during this cross-cultural inquiry were considered to describe the complex journey of this inquiry.
Conclusion

This cross-cultural inquiry into two cases was ongoing, from the designing of the inquiry to the reporting of findings, and involved methodological challenges throughout the inquiry. First, collecting and analysing teaching practices of children with ASD in a small class required understanding what and how these teachers were actually doing in each case and its classroom setting. Therefore, fitting methods of gathering and analysing data to their natural contexts of teaching (e.g., typical environment and time frame) required methodological flexibility and cultural sensitivity. Decisions to adjust and modify these methods were active throughout this entire inquiry, and it was considered important to document these details because this decision-making may make important evidence of case-specific aspects visible (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012b). Ongoing recording of these decisions and their rationale in reflection logs, during data collection and analysis activities, highlighted methodological difficulties arising during this inquiry and the concerns that teacher participants reported due to case differences, or the conceptual differences between Japanese and Australian perspectives during data preparation.

Moreover, identifying cultural similarities and differences to address the research questions was challenging, because most observable differences between the Japanese and Australian cases appeared to blind important findings (i.e., “every aspect of their work … is different”). To extract the important findings and their explanations, ecological features of each classroom were inspected within each research topic, and the shared aspects of these ecologies between the cases were identified. These aspects were then employed to frame all data by using NVivo and narrow the researcher’s analytical views to the points that the teaching practices of different teacher groups were able to be compared and contrasted. This ecological structure was also useful to manage and systematise the massive and somewhat different data sets for each case (as a result of naturalistic inquiry) and helped extract case-specific examples about local strategies and practices for teaching children with ASD in the classrooms. The following two chapters present the findings from the Japanese and Australian case studies within the outline described in this chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: JAPANESE CASE STUDY

This chapter presents the findings of the Japanese case study analysis within the structure outlined in Chapter 3. First, highlights in this chapter are discussed. Key findings relevant to each research question are addressed separately. These findings are then synthesised in Chapter 6 to identify key findings that are contrasted to the Australian findings discussed in Chapter 5. More detailed examples for this report are available in Appendix O.

Overview

For the Japanese case study, the three participating special education teachers, who were based in their school’s Special Needs Education Unit (SNEU), generally did not articulate their thoughts clearly in their interviews with the researcher. They used ambiguous terms with broad or vague meanings, frequently referred to “this” or “that” instead of mentioning specific topics, and often referred to abstractions. Their holistic descriptions involved implications about their understandings of practice and, therefore, required clearer articulation than they gave during the interviews. Some key terms they used in the interviews and documents have been highlighted in the translations and interpretations (see Figure 3.4 in Chapter 3) and are introduced for discussion throughout this chapter.

This chapter’s first section presents the general views of these teachers about their teaching practices. It highlights the holistic learning goals emphasised by the site school and by the teachers themselves, which were consistent with educational emphasis in the Japanese national curriculum and education policy. Emphasis on peer interaction and relationships was common within the site school, its SNEU, and its classes. The three participant teachers had been trained to use a lesson study approach, as discussed in Chapter 2, to improve lessons and instructions as a teaching group rather than as distinctive, individual teachers. The schoolwide approach of lesson study therefore required the teachers to work as members of the SNEU team as well as representatives of the school.

During their interviews, these teachers emphasised their interactions with the children in their classes. The researcher’s direct observations of whole-day activities and duties confirmed that the teachers actually stayed with their class throughout the full school day. All three teachers said they had no time to interact with other teachers. However, in their weekly
reflection interviews with the researcher, they revealed that they had frequent informal interactions with other teachers and had participated in six formal meetings about lesson development across the nine weeks of field research that this study entailed.

The second section of this chapter confirms the teachers’ and their school’s holistic approach to group instruction. It demonstrates their peer-based practices and strategies for teaching children with ASD and illustrates their group-oriented practices, including peer-mediated learning environments and support strategies to facilitate children’s peer interactions and relationships and independence building. In their interviews, the teachers revealed that they viewed the three aspects of group instruction (i.e., planning, implementing, and evaluating) as interrelated, which suggested the value of these teachers engaging in ongoing lesson development across the observation weeks (ObWks) of this case study. The teachers’ responses during reflection interviews confirmed that they reflected critically on their lessons as a whole at the end of each day to try to identify shortcomings and ways to further improve lessons for the next day. They also reflected on their experiences over longer periods to identify ways to improve their overall teaching performance. Their holistic focus for improving lessons was also evident in their group discussions during teacher meetings.

Teachers participating in this case study found the video-clip examples used in the Key Moment interviews to be helpful as they tried to articulate what they were doing during lessons. These video clips provided concrete examples that the teachers could refer to during their discussion. This method was particularly helpful for them in answering research questions (RQs) 2 and 3. Video analysis provided many videoed examples that demonstrate what these teachers were doing with the children with ASD. However, decisions about which video-clip examples to use in reporting about this case study were guided by the teachers’ efforts to explain what they do by referring to the Key Moments.

The third section of this chapter demonstrates that the teachers’ views of holistic educational values (i.e., whole-person education) are consistent with both the national curriculum and their school’s emphasis. This section shows how preservice and inservice training through the lesson study approach guides the teachers’ approach to teaching children with ASD. The school’s emphasis on peer relationships addressed in school documents and in situational analysis (SA) interviews with the researcher was evident during progressive observations. Moreover, the three teachers often talked about educational values during the first and second semistructured interviews (Interviews A and B) as well as the reflection interviews. In these ways, the Japanese case study indicates that these values are embedded in the teachers’ everyday practice, which includes group instruction. Answering RQ3 therefore involved data from all interviews in this case study, in addition to the third semistructured interview (Interview B).

The teachers’ individual perspectives exposed developmentally-differentiated practices for children with ASD. These teachers outlined their perspectives (i.e., the need for group
participation, group cooperation, and group contribution), making clear that different age groups affect the ways of teaching most appropriate for children in their classrooms. The researcher’s lesson observations were consistent with these findings. The more comprehensive interpersonal abilities observed in older children with ASD suggest that scaffolding these abilities throughout the school years helps these children to become more aware of peers and more willing to interact with and help their peers.

**RQ1: Daily Practice**

This section examines findings related to the first research question:

> What makes up the daily practice of special education teachers working with children with ASD?

Table 4.1 presents demographic information for the three teacher participants in the Japanese case study. All three held a Bachelor degree in teaching primary and special education, which they had obtained from the host University of the school where they were then teaching. Detailed information collected from the Teacher Background Information Sheet (see Appendix D) and from conversations with these teachers revealed that Ms Chiba’s first major was special education and her second major was in history education, while the other teachers’ first majors were Japanese language and linguistics (Ms Ando) and history (Mr Banba), with their second major in special education. These differences affected how the teachers completed their subject courses. For example, Ms Chiba completed more courses in special education and submitted her Bachelor thesis on special education, while Ms Ando and Mr Banba took fewer courses in special education and wrote their respective theses on their first majors. All three teachers completed four weeks of practicum in primary education during their third year of university and two weeks in special education during their fourth year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching experience (SpEd)</th>
<th>Other experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT1</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching (Primary &amp; Special Education)</td>
<td>4 years and 1 month (the 5th year)</td>
<td>9 years as a regular education classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT2</td>
<td>Mr Banba</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching (Primary &amp; Special Education)</td>
<td>3 years and 1 month (the 4th year)</td>
<td>1 year as a regular education classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT3</td>
<td>Ms Chiba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching (Primary &amp; Special Education)</td>
<td>1 month (the 1st year)</td>
<td>6 years as a regular education classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These teachers had experience in teaching regular education classes for at least 1 year before they began teaching in special education. While Ms Ando and Mr Banba had been teaching special education classes for several years at this unit, Ms Chiba was a novice in teaching special education classes and was relatively new to the school, but she had
considerable experience in primary teaching. In her Interview A at the beginning of the field research, Ms Chiba reflected that her approach was based on her perception and experience of regular teaching practice, and she was struggling with the need to shift her focus from regular to special education. The head of the SNEU and one of three teachers were male, probably because the school was the research school attached to a national university. This ratio was similar to the ratio of male teachers in the regular education classes at the same school.

Table 4.2 details SNEU classroom contexts at the Japanese site. The average adult–child ratio was 20% (i.e., one teacher per five children). The classroom teachers were usually alone with the children in their classrooms during lesson observations for this case study. The SNEU head (hereafter, Head) and a support teacher, who also held teaching qualifications, were extra adults available for this unit. They usually helped the teachers as needed with children’s toilet requirements and school lunch (only for Ms Ando), lesson observations, taking photographs during lessons, and being a learning resource (i.e., role playing) as learning facilitators in lessons. The heavy responsibility of the classroom teachers was highlighted during the researcher’s interviews with inschool stakeholders. Follow-up conversations with these teachers at the end of the 2010 school year (i.e., the year when this field research was conducted) confirmed that classroom enrolment was stable during the whole school year, which was consistent with the wider school approach of managing a class as a whole (or “ideal class”) throughout the school year. As noted in Chapter 3, the primary category of disability for special placement of children in this SNEU was intellectual disability (ID). Indeed all the SNEU children had ID.

Table 4.2
The Japanese Classroom Context in the SNEU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher code</th>
<th>Age group of children</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of children with ASD</th>
<th>Number of adults</th>
<th>Adult–child ratio</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT1</td>
<td>6-8 years old (Year 1-2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–6 (0.17)</td>
<td>One teacher sometimes came to classrooms as a learning resource, not supporter. No child was in a wheelchair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT2</td>
<td>8-10 years old (Year 3-4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–5 (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT3</td>
<td>10-12 years old (Year 5-6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4 (0.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adult refers to a person who supports the children in the classroom during the lesson observation, and the ratio is based on formal documentation about staffing during classroom observations.

Table 4.3 presents pseudonyms, gender, and ASD diagnosis of children in the SNEU during this field research. Each SNEU class included two children with ASD and two with Down Syndrome, but no child requiring intensive physical support (e.g., wheel chairs). In the whole SNEU, there were more male (n = 12) than female children (n = 3), with only one female among the six children with ASD. Of all the unit’s children, only the two with ASD, Bunta and Daichi, required consistent supervision because they tended to escape from their classrooms. The researcher’s observations and reflection interviews with the teachers confirmed that these...
children were rarely absent from school; only Daichi was absent for one day during the field research.

Table 4.3
*Demographic Summary of Children in the SNEU*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ASD Diagnosis</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA1</td>
<td>Aiko</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA2</td>
<td>Bunta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA3</td>
<td>Chiaki</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA4</td>
<td>Daichi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA5</td>
<td>Eji</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA6</td>
<td>Fuji</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SNEU3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>Genki</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC2</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC3</td>
<td>Ichi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC4</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC5</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC6</td>
<td>Luna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC7</td>
<td>Makoto</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC8</td>
<td>Naoki</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC9</td>
<td>Osamu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SNEU3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the SNEU was located within the host primary school, the children with ASD had many opportunities to interact with typically developing peers through interactive activities. To distinguish between children from the SNEU and those from regular education classrooms, this case study report uses “SNEU children” or “the children” for the first group, and “RC children” for the latter group in general. This study also uses more detailed codes to specify the classes. For example, “RC children of Year 6” refers to the children from the Year 6 regular education classroom, and “RC children of Year 4C” refers to those from Year 4 classroom C in regular education. Similarly in this study, the teachers from SNEU are referred to as “SNEU teachers” or “the teachers”, while those from regular education classrooms are referred to as “RC teachers” in general.

Table 4.4 shows three aspects of special education teachers’ daily practice to address RQ1 (i.e., teacher role, everyday structure, and everyday approach) as well as primary and supplementary data sets employed for each aspect. First, this section describes various views about the SNEU teachers’ role emerging from SA interviews (i.e., with stakeholders outside the classroom). This section aims to contextualise the classroom teaching of the participating teachers in RQ2 from different layers of perspectives (i.e., prefecture, school, and the SNEU). Second, the section presents the structure of the teachers’ daily practices emerging from document reviews and everyday variations and adjustments addressed during the teachers’ first semistructured interview (Interview A), which was supported by evidence from teacher observations, reflection interviews, and the researcher’s reflection logs. The section also highlights the teachers’ emphasis on communicating with parents through consistent exchanges using documents. Third, the section also illustrates both the teachers’ active engagement.
throughout the day with the children who have ASD and the emphasis that teachers place upon peer interactions and relationships. These findings emerged from thematic analysis of Interview A with evidence of teacher observations, reflection interviews, and the researcher’s reflection logs.

Table 4.4
*Data Sources Used to Address RQ1 in the Japanese Case*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The teachers’ role

SA interviews with inschool stakeholders and university professors revealed that the school emphasis was consistent with the Japanese traditional holistic approach (i.e., whole-person education). These SA participants believed that the teachers must develop their understanding of individual children and of the class as a whole through close interactions and careful observations and then improve their teaching practice progressively. Data from SA interviews indicated that all SA participants agreed that the role of the school was to lead other schools. For example, the school’s vice principal expected the SNEU teachers to disseminate their practice to outside schools through open lessons, school documentations, or publications. He said that the teachers need to be able to talk about their practice clearly and in detail; otherwise, other people cannot understand all aspects of what the teachers are doing. The process of developing their classroom practice (i.e., lessons) was also highlighted in school documents related to lesson study.

The school staff members who were working closely with the teachers (i.e., Head and support teacher) were likely to have more specific views about teaching children with ASD in the school, while other outside-classroom stakeholders had more general views. For example, the Head and support teacher were found to be more focused on the SNEU teachers’ current classroom practices, while the talk of other outside classroom stakeholders was generally more abstract. More specifically, age-appropriate support and learning aims in life-skills unit (i.e., *seitan*) were highlighted by the Head saying that he is “working together with the SNEU teachers to improve every aspect of the lesson from the children’s point of view.” The Head addressed the benefits of having other teachers observe the teachers’ lessons and mentioned an
ongoing inquiry to find new ways of viewing how the children are learning through “blending theory and practice.” This application of different points of view was also highlighted by other inschool stakeholders to understand the children and their practice, although these stakeholders underlined their view that the primary responsibility of the classroom teachers is to manage their own classes. The deputy vice principal indicated his belief that other people’s reflections may help the teachers to find new solutions to school problems.

[By having other teachers observe the lessons,] we were able to share the problems of each of the classroom teachers. If these teachers come to the SNEU frequently and confirmed how every aspect of the lessons or the children changed over time, they can see the lesson or the child from their point of view. Also, having more teachers observing the same lesson helps us find the core problems. (Japanese SNEU Head)

To respond to every child, the teachers first need to identify the viewpoint of each child in detail. When talking to others who observe their lessons, the teachers should ask the observers for their reflections, because these reflections sometimes give the teachers alternative viewpoints, which help them to make new discoveries. (Japanese Deputy Vice Principal)

Interviewing inschool stakeholders highlighted that relationships between the teachers and children and among the children are a core feature of their practice. School administration staff stressed the school’s emphasis on interaction and relationships between children in the SNEU and in the regular education classrooms. School policy was that “all teachers together educate all children of the school; therefore, the school structure encourages teachers and children to have interactive activities” (Japanese vice principal’s interview), and the school’s prime educational aim was “to work for friends’ happiness” (school website). Similarly, the inschool stakeholders conveyed in their interviews the inclusive fundamental view that “every one is our friend (nakama).” For example, these stakeholders’ responses to the question about inclusive perspectives revealed their shared view of a “class as community” comprising one classroom teacher and all of the classroom children. Ideal support for a child with ASD is therefore seen to involve the class as a whole solving problems together and helping the child with ASD as part of their classroom community.

Moreover, the deputy vice principal viewed “all aspects of everyday events (e.g., children’s problem behaviours and learning difficulties) as learning opportunities for the teachers and the children” and stated that this principle is critical for ideal school and classroom management. He believed that this principle can help both special and regular education teachers maintain positive attitudes toward children with ASD and can help the other classroom children also to respond to the children with ASD with a positive attitude. Here the other children’s development of their positive relationships with the children with ASD is the premise for school and classroom management to facilitate children to help friends who need help.

While the other stakeholders’ overall view of the SNEU teachers’ practice was positive, some of the other outside-classroom stakeholders still mentioned issues in their current practice during their interviews. For example, a university professor suggested improvement through a continuing system of educational support that allows the teachers to develop coherent
educational aims for each child from kindergarten to high school. This aspect is detailed later in this chapter for RQ3.

**Everyday structure: working though a day**

To outline a typical day for the Japanese teachers, weekly schedule sheets, which each teacher provided to the parents every Friday, showed how the structure of school days follows the schedules. Other data from direct observations of the teacher’s full day, the researcher’s reflection logs, and Interview A transcriptions illustrated detailed activities throughout the school day and the everyday variations and adjustments that the teachers made (see Table 4.5). In this way, the children were less likely to encounter unpredicted events during the week, because weekly schedule sheets informed the parents and the children every Friday about updated schedules for the next week. These schedule sheets indicated that a typical day had a total of five lessons, and each lesson time was set at 45 minutes unless special school events occurred on the day (see Appendix O1). Their time allocation for the lessons and other daily activities (e.g., break time, lunch, and cleaning) was consistent with the school’s regular education schedule.

The researcher’s immediate reflection, conducted after Interview A, reported that the teachers struggled to describe their typical days in general. An emerging theme that “every day is different” from thematic analysis of this interview captured how the teachers’ view of everyday differences arose from everyday variation in what the teachers and children were doing on the day (see Appendix O2). Data from teacher observations and the researcher’s reflection logs also noted these everyday variations depending on what happens on the day through responding to weather, upcoming events, and the children’s needs at the time. For example, the teachers arranged for the children to watch DVDs, when they noticed that the children were too tired to follow the scheduled activities.

From the latter half of Lesson 1 … I can use the thirty minutes as I like because the time is for classroom management activity … Because we are now growing summer vegetables, we usually water or observe them. But we recently had rainy days and no need to water the plants. Well, it is up to the situation. For example, today, we had “lettuce party”, yesterday. RC children of Year 2 brought us “lettuce wraps” and ate them together. And then, because we wanted to bring them thank-you letters, we were making the letters today … The 30 minute period between 9 am to 9.30 am is very flexible. (JT1’s Interview A)

The age differences in how time is spent in learning areas became apparent through a combination of data analyses. The data based on weekly schedule sheets confirmed the teachers’ adjustments through teacher observations, reflection logs, and Interview A showed the coherent learning areas of the national curriculum for children with ID and addresses age-different time spending. Ms Ando (JT1) spent most time on instructing daily life skills, while Mr Banba (JT2) and Ms Chiba (JT3) spent most time on implementing seitan life-skills lessons. Moreover, Ms Chiba spent much more time on academic learning, compared with the other two teachers (see details in Appendix O3).
### Table 4.5
**Summary of SNEU Schedule for the Japanese Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule for all</th>
<th>Note (place, class differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>School gate opens for children.</td>
<td>SNEU children come to school by public transport or walk with parents (younger children) or by themselves (older children).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Preparation Time (e.g., change clothes, unpack bags)</td>
<td>Own classrooms. SNEU1 had RC-Year6 children support younger children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05–8.15</td>
<td><strong>Morning Group Activity</strong></td>
<td>School playground for Sport Activity (M, Tu, &amp; Th) and Multiaged Group Time (F); and own classrooms for Paired Reading Time (W). SNEU children paired with RC-children during these activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td><strong>Morning Song Time</strong></td>
<td>Own classrooms. One peer group of RC-children came to each class to sing a song for the month together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.25–8.45</td>
<td><strong>Morning Class Time</strong> (e.g., sing a song for SNEU, confirm today’s schedule)</td>
<td>Own classrooms. Only SNEU1 had a group preparation time before this activity and it involved singing a song selected by the child who was appointed as the leader of the day. Only SNEU3 had time for each child to advise the class what they want to achieve today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45–9.30</td>
<td><strong>Lesson 1 (Morning Class Time: Spare time after the activity was used according to the day)</strong></td>
<td>Own classrooms. SNEU1 and SNEU2 spent more time for Morning Class Time (until 9.05 am) and used the spare time for group activity. SNEU3 used less time for Morning Class Time and used the spare time for both group activity and individual academic learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.40–10.25</td>
<td><strong>Lesson 2 (M, W, Th: Whole SNEU lesson; Tu, F: Lesson for each class)</strong></td>
<td>RC-teachers (M: English, W: Music, Th: Physical) instructed the whole SNEU lessons, while the SNEU members supported the children at one of SNEU classrooms for English and Music or gymnastic facility for physical. Lesson for each class was allocated time for academic learning, Arts, ICT, or group activity. Own classrooms, computer room, or library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25–10.45</td>
<td><strong>Break Time 1</strong></td>
<td>Playground, playroom, own classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50–11.35</td>
<td><strong>Lesson 3 (Seitan lesson)</strong></td>
<td>SNEU1: Mostly playroom. SNEU2 and SNEU3: Own classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45–12.30</td>
<td><strong>Lesson 4</strong></td>
<td>SNEU1: Own classroom, writing tomorrow’s schedule and preparing for school lunch. SNEU2: Own classroom, packing up for Seitan lesson, watching video, and preparing for school lunch. SNEU3: Seitan lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30–13.10</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Time</strong></td>
<td>SNEU1 and SNEU2: Own classrooms, having lunch. SNEU3: Own classroom, preparing for school lunch and having lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10–13.30</td>
<td><strong>Break Time 2</strong></td>
<td>Playground, playroom, own classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.35–13.55</td>
<td><strong>Cleaning Time</strong></td>
<td>Own classrooms. RC-Year6 children helped each class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00–14.45</td>
<td><strong>Lesson 5 &amp; Going Home Preparation (e.g., change clothes, pack bags.)</strong></td>
<td>Own classrooms. SNEU1: A little time for academic learning, and most for preparing to go home. SNEU2: Writing for the next day’s schedule, a little time for academic learning, and the rest for preparing to go home. SNEU3: Most time for academic learning and the rest for writing for the next day’s schedule and preparing to go home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td><strong>Going Home</strong></td>
<td>SNEU1: Parents come to pick up the children at the waiting area. SNEU2 and SNEU3: Use public transport or walk home independently; Daichi (see Table 4.3) with parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across a typical day, that the teachers conducted relatively many group activities with the children, particularly in the morning. These group activities included the activities (a) among the whole school, (b) between SNEU children and regular education children, and (c) among all SNEU classes (see Appendix O4). Similar to the inschool SA participants, the SNEU teachers considered every aspect of school life as learning. Daily living activities included routines for changing clothes, preparing for lunch (serving lunch for the class), and cleaning their own classrooms in the school. Age-specific adjustments of time, duties, and activities among the different classes were displayed in Table 4.5. For example, Lesson 3 was usually allocated for seitan in all SNEU classes, but the use of Lesson 4 depended on the needs of the children in each class. For example, SNEU1 (i.e., the youngest class) required more time to prepare school lunch than the other two classes. Children in this class also needed to complete a literacy activity of writing the next school day’s schedule within this time frame, whereas the two classes of older children performed this same activity in Lesson 5 because younger children needed more time in Going Home Preparation (e.g., changing clothes and packing bags).

Furthermore, the SNEU teachers spent a lot of time on other duties such as paperwork, meetings and communication, and lesson preparation. Data from the researcher’s teacher observations and reflection logs indicates that the Japanese teachers worked until very late each school day. They rarely went home at the official time (4.45 pm) and sometimes stayed after midnight. They also came to school over weekends for their paperwork or lesson study preparation. SA document reviews show that during the period of field research the teachers produced and received various written communications concerning their work (see the list of documents in Appendix F1). They did not take sick leave even when they were very ill. The researcher observed time during her observation period when Ms Ando and Ms Chiba were very unwell; Ms Chiba wanted to stay after school to prepare for the school’s Lesson Study Conference but was ordered to go home. The school’s vice principal reported during a pilot visit: “Our teachers are very diligent and busy and stay at school even after midnight before Lesson Study Conference” (the researcher’s reflection log recorded after this piloting). This finding is also consistent with a 2006 national survey reporting that teachers spent a monthly average of 34 hours overtime across weekdays and 8 hours during weekends (MEXT, 2007).

The inquiry highlighted three aspects of teaching related duties in the Japanese special educators. The first aspect of duties that the teachers considered was paperwork. Reviewing SA documents reveals that the teachers produced considerable paperwork (e.g., informative documents to parents and lesson study related documents). During Interview A, the teachers actively acknowledged the importance of communicating with parents, which was also highlighted in the researcher’s teacher observations and document review of written communications between the class and home. For example, the researcher’s observations of the teachers’ full days recorded frequent face-to-face communications when parents came to drop or pick up children at the school (SNEU1, JA4) and teachers’ phone calls to inform parents about
how they are doing. On a daily basis, the teachers exchanged written communications with parents through Class–Home Communication Books (C–H Communication Books) and produced Class–Home Newsletters (C–H Newsletters) every Friday to inform parents how the children were spending a day during the week (e.g., activities and photographs). In their first newsletters, the teachers provided their personal contact details and invited parents to contact them if there was a need. In fact, the university professor, who was the SNEU’s lesson study supervisor, said producing a newsletter every week is a good practice but expressed some concerns about the practice consuming the teachers’ time and effort. He highlighted the need for balance between the amount of work teachers perform and its efficiency.

Field research also revealed the significance of relationships between parents and the teachers and the privilege of communication between the school and home. Two examples showed how seriously these teachers took everyday communication with parents through the communication books or emails for their practice. The school administration staff and the teachers were very concerned about showing the book to the researcher and were unwilling to ask the parents about sharing the contents with the researcher. These school teachers and other staff expressed their concern about possible negative impact on the parents’ trust and feelings toward the school, even if the parents were asked for permission to allow the researcher to read their children’s communication books. As an alternative, the classroom teachers agreed to code the content of the books for the six children with ASD with a C–H Communication Book Checklist (see Appendix O5), which showed their everyday reporting of what the children did during the school day. These teachers also frequently described their observations of peer interactions and relationships reflecting the emphasis upon peer interactions and relationships within the school.

I wrote emails about how the children were today after they went home. In my class, half of parents use communication books and the other half use emails. For the communication books, I must write them while the children are there, like after quickly eating school lunch. Because it is too hard for me to do this for all parents of the six children, I made an agreement from three of the parents to use emails. So I write emails after the children have gone home. The parents also email me almost every day. (JT1’s Interview A)

I need to inform parents about each child’s day from the time when the children come to school to the time when they go home. So I need to write C–H Communication Books…in my spare time … Sometimes I start out at Break Times 1 … between Lesson 1 and Lesson 2 or between Lesson 3 and Lesson 4 … Or before going out at the Break Time 1, I try to write in at least one book, and write in other books at Lunch Time. Children take their time to finish their lunch but we can eat lunch faster than the children. So I often write in the books at the time too. (JT2’s Interview A)

The second aspect of duties is communication with other teachers. The researcher’s progressive reflection interviews revealed that the teachers had extensive informal and formal communication with other teachers. However, the teachers insisted during Interview A that they hardly had time for communicating with other teachers and needed to quickly snatch time to communicate with other teachers. For example, Ms Ando tried to inform a regular education classroom teacher about her class visiting that teacher’s classroom later in the day while playing
with children during Morning Sport Activity. Informal communications were face to face, mostly through daily casual conversations with other teachers and sometimes through group discussions after school hours. Formal communications were through various scheduled meetings: Whole School General Meetings, Lesson Study Meetings, and Grade Meetings (i.e., Whole School Meetings for each year group of Year 1–2, Year 3–4, and Year 5–6 teachers). Lesson Study Meetings focused on lesson development, while other meetings were for administrative purposes. Table 4.6 shows that the researcher observed a total of four different lesson study related meetings during the period of this field research. Each meeting had different meeting participants and different foci.

Additionally, SA document review revealed that the teachers were consistently engaged in the lesson study approach throughout the school year: Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters (see Appendix I), produced by the whole school Lesson Study Committee, indicated a total of seven different lesson study events (i.e., both inschool and open school). The event observed during field research was an open school. The newsletters issued at the beginning of the year summarised achievements in lesson study practices over the previous year and proposed the next step for research in the year ahead. Inschool research entailed a 3-year cycle (i.e., Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3), and the year of this field research was the second phrase (see Appendix O6).

Table 4.6
Types of Meetings Related to Lesson Study Observed for the Japanese Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Study Meeting Types (Meeting Code)</th>
<th>Meeting Participants</th>
<th>Meeting Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three SNEU Meetings (MO1, MO2, MO3)³</td>
<td>SNEU classroom teachers, SNEU Head, and one university professor (i.e., supervisor)</td>
<td>Reflecting on each lesson and improving the lessons with detailed focuses of each SNEU class (held in the SNEU staff room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Post-conference SNEU Meetings (MO4)</td>
<td>SNEU classroom teachers, SNEU Head, and senior teachers who previously taught at the SNEU</td>
<td>Linking educational theory and practice to improve lessons of life-skills unit (held in the SNEU staff room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Post-conference SNEU Open Meeting (MO5)</td>
<td>SNEU team (Head, classroom teachers, support teacher), supervisor, visitors to the conference</td>
<td>SNEU team provided visitors (outside schools) with information on the SNEU’s lesson study research outcomes (held in a SNEU classroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Post-conference Whole School Open Meeting (MO6)</td>
<td>Lesson Study Committee, school administration, visitors to the conference</td>
<td>Whole school Lesson Study Committee provided visitors (outside schools) with information on the whole school Lesson Study Committee’s research outcomes (held in the school conference room)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³MO3 occurred at the end of all meetings listed in this table.

The third aspect of duties was preparation. Thematic analysis of Interview A shows that the teachers spent considerable time during and after school hours preparing variation in everyday lessons and activities. The researcher noted in her progressive observations that this preparation increases before the Lesson Study Conference. The teachers’ emphasis on preparation for teaching is detailed in the following section that concerns RQ2.
Because] the activities are varied every day, I prepared for activities for the next class in the short break time between lessons, when it is necessary for the next class. (JT3’s Interview A)

[After school hours], I prepare for the next day’s lessons. For example, today we were doing an activity where we delivered thank-you letters [to RC children], so I printed out photos for the letters, cut the coloured drawing papers for writing massages, and so on …. This is making learning materials. (JT1’s Interview A)

Everyday approach: working with a child with ASD

A strong theme of “doing things together” that emerged from thematic analysis of Interview A revealed an important aspect of the special educator’s practice—sharing experiences (Appendix O2). This aspect applied to their emphasis on staying with the children with ASD all the time and conducting group activities and working in groups on many occasions. First, as the teacher participants revealed during Interview A, these teachers appeared to spend almost all school day with the children with ASD, from daily routines through to playing time. Across a typical teaching day, their everyday practice appears to involve support-based learning and facilitation of the children through active interactions with them. Teacher observations confirmed that these teachers engaged in many activities together with the children. For example, at Morning Group Activity (see Table 4.5), the teachers went to the common playground and played group activities together with the children. During break time, they also went to the playground and played with the children, and they ate the same school lunch with the children. At the end of the day, they cleaned their own classroom with the children and walked to bus stops (with older children) or to the parents’ waiting area (with younger children).

In her capacity as a volunteer teacher aide with Ms Ando, the researcher learned that the total of the three whole-SNEU group lessons in Lesson 2 was allocated as one noncontact hour (i.e., during Lesson 2 each teacher supposedly had 45 minutes of planning time without the children). However, there were individual differences in how the teachers used this hour, as the researcher’s teacher observations and the participants’ reflection interviews following the observations in ObWk5 revealed: Only Ms Ando used this time as noncontact hour (see details in Appendix O7). Given the individual differences in either using or not using this noncontact hour, being with the children all the time appeared to make the teaching day busier for the teachers in general. In fact, the three teachers anguished that they tried to find time to write C–H Communication Books while being with children all the time (i.e., multi-tasking).

During a reflection interview held soon after the researcher observed a full day of Ms Ando, Ms Ando characterised her role as close to a parental role with Bunta. She said that Bunta sometimes called her okaa-san (i.e., mum), although he surely recognised the differences between his mother and Ms Ando. On this observation day, Ms Ando spent her noncontact hour during Lesson 2 preparing for the next lesson. At this time she stayed in the SNEU staff room, which was located in front of the SNEU1 classroom, while Bunta had a Music lesson with other SNEU classes. Bunta escaped several times from the lesson and came to the staff room, and each time Ms Ando took Bunta back to the lesson and stayed with him until he settled again.
This parental role was also confirmed in her third semistructured interview (Interview C), when Ms Ando expressed her complex feeling of being simultaneously happy and a little sad about Bunta becoming more independent from her during the SNEU Camp. (Note. At the camp, held in ObWk8, all SNEU children and teachers cooked dinner and stayed over one Thursday night at the school. All staff and teachers from the whole school shared the dinner with the children, and some RC teachers voluntarily stayed overnight with the camp group). Ms Ando observed that in contrast, Bunta was more attached to her during the school camp held in the previous year. This example reflected that the teachers build warm and strong relationships with the children and provide them with support-based learning. Emphasis on building these types of relationships with the children was also expressed by in-school stakeholders when giving their view of the teachers’ roles.

During his Interview A early in the field research, Mr Banba said repeatedly that he was always with Daichi, who required constant supervision and more support than other children in his class. The researcher’s early observations also noted that Mr Banba appeared to spend more time with Daichi than with other children, although over the course of her progressive observations she noted Mr Banba was spending less time with Daichi. Further, whereas early in the field research Mr Banba had tried to hold Daichi’s hand during activities, as time moved on Mr Banba reduced and eventually stopped this physical support. It appeared that Mr Banba would probably speak differently about his support for Daichi if the researcher had interviewed this teacher later in the term.

The second aspect of “doing things together” also reflected the frequency of peer interactions that the researcher observed within the whole school, the whole SNEU, and each SNEU class during teacher observations. This high level of frequency was consistent with the school’s emphasis on peer interaction and relationships (i.e., “working for friends’ happiness”). Data from the researcher’s teacher observations illustrates how the school used han, the small peer groups used routinely in Japanese regular education to facilitate children’s sense of group responsibility and leadership. Using han adeptly, different functioning levels of group responsibility and leadership were incorporated to manage each class, the SNEU, and the school as a whole. Teachers used group activities (i.e., children doing activities together) to facilitate the children’s experience and understanding of group responsibility and used peer support to develop positive peer relationships across the school community. Many peer groups decided their own duties in the school and engaged in these duties throughout the school year. These peer groups contributed not only to their individual classes, but also to the whole-school. Some peer groups of upper grade regular education children set their group duties particularly to support SNEU classes. Table 4.5 confirms that these supports were allocated across the typical school day (see examples of the school’s using han in Appendix O8).

Because each SNEU class had only a small number of children, han were not used formally. However, across the school day the SNEU teachers seemed to approach their whole
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RQ2: Group Instruction

This section examines findings related to the second research question:

*How do special education teachers use “group instruction” to teach children with ASD?*

The main source of data was the teachers’ talk in their second semistructured interview with the researcher (Interview B) about lessons for their classes. English translations of the Interview B transcriptions were analysed according to three ecological categories for dealing with group instruction (i.e., planning, implementing, and evaluating). These categories are common in the teacher-practice literature in both English and Japanese languages. By the time of Interview B, the Japanese teachers were deeply engaged with lesson planning through individual reflections and lesson study teacher meetings. Each of the participating teachers brought a copy of their
lesson plans to Interview B to discuss with the researcher (see Appendices G3e). The teachers were able to articulate what they were doing in their lessons they were then teaching, how they developed the plan progressively from the beginning of the school year, and what else they planned to do beyond what they had already included in their plans.

The researcher found separate categories of planning and evaluating were not appropriate for coding the Japanese texts and therefore intentionally did not use these for the Japanese case. Table 4.7 summarising initial analysis of the Interview B transcripts shows that totals for the content texts appeared to not add up to 100% indicating overlaps in these categories. The researcher therefore conducted a Matrix Coding Query of the plan–evaluate nodes in NVivo to test whether they overlapped categories in the talks (JTs1-3: 57%, 83%, and 71%, approximately). The result of this test suggested that there is no clear boundary among these three categories in the Japanese teachers’ practice. The researcher then repeated thematic analysis on the texts of Interview B, to find key aspects contributed to overlaps across these three categories (see Appendix O10).

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological category</th>
<th>Ms Ando a</th>
<th>Mr Banba</th>
<th>Ms Chiba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning a group lesson</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
<td>58.23%</td>
<td>65.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a group lesson</td>
<td>41.32%</td>
<td>38.41%</td>
<td>31.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a group lesson</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
<td>23.79%</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Ms Ando’s transcribing text of Interview A was coded as plan-node (41%), implement-node (41%), and evaluate-node (31%) in NVivo. Overlapping means that the same text was coded as both plan-node and evaluate-node.

Table 4.8 shows three themes of daily practice identified to address RQ2 (i.e., planning a lesson, improving social situations, and improving learning situations). The researcher identified these three themes first through conducting thematic analysis (see Table 3.16 in Chapter 3) of Interview B transcriptions. Table 4.8 also shows primary and supplementary data sets that provided information regarding these themes, in addition to Interview B. The teachers’ reflection interviews provided weekly feedback on what the teachers did during the week and identified adjustments or changes they made to their lessons. It helped the researcher better understand the detailed process of how the teachers developed a lesson by repeating a similar lesson and revising it over weeks. It also helped the researcher clarify the teachers’ instructional intentions in teaching of children with ASD. Comments in video-clip examples of Key Moments also offered the teachers’ perspectives on what they are doing during their lessons. Data from the researcher’s observations of lessons were cross-checked with the teachers’ talk and yielded concrete examples of what these teachers were actually doing. These observation data gave snapshots of the ways that the teachers used peer interactions to support children with ASD during group lessons. The researcher’s observations of teacher meetings showed that in these meetings the teachers shared their views of what happened during lessons and discussed
ways to further improve the lessons. As mentioned earlier, more examples of transcriptions of the videos presenting Key Moments are discussed throughout this section in conjunction with the teachers’ reflections on the videos, since the researcher found these useful for articulating the teachers’ teaching strategies.

Table 4.8
Data Sources Used to Address RQ2 in the Japanese Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Instruction</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Reflection Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Observations</th>
<th>Lesson Observations</th>
<th>Meeting Observations</th>
<th>Reflection Logs</th>
<th>T Documents</th>
<th>SA Interviews</th>
<th>SA Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning a lesson</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving social situations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving learning situations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


First, this section shows that the Japanese teachers tried to improve their lessons progressively. Because these teachers were deeply engaged in a group implementation of lesson development (i.e., lesson study), data on the researcher’s observations of teacher meetings helped to reveal what the teachers emphasised when planning a lesson. Next, the section illustrates that these teachers used relationship-based and group-oriented practices. Across the three themes, they emphasised two aspects for their lessons: (a) for a class as a whole and (b) for individual children with ASD. That is, the teachers tried to create social situations in which the children with ASD interact with and help each other (i.e., building class functioning without teachers’ support) and to create learning situations in which these children become more independent and take social initiatives to help peers. Importantly, the teachers considered peers as learning supports for the individual children to complete their tasks independently and for this reason took a less active role. In terms of these aspects, the children’s age group appeared to affect how these teachers instructed their children; the teachers prepared lessons that they considered appropriate to the children’s age and development. The focus for the youngest group (i.e., SNEU1) was “group participation”, while for the older groups (SNEU2 and SNEU3) it was “group cooperation” and “group contributions” respectively. These foci were consistent with findings for RQ1 about how the teachers worked throughout the school day. Throughout this second section of this chapter, examples selected carefully from data on each teacher demonstrate their teaching practices and strategies.

Overall, the Japanese teachers used seitan (i.e., seikatsu tangen gakushu, a life-skills unit). They repeated similar lessons but modified them progressively across weeks. Their basic lesson sequence was consistent, but the details in each lesson were changed progressively over the period of one set unit and were varied in lessons across the unit (see Ms Ando’s example of
her lesson development in Appendix O11). The typical lesson included (a) introduction (group opening and group instruction), (b) body (main group activities, including individual and group tasks or play), and (c) conclusion (group reflection and group closure). The later lessons involved more interactive group activities.

Table 4.9 shows one lesson type and title used by each teacher during a unit period of several weeks. This study focused on these lessons in order to demonstrate the teachers’ most featured practices, while additional findings from other lessons that the teachers conducted over the observation weeks are also discussed. For example, although Mr Banba and Ms Chiba finished their unit early, they applied a similar lesson format (i.e., cooking) to other activities in the following weeks. This approach enabled the children to transfer and generalise what they learnt during the previous unit (e.g., cooking knowledge and skills, and social and communication skills).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Unit Period</th>
<th>Lesson type</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>ObWks 2-8</td>
<td>Thematic play</td>
<td>Baikinman Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Banba</td>
<td>ObWks 2-7</td>
<td>Cooking activity</td>
<td>Let’s make pancakes together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Chiba</td>
<td>ObWks 3-6</td>
<td>Cooking activity</td>
<td>Little Pooh’s small sponge cake shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three participating teachers believed that the children cannot interact with or support peers unless they can first complete their tasks independently. Progressive observations revealed that these teachers add extra tasks later in the unit because the children have been trained to complete tasks step by step. These observations also highlighted the teachers’ exposed use of scaffolding techniques to teach new activities and skills to the children with ASD. That is, the teachers first introduced new activities and required skills by demonstration or direct instruction; then they trained the children to complete the activities and use the skills by repeating the activity with supporting prompts. Finally, they faded the prompting. These scaffolding techniques were also used to train the children to work with peers, to help friends, and to work in a team by adding more interactive group activities later in the unit. In this way, the techniques facilitated peer-mediated environments.

First, I believe that the children need to be able to complete their own tasks by themselves. Then, they will be able to afford to consider their peers. Children who can complete their tasks by themselves will start to look at their peers naturally. And then, when the children start looking at their peers and considering their peers as part of their group, they can understand that they can please these peers. And the children can feel happy about pleasing their peers. I think that the activity of making small sponge cakes is one typical example [of how the children can experience these learning steps]. (JT3’s Interview B)

Planning a lesson

All three Japanese teachers agreed that good preparation is a first step to support children with ASD. To create a “good” lesson, the teachers observed their class carefully and developed the lesson progressively across the weeks. These teachers used a term, the children’s jittai (i.e.,
actual conditions), to describe individual and group conditions in the class, and they summarised these conditions in their lesson study plans. The so-called “actual conditions” identify many aspects of the children: (a) their interests and preferences, (b) abilities and needs, (c) peer relationships, and (d) inner engagement (i.e., thoughts). The teachers used this knowledge to guide their preparation of lessons and their choice of activities that motivate the children to engage in what is underway and to interact with peers.

First, the teachers chose their lesson themes based on the children’s interests and preferences. For example, Ms Ando selected as her lesson theme a hero cartoon called Sore ike! Anpanman (Let’s go, Anpanman!; see http://www.ntv.co.jp/anpanman/). This cartoon was very popular among young children in Japan, and the children in her class particularly liked one of the characters in the cartoon, Baikinman. Ms Ando, who had been working during the previous year with Bunta, a child with ASD, said that she decided to use this cartoon for her lesson theme when she first found that she was going to work with Bunta again that year.

If Bunta was not interested enough in the learning resource theme or if the learning resource was other than Baikinman Land, he might escape from our classroom. Even if it was time for playing at the playroom, Bunta might want to get his drawing tools from the classroom and instead enjoy drawing in the playroom. (JT1’s Interview B)

This use of hero cartoons to create imaginative and structured play in which the children engaged in role play with set rules was somewhat similar to a practice discussed in the English-language literature: play scenarios. Teachers use structured play scenarios to teach children new skills. In creating imaginative scenarios with toys, actions and words can be used to provide a social foundation on which children are able to interact with peers in appropriate ways (Brown, Hewitt, & Thompson, 2012). Creation of playful situations involving the children’s interests was a focus for the Japanese group lessons. These teachers put great efforts into creating social situations.

In Mr Banba’s lesson, the children made a group pancake, which the children named “fuwafuwa pancake.” The term fuwafuwa is an onomatopoeic word describing soft texture; on many occasions these Japanese teachers used onomatopoetic words to describe what is happening when talking to the children (e.g., zā zā for scooping sand, pacchin for cutting paper with scissors, guruguru for mixing cake mix, and chīn for a microwave oven buzzer). It seemed that through their selection of words, the teachers tried to encourage the children to engage more keenly in the activity under way. It may also reflect these teachers’ emphasis on sharing the same image of activities among the children.

Second, the teachers assessed children’s current abilities and identified needs to further develop learning materials. Reflection interviews provided concrete examples showing that the teachers “tried to decide many things by trial and error” (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk2). In one example, Mr Banba explained why and how he developed a learning tool (a cooking bowl) for one child with ASD (Daichi), who found it hard to turn a bowl to transfer cake mixture from his individual bowl to his group container. The example also involved several
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attempts by Mr Banba to develop the cooking tool (i.e., putting handles on an individual bowl to prompt a better angle for the child to twist his wrist), which enabled Daichi to complete the task independently (see photograph in Appendix O13). Similarly, Ms Chiba said that she had been “focusing on preparing for learning tools that were manageable for Fuji (a child in her class)” (JT3’s Interview B) so that he could complete his tasks independently.

In the video (JT2’s VC9), the children poured their own cake mixture from their individual bowl into one group container. When the children tried the task with the original bowl that I prepared initially, some of them could not pour the mixture because they could not use this particular hand movement. So I made a new learning tool and let the children try it. The children were able to pour the mixture into the group container very well. So I thought it (the new learning tool) was working well. It was the first time that Daichi was able to complete the task independently. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4 with JT2’s VC9)

Third, the teachers examined peer relationships to plan a lesson that involved children with ASD in a peer group and they facilitated peer interactions during the lessons. For example, Mr Banba talked about how good preparation helped one child with ASD, Daichi, to work with his peers. His comments also showed that Mr Banba considered how to continue improvements on an ongoing basis.

To involve Daichi into the class, it is all about planning. If I am preparing for the lesson carefully, Daichi becomes interested in the activities. In this activity, the children currently do their tasks individually. But I will try to manipulate the activity to make the children work at the same tasks in a group of two or three children. Well, in this activity, I’m aiming for the children to engage in the tasks while also paying attention to their friends who are the other children. (JT2’s Interview B)

Fourth, the teachers articulated children’s thoughts to set up the group activities. They tried to understand what is happening during the lesson from the children’s point of view. For example, Ms Chiba considered the lesson procedures such that they would create opportunities for the children to feel some achievement.

I have just wondered whether only saying yummy is not clear to Ŗji. I discussed with the Head about the children asking customers to put a sticker on the cup if they thought it was yummy. I am not sure whether the children can do this or not. The empty cups would be lined up, as many as ordered by customers. And then, I would say “Great! All of your customers said yummy and put stickers on their cups, didn’t they?” (JT3’s Interview B)

Similarly, Ms Ando articulated thoughts about Bunta’s behaviour when she tried to develop further activities while preparing a later lesson. She said that Bunta brought her a cardboard box and said to her “tonneru” (tunnel) during free play time. Ms Ando interpreted his interaction to mean that he wanted her to make a tunnel from the box. She first reported this event during a reflection interview conducted prior to Interview B, and she discussed it again during Interview B. Her repetition may indicate that her effort to understand Bunta’s preferred play through this event was meaningful for her lesson development.

As children’s actual conditions were changing over time, the teachers recognised their need to modify lessons in tune with these changes. A strong theme, “improve a lesson tomorrow”, emerged specifically from the analysis of overlapping texts between two categories, planning and evaluating. It suggested that these teachers were engaged in an ongoing process of improving lessons as their knowledge of children developed further. For example, Ms Ando
said that she changed her approach to preparing lessons by trying to understand what the children want to do during the lesson to make them enjoy the lesson more. She also said that she stopped some activities (e.g., using jumbo blocks) because the children were getting bored and less engaged in these activities. She added new activities or modified the planned activities as the children created their play spontaneously during the lesson. As a specific example, the children spontaneously started pretending to ride on a box in a pool filled with colourful plastic balls (see photograph of Video Sample 7 in Appendix O12). Ms Ando discussed this with the class and suggested they name the box “Mogurin Rider”, a piece of equipment used by one of the cartoon’s characters, and the class agreed with her suggestion. After school, Ms Ando decorated the cardboard box similar to the one in the cartoon (see Ms Ando’s photo of Mogurin Rider in Appendix O13).

So far, I am more likely to reflect on how the children enjoyed the activities. I am still reflecting on which activities the children enjoy most or what activities or playroom equipment they want to have … I am still developing playing activities … In terms of flow of learning activities and environmental settings, I have changed the lesson more and more along with the lines of how the children played. (JT1’s Interview B)

To obtain better understanding of the children’s actual conditions and thus to develop better lessons, these teachers engaged in group process of reflecting on their lessons individually and discussing further improvements. The format of these group implementation included casual chats, asking for advice, informal discussions, and formal meetings. Mr Banba talked regularly to other teachers about his lesson attempts and their outcomes to help him articulate his ideas and reflections. One example shows that he discussed with other teachers his continuous attempts to improve his lessons by making a manageable cooking bowl for Daichi, distinguishing spaces for each activity through his arrangement of desks, and supporting another child, Chiaki, to help his peers.

Every day I cannot implement many things that I want to. For example, when I decided to try to use “that bowl” today, I talked to other teachers about how “that bowl” worked for the children during their lesson. Or after changing the desk arrangement, I asked other teachers if the arrangement made it easy for the children to engage in the activities. Or after I gave verbal prompts for Chiaki to lead his friends, I talked to other teachers about how it went ... After confirming [how my new attempt worked during the lesson] through talking with other teachers, I will decide “how I will do things better tomorrow”. (JT2’s Interview B)

These teachers also asked other teachers for specialist curriculum advice (e.g., in Arts, Physical, and Early Childhood Education) for developing their lessons. For example, Ms Ando said that she intentionally visited one regular classroom teacher, whose speciality was Arts education, to obtain advice about environmental settings. She wanted to have the children together create a jumbo background picture with one particular art technique (i.e., colouring a cartoon drawing with scattered coloured papers).

As well, the SNEU had several visitors from outside the school, which prompted discussions between the SNEU teachers and the visitors. These visitors were usually senior teachers who used to work for the SNEU and were then working at different schools after a regular rotation (Note. The site of this school was used as the place for professional
development of teachers within the prefecture, and teachers were rotated through transfers between this school and other public schools. The researcher learned through progressive observations and verbal confirmation with the Head of SNEU that the unit had at least eight informal discussions for the teachers between Preparation Week 1 and the Lesson Study Conference (ObWk6). For six of these informal discussions, senior teachers or a university professor observed their *seitan* lessons and had conversations with the Head and/or the teachers. For two discussions, the SNEU teachers went to a Lesson Study Conference held at a public school within the prefecture over the weekend of ObWk5 and talked to senior teachers about their lessons. For example, Ms Ando received advice from one senior teacher (JOB1) whose speciality was physical education about environmental settings most appropriate for enabling the children to play in a group.

The JOB1 ... came here today to bring balls and just happened to observe the lessons. Because JOB1 is specialised in physical education, he gave me advice from a physical education point of view. (JT1’s Interview B)

Although, in Interview A, the teachers said that they hardly have time to have formal meetings, the SNEU had five formal lesson study meetings from ObWk1 to ObWk7. The researcher attended two teacher meetings prior to the Lesson Study Conference, two during the conference, and one after the conference. Except for one meeting held with visitors during the conference, the conversations at these meetings were recorded and analysed separately from the results of Interview B. Thematic analysis of the meeting conversations revealed four important themes relating to lesson planning: (a) children’s actual conditions, (b) visualisation of a lesson *bamen* or scene, (c) learning goals, and (d) learning support (see Appendix L3).

The first theme emerging from analysis of observations of these teacher meetings confirmed the teachers’ concern about children’s actual conditions. In particular, during the first and second meetings held with their external lesson study supervisor (i.e., university professor), the teachers talked most about this topic (MO1: 64.9%, MO2: 62.6%). They gave reasons for their current practices or raised questions for further improvements. For example, in the first meeting observation, Ms Chiba explained why she allowed the children to concentrate on completing only one step at each lesson, describing how the children were struggling during the lessons in the previous week.

Last week, the children tried to do all cooking procedures with the procedure guides. However, it was very hard for them to complete all [steps] from the first trial. There were too many things they needed to remember, and the children were really struggling. This made it impossible for me to see every child and every aspect of the lesson. So I was thinking that I could extract small steps from the whole procedure and allow the children to concentrate on one step per day. And I tried that today. (MO1.Intervals:3-4/JT3)

Similarly, Ms Ando reflected critically on how the children had engaged in free play and advised the meeting that she wanted to improve her lessons. One example concerns Ms Ando using the word “*imeiji*” (image) in the children’s play. The Japanese teachers said repeatedly that they want the children to share the same image of a lesson or activity with their peers and they themselves want to share that same image with the children. They emphasised positive
experiences of the children during lessons and advised of their belief that sharing the same image can encourage the children to have positive experiences with peers. This view may explain why the teachers used onomatopoetic words to interact with the children. That is, the descriptive expression may help the children to view the lesson scene in the same way as each other and as their teacher. The school’s request of the researcher during her pilot visit that she have a lot of positive interactions with the children was also consistent with the school’s emphasis on relationships with the children. Prior to the observation weeks, the school’s vice principal advised his belief that any negative experiences in interactions with the researcher (e.g., the researcher staying in classroom only for her observations) would negatively influence the children’s learning. This claim indicates that children’s inner interactions (i.e., sharing the same image) were highly valued within the school. It may also enhance understanding of why the Japanese teachers focused on articulating the children’s thoughts and desires when planning their lessons.

I think I need to improve free-play time (during my seitan lesson) since the children’s play is still not dynamic yet. I have been considering possible improvements through image and the settings of play. However, I have not yet found the solution. So that is my next mission .... I want the children to move around the play room actively. Are each of the playing spaces not connected to each other because of the setting of the play environment? As you (i.e., the university professor) suggested yesterday, one solution would be to have the children patrolling the room together at the beginning of the lesson together .... I want the children to play dynamically at the beginning of the lesson (Note. Ms Ando used an onomatopoeic word, “woohoo” to convey the image of the children playing dynamically). (MO2.Intervals:50-51/JT1)

The second theme, visualisation of a lesson scene, revealed that the teachers tried to visualise what is happening during the lessons as the teachers themselves observed these lessons, or what they want to happen during future lessons. These teachers used a broad term, bamen, to describe the moment of a lesson as a whole situation. The direct translation of bamen is scene, and during their reflection interviews about Key Moments the Japanese teachers repeatedly used this broad term to describe the moment of a lesson as a whole situation. They used this term to articulate what is happening at the moment of the lesson, including all interactions, events, and the children’s inner engagement (i.e., their thoughts). In one reflection, Mr Banba explained his intention to foster “a sense of group belonging” in the children of his class by setting up a lesson scene where the children become aware of their peers’ presence and are encouraged to interact with these peers and to help them during the lesson (see Video Sample 1 in Appendix O12). More specifically, he employed a video letter from Mr Chef (i.e., the Head of SNEU pretending to be Mr Chef) to create a playful and exciting opening for the group lesson. “This bamen” referred to the complex interactions between the children and Mr Chef shown in the transcription of this lesson scene (see Video Sample 1 in Appendix O12). This process of visualising a lesson scene was a part not only of postlesson reflection, but also of embodying “ideal” lessons during lesson planning (either in documents or thoughts). That is, the teachers tried to clarify the image of what they want to happen during the lesson and articulate possible interactions among the children prior to lessons. More details are provided in the next section.
I would like to make the children conscious that they were engaging in the activity within this group of five. I used their pictures to help the children become motivated to engage in this activity with everyone together. So I set up this bamen … I think that the children would be more highly motivated if we use some playful aspects that make the children conscious that they are engaging in this activity with everyone together … Also the letter showed that the chef said “Chiaki, we are counting on you!” and he was into the video letter like that. So Chiaki was very motivated to engage in the activity. And I think that’s why Chiaki gave more and more verbal prompts to his friends. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5 with JT2’s VC12)

The third theme, learning goals, was also discussed during teacher meeting observations. One example showed that the teachers planned their lessons based on long-term classroom goals and referred what the children did during the lessons to these goals. The process of setting up classroom goals was only from the teachers’ self-reports because each class has already set its classroom goals through a class discussion before the observations started. These classroom goals emphasised learning engagement (i.e., children working hard and trying their best) and peer relationships (i.e., children working with and for friends).

The classroom goal refers to what everyone wants to achieve or what I want them to achieve. So I think that [classroom goal] is what I can always use for the class to confirm or reflect on “What you did just now was to consider this point” or “We are sad because you could not complete this, so let’s do it next time.” (JT3’s Interview B)

In relation to learning goals, the teachers used another broad term concerning the children: their sugata. This term describes how the children behave and interprets how they feel or view their learning experiences during the lesson. It is closely linked to the children’s actual conditions, and lesson plans specified each child’s “ideal sugata” to visualise how the teachers want the children to behave and feel during the lessons. These “ideal sugata” were aligned with schoolwide lesson study goals articulated in the Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletin which was given to visitors at the conference (see more details in RQ3).

Additionally, these teachers reported on their children’s sugata—how they worked—during a lesson in their C–H Newsletters. For example, Mr Banba addressed what each child did well during the week. After mentioning individual achievements, he concluded that, while adopting the children’s slow pace, he discovered the “wonderful sugata of each child” (JT2’s C–H Newsletter No.2). Mr Banba also reflected on the lesson observed in ObWk1 within his C–H Newsletter:

Using cardboard boxes made it clear for the children where to put sand in, and making furrows became a fun activity with a clear goal. Therefore, the children were able to engage actively in the activity by themselves. Rather than just waiting for my instruction, they were able to engage by observing what their friends were doing … Like an example that Ken said to friends, “Please take sand from this side, I will do so from another side”, the children were also able to interact with each other to progress the activity by themselves. When the children pulled out the box together, Chiaki saw a friend saying “one, two, three”, called other friends to join the activity, and had the fun experience of feeling a unity with everyone. (JT2’s C–H Newsletter No.7)

Similarly, Ms Ando mentioned in her newsletter how gently the children planted seedlings into their farm and she interpreted the children’s thoughts from their sugata. These examples indicated that the teachers routinely employed a holistic view of the children and tried to interpret the children’s behaviours and articulate the children’s points of view. The content of
these newsletters reflected the teachers’ belief that what the parents wanted to know most was how their children enjoyed their days at school.

The children planted their selected seedlings by moving sand again and again from our farm to pots. I saw that they were very gentle in handling the small seedlings and covering sand over the seedlings. This children’s sugata (i.e., how they worked with the seedlings) told me that these children wanted to look after these plants kindly and carefully. (JT1’s C−H Newsletter No.6)

The fourth theme, learning support, was closely linked to learning goals. What the teachers wanted the children to achieve led to what the teachers prepared for the lesson and how they supported the children during the lesson. Their lesson study plans included in the Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletin (i.e., a summary of lesson study reports from all lesson study groups, provided to visitors at conference) showed that the Japanese teachers planned support for the class and for individual children and summarised what these teachers had done to support the class. All teachers focused on (a) learning materials and tools, and (b) environmental settings in their plans. They also discussed further improvements in these two aspects during lessons and talked about individualised support in terms of these aspects. Progressive observations confirmed that the teachers worked on materials and settings from the beginning of lesson observations through to the Lesson Study Conference. These details are discussed in the next two sections.

Video analysis of the teachers’ meeting conversations also showed that the external supervisor (JUP1) facilitated teachers’ discussions. For example, during the first teacher meeting observation, the supervisor questioned opportunities for improvements in Ms Chiba’s lesson. The supervisor advised Ms Chiba to modify the lesson procedures “uniquely”, not simply by giving more difficult tasks to those children who are more skilled than the others. The supervisor did not give the teachers direct instructions about what to do. Instead, he encouraged the teachers to think of different ways to do what they are doing at the time. He usually raised questions about unsolved topics during the meetings and then let the teachers discuss these topics in the group.

I thought that more improvements are possible in terms of procedures and environmental settings. Also, I could not see clearly which parts of the lesson would enable individual children to use their own strengths … Because it seemed that the children were struggling to complete procedures one by one, I wondered how you (i.e., Ms Chiba) would like to draw out each child’s strengths. (MO2.Interval:6/JUP1)

Through group discussions and several attempts, Ms Chiba was able to develop her lesson. Instead of allowing older and more skilled children to complete difficult tasks for the younger children, she allowed all children to complete all the cooking tasks by themselves, with older children supporting younger children. Ms Chiba’s reflection on a group discussion reported in Interview B demonstrates how other teachers helped Ms Chiba shift her focus to the children’s point of view.
First, I assumed that in contrast to the abilities of the Year 6 children, for the younger children (Naoki and Osamu) the task of baking [small sponge cakes] might be too difficult. I planned to let Naoki and Osamu by themselves complete up to the task of mixing and then the older children (Ēji and Fuji) attend to the baking task for all the class. But in talking with the Head [about the children’s feelings] I realised that the two different levels of involvement by the children in their cake making would mean they would feel differently about the outcome. The children who completed all tasks right through to the actual baking that produced the cooked cake would feel satisfied with the cake as the final product of their efforts. Yet the children involved only in the first few tasks of measuring and mixing, but not the actual baking, would feel less satisfied with the cake. So the two groups of children would feel differently when their customers say “happy” after they eat their cakes. That’s why I began to want all the children to complete all the tasks themselves for making the cake. (JT3’s Interview B)

In addition to learning support prepared prior to the lesson, the teachers talked about supporting strategies used while lessons are under way. Interactive strategies (i.e., doing things together, verbal prompts, and praise) were discussed during the meetings and were used to facilitate children’s learning during a lesson. For example, the external supervisor reflected on Ms Ando’s lesson and regarded the children’s natural interactions with the teacher as effective feedback or motivational strategies for teaching the children.

I witnessed the scene in which Ms Ando moved the box rider in the ball pool (see photo in Appendix O13). I saw both the children and yourself shouting for joy while playing together. You know, we have been talking about immediate feedback to the children (i.e., formative assessment). At the time, I thought that the teacher shouting for joy could be the most effective feedback for the children. (MO1.Interval:64/JUP1)

Moreover, one senior teacher (JOB1) attending the conference addressed the significance of praising the children’s ideal sugata during Mr Banba’s lesson. She also said that the teachers needed to have a clear image of what they want the children to become or achieve in order to maximise lesson outcomes for the children. The teacher’s contributions suggested that group discussions helped the teachers to understand what they need to look at when they try to improve a lesson.

Different activities have different learning goals or particular skills that you want the children to obtain. For example, you want them to wipe the table if they made a mess, or you want them to put ingredients into a bowl without making a mess. Luna was very careful as she put ingredients into her bowl, wasn’t she? After you (Mr Banba) praised her for how she performed that specific task, the children who came after her trying to do this task were not able to do it. But I believe that if teachers make clear to the children what are the skills they need to learn through the activity, the children will want to develop these skills and will take on acquiring these skills as their own learning goals. The teachers can then give praise when the children really try to achieve these learning goals and the children themselves will feel good about their efforts. (MO5.Interval:13/JOB1)

Improving social situations

A theme, “creating social situations”, occurred often in the transcriptions of Interview B, reflection interviews, and teacher meetings. Creating these social situations was part of the teachers’ support for their class as whole and part of their progressive ways of lesson development, addressed earlier. The teachers agreed that the school has a role in providing the children who have ASD with learning opportunities where they can work with peers. The teachers’ explanations of learning goals designed for this SNEU were age-appropriate social interactions. For Ms Ando, introduction of the lesson was the time to share the same image of
the lesson to facilitate peer interactions, whereas for Mr Banba and Ms Chiba, peer cooperation and group contributions were important respectively. Group activities added to the introduction in the later lessons of the set unit were used to motivate the children to engage in group lessons and interactions.

During Interview B, the teachers talked about how they carefully assess the lesson scene to use peer support in their lessons in various ways, through (a) peer modelling, (b) peer prompts, and (c) peer instruction. Video analysis of lesson observations confirmed the teachers’ use of these strategies. The teachers observed the children’s behaviour and how the children performed the lesson activities. The teachers praised children highly to signal that they valued the ideal sugata of the children during the lessons. The teachers said that acknowledging to the children what is good behaviour helps them understand what they need to do or how they need to behave in the moment of the lesson, and then, in daily living scenes. The strategy of peer modelling was observed routinely during the lessons as well as across the school day. Notably, the teachers’ reflection interviews on Key Moments helped them to articulate how they were viewing the lesson scene, what they were doing to respond to the scene, and why they made decisions at the time.

First, the teachers said that to help the children with ASD judge what to do next independently (without the teacher’s support), they encouraged the children to observe their peers who are doing the same activity. These teachers highlighted the ability of the children to know that they can look at peers for guidance if they do not understand what to do in a social situation. To maximise peer modelling, the teachers carefully designed the children’s learning environments. For example, Mr Banba and Ms Chiba arranged children’s desks in a circle so that they could see each other doing activities. Ms Ando, on the other hand, displayed pictures of the SNEU1 children showing how to play with specific equipment (e.g., waiting for a turn and tickling a friend on the slider). In addition, the teachers used a lot of prompts to remind the children to look at what peers are doing at the time or at the peer- or self-modelling pictures, instead of telling the children what to do all the time.

To facilitate ideal behaviours, the teachers immediately acknowledged the children who were doing what the teachers had asked them to do. For example, Ms Ando praised the child who tidied up her own and her friends’ desks and chairs before leaving the classroom. Mr Banba thanked the child who neatened the school slippers at the toilet, and Ms Chiba acknowledged the child who brought every other child’s brooms to the class when cleaning the room after a craft activity. Mr Banba also said that he acknowledged Daichi was working hard to the class because he wanted other children to have a positive feeling toward this child. Mr Banba said that the rest of class often saw Daichi being told to stop his repetitive behaviour (i.e., turning the air-conditioner on and off and staring at the fan), which might affect how they respond to Daichi as a member of SNEU2.
I encourage Daichi to engage in the activity together with me. And then, I tell the whole class [about his achievement or presence.] For example, I say, “Look! Daichi is with us too!” I encourage the whole class to pay attention to see how Daichi is. (JT2’s Interview B)

To lead the children towards modelling their peers or using a peer as a model, the teachers used well-defined themes of lessons and interactive group activities to encourage the children to share the same image of what they are doing. For example, Ms Ando talked about how she used role play to encourage the children with ASD to play with peers. Each child and Ms Ando selected a hero character from the cartoon used for her lesson theme and called each other by their character names while playing in Baikinman Land. To encourage the children to engage deeply into this role playing, Ms Ando progressively developed her lessons by designing the children’s favourite playing activities with specific names related to the cartoon, preparing individual wrist bands with their own characters’ stickers, and decorating the playroom with the children’s art work or with objects the children requested (see examples of the equipment and tools in Appendix O13).

Ms Ando also used this role play to facilitate the children’s play and encourage them to play in a group. For example, she pretended to be her character to play with the children and encouraged Aiko, who always stayed with her, to play with peers. She also used similar strategies to involve Bunta in the class. For example, Ms Ando asked other children, “Where is Baikinman (i.e., Bunta’s character)?”, when he was not playing in a peer group, and other children called Baikinman’s name loudly to invite him as part of their play.

Aiko’s character is Anpanman [in the lesson], and I am Shokupanman. So when Kareipanman comes to us, the three characters were together [in the animation, these three characters are friends]. So I encourage Aiko to call Kareipanman’s name to invite Jun into our play. We call Jun’s name together and jump together while holding hands. (JT1’s Interview B)

Ms Ando divided the children into peer groups depending on hero characters. The children’s group play was also enhanced through together watching DVDs of the cartoons, doing the dance with the cartoon music, and listening to Ms Ando’s story telling at the beginning of the lesson. Similar group strategies were also observed during the lessons of Mr Banba. To increase the children’s motivation he used a video letter from Mr Chef (see Video Sample 1 in Appendix O12). Mr Banba also used small peer groups to encourage the children to concentrate on specific peers to work together during the lessons. In contrast, Ms Chiba tried to encourage the children to work in a team for others (i.e., peers or customers) in her lessons. In one example, Ms Chiba talked about how she facilitates the children who have ASD to feel that they are contributing to the class activity group through letting all children do things together for every small task, using more individual roles, designing one complete product with four individualised flavours of cakes (one child for one flavour in the product), and serving the cakes for others outside the classrooms.

To motivate Éji and Fuji to participate in group lesson with everyone together, [I let the children] make a welcome board for the shop with everyone together. And I let everyone go to other classes to inform about the shop [to take orders], although it is quicker for only Éji to go because he can speak. Also, I let each child have their own role. The role encouraged the children to understand that “only I make this flavour.” (JT3’s Interview B)
Second, to increase peer prompts among the children, the teachers again praised frequently to show that they value behaviours of helping peers. In one lesson scene (see Video Sample 2 in Appendix O), Ms Ando encouraged the other children to help Bunta join the group by calling his name. This example shows that Ms Ando first praised Ichi, who spontaneously called Bunta’s name, and then restated what made her very pleased after every child moved to a group. In the weeks after, it was observed in many scenes that Ms Ando sat quietly without direct instruction to the class until the children recognised what to do and told each other what to do at that time. These strategies (i.e., praise and wait for the children’s spontaneous support) were observed consistently in each class during the seitan lessons as well as across teaching days.

In relation to peer prompts, Mr Banba in particular mentioned the importance of two-way interactions among children. In one lesson scene (see Video Sample 3 in Appendix O), Mr Banba told Makoto to listen to peers telling him to put on his mask at the beginning of the lesson. After he viewed this video-clip during his reflection interview, Mr Banba addressed the reason for this instruction in his reflection interviews. He considers how Chiaki and Ken feel when their kind support was refused by their friend and he wants to value their kindness in giving peer prompts. At the same time, he also said that he wants Makoto to understand that he needs to listen not only to a teacher but also to friends if they are correct. In his later interview, he clarified that he was trying to encourage the children to support peers as well as to respond to peer support because he believes that interactions need a two-way interface.

Third, the teachers selected one child in their class as a key person to encourage the children to follow peer instructions during the lessons. The teachers called this process of organising the class with key persons, classroom management. All of the children chosen during their unit period happened to be those with ASD (i.e., Aiko, Chiaki, and Ėji). The ways of using these key persons were different in each class.

Ms Chiba, for the class with the oldest children, specifically positioned Ėji as a shop manager and gave him responsibility to lead the whole class. Ms Chiba chose Ėji because he was able to complete all tasks independently. Having given the leadership to Ėji, Ms Chiba prepared support for him to accomplish his role successfully. This support included (a) scripts for what he needs to say, (b) a magnet that he can place on the procedure posters along with what the class is doing at the time, (c) a reminder for him to look at other children to check if they need help, and (d) wider acknowledgement of his role to the class and other classes.

Ēji is a shop manager. Because Ėji was able to complete his tasks, I wanted him to step up. On top of completing his tasks, I wanted Ėji to give friends verbal prompts to lead the class. (JT3’s Interview B)

Ms Banba, in contrast, asked Chiaki to help Daichi as his partner, but did not identify Chiaki as a class leader to the class. Mr Banba carefully observed the relationships among the children in
his class and then decided how to organise the class during the lesson. Lesson observations confirmed that Mr Banba used scaffolding strategies to model Chiaki in a way specifically to interact with friends (i.e., social skills for how to help friends in an appropriate way), to train him to use the skills with a specific peer (i.e., Daichi) at the specific social scenes by repeating the same activity with visual cues, and to fade the reminding strategy for him to pay attention to see what the peer is doing now.

Chiaki had the image of the whole activity including what to engage in or what the completion of the activity is. After that, Chiaki has become able to interact to his friends. I thought I could take this point further. Also, Chiaki’s relationship with Daichi is becoming better established, so I hope that Chiaki can interact with Daichi through me. So first, three of us somehow try to engage in the activity together. Once Daichi can interact with me, I instruct Chiaki specifically how to interact with his friend by saying “try to engage in this activity with Daichi in this way.” And next, I step back and ask “Chiaki, try to engage in this again like before” in order to encourage him to interact with a particular friend (Daichi). (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5)

More specifically, Mr Banba made his lesson better organised by reducing unstructured time (e.g., waiting for peers). In ObWk3, SNEU2 children attempted, for the first time, to complete cooking independently from the start to end. During previous lessons, Mr Banba had stopped them at every step to give his instruction, and Chiaki, who finished his task quickly, was simply asked to wait for the other children to finish their tasks. Chiaki then started wandering around the room and playing the music player, while Mr Banba was busy helping Daichi and other children. After all the children finished their tasks, Mr Banba set a rule that the children need to wait for their group members to finish their tasks by staying close with group members and checking if they need any support. He reflected on the lesson scene and spoke about the reason for this instruction. During the next week’s lesson, Mr Banba reminded Chiaki to check on Daichi, one of his group members, after he completed his tasks. He said to Chiaki, “Is Daichi doing OK, Chiaki?”, and Chiaki checked on Daichi and said “Yes, OK.” Mr Banba then decreased his prompts over the following weeks.

I told Chiaki that he cannot end the activity while his group members are still doing it. I said to him that it is not the end until both of his other two group members completed their tasks. I said so because I saw him wandering around. Well, it was fine at this point. But that’s to be the ideal behaviour in future lessons. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk3)

On the other hand, Ms Ando did not specifically ask Aiko to help peers but recognised her natural leadership in the class and manipulated the children’s movements by leading Aiko to come to Bunta. Ms Ando detailed this instruction during her reflection interview in ObWk5 and said that she has changed her way of interacting with the children to this way: (a) invite Aiko to play or suggest a way of playing to her, (b) obtain her agreement while encouraging her into this play, (c) play together and develop their play together.

Bunta was playing alone and other children were playing in a different area. In this situation, when I went to Bunta, other children came to us. I realised that Aiko, who was sensitive to the situation, was the first child to come to us, as if leading other children to us … Although Bunta was more likely to play alone, Aiko came to Bunta after watching me going to Bunta, and then other children also came to Bunta. Today, the children moved like that in the lesson. (JT1’s Interview B)
In addition to the key person, peer instructions were used regularly during each lesson. As the class rotated over the child who would be “today’s leader” every day, the “today’s leader” child gave a group instruction to the whole class at the start and end of almost all seitan lessons. These group opening and closure procedures were sometimes skipped or replaced with alternative activities (e.g., doing group exercise with DVDs in SNEU1 and watching a video letter from *Mr Chef* in SNEU2) in the later period of the unit.

In order to use peer support (i.e., peer modelling, peer prompts, and peer instruction) effectively, the teachers progressively modified environment settings for group activities. For example, in Ms Chiba’s reflection on a video-clip example, she explained the reasons for the new arrangement in learning procedures that were different from what they had been. In the new arrangement, the children were asked to complete a certain amount of their tasks by themselves first before they were required to wait for their peers to finish the tasks. These children used to complete the activity step by step as a group. Being required to wait for their peers at every step frustrated a child with ASD (Éji) who was able to complete these tasks quickly. She expressed her concern about the negative impact on peer relationships between Éji and another child (Osamu), who required more time to complete the same amount of work. Ms Chiba assessed peer interactions during the past lesson and anticipated improved peer interactions from the modified settings.

Instead of getting irritated about waiting for their friends, some children were able to complete their tasks at their own pace and to help their friends. If everyone was asked to follow each procedure at the same time, Osamu had difficulty keeping up with the others and could not complete his tasks. If Osamu could not finish a task, Éji could not stop himself from doing Osamu’s work for him. Osamu would become annoyed because he wanted to work on the task by himself, but Éji would finish the task for him rather than helping Osamu so that Osamu could finish the task himself, more quickly than otherwise. In the new way, Osamu could finish his task by himself at his pace and to have peer support at the end. (JT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5 with JT3’s VC10)

At times the teachers anticipate peer interactions at immediate situations in the lessons. In one lesson scene (see Video Sample 4 in Appendix O12), Ms Ando “accidentally” broke the cubic house, which the children had built with jumbo cubic blocks during the lesson, and the children complained to her. Ms Ando’s reflection on the scene showed the nature of ongoing lesson development. Ms Ando’s reflection on the scene showed the nature of ongoing lesson development. Ms Ando said that she tried to create a social situation by facilitating the children’s emotions (e.g., anger and cooperation). She quickly assessed the lesson scene and anticipated peer interactions when deciding on her instruction. This type of assessment appeared to be similar to a notion of formative assessment in the lesson study literature (Crockett, 2007). During the reflection interview about this video clip, she also critically viewed her action and identified further improvements for her instruction.

My intention of leading children work together to solve my mess was a failure. My knocking over the cubic house was a deliberate accident. I reflected later than I should have made this a ‘bigger’ accident and I should have been meaner to the children after I’d knocked over the house. I should have staged it so that I was the children’s “enemy” and that the children resolved the problem collaboratively. Or acting together, the children could have blamed me or directed their anger at me. I wanted to make this “accident” seem to be bigger in the children’s eyes. But
at the time, I went to help the children straight after I caused the accident—and that was a failure. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1 with JT1’s VC2)

Formative assessment was also used to make unpredicted events or happenings into a group learning opportunity. One example shows Ms Chiba’s reflection on one video clip (see Video Sample 5 in Appendix O12). In the video, Osamu dropped his egg on the floor while Ėji was supporting him in his task, and Ms Chiba was working hard to encourage the children to think what to do at the scene. In this way, Ms Chiba emphasised the children’s inner engagement. She considered that making a mistake does not matter, but that making decisions to solve the problem together is important.

I believe that this dropping an egg is not a failure. It’s what happened when they were working hard to do their best. And then, I wanted everyone to think about what they could do for Osamu, instead of saying “oops.” Also, I wanted Osamu to decide on his own what to do next—whether relying on a teacher (me) or trying his best to solve the problem by himself. (JT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6 with JT3’s VC13)

The notion of doing things for others, which is consistent with SA results, was also illustrated in the example noted in the researcher’s reflection log (see Story Two in Appendix O9). Ms Chiba used Osamu’s inappropriate behaviour as a group learning opportunity. First, she stated the fact that Osamu did not come back to the classroom after the school bell and asked the children whether they would mind starting their favourite lesson (i.e., a cooking activity for seitan) without him. During the reflection interview held after this lesson observation, Ms Chiba said that she wanted to see whether the children understand “group responsibility” because it links closely to the learning aim of her seitan lesson. Hence, the teachers tried to make a link between their seitan lessons and everyday learning situations.

**Improving learning situations**

Another theme, “facilitating children’s learning”, emerged from Interview B and has been reinforced by consistent messages in both the reflection interviews and teacher meetings. These revealed that the Japanese teachers encouraged the children with ASD to complete the activities independently because these teachers believe that the children need to build their independence before active involvement in peer interactions. They adjusted the level of activities for the children who can complete these activities without problems, so that the children can learn new skills by repeating similar activities. For example, Mr Banba assessed Chiaki’s thoughts (i.e., wanting to do everything) while the lessons were under way, and this gave Chiaki opportunities to feel self-satisfaction (i.e., pride) during the lessons.

I encourage Chiaki to pay more attention to his surrounding, or give him extra tasks that he can do proudly. Because Chiaki wanted to do everything, I gave him extra tasks. But now I believe that Chiaki cannot give verbal prompts to other children [help his peers verbally] unless he can complete his own tasks independently. So I lead Chiaki to complete his own tasks independently and also give him extra activities. (JT2’s Interview B)

A number of supporting strategies to increase children’s independence were discussed in Interview B: (a) clear procedure, (b) visual cues, (c) manageable tools, and (d) music prompts.

The teachers’ interviews also revealed an emphasis on improving this support from the
children’s point of view. A combination of reflection interviews and video of lesson observations confirmed the teachers’ use of such support and progressive improvement in how this strategy worked throughout the observation weeks.

First, the teachers emphasised clear procedures for the children with ASD. These included providing environment settings that bear on the children’s logical ordering of activity procedures. For example, Ms Ando talked about setting up and communicating structured procedures as part of her support for the children with ASD (i.e., Aiko and Bunta). The Japanese teachers tried to anticipate what task orders the children can make sense of and adjusted their procedures accordingly. Mr Banba found that Daichi appeared to see that the lesson had ended after the cake was taken out from the microwave oven, and so decided to give him an individual role in the class (i.e., serving a cake to the children) at the very end of the lesson. He believed that it helped Daichi understand that the lesson was not finished until he had completed his serving task.

I can say that this approach applies to all the children. Bunta and Aiko can feel secure if the lesson flow of activities is clear to them … For example, with procedures of playing: first we transform ourselves into our own characters, then we dance “Sun Sun Exercise”, take off shoes and socks, and then play as we like. Then we pack up the room. I think that by teaching the procedures to Aiko and Bunta, they can feel secure in playing. (JT1’s Interview B)

All the teachers used colour coding strategies for everyday settings for all the children’s personal belongings. Both Mr Banba and Ms Chiba applied individualised colour coding to specify each child’s tools and positions (e.g., places to stand and own group members). The teachers organised the learning environment similarly by differentiating the places for each set of activities (e.g., measuring, mixing, baking, and eating). Appendix O13 provides examples of arrangements used by Mr Banba.

Second, in relation to making procedures clear, the teachers employed a lot of visual supporting materials (see Appendix O13 for procedure guides attached to the places for each activity) and reminding strategies to encourage the children to complete their tasks independently. In these visual supporting materials, the teachers used short, clear words to indicate the procedures. They also adjusted the formats using, for example, posters showing the whole procedure, small books showing the procedures step by step, individualised cards showing the procedures from each child’s point of view. According to the SA interview with the Head, these strategies are based on the TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and Communication related handicapped CHildren) program. However, the teachers did not specifically refer to this program by name to explain their instructional supports.

I also gave Daichi a guide to activity procedure and asked him “What is next?” and “What is next?” So that Daichi can understand what he needs to do next, I confirm the steps with him again and again. (JT2’s Interview B)

The children may become able to judge what to do and complete it without my verbal prompts. Now the children rely on me. But instead of saying “Miss, I’ve finished it” after mixing, I want them to be able to say that to their shop manager [Ēji]. I want the shop manager to care about what his peers are doing without my verbal prompts … I’d like the children themselves to be able to judge what to do and to follow through taking actions by themselves. (JT3’s Interview B)
Third, the teachers of older children focused on developing manageable tools for children with ASD. For example, Mr Banba developed an individualised bowl for Daichi as discussed earlier and a modified cake cutter and board for the class (see Appendix O13), so that these children could perform all the procedures without Mr Banba’s support. Ms Chiba provided easy-to-squeeze ingredient bottles and put numbered stickers on the baking machine to indicate which cakes should be turned over first (Note. The baking machine heated unevenly so the children needed to follow a specific order to produce evenly baked cakes; see Appendix O13). Ms Chiba also wanted the children to measure ingredients precisely. The older children used a spoon to measure some ingredients (e.g., oil, milk, honey, and flour) on the understanding that they needed to make the spoon full to count one, whereas the younger children used a transparent cup and poured in the ingredient up to a designated line marked on the outside of the cup.

Fourth, all teachers used music as both learning support and learning facilitator. They used different music for different sets of activities to help the children understand transitioning from one activity to another. They selected fun music to motivate the children to engage in the activity. However, Ms Ando acknowledged her struggles using music in her lessons since Bunta strongly refused to listen to music, particularly from the cartoon, during free play time. During the teacher meetings, reflection interviews, and her third semistructured interview (Interview C) she explained the possible reason for his refusal. In her view Bunta could not accept the sound of his favourite cartoon music without seeing the TV screen. Since he was not pleased when hearing cartoon music in the playroom, for packing up time Ms Ando selected one music piece used in her previous lesson and did not use any music during play time.

Video analysis of lesson observations also revealed strategies that the teachers used during the lessons. In one example, Ms Chiba explained how the settings were changed from the previous lesson (see Video Sample 6 in Appendix O12). The example illustrates that Ms Chiba encourages the children to think about how they can modify their procedures in the new settings (i.e., one set of ingredient bottles). After watching this video-clip example during her reflection interview, Ms Chiba observed that this arrangement facilitates natural interactions among children through them taking turns and giving a bottle to their peers. This example also indicates that Ms Chiba links learning experiences during seitan lesson to everyday skills.

Similarly, Ms Ando also developed a lesson story through which the children can have real life experience linked closely to their own daily life. First, to facilitate the children’s autonomy, Ms Ando tried to involve them in the process of creating lessons. In one lesson scene (see Video Sample 7 in Appendix O12), she used group reflection time at the end of each lesson for the children to articulate how they view the lesson and what they want to have more of. Through this process, the children tried to talk about their thoughts and feelings and develop a shared image of the lesson among peers. This was consistent with the message Ms Ando conveyed in her C–H newsletter.
All children in SNEU1 love Anpanman … In the previous seitan unit of “Let’s play in the playroom”, we set a learning topic like jumbo cubic blocks, therapy balls, and the circuit and we played together. In the next unit, we want to have playing activity based on the stories of *Anpanman and the Treasures in the Desert, Anpanman and the Rainbow Ghost*, and *Go! Anpanman: The Pyramid of the Rainbow*. In these activities, we want to share the same images of play to create our world of playing. (JT1’s C–H Newsletter No.8)

Ms Ando’s story became more concrete particularly with an enemy character from the cartoon, Sandman. Figure 4.1 shows how the lesson story was created with Ms Ando’s view of the children’s *sugata* during the lessons. In the story, Sandman initially visited the SNEU1 children’s Baikinman Land and behaved badly (he scared off the children) in ObWk5, but he became a friend of the children in ObWk6. This story was developed progressively, including the children’s responses to the scene along the way (e.g., they were very scared and wanted to have a place to hide). It was also developed through group discussion with the children during the group reflection time (e.g., about how to fight with Sandman), and during teacher meetings (e.g., after Mr Banba suggested that the children become friends with Sandman, Ms Ando accepted his suggestion because she said she was concerned that simply defeating Sandman is not the ideal lesson).

*Figure 4.1. Lesson story development (Ms Ando).*

During her interview, Ms Ando explained her thinking that this experience of forgiving Sandman is a good example of teaching the children that in their real life it is a good thing to forgive friends after they say they are sorry for causing harm. To maximise the children’s learning experience during the lesson, Ms Ando picked the moment when Haru said “*Ii yo*” (It’s OK) to ask the class whether they could forgive Sandman. After two children said “No” to forgive Sandman, Ms Ando praised Haru about her kindness to Sandman. After this interaction with Ms Ando, the two children, who initially did not accept Sandman’s apology, agreed to become friends with Sandman.
RQ3: Valued Outcomes

This section examines findings related to the third research question:

What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction?

First, thematic analysis using an ecological framework was conducted on Interview C. The analysis focused on valued outcomes for (a) a child with ASD, (b) the teachers, and (c) the school, since these categories were found to be effective to address RQ3. Table 4.10 shows that various and different sets of data sources were used for each category. In addition to Interview C, the texts of two previous teacher semistructured interviews (i.e., Interviews A and B) and of all reflection interviews were an important source of details and supplemental information about valued outcomes, particularly for a child with ASD. Educational values were addressed in these interviews when the teachers talked about their daily practice, group instruction, and weekly reflection (see Tables in Appendix O14). This analysis suggested that educational values for the children are embedded in their daily practice and group instruction.

Table 4.10
Data Sources Used to Answer RQ3 in the Japanese Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued Outcomes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Reflection Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Observations</th>
<th>Lesson Observations</th>
<th>Meeting Observations</th>
<th>Reflection Logs</th>
<th>T Documents</th>
<th>SA Documents</th>
<th>SA Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child with ASD</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T Documents: Teaching documents; ^bSA Interviews: Situational Analysis Interviews; ^cSA documents: Situational Analysis Documents; °: Primary data source; √: Supplementary data source.

The teachers had spoken repeatedly about what they want the children to achieve before the researcher conducted Interview C. Therefore, their talk about valued outcomes for the children during Interview C tended to be more abstract, as they debriefed and summarised what they had said earlier about it. Reflection interviews using Key Moments were particularly helpful for the teachers to articulate their views of what the children had achieved progressively across the ObWks, with visual examples of what they valued for the children. The results of analysing lesson observation videos as well as field notes and reflection logs were used to reconstruct representative stories in terms of valued outcomes for the children that the teachers had spoken about. A summary table of reflection interviews (see Appendix O14) indicates that Ms Chiba was more likely than the other two teachers to talk about valued outcomes for the teachers across the ObWks. It suggests that she was engaged in her own learning through her first year of special education teaching at the school.
Results of the thematic analysis of SA interviews and SA document reviews are also discussed throughout this section. Educational values addressed by outside-classroom stakeholders and written in documents concerning lesson study were relevant to what the Japanese teachers valued as learning outcomes for children with ASD and to their approach to their teaching. The results from analysing these data and teacher meeting observations were significant, particularly for finding out what the teachers and the school learnt from their lesson study experiences. Direct observations of schoolwide lesson study meetings were not conducted during this fieldwork because of ethical issues. However, the school documentation provided to the teachers conveyed case-specific background in terms of valued outcomes for the children, the teachers, and the school.

Particularly, Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters given to all teachers and the Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletin provided to visitors during the Lesson Study Conference outlined the theoretical framework of what the school’s research focused on in the year. These materials also explained clearly why the Japanese teachers placed strong emphasis on describing individual children’s “ideal sugata” and “ideal lesson” in their approach to lesson development. That is, these teachers were instructed by the school’s Lesson Study Committee to “embody or have a clear image of the ideal sugata of children as described in the Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletin” (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.13). In other words, the individual teachers were expected to articulate what behaviours or thoughts that the teachers thought the children should have, in terms of a lesson study learning goal (i.e., facilitating children to feel self-learning) set by the committee. The teachers were then instructed to develop a clear image of ideal lessons by describing the detailed interactions, instructions, and children’s inner engagement (i.e., thoughts and understandings) from moment to moment in the lessons.

Valuing the child with ASD

Overall, thematic analysis of teachers’ semistructured and reflection interviews confirmed that the SNEU teachers are concerned about children’s ideal sugata and addressed three learning outcomes: (a) shakaisei or social nature, (b) engagement, and (c) independence. Figure 4.2 illustrates that in the teachers’ views an ideal child is one who can demonstrate these three learning outcomes. The teachers also spoke about ideal classes that function without teachers, through the children working together in a group to produce these learning outcomes (i.e., class as community).
Figure 4.2. Ideal child’s sugata demonstrating three learning outcomes: social nature, independence, and engagement in the Japanese teachers’ talk.

The first valued outcome for the children was “social nature” in children with ASD. This term has a broad meaning, by which the teachers meant a personal nature that is essential for living in society, and it can be facilitated in the children at school through positive experiences of interacting with peers. Two examples suggest that the teachers valued social awareness and willingness in terms of a child’s social nature. The teachers repeatedly discussed steps to improve a child’s social nature during the ObWks: (a) becoming aware of others, (b) learning to work with others, and (c) learning to work for others. These examples address children’s internal learning outcomes in terms of being aware.

The children need to realise how their friends are and/or what they need to do now. The children need to think what to do in that situation by realising how their friends are … Personal nature and ability are what I want the children to have and that I want to cultivate within each child. It is good for the child to be aware of how other children are when the child is not working hard. And it is good for other children to have positive attitudes towards the child who cannot do as many things or cannot do them as well as they can. These children with positive attitudes are willing to encourage the child with more needs to try to do things with them, because it is not simply a matter of the child can work hard by themselves or not. So I think it is good for the children to realise it if they have the ability. (JT2’s Interview B)

Shakaisei includes responding to friends who have talked to the children, being able to complete the interaction by following what the friends do, and learning the kindness of being willing to do something for friends. I am not sure how much they think about it, though … When the children encountered some troubles in a group, they understood that the situation was bad and they should not laugh at it … There are a lot of opportunities for these types of learning, especially when learning in a group situation. (JT1’s Interview B)

The Japanese teachers valued the children feeling comfortable with peers and responding to peers’ interactions. The teachers also stressed the ability of judging what to do through observing what other children are doing and applying the skills to other social situations. In terms of working with others, the teachers wanted the children to realise that they share
experiences with peers and so need to accept peers as part of their group and be willing to interact with them.

I’d better say that Daichi became able to accept other children, rather than that he actually interacted with them. When Ken suggested to Daichi, “Let’s wear the aprons”, Daichi tried to put on his apron but he couldn’t do it by himself … If friends ask him to do so something, Daichi will try. When he’s emotionally stable, he can respond more effectively, but it’s still hard for Daichi to get things done if he’s inside his own world. Even so, Daichi now seems to be aware of peer prompts without having negative feelings about them. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5)

The children are required to engage in their tasks by themselves within a group, whenever, wherever, and with whomever. That’s their true ability, I think … The children can then understand what to do at the time by looking at what their friends are doing … An important skill for them to learn is through recognising, “Ah, everyone else is doing it like this, so I have to do it this way too.” (JT2’s Interview B)

Ms Ando interpreted the children’s word as peer acceptance of Bunta in her class and was pleased about it. Similarly, during Interview C, Mr Banba reported that when Daichi, a boy with ASD, was absent, his classmates reacted to the situation by copying his repetitive behaviours. More specifically, one classmate tried to switch on and off the air-conditioning, and another classmate made a strange noise when eating lunch. Both behaviours were recognised as Daichi’s repetitive behaviours, and Mr Banba regarded them as characteristics of Daichi. Mr Banba interpreted these imitative responses as peer acceptance. He thought that all classmates missed Daichi and accepted him as an important member of SNEU2.

I was pleased when I saw Bunta was working hard, but I was more pleased when his friends found him working hard and said surprisingly “Bunta has a lot of balls!”, and “His bucket is full!” Because the tone of their voices expressed their surprise, I thought that here the children were not just accepting Bunta as one of them, but also indicating that this behaviour—working hard—was a good part of Bunta. I was very pleased at what they said about Bunta. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1)

In terms of working for peers, the teachers highlighted that the children can care about peers, help peers, and feel happy when they can please other people. For example, during the second teacher meeting, the SNEU teachers and Head discussed how Ms Chiba can encourage SNEU3 children to feel happy (or satisfied) when their customer said that their cakes are delicious (MO2.Interval:13). The teachers’ conversation suggests that they emphasised empathy for the older children.

One example indicates that Mr Banba also considered the children’s future and emphasised the importance of two-way peer interaction and relationships. Figure 4.3 shows what ability or skills Mr Banba wants the children with ASD to obtain through positive experiences of peer interactions. He advised that Chiaki’s social willingness to interact with peers cannot be facilitated unless Chiaki has had a lot of experiences interacting with peers who respond to his interactions. Other teachers also emphasised children’s social responsiveness during the lessons. Ms Ando patiently waited for Bunta to respond to peer prompts, while Ms Chiba increased natural interactions among the children by manipulating social situations in which the children must interact with each other to complete the tasks (e.g., sharing one set of ingredient bottles among them).
Chiaki spontaneously took Daichi’s hand to escort him gently. I believe that fostering *shakaisei* in children ... is very important for their future, because it’s likely they will work within a small group like this SNEU2 in future, and this [holding hands and doing things together] is linked to their ability to feel comfortable, their happiness, and other benefits from doing things together with friends and colleagues. I believe that this is the most important personal quality for the children; the ability to both invite friends and respond to their invitations is very important for them. It was a wonderful *sugata* of Chiaki and Daichi, wasn’t it? ... Chiaki, Daichi, and Luna were working as a team on their tasks, without my help. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6 with JT3’s VC15)

*Figure 4.3. Two-way peer relationships during the pancake unit (Mr Banba).*

The second learning outcome for the children was engagement. These teachers were more likely to consider inner engagement of the children during the lessons, although Ms Chiba and Mr Banba also discussed the children’s work accuracy (e.g., ability to measure ingredients without spilling them). One example shows Ms Ando’s reflection on a Key Moment where Bunta, doing craftwork, was trying to tie a string to a bamboo branch and Ichi was looking closely at how Bunta was doing this at the back corner of the classroom while Ms Ando was busy with other children at the front of the room. Ms Ando valued the children following through with inner engagement (i.e., thinking hard to find a solution) and trying to do their best by working hard. This Ms Ando’s example indicates both a disadvantage and an advantage of group lessons where one classroom teacher looks after the whole class. In this situation, the children have to wait for the teacher to come to help them, but doing so may facilitate their learning engagement with and from peers.

The children gathered in front of the bamboo branch, after being asked to put their craft there … As I could see from this video, I think that the children probably did not understand what they needed to do and were puzzled. They tried to work out how to tie the string from their craftwork to the bamboo branch. I would be more pleased if they tried to work it out for themselves by asking each other or intentionally observing what their friends were doing, instead of asking me for help immediately. I could see that the children tied their craftwork string to the bamboo finally. Even though it fell off quickly, I’m pleased that they tried their best. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk7 with JT1’s VC22)

The teachers also valued the children being motivated and working hard while playing or completing their tasks with peers. The teachers also stressed the importance of the children understanding their learning aims because they believe that to be motivated, the children need to feel satisfied about their learning experiences. This may explain why these teachers stressed the need to understand and incorporate the children’s interests and preferences in their lesson planning.
[In JT2’s VC6: Chiaki asked Mr Banba to buy more flour, and the other children asked him to buy a new microwave. Mr Banba agreed to all requests.] This is a *seitan* lesson, which values how the children direct themselves and engage in the activity. That is, it values the children having their own thoughts, motivations, and aims to engage in the activity, and that they embody these internal aspects and put them into practice. I wanted to foster in the children a feeling of satisfaction or achievement from their experiences. Of course, if they asked me for something unrealistic, I would say, “I am sorry but it would be too difficult.” But I want to try to respond positively to their requests as much as possible. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk2 with JT2’s VC6)

Thematic analysis of the teacher’s talk suggested that these teachers descriptively clarify variations in each child’s efforts to work hard (i.e., ideal *sugata*) in relation to the levels of independence involved in the task. Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5 show the Japanese teachers’ views of steps in children’s achievements and development of their ability for group work or play. For example, they considered it to be a sign of positive engagement if Ōji helped friends after completing his own tasks (Ms Chiba), if Daichi completed tasks with teacher or peer support (Mr Banba), and if Aiko looked around at other children using scissors during craft activity because she did not know how to use them herself (Ms Ando). To increase the children’s engagement in lessons, the teachers set targets for different tasks and skills. That is, the teachers considered the children’s satisfaction with individual and group achievements and made reasonable and ongoing adjustments to the difficulty and amount of tasks for each child according to their individual needs. These teachers believed that as they claimed during group reflections, participation in lesson planning motivates the children because it helps them to feel autonomy and satisfaction in the lessons.

**Figure 4.4.** A Japanese view of developing group work (Mr Banba and Ms Chiba).

On the other hand, Ms Ando’s talk revealed a complication in defining children’s engagement in play-based activities—with variation according to what she believes the child should be. But variation of engagement was also found in terms of what type of activities the class is focused on at the time of the lesson. For example, Ms Ando valued children enjoying their favourite play activities individually or in groups during free play, but she wanted them to engage in cooperative group play when it was set for the lesson scene.
During the earlier lessons, the goal was playing together with friends, so the children engaged in the same playing activities. As to the current stage of children’s development in my class, the children are likely to engage in parallel play. The children are in the same space, but engaging in different activities. I think the children are still at the stage where they’re more likely to engage in their own favourite play individually. But I don’t want Aiko to be like that. I want her to be aware of the peers around her and to play together with everyone. When I set as the play activity, for example, “ball play”, Aiko tends to be able to enjoy playing together with friends … For example, Aiko had a ball, the same size as Jun’s, and they played by throwing it to each other. So I think Aiko has advanced her play from parallel play to play that interacts to some extent with her peers. (JT1’s Interview C)

Figure 4.5. A Japanese view of developing children’s play (Ms Ando).

The third focus was the children’s ability to work independently, with minimum support from teachers. Individual differences in the teachers’ concerns were revealed through cross-checking three semistructured interviews (see Appendix O14). During Interview A, Ms Ando talked about fine motor skills, while Mr Banba and Ms Chiba did not. This may be because Ms Ando was teaching younger children who require more support than older children in daily life skills (e.g., support for changing cloths, toileting, cleaning a classroom, and preparing school lunch). Ms Chiba discussed work accuracy and communication skills in particular because she believed that SNEU3 children, who had already established essential daily life skills at school, need to interact with peers. However, during Interviews B and C, Mr Banba and Ms Chiba were more likely to talk about fine motor skills in contrast to Ms Ando who talked more about gross motor skills (e.g., movement in dynamic play). This may be because both Mr Banba and Ms Chiba used cooking activities and focused on developing manageable tools for the children with ASD in their seitan units, while Ms Ando used play-based activities and focused on facilitating dynamic playing movements among the children.

The teachers believed that the children need to understand clearly what to do to be able to increase their independence. They therefore valued the children’s comprehensions of procedures (e.g., steps and order of cooking activities) and rules (e.g., taking a turn and waiting for and helping friends) that they developed through repeating and performing similar activities. They also valued the children’s ability to read social situations: understanding what to do by observing peers doing the same activities. The teachers said that the children who have
successfully worked without teachers’ support through repeating a process with peers can increase self-confidence. One example from Mr Banba also implies that a good group offers advantages to those who are involved in it. The teachers talked about fun and happy experiences that the children can share through working with peers, believing that “a group can achieve more than individuals.” The teachers also said that the confidence children obtain through group success encourages the children to try their hardest at new things and to care about peers.

If adults are present, the children are always passive. They don’t much engage in things, or the adults help them all the time. This is what I need to improve. I can’t help myself doing all the work … But within a group of children, they can feel achievement through doing the tasks by themselves. I think it links in with their confidence, motivations, and happiness. They can feel, “Ah, I can do this!” Because each child can have these positive thoughts or feelings, there’s additional happiness in doing an activity with five friends … The “goodness of group” (i.e., benefits of group) means that 1+1+1+1+1 is not just 5. [A group can achieve more than the sum of its individuals]. (JT2’s Interview B)

The teachers also believed that caring about other people is the “right thing” in their teaching context and valued the children taking initiatives to help friends in social situations where a friend is still doing the task or when a friend does not know what he or she needs to do next. These problem-solving skills to judge the situation and find a solution were mentioned most by Ms Chiba. Her story of Osamu dropping an egg was a typical example where Ms Chiba encouraged Osamu to think about what to do and also encouraged other children to think about this to find a solution so they could help Osamu.

Even if we called the children ‘a group’, there is a fundamental principle that they will complete their own tasks by themselves. So there is a premise that the children are able to recognise their own tools and places and to judge what they need to do using the colour cues. But you know, it is not right that the children can start playing after they complete their own task. Instead, the children need to pay attention to how their friends are and give verbal prompts to the peers who have not yet finished their tasks. The children often remember their friends’ colours too. So they can use the colour cues to help teach their peers where they need to place the tools. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4 with JT1’s VC10)

Figure 4.6 illustrates results of video analysis of the changes that take place when the children of SNEU1 gather in a group at the end of a lesson (see this analysis protocol in Chapter 3 and Appendix L2). The middle diagram shows how much time (Note. 1 interval = 15 seconds) it took all children to gather in the group each week (Note. ObWk3 was excluded in this figure because they did not gather in a group that week). The top blue boxes indicate Ms Ando’s initial actions immediately after the children finished packing up the room, while the green boxes show the children’s initial responses to the scene. The red box explains Ms Ando’s extra instruction to the class. This example indicates how over time the children of SNEU1 became more interactive and could come to form a group independently without Ms Ando’s instruction or prompts, moving (a) with direct instruction and music prompts, (b) without instruction but with music prompts, and (c) without instruction or prompts. This example also highlights the influence of different levels of peer interactions and relationships in terms of the three outcomes: considering friends as part of the group (i.e., social nature), thinking of what to do from the situation (i.e., engagement), and spontaneously gathering as a class (i.e., independence).
Most children came spontaneously, and Bunta called the name to join the group. Jun told the class about finishing their packing, and most children started sitting in a group before the music stopped. Ms Ando praised Ichi, and other children called Bunta.

Ms Ando stopped the music and asked the children to gather in a group. Ms Ando stopped the music and sat quietly. Ms Ando stopped the music and sat quietly. Ms Ando sat quietly.

ObWk 1: 15 intervals, ObWk 2: 5 intervals, ObWk 4: 4 intervals, ObWk 5: 4 intervals

Some children did not come, and other children did not care about peers who were not in the group. Most children came spontaneously, and Ichi called Bunta’s name to join the group. Most children came to sit in a group while calling Bunta’s character name. Jun told the class about finishing their packing, and most children started sitting in a group before the music stopped. Ms Ando praised Ichi, and other children called Bunta.

Figure 4.6. The children became more independent during the unit of Baikinman Land.

These key learning foci that emerged from the teachers’ talk (see Figure 4.2) are consistent with the school’s traditional learning goals announced on the school website and were discussed by the stakeholders outside the classroom (e.g., vice principal, deputy vice principal, and SNEU Head). The school’s emphasis on “working for friends’ happiness” appears to be linked to a theory of whole person education mentioned on the school website.

As you can see in our school’s emphasis, we are most concerned about “working for friends’ happiness.” In the SNEU and even with the children who have ASD, we work hard for the happiness of every child coming to the school. Creating happiness is not only for our teachers, but also for the children at the school. We maintain a traditional stance that all children work hard while caring about their friends’ growth and happiness. (Japanese Vice Principal)

One story illustrates how the school and SNEU teachers underlined children’s kokoro or heart as their educational value (see Story One in Appendix O9). The concept of heart appears to have a broad meaning covering all three learning goals. That is, the children were expected to care for and show empathy towards friends who were sad (i.e., social nature), to think hard about how friends feel and how they can help their friends (i.e., engagement), and to find a solution in a team through group discussion, instead of the teacher instructing what to do (i.e., independence).

Within the story, the school administration used emotional terms (e.g., unpleasant and sad), and the SNEU’s resolution of the difficulty concerned feelings. The teachers’ use of the term, “friends” when they referred to other children at the school is also consistent with the school’s emphasis on matters of the heart.

The concept that everyone is our friend was also confirmed during the lesson observations and interviews of the SNEU teachers; the children became friends with Sandman
in SNEU1; Daichi was accepted by other children in SNEU2; and the children respected what Osamu can do in SNEU3. This concept is also linked to ideal classes where the teachers tried to establish a class community through sharing positive experiences. The teachers called this a form of classroom management and spoke about it particularly when they were asked what they meant by ‘peer group’ in Interview B. The teachers highlighted the school’s role in maximising the benefits of using peer groups for teaching the children with ASD (i.e., the “goodness of group”).

The teachers also discussed how social learning opportunities in peer groups in many ways help children with ASD. Ms Ando said that the children can try their best to overcome their weakness with peers as their social model. For example, Aiko, who tended to eat only what she liked at the beginning of the school year, was challenged to eat many things when she was in peer groups (e.g., the pancake cooked by other SNEU classes and vegetables harvested from their farm) and she then became able to eat all the school lunch meals. In her third interview, Ms Ando described a scene where Aiko was looking around her peers who were eating the pancake and slowly tried to put it into her mouth. 

_Shudan no yosa_ (i.e., goodness of group) is fun, isn’t it? ... There are some things we can do only in a group. For example, when we transit from our room to another room, the children can make a judgement by thinking “because my friend’s chair is pulled out from the desk, I’m willing to tidy it up for the friend.” The children judge the situation by themselves and do something nice for the friend … If a child is praised, he or she smiles. I can see the children walking together … happily holding hands. (JT1’s Interview B)

This example of what Ms Ando regarded as children’s ideal _sugata_ working for friends’ happiness also highlights peer interaction and relationships among the children. Similarly, Ms Chiba said that she is sometimes surprised with the children sitting in a group together without any direct interactions. A scene where Osamu and Naoki were playing together while Œji and Fuji were sitting very close to them without any verbal communication was observed during the late weeks of the observations. Ms Chiba reflected on the scene and said that it shows they become a “class” by feeling that “they are lucky to be together” (JT3’s Interview B). Ms Chiba also reflected on the video-clip example from her lesson conducted during the Lesson Study Conference showing that Œji spilt cake mixture. She said that she wanted other children to understand how he feels when she found out that he was very sad and became very emotional about his mistake (i.e., with tears in his eyes).

I thought it would make this lesson with the sponge cakes meaningless if other children did not consider how Œji felt and if they could still feel satisfied that they had completed their own tasks as usual even though a friend was suffering through sad feelings. So I did not want to keep going unless I created the scene that the children show empathy for Œji, even though they might not be able to feel exactly how Œji felt. (JT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6 with JT3’s VC14)

The coherent focus of peer interactions and relationships in the teachers’ talk as well as how they talked about these social aspects suggest that these teachers considered frequency and quality of peer interactions as their indicator for assessing children’s achievements. For example, Mr Banba viewed Chiaki’s giving peer prompts as his learning outcomes, and Ms Ando said
that her class had established a “deep” relationship because over time the children had given more peer support or prompts to each other. Ms Chiba and Mr Banba reported improvements in how the children interacted with peers.

[In the first video (JT3’s VC6), Fuji said “pink, pink” and Ms Chiba praised him] I want Osamu to feel satisfied that he was able to complete his tasks by himself. So I want to have an activity where other children can respect what Osamu has done rather than take his hand and help him complete his tasks. I was pleased because Fuji told Osamu that the spoon Osamu was holding was the wrong colour and Naoki supported Osamu verbally by saying “more.” So I told Fuji that his verbal prompt was great for helping to teach Osamu and that such a verbal prompt was appropriate. (JT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4 with JT3’s VC6)

My praise may have helped Chiaki to strengthen his good behaviour interacting with his friends nicely. The behaviour will be linked to the next situation in the lesson and to other situations. Valuing Chiaki’s good behaviour when five children are there can enable Chiaki to feel satisfaction or feel his achievement … because Chiaki can understand if I say something verbally. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5 with JT2’s VC14)

Although the teachers reported these children’s achievements, they did not measure the actual increase in the children’s use of peer prompts or how much the children actually improved their interactions with each other. Their assessment was based on their progressive and subjective reflections, rather than systematic assessment. Video analysis of lesson observations (see the detailed analysis protocol in Chapter 3 and Appendix L) was conducted to see whether the children with ASD, and the classes overall increased peer prompts (Ms Ando) and whether they improved their interactions with peers (Ms Chiba).

Figure 4.7 shows the results of video analysis using a classroom observation matrix to count the frequency of peer prompts in 15-second intervals during Ms Ando’s lessons in the first, middle, and last week of the observations. Three categories of interactions were counted: The targeted child (a) gives a peer prompt to other children, (b) responds to a peer prompt and follows the instruction, and (c) is aware of peer prompts but does not follow the instruction. The result shows that Aiko gave more and more prompts to peers, and it also implies her social initiative to her friends. In contrast, Bunta did not take initiative to interact with his friends. However, Figure 4.7 indicates he was becoming aware of peer interaction (i.e., prompts) and was gradually responding to the interactions. This was consistent with Ms Ando’s reflection that the lesson experiences facilitated Banta’s awareness of his friends and enabled him to respond to his friends, rather than relying on adults’ prompts. The overall increase in the categories of responding and being aware also implies that SNEU1 established peer relationships among the children.
Figure 4.7. Bar charts about frequency of peer prompts in SNEU1 (Ms Ando).

Figure 4.8 shows another example of how the children of SNEU3 learnt from their experiences to improve their ways of helping peers. The episode in ObWk2 was detailed earlier in RQ2 (see Story Two in Appendix O9) and summarised in Figure 4.8. In both episodes in ObWks 2 and 4, Osamu did not come back to the classroom after the school bell rang. In contrast to ObWk2 when Ms Chiba encouraged the children to realise the situation and think about what to do, Ms Chiba said only, “Oh, Osamu is not here”, and Ėji and another boy went out to call Osamu.

Event: Osamu did not come back after the school bell.

Ms Chiba asked if they don’t mind starting the activity without him.
Ms Chiba stated the fact that he is not here yet.

ObWk2
Ėji went to call Osamu (shouting) and pulled his hand to come back.
Ms Chiba gave “big” praise to Ėji.

ObWk4
Ėji & Naoki went to call Osamu without shouting and pulling.

Figure 4.8. Osamu’s behaviour became a learning opportunity for the class (Ms Chiba).

In contrast to ObWk2, Ėji did not pull Osamu’s hand and, instead, verbally encouraged Osamu to come back. After Osamu cried about being scolded, other children tried to help him to prepare for the next lesson (e.g., washing hands and wearing his apron) without any prompting in ObWk4, while they were only waiting and observing Osamu preparing in ObWk2. Ms Chiba reported this episode when she was asked about her reflection on the week and also in both
Interviews B and C. Her interpretation of the episode was that Ėji became thoughtful about his friends and that the class had become a community.

I would like Ėji and Fuji to consider not only themselves but also how others feel. Ėji is a typical example … He cannot help thinking that things are fine if he is fine. So I want him to understand that it makes others feel unhappy if he considers only himself. (JT3’s Interview B)

Valuing the teachers

Overall, the experienced teachers were more likely to say that they confirmed effective practice and strategies that they used for the children with ASD and firmed their understanding of “good” lessons, while a novice teacher (Ms Chiba) said that she leant new aspects of teaching and supporting the children with ASD from other teachers (e.g., other SNEU teachers, the Head, RC teachers, and previous SNEU teachers). For example, Ms Ando reported that she reconfirmed the importance of a well-defined theme for a group lesson from her reflection on her current and past lessons as Bunta improved his learning engagement, in contrast to a past lesson using another cartoon for her theme. Ms Chiba realised that her way of approaching her practice was strongly influenced by her past teaching in regular education. Both of these teachers’ talking was concentrated on important aspects of delivering good lessons that address holistic learning goals in terms of teacher outcomes.

Figure 4.9 illustrates how these teachers viewed what skills and knowledge they need to have and/or had developed through their past and current lesson study experiences. It also addresses how a lesson study practice is related to their skills and knowledge development in terms of creating “good” lessons. These teachers agreed that although performing the intensive engagement of lesson development cannot be continued across the whole year, their experiences gave them fundamental knowledge and skills to deliver good lessons built on what they have done to the class without intensive effort and time (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk8). It suggested that their experiences of intensive lesson study engagement gave the teachers more frameworks or models for good lessons that they may be able to use as samples and abilities to deliver good lessons in general.

Figure 4.9 shows understanding of a child with ASD as a whole (i.e., actual conditions) as their central concern and three different aspects of improving the child’s lesson experiences: (a) ideas about learning materials and environments, (b) skills and knowledge in using effective strategies to facilitate children’s learning experiences, and (c) comprehension of important theories related to learning and teaching. The teachers agreed that they need to create their lessons to be suitable for the actual conditions of each child in their classes. But this also seemed to be essential for the teachers to develop their “ideal” lessons, which respond to children’s actual conditions.
Figure 4.9. The Japanese teachers’ views of their essential skills and knowledge developed through lesson study experiences.

The teachers repeatedly talked about their ideas about ideal lessons in the interviews and during lesson study teacher meetings. In terms of these four aspects, the teachers reported that they had valued advice and support from other teachers across the ObWks. Their talk about group experiences shows that they appreciated every opinion, whether applicable for their current practice or not. For example, Mr Banba said that talking about his lesson helped him to articulate his current and future practice. In fact, thematic analysis of the teacher meeting observations shows that the teachers spent a lot of time articulating through group discussions what they are doing, what they have been doing, and what they want to do more. Other teachers were able to give more concrete advice grounded in classroom practice. This suggests that the ability to describe a lesson as a whole is important for their lesson study practice, to talk about their practice and embody ideal lessons from moment to moment (i.e., lesson scenes). Their teaching approach was consistent with the traditional holistic approach of the school discussed by school administration staff and university professors.
First, the ability to understand a child as a whole is essential for the Japanese teachers so they can develop lessons appropriate to the condition of each child in the class. Because these conditions differ among children and change along with their growth and learning achievements, the teachers need to continuously seek to update their understanding of each child. To create desirable social and learning situations in which the children experience what the teachers expected, it is vital for them to consider children’s perspectives. Having other teachers around seemed to help these teachers to understand a child’s actual conditions from different teachers’ points of views.

Ms Chiba in particular reported that she had become able to consider her lesson from the children’s points of view. On the other hand, other SNEU teachers said that they were happy to spend more time discussing Ms Chiba’s lesson during the lesson study teacher meetings because they wanted to help her understand the SNEU practice. That Ms Chiba was most engaged in her own learning throughout the ObWks (see Appendix O14) implies that the teaching practices of this novice teacher may be strongly influenced by collegial advice in the school. In fact, Ms Chiba said that she learnt about the children with ASD in her class from ObWk1. During that week she went on a three-day field trip with Ėji and Fuji and other RC children in Year 6 and was advised by other RC teachers about giving these children more learning opportunities even though they might fail. She said that through the group experiences, her mind was opened to see more possibilities in the children with ASD and she became better able to provide opportunities to facilitate their learning experiences and support, which were designed incorporating these children’s points of view.

However, although Ms Chiba talked more about improvements of her teaching, other SNEU teachers reported that they too learnt from group discussions focusing on Ms Chiba’s lesson. They reported that through lesson study practice, they became more able to articulate what kind of behaviours and actions signal that the children understand or think about the learning experience as the teachers expect. One example suggests that Ms Ando learnt a new perspective of looking at peer interactions from how Ms Chiba talked about and viewed her lesson. Similarly, progressive observation and reflection interviews showed that the teachers became clearer about what they want the children to achieve through articulating ideal sugata of the children with other teachers. For example, Ms Ando’s lesson story of becoming friends with Sandman was one of the outcomes from the second teacher meeting as Mr Banba said that he might make the children become friends if he is doing this lesson. For another example, Ms Chiba considered how she can encourage Ėji to help Osamu in an appropriate way so that he respects what Osamu can do after conversations with the Head, and then she manipulated the lesson situation by changing procedures, giving the class one set of ingredient bottles and naming Ėji a shop manager.
When we talked about Ms Chiba’s lesson, Ms Chiba said that Ėji took over and finished his friends’ tasks as his way of interacting with friends. Instead, Ms Chiba wanted Ėji to interact with these friends by cherishing what the friends could do by themselves, and to wait for the friends and let them do it. You know, the language of “cherishing his friends” sounded wonderful to me. It made me want to become able to see the children in Ms Chiba’s way and want to praise the children when they interact with their friends in such a way. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4, held after MO1)

The benefits of applying different points of view to understand the children and their practices, highlighted in SA interviews with inschool outside-classroom stakeholders, were confirmed in the teachers’ talk. For example, Ms Ando reported a benefit from the advice of other experienced SNEU teachers: It is the valued outcome that Bunta was engaged in his own play, while other children were playing in a group. She said that this advice enabled her to avoid the potential risk that she might have forced Bunta to play together with peers even though he was not yet ready for it. She expressed relief and appreciated the advice because it might have prevented an unhappy experience for Bunta.

[Other teacher’s advice] made me relieved, and also the children can be relieved … Pushing myself too much cannot make anything better. I think it is important to have other teachers who have observed my lessons as outsiders and have told me their opinions that this child is still in a developmental stage, since this has helped me to see the child more objectively. When I played together with the children, unconsciously I tried to push them to engage in group activities more and more. It [other teacher’s advice] can stop me pushing myself more than I should. (JT1’s Interview C)

The second teacher’s outcome concerns ideas about appropriate learning materials and environmental settings, which were closely linked to the children’s actual condition. For example, the Head often observed Ms Chiba’s lesson, pointed out a lesson scene where the children misunderstood what Ms Chiba had instructed (e.g., Ms Chiba asked the children to measure one cup of flour, and the children counted one with half of the cup), and explained to her how the children would understand their lesson experience at that specific moment. One example showed that Ms Chiba changed her ways of understanding one lesson activity from her own to the children’s perspectives through group implementation. After this lesson she used afternoon lessons to teach the children how to measure ingredients precisely, and she also changed the measuring instrument from a spoon to a small cup for the younger children to measure liquid ingredients. The teachers’ process of lesson development emphasised making all aspects of a lesson responsive to each child’s conditions, including how the child may think or view his or her experience. Therefore, the teachers were trying to interpret the children’s responses (phenomena) to reflect on what is happening in the lesson (e.g., what the children are looking at and doing). This may address the need to recognise that observing a lesson with multiple eyes helps to capture important scenes during the lesson.

I could not identify any parts that the children would find difficult because I had no problem completing the activity when I tried it myself. For example, when I tried to measure ingredients by using measuring cups or spoons, I understood from common sense or from an adult perspective that measuring out “one spoon” means filling the spoon up to the top. I did not realise that this is not common knowledge from the perspectives of these children. But after observing situations like this with the children and asking other teachers to observe my lessons because it is difficult for me to see everything that happens, I realised it’s very difficult for the children to hold and pour this (ingredient) with one hand … On each occasion when the teachers
observed, they told me that the children spilled the flour or could not measure the flour correctly. So then I considered what I needed to change in smooth out these parts that the children found difficult. (JT3’s Interview B)

Ms Ando spoke about benefits of working with different teachers because “each of the teachers has a strong or professional area, and they can tell me about something I did not know or did not realise” (JT1’s Interview C). For example, one previous SNEU teacher talked about improvements in her lesson from a physical education point of view, while one of RC teacher gave her advice about making a group drawing displayed on the wall of the play room from an Arts education point of view. Similarly, these teachers said that group discussions at teacher meetings gave them ideas that they might be able to use in their future lessons.

The third outcome for the teachers was that they improved ways of supporting the children with ASD. The teachers talked about this topic consistently during their interviews and lesson study meetings. Their greatest concern was giving effective praise and verbal prompts during their lessons in order to facilitate the children’s learning experiences. A mismatch of perceptions of *hyouka* (evaluation) between the teachers and the researcher was found in the first interview (Interview A) and the early reflection interviews. Although the prompting question was designed to find out what the teachers do in terms of assessing children’s outcomes, their answers were focused on praise that the teachers gave the children during the lesson. The Japanese teachers’ concept of evaluation was defined in an Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter that summarised a group discussion at a whole school lesson study teacher meeting. The summary document found the discussion of “evaluation” at the meeting was too abstract and asked the teachers to continue their active research in terms of ideal lessons that address their research focus (i.e., facilitating children’s self-learning). According to the newsletter (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.17), the Lesson Study Committee had been exploring the meaning of “evaluation” in terms of metacognitive ability (i.e., knowing about knowing; cognition about cognition; and understanding what we understand) but concluded that they remained unsure about it. The meeting resolved to ask the school’s teachers to theorise three different types of evaluations: self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and teacher evaluation. Peer evaluation in particular was emphasised in this newsletter as an essential process of sharing group achievements to feel self-learning.

This example indicates that the school encouraged the teachers to use peer evaluation to facilitate the children’s learning in a group. Peer evaluation was routinely found across teaching days as the RC children who came to the SNEU classrooms to help SNEU children spoke about what the children did well (e.g., working hard, cleaning carefully, and singing a song happily) at group reflection time at the end of the activities or tasks. Similarly, the teachers addressed effective praise that encourages the children to feel satisfaction and group achievement during their interviews, and also explored well-designed praise suitable for each child during their teacher meetings. For example, Ms Chiba was considering situations where the children can feel happier about their outcomes, and other teachers spoke about their opinions in terms of setting
up a lesson scene (e.g., stickers on empty cups mean that the customer thinks that their cakes are delicious; a competition between two peer groups encourages the children to work hard).

The teachers said that they learnt or confirmed effective strategies to facilitate the children’s learning. Ms Chiba reported that she was taught a way of encouraging Fuji to be aware of peers by the Head demonstrating that he physically shifted Fuji’s position so that he could see other children. She said that this advice was also linked to her current table arrangement where the children can see each other during activities. In Ms Ando’s reflection on a Key Moment where she was announcing her character changing from an enemy character (i.e., Sandman) to a hero character during free play in ObWk4, Ms Ando explained that she investigated her role as a teacher in play-based activity and discussed her concern with other teachers before changing her character role. This suggested that she established her theory related to play-based activity through her attempts taking different roles (i.e., characters) and through group discussions. It also reflected the fourth outcome.

My primary role is supposed to be the one who links the children together, who connects other children with the child who is playing alone, and who praises the children. My role could be to encourage the children, who are pretending in the roles of their characters, to become more excited. I should take such roles. I was not able to tie the children together if the children attacked me [because my character was Sandman]. Personally, I considered what my role is first. JOB1 also talked about tying the children together and we reached a consensus through a discussion about how I would have a greater role in encouraging the children if they were in the roles of their characters. After that, I also talked to an RC teacher, who was previously an SNEU teacher about the teacher’s role in play. She suggested how I should praise the children better, so giving an evaluation (i.e., positive feedback) was one of my roles too. I had advice from these two teachers and defined my roles in that light. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4 with JT1’s VC11)

Analysis of the meeting observation videos indicates that during the meetings the teachers addressed various theories related to their current practice and how to put related educational theories into practice in their teaching. This theme was discussed more during the post lesson study meeting with senior teachers (MO5) and during the debriefing meeting with the external supervisors after the Lesson Study Conference (MO3). For example, the Head told the SNEU lesson study supervisor that he thought they were not sure about their view of the children’s learning in seitan lessons, which was described in their SNEU Lesson Study Report. In the report, the teachers discussed the children’s learning in three separate aspects: persons, objects, and experiences. Analysis of the teachers’ conversations during the meetings showed that they did not say it clearly but the teachers’ talk seemed to reflect their understanding that a child develops joint attention, which is somehow consistent with studies in the English-language literature viewing joint attention as “a person’s ability to share an activity or experience with another” (Brown et al., 2012).

The teachers repeated this concern during the SNEU lesson study conference meeting held with the SNEU teachers, the Head, and previous SNEU teachers (MO5). In the meeting, one previous teacher said that the SNEU has continued to use one traditional theory that these three aspects are interrelated rather than separate. During the last lesson study meeting held with their supervisor in the week following the conference (MO3), Ms Ando reported to other SNEU
teachers that one of the visiting teachers at the conference also enquired about this topic as she too thought these three learning aspects are interrelated. These findings indicate that through their group implementation of theory inquiry, the Japanese teachers had established an understanding of children’s learning from both practical and theoretical points of view. That is, they interpreted their classroom practice through both their intensive engagement with the children and relevant theories provided from experienced teachers.

Similarly, through a group process of developing a lesson, the teachers developed their professional knowledge and skills by connecting their current practice with other teachers’ practice and/or their past practice. For example, during the first meeting (MO1), their external supervisor pointed to an issue common to Mr Banba and Ms Chiba, who both were using cooking activities for their lessons. Both teachers had in their lessons unstructured time when the children are required to wait—for the cake to be cooked (Mr Banba) or for other children to finish their tasks (Ms Chiba). After the supervisor raised this waiting time as an issue, the teachers discussed possible solutions for each class. Mr Banba said that because the children want to observe the cake being cooked in the microwave, he wants to provide two microwave ovens to reduce cooking time and also to enable all children to engage in this group observation. The teachers also talked about other teacher’s practice during the meetings. During the first and second meetings (MOs 1 and 2), other two teachers and the Head talked about the lessons that some senior teachers had conducted in the past to give more concrete examples of what Ms Chiba could do. The external supervisor talked about other schools’ practice during the meeting held in the week after the conference (MO3).

While these teachers reported that they received valuable advice and support from other teachers across the ObWks, they also spoke about improving their conversation skills to share their experiences and thoughts with others. During his SA interview, the school’s vice principal emphasised the teachers’ skills in describing how they approach their current practice, which helps to carry their outcomes beyond the school. During Interview C, Mr Banba said that through intensive engagement in lesson study practice, he had become able to talk about his lesson experiences and attempts, in contrast to how he had been during the last lesson study experience. His talk suggested that for teachers to share lesson experiences with other teachers, they need to talk about the lesson as a whole (i.e., lesson scenes). These teachers also said they “appreciated suggestions or advice” when they talked about what they discussed with other teachers. This reflects their willingness to talk about their lesson experiences with other teachers, even though the other teachers’ views of lesson scenes were often critical. These teachers’ respectful and appreciative manner toward others’ opinions suggests that they considered every aspect of group discussion at the lesson study teacher meetings to be useful.

The teachers also said that group sessions of discussing their practice encouraged them to look at and consider their current practice in depth. For example, Mr Banba reconfirmed the importance of talking about his lessons with other teachers and having someone observe his
lessons to help him capture every child’s learning experiences. He also said that during his later reflection interviews he became clearer on what he was not sure about before and what he needed to do to maximise improvement (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6), because other teachers had pointed it out to him (e.g., Mr Banba gave children support too quickly) and encouraged him to look at alternatives (e.g., be patient and wait for the children to take actions spontaneously). Group implementation of lesson development also triggered Ms Ando’s new way of thinking about practice and provided her chances to look at other teachers’ play-based lessons and consider their lesson scenes from the viewpoints of children in those lessons. These experiences helped Ms Ando to improve her lessons. This implies that the process of involving other teachers in lesson development pushes the teachers to consider hidden or difficult issues around learning and teaching, which generally may be ignored or unnoticed.

If I worked on my lesson by myself, I would not be able to realise or see some issues. Sometimes I would not be able to find a solution if I use only my own knowledge. Sometimes ideas come into my mind while I have a conversation with others. I prefer to see others’ work without constraint and talk about my ideas, even if it’s only a casual chat. I think I’m lucky to find at least one idea that is useful for my lesson from those ideas. If I work alone, I become overwhelmed and I’m unable to watch all the children. When I watch Daichi, I cannot watch the other four children. I very much appreciate these aspects of having group discussions. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4, held after MO1)

A benefit of group implementation is that I can receive advice from various innovative points of view that I will not have by myself. Also, it enables me to develop my knowledge through comparing my lessons with others’ lessons and through thinking about what I would do if I was in the situation that other teachers may be in. I identified a lot of things that I can use for my lessons. I also came to appreciate that it is important to sometimes observe others’ lessons whether they’re good or bad … In observing others’ lessons, I can consider the reasons behind the lesson scene. For example, I can think about why these children are playing dynamically or why the teacher did not do something in a way I might have done it. When implementing my lesson, I cannot think carefully about why things may or may not work because my mind is fully occupied before and during the lesson. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6, held after Lesson Study Conference)

In addition, asking Mr Banba about whether he would change his approach to the lesson if he does not make a lesson study plan highlighted a perception of lesson making. That is, lesson making is ongoing and part of teachers’ professional role in their teaching context. This notion reflected the vice principal’s talk. It was also consistent with the teachers’ guide book for seitan published by the Japanese National Institute of Special Need Education (2006).

I usually make the plan in my head. Well, the lesson study plan is only about one lesson that I had at the conference. The plan shows the details of only one particular lesson. But “making a lesson” is not about the single lesson. I must be aware of “making a lesson” all the time. So I think that making or not making the lesson study plan are not much different from each other. (JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk8)

**Valuing the school**

For school outcomes, key findings emerged from reviewing of school documentation and analysis of SA interview transcripts rather than from the teachers’ talks. During the SA interviews, the Head and support teachers focused on the SNEU teachers’ current classroom practices, while other stakeholders’ talks were more abstract and broader. This indicates that the
staff members working closely with the special educators had more specific views about teaching children with ASD in the school, while others (i.e., administration staff or outside school stakeholders) had more general views about these special educators’ teaching practice for children with ASD in the school. Particularly, lesson study related documents were helpful for extracting historical aspects of school outcomes from lesson study practices (see Appendix I). Throughout the ObWks, the teachers expressed difficulty when asked about valued outcomes for the school, but they mentioned the benefits of intensive schoolwide lesson study practice through comparison of their school with other schools.

During Interview C and reflection interviews, the teachers addressed both advantages and disadvantages of a group approach to lesson study practice. They pointed out that the school had supportive environments in contrast to other schools where they had worked previously. For example, Ms Ando observed that the school’s teachers and administration staff are very supportive and willing to both converse and give productive advice that stimulates her to think deeply. In her previous schools, some teachers offered unproductive criticism that made her feel less than fully human. Mr Banba also highlighted the school’s strength in providing new teachers with opportunities to receive advice from some of the SNEU’s previously senior teachers. These current teachers agreed that the supportive environment was not established instantly through their current practices and was already in place when they started teaching at the school. This implies that the school had established team building through a long history of schoolwide lesson study practice.

Ms Ando acknowledges her role to help a novice teacher. This example also shows that having group meetings set in place [for them?] was very helpful for the SNEU team because each classroom teacher was busy with their own practices. Similarly, during his SA interview, the Head spoke about his experience of the previous year when Ms Ando, Mr Banba, and he struggled to manage lesson study practice because there was no extra teacher to observe their lessons. He highlighted his availability to observe each classroom lesson, to organise appointments, and to arrange meetings for the teachers to have discussions with previous SNEU teachers and other helpful professionals (e.g., university professors and education department officers).

It would be great if I was able to give Ms Chiba more advice daily. But in fact it is hard for me even to observe her lessons. So I have expressed my sincere apologies to her. I think that the meeting was a good opportunity for me to give her advice. (JT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4, held after MO1)

Group implementation also developed cross-disciplinary practices between the SNEU and other teaching areas of regular education subjects. For example, during Interview C, Ms Ando noted advice that she had received from colleagues presenting viewpoints from physical education, life environmental studies, and science. Review of lesson study related documents (e.g., Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters, Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletins, and SNEU Lesson Study Bulletins including SNEU lesson study lesson plans) revealed that what the participating
teachers recognised as valued outcomes for the child with ASD were linked clearly with the schoolwide and SNEU lesson study aims.

In the lesson study framework developed by the SNEU, the whole school lesson study aim of “facilitating children’s ability to feel self-learning” that had been set after the previous year’s Lesson Study Conference was linked to the SNEU lesson study aim of “facilitating children to enrich their lives.” These learning aims were abstract and therefore required all teachers to explore what these learning aims mean to the children and how the teachers can address these learning aims through their everyday practice. In other words, the teachers’ everyday explorations of the children’s learning in their classrooms established the theoretical framework for what the school, the SNEU, and the teachers need to do with the children. It indicates that the schoolwide lesson study approach enhanced the theoretical development of a research topic from multiple perspectives. Each lesson study group focused on a distinctive teaching area and was engaged in researching that topic, and all groups exchanged their research findings about their lesson study processes and outcomes.

The Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters provided the teachers with learning materials that helped them connect their current practice to relevant policy and theory. For example, one newsletter introduced a national movement related to the new Basic Educational Law and explained that the new law emphasises facilitating the children’s motivation to pursue their own learning (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.14). The newsletter concluded that the philosophy of life skills (or Zest for Life) has not been changed by the new law. These newsletters also provided the teachers with a summary of schoolwide lesson study group discussions (by representatives from each lesson study group) and enabled teachers of the whole school to maintain the same understandings of key terms used in their Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletin.

In this research, we define “learning” as: the process through which children solve a problem while using their current knowledge, skills, perspectives, and thoughts, while learning from each other through interacting with peers and teachers. This experience of problem solving strengthens the children’s ability to obtain new knowledge, skills, perspectives, and thoughts. (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.2)

The children’s sugata of feeling self-learning includes three bamen or scenes: (a) the children acquire new knowledge and skills by realising that they have been able to understand what they had not understood before that learning; (b) the children realise the factors involved in problem solving by knowing how they became able to understand the problem at hand; and (c) the children apply the new knowledge and skills to another problem because they realise that they can use this knowledge and skill for different bamen. (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.2)

These examples from Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters are consistent with what the teachers said about their own practices and about the children in their classes. The examples imply that sharing information on research outcomes helps the school to further develop theoretical frameworks of children’s learning across different disciplines. According to an article in the 17th Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter that presented a summary of the research outcomes and further improvements in each lesson study group, the SNEU concluded that it will need to develop the theoretical framework of what the children are aware of while engaging in a
learning process of “being aware, feeling, and thinking.” The unit advised that it will need to explore this topic through more carefully observing the children’s sugata, because the children need to engage in this process to make decisions (Inschool Lesson Study Newsletter No.17). The unit confirmed that its lesson study approach is ongoing and the SNEU’s staff work continuously to develop this approach further.

Conducting schoolwide Lesson Study Conferences encouraged the school to develop the school’s documentation as testament to good practice of the school’s teachers. Specifically here, the SNEU report mentioned above theorised what kind of sugata these teachers want each child to demonstrate and how these teachers have supported each child during lessons. A summary of these ideal sugata and the support designed for each child with ASD outlined in the teachers’ lesson study plans is available in Appendix O15. This summary provides six models of practice designed for six children with ASD.

Similarly, a review of back issues of the Schoolwide Lesson Study Bulletins over the last 10 years provided examples of teaching practice for different children. Some reports had outlined the histories of schoolwide lesson study practices, they had addressed important policies, related theories and key abstract research questions, and they had provided descriptions of every ideal lesson conducted in the relative years. Research foci reflected either key issues highlighted in the MEXT documents or upcoming changes in national policy. These were linked to what all SA participants agreed was the leading role that the school plays, given its position attached to a national university. For example, the vice principal expected the SNEU teachers to inform outside schools about their practice through open lessons, school documentations, or publications. He said that the teachers need to be able to talk clearly about their practice, otherwise other people cannot understand the full picture of what they are doing. He expected the teachers at the school to theorise national policy and create good models available to teachers outside the school. The lesson study approach therefore helped the school to record numbers of teaching models that its staff developed, which were based on classroom practices and developed with different research foci each time. Mr Banba said during his Interview C that through lesson study engagement, teachers can look at their practice (i.e., life-skills unit) from the different research focus in each year and so can have deep understanding of what they are doing.

Notably, while the school had produced a number of valuable outcomes, one university professor (i.e., the lesson study supervisor) pointed to further possible improvements in SNEU practice. He claimed that the SNEU needed to clarify what social skills the children specifically with ASD need to improve, because the traditional practice of the life-skills unit was designed for children with ID. It therefore focused on internal aspects of children’s self-achievements and happiness but did not consider actual skills building. The professor argued that the SNEU needed to progress its planning on development of specific social skills in children from Years 1 to 6 to respond to a 2007 shift in education policy that seeks to address needs of children with
ASD. This concern reflects how, despite an ideal sugata and the support illustrated in Appendix O15 for developing the children’s social and communication skills, the primary focus of the SNEU’s practice was experience and process, not skills building of the children with ASD.

**Synthesis**

This section summarises key findings of the Japanese case study considered in this chapter in order to compare and contrast with the findings of the Australian case study considered in the next chapter. The section presents a summary for each of the nine ecological categories, with the framework it develops synthesising complex findings from discussion in both this chapter and the next chapter for the discussion of cross-case findings in Chapter 6.

**Teachers’ role.** Findings showed the link in educational values between the national curriculum and the school. Peer interactions and relationships were emphasised in the in-school stakeholders’ talks, which demonstrated the school’s focus on everyday problem solving and highlighted the teachers’ role in schoolwide lesson study. Group efforts in teaching between the SNEU and regular education were highlighted.

**Working through a day.** Findings point to the usefulness of combining data sets and analysis to understand the Japanese teachers’ typical day. A gap was found between the teachers’ perceptions (interviews) and actual practices (observations, reflection logs, and document reviews), but these findings helped the researcher to interpret the teachers’ talk and other data through cross-checking. For example, the Japanese teachers struggled to talk about their typical days because as they observed, for them “every day is different.” Observation data and teachers’ documentations confirmed these everyday variations in need for adjustment and flexibility to respond to the children’s requirements at the time. But these findings also suggest that their teaching days were highly structured and scheduled. The teachers provided parents with weekly schedule sheets showing variations across weeks and how they followed the schedule. Therefore, what would happen during the day was fundamentally predictable for the children with ASD in general. The environment surrounding the SNEU (i.e., within a regular education school) may also have made the SNEU school days more structured as school chimes and announcements were audible within the unit.

Moreover, the teachers reported their busy days and working until late to conduct their duties after school hours. They said they had not much time to communicate with other teachers, but progressive observations revealed considerable formal and informal communication among the teachers and showed intensive group implementation of lesson development. For the children with ASD, the teachers also emphasised communication with parents. The teachers’ views and everyday practice of their work with children with ASD were consistent with what in-school SA stakeholders expected their roles to be. First, both the teachers and the school administration considered every aspect of school life as learning. Both also highlighted the relationship among the children. Peer groups were routinely used in the school and in the SNEU,
and the SNEU had regular interacting opportunities with typically developing children, who visited the SNEU to support daily chores and as whole-school group activities were scheduled. SA confirmed that this approach is schoolwide.

**Working with a child with ASD.** The Japanese teachers had a strong sense of “doing things together”, which reflected their emphasis on building relationships through sharing experiences between the teachers and the children as well as among the children. This emphasis was common in the SA findings. The individual needs of the children with ASD were affected in the way the teachers worked with them across a teaching day; stronger need for daily living activities required teachers’ consistent supervision and support (SNEU1, Daichi), while advanced daily life skills required less direct support (e.g., providing only limited verbal prompts for older children in SNEU3). The school and SNEU also shared a common teaching practice of using peer groups and activities: Groups of children took responsibility to plan, implement, and evaluate activities as a team. The range of their responsibilities was expanded according to the children’s ages and abilities.

**Planning a lesson.** Findings revealed the teachers’ ongoing and intensive engagement in “improving a lesson tomorrow.” They repeated similar but revised group activities, held group reflections on the lessons, and made their ideal lesson specific and visualised. This progressive approach to lesson development appeared to show their focus on holistic understandings of the children’s actual conditions that changed over time. Their planning was based on visualising the future lesson scene, and they considered (a) learning tools and materials, (b) environmental settings, (c) articulation of possible interactions or events that would happen during lessons, and (d) teachers’ responses to the interactions and events. For their holistic approach to teacher practice, their group implementation of lesson development may be necessary in order to involve multiple eyes into understanding every aspect of the lesson scene. Because they inquired into what they can do better, their individual and group reflections on their lessons were critical to their practice in lesson development.

**Improving social situations.** The Japanese teachers manipulated group activities to enhance natural interactions, to develop peer relationships (i.e., sharing the same image and happy experiences of what they are doing) and to increase peer support (i.e., peer modelling, peer prompts, and peer instruction) among the children to support the class as whole. The teachers gave a lot of praise and employed scaffolding strategies to teach children to use peer support, while at the same time they worked to decrease their direct support. Through the process of developing peer-mediated environments, the teachers tried to establish a community for classmates in which the class can function without teachers’ guidance. These teachers also engaged in ongoing immediate reflection (i.e., formative assessment) on the children’s responses to the learning scene (e.g., interactions) and tried to anticipate their thoughts during the lessons.
Improving learning situations. The Japanese teachers used various supporting strategies to enhance children’s independence so they can complete their tasks themselves. These include particularly: (a) clear procedure, (b) visual cues, (c) manageable tools, and (d) music prompts. Their use of visual strategies, also used across the school, was clarified with the Head mentioning the TEEACH program. This may also imply that their practice is based more on everyday experiences than on findings from the literature. The teachers focused on adjusting levels of activities for each child to allow each child to acquire new skills and feel achievement. They differentiated support for the children by using different tools and materials or altering procedures among them. These adjustments were based on the teachers’ reflections on the children’s actual conditions and articulations of ideal sugata of those children during the lesson. These teachers were very responsive to the children’s learning and tried to encourage the children to think by themselves to find solutions. The children’s problem-solving skills were facilitated through real life experience manipulated by the teachers.

Each seitan lesson in the Japanese SNEU classrooms was to some extent similar to using social-skills training groups, which recent studies (e.g., Krasny et al., 2003) have found to be effective on school-aged children with ASD. Studies in the English-language literature have defined social-skills training groups as the interventions in which approximately four or five children with ASD participate in social-skills lessons taught by a teacher or therapist and work with other classmates (Bohlander et al., 2012). These interventions were designed with session topics in terms of targeted social skills and were likely to be activity-based to foster social interactions among children. In particular, the activity of jumbo cubic dices in SNEU1 was similar to the typical activity of Lego therapy used in these interventions, and the cooking activities in SNEU2 and SNEU3 were similar to the cooking activities described in Bohlander et al. (2012) as each member had an individual role (e.g., head chef, sous chef, and ingredient gatherer) in the group to complete the cooking collaboratively. The strategies for facilitating the children’s social initiations also appear to be somewhat similar to pivotal response training (e.g., waiting, prompting without verbal communications, and scaffoldings).

Valuing the child with ASD. The Japanese teachers consistently talked about holistic learning goals for a child with ASD, a position that reflects the school’s whole-person education values. The frequent appearance of these values in the teacher’s talk about daily practice, group instruction, and weekly feedback suggests that these values have guided how they teach and work with these children. Although the teachers spoke about specific social and communication skills, their primary focus was abstract (i.e., cultivating children’s hearts). They tried to describe the detail of ideal behaviours, interactions, and inner engagements of the children (i.e., ideal sugata) to address three abstract learning outcomes that involve development of the children’s social nature, engagement, and independence. These outcomes were not separate but were interrelated and had different descriptions according to children’s development levels: from one learning focus (e.g., individual achievements or one preferred friend) to multiple foci (e.g.,
group achievements or team work). The teachers also emphasised concern for class community as part of learning outcomes and highlighted fun and successful experiences of sharing experiences with peers. They said that their well-defined seitan lessons allow the children to share positive experiences through objects and activities with their peers, and to facilitate their three learning outcomes. The teachers reported the children’s achievements, but their assessments were reflective rather than systematic. They were likely to reflect on the frequency and quality of peer interactions as indicators of these three outcomes. The researcher’s video analysis of peer interactions confirmed that the children actually became more interactive and improved their ways of interacting with peers and that the class functioned without teachers’ support.

Valuing the teachers. Thematic analysis of teachers’ talk indicated the skills and knowledge that the teachers see to be essential for delivering “good” lessons—ability to understand the whole child, ideas for developing appropriate learning materials and environmental settings, skills and knowledge to use supporting strategies effectively, and comprehension of important theories. To respond to the children’s actual condition, the teachers emphasised the ability to look at the lesson scene from the children’s point of view. Because these conditions changed over time, the teachers needed to have the will to try continuously to improve lessons. The Inschool Lesson Study Newsletters provided teachers with important information about their lesson study focus and helped them to update their knowledge of the relevant policy and education literature. Importantly, their lesson study approach provided opportunities for them to implement this style of lesson development as a group. It helped the teachers to understand each child as a whole (i.e., the child’s actual conditions) by capturing every aspect or as much as possible of a lesson scene from different teachers’ points of view. It also trained the teachers to articulate the abstract context of their practice through collegial conversations.

Valuing the school. Findings showed the participating teacher’s view of school outcomes from the schoolwide lesson study practice. First, the teachers highlighted supportive environments at the school, comparing with environments at other schools. Second, the teachers appreciated the benefits of the schoolwide lesson study approach that helps teachers to look at their practice from the perspectives of different subject disciplines. This inquiry showed that this approach supported the development of a theoretical framework around teaching and learning through lesson study groups of teachers in different teaching areas engaging in their research on the same topic. This may be one reason why the teachers were willing to talk about their lessons with the teachers with different subject backgrounds (e.g., SNEU and regular education teaching areas). The schoolwide lesson study approach had also established historical records of lesson study practices, which provided the teachers with various examples of teaching practices. The school’s records showed that they implemented policy or theoretical interpretations into classroom practice using this approach. However, the lesson study
supervisor pointed that the SNEU research focus was strongly influenced by the school tradition, and it was therefore expected the SNEU would move to providing ASD-specific learning support as an issue that the most recent national policy change had addressed.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the researcher conducted observations of lessons at the SNEU only once a week. Some changes may therefore have been missed, although in reflection interviews the teachers were asked to reflect on their whole week. In fact, the vice principal highlighted the limitation of this approach and suggested observing just one teacher throughout a term because the process of creating a lesson is the strongest focus of their practice. However, the progressive observations and reflection interviews were found to be helpful for understanding what these Japanese special education teachers do over time with children with ASD in their classrooms. It was found that the teachers must engage in decision-making every day and that lessons are changed every time they are presented. In particular, employing video-clip examples in reflection interviews was effective for gaining understanding of what the teachers are doing with the children from the children’s points of view, because the teachers were able to clarify abstract expressions with the video examples when they spoke. It was found that the Japanese teachers came to enjoy watching these videos and talking about their practice and became able to articulate their practice across the weeks.

The Japanese case study analysis addressed how the embedding of holistic educational values in the teachers’ everyday practice shaped powerfully how they talked about and taught each child with ASD in their classrooms, as highlighted in the situational analysis. The teachers used broad terms and consistently talked about holistic learning goals for a child with ASD (i.e., cultivating children’s hearts). They were highly engaged with continuous improvement through a progressive process of articulating ideal lessons, which are responsive to actual conditions of each child (e.g., needs, abilities, interests, thoughts, and peer relationships). Because of the holistic learning goals of lesson development, the teachers valued pursuing it through group implementation, as the multiple eyes of other teachers can capture what one classroom teacher on their own cannot see while teaching their classes. Critical reflection can also help the teachers to develop ideal lessons. Importantly, their intensive approach to the schoolwide lesson study seemed to make it possible to put theories (or policy) into practice through inschool research focusing on classroom practice. The next chapter outlines findings from the Australian case.
CHAPTER FIVE: AUSTRALIAN CASE STUDY

This chapter presents the findings of the Australian case study analysis within the structure used in Chapter 4. Highlights of this chapter are discussed first, and then each research question is addressed. Key findings for each ecological category are summarised, for comparison and contrast with the Japanese findings in the following chapter. More detailed examples for this report are available in Appendix P.

Overview

The first section reports representative findings for the three aspects of teacher role, daily practice, and needs for children with ASD. For the three Australian teachers participating in this case study, it was clear that work has political, professional, and personal components (Noffke, 1997). The Australian teachers delivered lessons aligned with state curriculum and education policy (e.g., individualised plans) and worked within a special school system with an adult–child ratio higher (i.e., 2 children per one adult) than both the Japanese site of this inquiry (i.e., 5 children per one adult) and the Australian regular school system (i.e., 16 children per one adult; Chilcott, 2014). These teachers were trained and expected to work as specialist educators in small classes that include children with ASD. The schoolwide approach of positive behaviour support (PBS) expected the teachers to “stay on the same page” and work with practitioners in allied fields related to ASD/intellectual disabilities (ID). The teachers’ views and opinions about teaching children with ASD contained impacts of their different personal backgrounds.

Interviews with the teachers revealed that they frequently encountered unpredicted events in their scheduled day (e.g., a child with ASD slept in, practitioners’ sessions changed, and unexpected visitors talked to the teachers at some time in almost every observed lesson). The researcher’s direct observations and reflection interviews with the teachers confirmed the gaps between what the teachers planned for the day and what they actually implemented during the day. However, these teachers considered changes in their schedules as part of everyday happenings and did not regard these everyday adjustments as improvements to their practice as the Japanese teachers did.

The second section details what these participating teachers said about their classroom teaching and cross-checks with what they were actually doing with children with ASD during
group lessons in terms of three aspects of teaching a lesson: planning, implementing, and evaluating. Unlike the Japanese participating teachers, these Australian teachers distinguished clearly between curriculum planning and everyday planning, and appeared to engage in the cyclic steps of planning, implementing, and evaluating a lesson separately. These views were shared among the Australian teachers, and were very specific and explicit about what the teachers were doing with children with ASD because the teachers employed terminologies well established in the English-language evidence-based practice (EBP) literature. The researcher’s observations confirmed their use of these specific strategies. Reflection interviews conducted with the teachers at the end of the lesson observation days were reasonable substitutes for the Key Moment interviews conducted with the Japanese teachers, without video-clip examples for this case study (see Chapter 3). This interview method was effective in encouraging the Australian teachers to identify notable moments and explain what they were doing and why they were doing so. The method was particularly useful in addressing Research Questions (RQs) 2 and 3, as it helped the researcher to choose video moments that demonstrated what these teachers said about what they were doing with children with ASD. Importantly, some video examples were available to show mismatches between what they said and what they actually were doing. At the same time, there were some conceptual, term-meaning gaps between interview questions and the Australian teachers’ verbal expression (e.g., collaboration and team work, lesson and learning experience). Key terms, including some concerning perceptions on teacher work and practice, are introduced throughout this chapter.

Personal differences were found in what the teachers said during interviews. The teachers’ work with different age groups (i.e., Prep or Junior/Middle school ages) showed alignment with Early Years Curriculum and Queensland Curriculum, Assessment and Report Framework (QCARF). Ms Deanne highlighted more holistic and broader learning goals in her teaching for the Prep children, while Ms Eden and Ms Fleck emphasised more focused learning goals in their Junior to Junior/Middle children. However, the direct observations revealed that all teachers used individualised and focused learning goals and instructions across the learning areas indicated in the state curriculum. These observations also showed that the three teachers took different approaches to assess children’s learning outcomes. That is, Ms Deanne took photographs demonstrating developments of each child across learning areas as a part of assessment in the context of early year practice for infant classes, while the two primary teachers employed Goal Attainment Scale (GAS, see RQ2 section) to produce quantitative measurements on targeted learning areas.

The third section shows that valued outcomes for children with ASD, the teachers, and school were closely aligned and interrelated. All of the Australian teachers were explicit about a target child’s achievements and were satisfied with outcomes from their current practice. Although Ms Eden, a second year teacher, expressed some self-doubt in her ability to organise her work, these teachers tended to be confident about their teaching capabilities. Because the
school emphasised PBS and other recommended practices, the teachers believed that good teachers display specialist skills and knowledge in PBS and in strategies effective for teaching children with ASD, based on the literature and developed through a wider professional development network.

The individual teachers employed age-appropriate practice for children with ASD. Ms Deanne (Australian Teacher 1: AT1) was focused on foundational skills and knowledge (e.g., awareness of self and others), Ms Eden (AT2) emphasised group participation and communication skills, with some literacy and numeracy skills, and Ms Fleck (AT3) highlighted more academic skills and knowledge (ICT, literacy and numeracy, and cooking) while negotiating group participation with Cate (Australian child with ASD 3: AA3) or facilitating independence in David (AA4). Although these Australian teachers expressed the importance of peer relationships, the findings from direct observations were not consistent with what they said. They were less likely to encourage peer interactions during group lessons and were more likely to support the children with ASD to engage in individual skills-building tasks during a group lesson.

**RQ1: Daily Practice**

This section examines findings related to the first research question:

*What makes up the daily practice of special education teachers working with children with ASD?*

Table 5.1 summaries the teachers’ teaching qualifications and past experiences in special education that varied. All teachers were professionally well-prepared with special education degrees. Ms Deanne and Ms Fleck had intensive teaching experiences in special education settings, while Ms Eden was a novice teacher with recent specialist training and extensive experience with people with disabilities.

Variations in individual experiences appeared to contribute to the teachers’ personal opinions during interviews. For example, Ms Fleck, who was new to the school and had taught in mainstream classrooms, tended to discuss differences of teaching practice between special and mainstream school. Ms Deanne, who has been working in the site school longer than the other two teachers, discussed her leadership role in the school and her role as a mentor teacher for Ms Eden. These personal differences appeared more evidently among the Australian teachers than the Japanese teachers.
Table 5.1  
*Demographic Summary of the Australian Teacher Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching experience (Special Education)</th>
<th>Other experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Diploma of Education (Primary and special); Bachelor of Education (Regular); Master of Education (Research)</td>
<td>10 years and 3 months (the 11th year) including 5 years as a head of special education unit</td>
<td>5 years as an advisory visiting teacher at mainstream classrooms; 6 months as a senior policy officer at the Central Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Advanced Diploma of Fine Arts (Ceramics); Bachelor of Education (Special education)</td>
<td>1 year and 3 months (The 2nd year)</td>
<td>10 years as disability support officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Diploma of Teaching (Primary and special); Bachelor of Social Science (Psychology)</td>
<td>12 years and 3 months (the 13th year) including 5 years as a support teacher at mainstreaming classrooms</td>
<td>1 year as regular education teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows a higher adult–child ratio in the Australian site (i.e., 53.3%, one adult per two children). Unlike the Japanese classrooms, one or two extra adults (i.e., teacher aides) were available for each classroom teacher, not only to assist children’s school life in general (i.e., toileting, nappy change, feeding, and playground supervision) but also to assist children’s learning activities during lessons (i.e., prompting, encouraging, and physically supporting to do activities). These adults held disability-related certificates (e.g., teacher aides, aged care, or disability worker) except for Adult4 and Adult8 who had nursing degrees and Adult7 who was a practicum student working with Ms Deanne (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.2  
*The Australian Classroom Context in the School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher code</th>
<th>Age group of children</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of children with ASD</th>
<th>Number of adults</th>
<th>Adult–child ratio (^a)</th>
<th>Others (Full-time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>4-6 years old (Prep)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3–5 (0.6)</td>
<td>Two teacher aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>9-10 years old (Junior)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1–2 (0.5)</td>
<td>Two teacher aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>7-11 years old (Junior/Middle)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1–2 (0.5)</td>
<td>One teacher aide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Adult refers to a person who supports the children in the classroom during the lesson observation, and the ratio is based on formal documentation about staffing during classroom observations.

Table 5.3 shows that most full-time teacher aides had considerable experience working with children with ASD in the site school except for Adult4. Such experienced teacher aides usually did not require basic instruction from their classroom teachers and sometimes provided ideas about classroom instruction or support from what they witnessed while working with different teachers. It was observed that these paraprofessionals, who did not have teacher
qualifications, spent more time with the children with ASD than the teachers did, and were occasionally active in teaching.

Table 5.3
Demographic Summary of Teacher Aides in the Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Who works with</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching/ supporting experience</th>
<th>Classroom role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Certificate IV (Disability Work &amp; Child Protection)</td>
<td>7 years as a teacher aide (this school only)</td>
<td>Teacher aide&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Certificate III (Teacher Aide)</td>
<td>8 years as a teacher aide (this school only)</td>
<td>Teacher aide&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Certificate III (Teacher Aide)</td>
<td>7 years as a teacher aide (this school only)</td>
<td>Teacher aide&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing</td>
<td>First year as a teacher aide</td>
<td>Teacher aide&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>Certificate (Aged Care &amp; Disabilities)</td>
<td>20 years in special education settings&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Teacher aide&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT1, AT2, AT3</td>
<td>Certificate III (Teacher Aide)</td>
<td>First year as a relief teacher aide</td>
<td>Relief teacher aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Third year university student</td>
<td>(Practicum student)</td>
<td>Teacher aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing</td>
<td>Temporary volunteer from Japan</td>
<td>Teacher aide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Full-time teacher aides; <sup>b</sup>Adult5 worked as a teacher aide in special schools and as a care worker in after school care and early childhood care.

Table 5.4 presents child pseudonyms, gender, and ASD diagnosis. Each class included at least one child with ASD. The primary category of disability for special placement in this school was ID, and all children at the school had ID. By comparison with the Japanese classes, classes in the Australian special school required more intensive support, especially the classes of Ms Deanne and Ms Eden. Class membership changed during the school year. All children in Ms Fleck’s class, except David, were new to the school in Term 2, having transferred from mainstream classrooms in regular education schools in pursuit of an effective and safe environment to achieve their learning goals. This irregular occurrence provided extra opportunities for the researcher to see one example of how the Australian teachers actually worked with a new class, because Ms Eden and Ms Deanne had completed their initial plans in Term 1.

When a majority of children was absent, Ms Deanne’s class was combined with Ms Eden’s class. The lesson followed Ms Eden’s schedule with her teacher aides plus one of Ms Deanne’s teacher aides. More irregular changes occurred in Ms Deanne’s class because she had a university practicum student for four weeks during this field research (Note. The student took some learning blocks to instruct the class) and also because she worked outside her classroom as an acting deputy principal and worked in the classroom only one whole day and one half day during each week of the last two weeks of the field research.
Table 5.4

Demographic Summary of Children in the Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ASD Diagnosis</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Age(^a) (Yrs:Mths)</th>
<th>Intensive needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA1</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>Consistent supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA2</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA3</td>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Junior/Middle</td>
<td>7:0</td>
<td>Consistent supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA4</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Junior/Middle</td>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC1</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>6:0</td>
<td>Wheel-chair/intensive daily support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC4</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC5</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9:8</td>
<td>Wheel-chair/intensive daily support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC6</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>Intensive daily support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC7</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC8</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>Intensive daily support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC9</td>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>8:7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC10</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior/Middle</td>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC11</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Junior/Middle</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Months were added for the Australian case because of the wider age range of the children.

To some degree, these conditions resulted in an irregular frequency of lesson observations (i.e., no observation during some weeks, but multiple observations during other weeks; see Appendix P1). In addition, follow-up conversations with these teachers at the end of the 2011 school year (i.e., the year of conducting this field research) confirmed continuing variations in classroom enrolment throughout the school year. For example, one child moved from Ms Eden’s to Ms Fleck’s class from Term 3, and one child in Ms Fleck’s class left the school after Term 3. Constant changes in child enrolments and the uncertainty this entailed were a feature of the Australian case, but not of the Japanese case where enrolments remained steady.

Table 5.5

Data Sources Used to Address RQ1 in the Australian Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily practice</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T Documents</th>
<th>SA Interviews</th>
<th>SA Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with a child with ASD</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Documents: Teaching documents; 2SA Interviews: Situational Analysis Interviews; 3SA documents: Situational Analysis Documents; o: Primary data source; v: Supplementary data source.

Table 5.5 shows three aspects of daily practice (i.e., teacher role, working through a day, and working with a child with ASD). It also shows primary and supplementary data sets employed for each aspect. Everyday variations and adjustments as responses to behaviours of children with ASD were addressed during Interview A. Findings here were consistent with
First, this section discusses various views about the special educators’ specialist role emerging from situational analysis (SA) interviews with both inside and outside classroom stakeholders. These SA interviews also inform findings in the later sections of this chapter for RQs 2 and 3. Information from SA was used to contextualise classroom teaching of the participating teachers from different layers of perspectives (i.e., classroom, school, and state). Second, the section presents scheduling of teaching days not only for classroom teaching but also for other duties (e.g., noncontact hour for paperwork and formal breaks). It revealed variations in classroom contexts during a school day. It also highlighted more extensive communications with various people of different backgrounds (e.g., parents, therapists, guidance officers, and school administration staff) in contrast to the Japanese teachers who had more communication with other teachers. Third, the section presents that the teachers’ working day was structured with practice recommended in the English-language literature (e.g., reward charts, routines, visual cues, and choice making), which the teacher participants discussed explicitly during the first semistructured interviews (Interview A) and which was consistent with evidence from the researcher’s teacher observations. The section also shows the variety of learning activities indicated in document reviews, which were observed during this inquiry.

**The teachers’ role**

All stakeholders during SA interviews emphasised the unique needs of individual children with ASD and stressed the teachers’ role in better understanding each child with ASD. Stakeholders’ talk and situational analysis of school policy also highlighted expectations about authentic learning. The school policy identified key learning areas that were expected to appear in the teachers’ individual plans for each child with ASD. These key learning areas included a wide range of learning goals related to behaviours, communication, decision making (i.e., choice making), play and recreation skills (e.g., reciprocal play, turn taking, and following rules of games), social skills (i.e., social tolerance and coping skills), and self-care (i.e., independence). Moreover, the principal of this school highlighted age-appropriate educational programs for children with ASD and significant ID and discussed age-appropriate environment at the school: Children of Prep to Junior classes played in the sandpit, those of Middle classes played in the adventure playground, and those of Senior classes played in the plain playground. This aspect of age-appropriate environment and programs appeared to be considered important for successful social inclusion of children with ASD because “it is important that these children and young people become as less obvious as possible in the community” (Australian principal’s interview).

SA interviews with inschool stakeholders, particularly the school principal and deputy principal, highlighted the high expectations of the Australian special educators as “specialists” with strong knowledge and skills based on practice recommended in the literature and with a
high level of engagement and independence in ongoing professional development. These expectations were aligned with the school emphasis on PBS and functional behaviour analysis and with parents’ expectations of the school.

I find that … parents of children with autism often have very strong interest and knowledge in the [children’s] condition themselves … [They] expect me to be up to date with recent research—not just around teaching and curriculum but also around the research about what might cause autism or the various treatments, which might be from a medical sense, from a natural sense, from a dietary sense and so on. So that probably takes me into the role of my teachers with children with autism. I think it’s important for me to be abreast of the best-practice teaching approaches. And in this particular school, that would include positive behaviour support, functional behaviour analysis, multi component planning and understanding the sensory implications of autism, the issues around communicative intent, the issues around the range of communication modalities and strategies that students with autism may require in order to be able to communicate effectively. (Australian Principal)

High expectations may come from the school’s selective employment process for the teachers. The school principal said that the school chooses who works at the school, which was not common in Queensland state schools. The principal and deputy principal perceived their leadership role at the school in terms of increasing the school budget to have funding for more resources including staff, learning and teaching materials, more specialist support, and more inschool professional development. They shared views on “best” teaching practice, the need for wider knowledge of recent research on children with ASD, and interest in guiding all staff—all teachers and others—in the same direction. For example, the school principal read the most recent articles and emailed the most important information to the teachers. She also highlighted the importance of facilitating a positive approach across the school by educating new staff about the “school culture” based on PBS.

I think that … it’s increasingly important for principals to be up to date with the literature of the research for the best practice, to know and to be willing to coach and mentor to all their staff, and to make sure we are embedding best practice in school policy and culture. If you can get a cultural situation in your school where best practice is embedded, then you can take your eyes off the ball for a little while because you know it’s there and it’s going to keep happening. (Australian Principal)

Similarly, these school administration staff stressed the importance of training teacher aides as the key persons for delivering educational programs. Given the teachers’ role in training these teacher aides in their classrooms, the school also provided professional development workshops for these paraprofessionals. The following examples also indicate that the changing enrolment of children, and therefore extra turnover in staff members (teacher aides) at the school, changed during the school year. For example, as noted above some children with ASD were transferred from mainstream schools as they became unable to cope with that environment. These class transformations in the middle of school year required the teachers to modify their educational programs for their classrooms.

I think that teachers are pretty well trained and certainly improve their knowledge if they have a child. I certainly did improve my knowledge of autism itself. But the teacher aides often don’t have that knowledge and don’t have access to that training. And they’re the ones who are implementing the program most of the time, so [training for teacher aides] is pretty important. (Australian Deputy Principal)
We’ve grown by 10 per cent this year since February, and it’s only June … [We are] almost constantly hiring new teacher aides, and even though most of them are trained through a Certificate III type, of course, their understanding of what autism is really, is quite shallow or not existent. (Australian Principal)

Moreover, a data-driven teaching approach was discussed by all SA participants who were inschool stakeholders (i.e., school administration staff and the speech therapist) as the important method to develop and implement “best” practice for the particular child with ASD, based on a clear understanding of the reasoning and theories underpinning this practice. For example, the deputy principal expected the teachers to use more quantitative data to guide their teaching, although he admitted the practical difficulty in implementing such a practice given the current work load.

I would expect … more data-driven, more evidence-based practice. The teachers are great at setting up the ecology, the setting for these children to function. But they are often intuitive … But really, sometimes you need to put some numbers down to say, ‘well he does this here but he doesn’t do it here’. So a bit more data would come in handy for them … know it’s hard … When I was teaching and was with someone, I knew that the child needs [a particular thing]; therefore I’m going to do it. But I often didn’t have the proof behind that. (Australian Deputy Principal)

The school speech therapist indicated a clear view of the difference in professional roles between the teacher and the therapist. Specifically, the speech therapist said that she was in charge when referring teachers to appropriate resources and providing the class with intensive formal training sessions for social language skills and communication skills about feelings. She also mentioned her role in connecting the teachers to the wider support network outside Education Queensland (e.g., Autism Queensland and pathologists from the local child hospital). In contrast, the therapist expected the teacher to provide background information about the communication needs of individual children with ASD. She said that younger children’s nonverbal expressions and high needs in many areas made the therapist reliant on the teachers giving an accurate picture of children to guide appropriate skills building. Therefore, consultation and collaboration between the teachers and the therapist were essential to provide effective educational programming for individual children with ASD. Moreover, the therapist expected the teachers to do follow-up instruction on the skills-building targeted during the therapist’s intensive training session.

I’m very reliant on teachers to give me a lot of background information on the student, to give me a direction to work on with the students because these students are often difficult to be directly assessed by me in special school settings, because they’ve got such high needs … A direct assessment wouldn’t give me an accurate picture so the teachers are really important in giving me that accurate picture of the children, which guides my therapy for these children. So then I work with the students on that one particular area that the teacher wants to train … For example … I provide formal training session for 20–30 minutes with PECS (Picture Exchange Communication System), and Ms Deanne follows it up in the classroom in daily situation. In normal daily situations where children may want something, Ms Deanne directs them to use the PECS books. Hopefully what they learn from the intensive session will be transferred over to that. (Australian Speech Therapist)

However, the speech therapist also indicated the different ways of working with different teachers according to what support the teachers wanted from her. In the case of Ms Eden, the therapist started by exploring the needs of the children because Ms Eden’s request was more
generic and broader than the requests of the other two more experienced teachers. Ms Eden asked the therapist for “support for communication skills”. After finding the right direction for each child, the therapist demonstrated group activities such as language stimulation or oral motor activities in smaller groups, and then instructed Ms Eden about how to do it by herself. In addition, the therapist highlighted an increase in her involvement in direct classroom teaching and face-to-face interactions with the teachers in recent years.

Interviews with teacher aides of this school highlighted a close relationship with their classroom teachers to support children with ASD throughout the school day. Elements of good relationships emerging from their interviews included having good and open communication and understanding how each other works, because different people have different perspectives and pursue things differently. Adult1, the most experienced teacher aide (i.e., seven years at the site school), explained her ways of working with the individual teachers to support children with ASD and stressed that children with ASD need to work with a range of people at different times. However, this teacher aide also noted that she and the teacher “work on the same page and same goals” because they might have different staff in their next classrooms.

I also found that I had a lot of conversations because sometimes I am not sure how Ms Eden wants me to work. It’s quite easy to speak to her, so I’ll try to find a solution … If I found him (Ben) having an extraordinary day, we discussed it during the day. (Adult3)

Using the same resources makes a big difference when we want to get young persons used to different people. It helps and makes it easier if they use the same resources such as toys and reading books and if they teach the child in the same way with the same methods. (Adult1)

In particular, one significant role of these teacher aides was “reading the minds” of younger children with ASD (i.e., AT1 and AT2) by interpreting the children’s behaviours because these younger children were often unable to communicate their feelings and needs. Therefore, a teacher was able to decide how she conducts the teaching day or adjusts her approach to a particular child with ASD. The researcher observed that these teacher aides provided the teachers with feedback about the children during time when the teachers were not with the class (e.g., toileting, break time, and noncontact hour).

I talked to Ms Deanne about how Anne was going. It’s mainly in the morning that we talked about what sort of day today would be after seeing kids in the classroom on the day. We talked about whether they are tired, angry, upset, and happy. We just have quick conversations throughout the day about if she’s a bit tired today and if we push her too hard. It’s mainly about where Anne’s at and what we’re going to do with her today. (Adult1)

**Everyday structure: working though a day**

A tabular summary of the Australian schedule revealed variations in time and activities among the teachers. Unlike in the Japanese case, here it has been impossible to summarise all the teachers’ days into one table. Three detailed tables were developed for each teacher’s typical schedule. The researcher’s observations revealed that the classrooms of the three Australian teachers were well structured with many visual cues (e.g., PECS and visualised schedules). The teachers arranged child desks or group tables according to their understanding of children’s
preferences and needs. For example, Ms Eden said that Ben did not engage in learning activities when sitting close to Kathy, and Ms Deanne said that Anne needed a clear and visible change from activity to activity.

Table 5.6 shows one example to outline a brief overview of Ms Eden’s typical day at the site school. This choice appeared most comparable to the Japanese practice illustrated in Chapter 4 in terms of the children’s age and the needs of her class and her teaching emphasis. Table 5.6 shows that Ms Eden’s teaching day was very structured and was systematised with a reward system that the other two teachers also used. More specifically, the day was purposely designed with two choice-time sessions, during which each child engaged in his or her preferred activities chosen at the end of morning circle time. The system was embedded in classroom instructions to motivate individual children with ASD. It also helped Ms Eden to implement individual focused instructions. That is, while the children were focused on their favourite activities, Ms Eden could allocate time to one specific child for academic instruction and assessment. This example from Ms Eden about the choice-time session also applied to Ms Deanne’s class structure.

Basically, I am alone with these six children during the time. They can choose what they want during this free time, but at the same time, I have to write everybody’s diaries to home. Everybody has to bring it with them when they pack up their school bags. So there is an alternative motive there. I make sure that these people are occupied and then I can get these things done as fast as possible and get back on board with them (AT2’s Interview A).

Moreover, Table 5.6 shows that the class worked mainly with the classroom teachers and teacher aides. Other people also worked with the classes across the day and week. All classes had three learning session blocks in the morning, middle, and afternoon. The younger classes of Ms Deanne and Ms Eden had one session divided into two sets because the teachers believed that these children required more varied activities to maintain their learning engagement and also because teacher aides gave toilet assistance or training during the first set of each learning block. Ms Deanne in particular observed that these children’s high needs in daily life skills unsettled the classroom learning environment, with people coming in and out all the time, which resulted in less focused learning structures during the unsettled time. Similarly, morning tea and lunch time were set separately from break time in younger classes as the children required more time and direct assistance with meals. In contrast, Ms Fleck tended to programme continued learning activities throughout each session block and even extended the learning time into each morning tea and lunch time for the younger classes, because the children in her class were more independent in daily life skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule for all</th>
<th>Note (place, activities)</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>School bus arrives</td>
<td>Pick up their children at the bus stop. Some children come with parents.</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Morning Preparation Time (e.g., unpack bags)</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom.</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.30</td>
<td><strong>Morning Circle Time</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom. Group activity for hello, feelings and weather, confirming today’s schedule, setting individual rewards, &amp; story time. Toileting with teacher aides. Swimming lesson (M: 9.00–11.15).</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30–10.00</td>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong> (W: Whole Junior lesson; Tu/Th/F: Lesson for each class)</td>
<td>Own classroom or other place (W: AT1’s room) Group activity after all children finish their toileting: Craft/communication (Tu), music (W), craft (Th), &amp; bike riding (F).</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day); speech therapist (Tu); all juniors and Deputy Principal (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00–10.30</td>
<td><strong>Child Morning Tea</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom.</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30–11.15</td>
<td>Outside Play 1</td>
<td>Playground. Toileting (11.00–11.15).</td>
<td>Teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15–11.45</td>
<td><strong>Session 2-A</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom. Individually focused academic learning for literacy (Tu/F) &amp; Maths (W) or group activity for HPE© (Th) &amp; life-skills learning (M).</td>
<td>AT2 (except Th); teacher aides (every day); other teacher (Th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45–12.00</td>
<td><strong>Session 2-B</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom or other place. Group activity with AT2 for SOSE© &amp; literacy (story) or with other teachers for Arts (W), HPE (Th), &amp; Music (F).</td>
<td>AT2 (M/Tu/F); teacher aides (every day); other teacher (W/Th/F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00–12.30</td>
<td><strong>Child Lunch</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom.</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30–13.00</td>
<td>Outside Play 2</td>
<td>Playground.</td>
<td>AT2 (only one day); teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00–13.30</td>
<td><strong>Session 3-A</strong></td>
<td>Own classroom. Individual favourite activity as a reward for the day.</td>
<td>AT2 (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30–14.30</td>
<td><strong>Session 3-B</strong></td>
<td>Not own classroom. Group activity from 14.00 after all children finish their toileting: Stretching, ranging, playing outside with rules, walking in the park, interactive stories.</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30–14.40</td>
<td><strong>Going Home Preparation</strong> (e.g., pack bags)</td>
<td>Own classroom. Daily prizes, group activity for singing goodbye</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.40</td>
<td><strong>Going Home</strong></td>
<td>School bus stop/parents</td>
<td>AT2 and teacher aides (every day).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ms Eden had her noncontact hour (Wednesday 11.45 am–13:00 pm, Thursday 11 am–11.45 am); ©HPE: Health and Physical Education; ®SOSE: Studies of Society and Environment.*
Although the Australian participating teachers had set schedules, what the teachers actually engaged in on the day often differed from the original schedules. These frequent changes in the schedules made it impossible to summarise how many hours they spent on each type of learning activity. The irregular changes, noted in the researcher’s reflection logs (see Appendix J1), resulted mainly through responding to the conditions of children in the class (e.g., health, moods, and behaviours). In addition, many learning sessions scheduled with other teachers or outside school practitioners (e.g., therapists and guidance officer) contributed their individual factors to scheduling variations. Subjective manual coding and objective Leximancer analysis of Interview A transcriptions also showed that the teachers’ teaching days varied every day (see details in Appendices M2 and P2). The segments coded as “everyday variations” in manual coding also revealed irregular events or situations happening in classrooms. This unsettled environment included (a) starting a new class in the middle of the year, (b) changes in classroom dynamics, and (c) visitors in and out of classrooms on a daily basis (e.g., senior-aged students coming to take orders from teachers and teacher aides for their in-school café, principal visiting and greeting the classes, and teachers of other classes coming to confirm the day’s schedule).

These Australian teachers also said that they spent a lot of time on other duties (e.g., paperwork, regular administrative meetings, daily communication, programming and preparation, assessment and reflection, and supervisions for buses). The researcher’s direct observations did not show the Australian teachers spent a lot of time on these duties at school. As soon as the children went home by school buses, these teachers left the school once they reorganised their classroom setting for the next day. It appeared that they preferred to do their work at home. The quality and content of paperwork produced for class and individual programs suggested that the teachers put great effort into these duties (Appendix I1). In addition, these teachers also needed to prepare learning materials for everyday activities.

I usually don’t [write my reflection], because I’m thinking and doing at the same time and because there’re so many resources that have to be made for planning. Even though I’ve done the whole semester plan, I have to do many things for my daily planning. (AT2’s Interview A)

Although these Australian teachers consistently said that they worked independently in their role as classroom teachers, the researcher observed informal communications among the teachers. Asking the teachers about any collaborative interactions for planning during reflection interviews also suggested that these teachers had many interactions and collaborative work with various people across the observation weeks (ObWks; see Table 5.7). In particular, when the teachers talked about interaction with other people, the teacher aides’ contributions appeared to be essential for the teachers to deliver a successful day. The researcher also observed that the teachers and teacher aides had quick conversations about the day’s plan in the morning and debriefed classroom events or child learning and behaviours throughout the school day. The Australian teachers also endorsed the importance of communicating with other teachers about the day’s schedule in the morning when they planned to have combined learning sessions (e.g.,
music) or to have other teachers come into the classroom for teaching (e.g., Arts lessons and relief teacher on their absent days). In addition, the teachers of younger classes (AT1 and AT2) viewed preparations in the morning as critical for these children, who required more structured time to maintain their learning focus and appropriate behaviours.

Table 5.7
Total Frequency of Collaborative Interactions and Work Related to Planning in ObWks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Ms Deanne</th>
<th>Ms Eden</th>
<th>Ms Fleck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher aides</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher colleagues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Deputy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physio therapist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number indicates the number of formal interactions that they had with each category of persons during the observation weeks. The teacher colleagues included all different teachers.

Table 5.7 suggests that Ms Eden has more interactions than the other teachers with the school principal or deputy principal. As Ms Eden was an early career teacher, she received more guidance for teaching-related duties such as Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and curriculum development. Moreover, Ms Deanne had more interactions with physiotherapists, since her younger children, with and without ASD, required more foundational motor skills. In contrast, one therapeutic session for Ms Eden and Ms Fleck with the physiotherapist was for children without ASD who were in wheelchairs. Very frequent sessions with the speech therapist in Ms Eden’s class indicated that the children’s high needs in communication skills required more intensive therapist supports. This finding was consistent with what the speech therapist said in her SA interview. The advice the teachers obtained from these allied therapists is discussed later in this chapter for RQs 2 and 3.

Everyday approach: working with a child with ASD

The text segments of Interview A coded as “everyday approach” (i.e., the second ecological category of RQ1; see Table 5.5) indicated that the Australian teachers were focused on “dealing with behaviours” across a day. The teachers said that children’s behaviours impacted on everyday teaching and, therefore that they observed a child’s mood to modify the way of delivering the lessons. High ranking appearance of the “behaviour” concept in a Leximancer concept map also indicated that Ms Deanne and Ms Fleck were highly concerned about children’s behaviours in their class teaching (see Appendix M2). The researcher’s observation of their class interactions showed that the children with ASD in these two classes frequently demonstrated destructive behaviours that interfered with classroom activities. In contrast, Ms Eden talked less about behaviours because no child demonstrated this type of behaviours in her class. She mentioned behaviours in terms of how to facilitate Ben’s group participation.
During Interview A, the Australian teachers highlighted instructional needs for responding to the nature of unsettled environment in their classrooms as ways of addressing needs of children with ASD. They viewed behaviours of children with ASD as the children attempting to communicate negative feelings. For example, Ms Deanne said that Anne’s health on the day affected this child’s learning on that day. As a teacher, she needed to let this child sleep when the child appeared to be tired and displayed acting-out behaviours (e.g., screaming, crying, and throwing objects); otherwise, Anne had seizures. At the same time, Ms Deanne needed to keep other children safe in the classroom. Ms Deanne was concerned that Anne’s sleeping pattern resulted in skipping the learning activity planned for her, as the researcher observed. For example, in ObWk6, Anne slept during a morning session to lunch time and had her lunch during the midsession. This finding about ways to avoid social conflicts was consistent among all Australian participating teachers, who the researcher observed to be proactive and responsive to individual needs of children with ASD and to make efforts to interpret functional reasons behind the children’s behaviours.

I’m using contact, touch, eye contact, or whatever I’ve got to make sure that the kids don’t need to resolve their behaviours to tell me that they’ve had enough or whatever. (AT1’s Interview A)

To deal with such behavioural needs, all Australian teachers said that they employed a reward system, which was a core feature of their classroom management. The researcher then observed that especially at the transitioning time from one learning context to another, the teachers consistently negotiated with the children who have ASD about what tasks the children need to do at the time and then what preferred activity they can do after that. The researcher observed that these teachers used clear instructions to show the children the end of each activity or event. The teachers said that they used this method to reduce the anxiety level of children with ASD at the beginning of a lesson or of a new task; the children were then able to start engaging in what the teachers had planned for them to do. Moreover, during Interview A, the teachers explained that they held clear but different expectations of learning for the individual children with ASD. These different learning expectations were associated with different contexts (e.g., break time, choice time, learning time, and group time). One example shows how Ms Deanne facilitated Anne’s understanding of particular classroom expectation. That is, Ms Deanne tried to be an instructional model to teacher aides by demonstrating how she wanted the teacher aides to deal with Anne’s behaviours at the right moment.

I talk more to Adult1, Adult2, or other teacher aides. We’ve been talking about Anne probably often being tired or our different ways of talking to her. That came up a few weeks back when she was throwing things a lot. It’s about how to get along with that. Certainly, with Anne, consequences are always that she needs to pick things up after throwing them. But the way to say that to her needs to be consistent, and we don’t go to pick them up. We actually spend quite a bit of time on that (until Anne picks up). I am sort of actually modelling [for teacher aides]. Pointing a finger at the things and standing with voice up—it’s not like that. It’s like, “Um, we have to go pick it up now.” It’s a kind of instruction in manners. (AT1’s Interview A)

During Interview A, all teachers talked about strategies related to specific approaches on social skills training (SST) involving prompting; choice making; environment settings and scaffolding; PBS applying positive reinforcement, preventive strategies, and functional assessment of
behaviours; and visual supporting mechanisms (e.g., visual schedule and PECS). The researchers’ teacher observations found that these teachers consistently used these strategies across a school day. In particular, these teachers highlighted their high use of promoting to encourage children with ASD to engage in daily routines and activities. The teachers also employed prompting strategies to facilitate children with ASD to make a request for what they want or to express their feelings. This use of prompting strategy is similar to strategies used in pivotal response treatment (PRT) as teachers tried to encourage the children to take social initiatives to the adults. It is also similar to findings in the literature about teaching children situated-based emotions (e.g., McHugh, Bobarnac, & Reed, 2011).

We spend a lot of time on nonacademic instructions. It’s not only about social skills training. Life skills are definitely [we spend a lot on], because we’ve got four students here still at toilet training. We’ve got students who have needs. Because one of our students has severe seizures, we have to spend a lot of time with him. We’ve got a student who [has to be fed by adult] ... So most of my day is not academic. I also spend a lot of time on facilitating instructions throughout the day, like prompting and encouraging. (AT2’s Interview A)

Moreover, the researcher’s observations revealed that the teacher aides were the primary persons who provided direct and close care of children with ASD during most of the school day. In contrast, the teachers led the class throughout the school day and instructed the teacher aides about what the teachers wanted to do with the class and with each child during a learning session. In addition, the researcher recognised through progressive observations that the teachers appeared to spend more time organising classroom ecology (i.e., which staff would work with whom and which children would work with which peers) in earlier weeks of field research than in the later weeks. These observations also identified that teachers put in extra time and effort when relief teacher aides new to the class joined the class. This finding was consistent with the teachers’ self-report during interviews.

**RQ2: Group Instruction**

This section examines findings related to the second research question:

*How do special education teachers use “group instruction” to teach children with ASD?*

To address this research question, the researcher used information from the second semistructured interviews with the teachers (Interview B) as the main source of data. The researcher analysed the transcriptions of Interview B according to the three ecological categories of RQ2 used as the initial categories for analysing the Japanese data discussed in Chapter 4. Table 5.8 summarises the distribution of text topics in initial analysis of the Australian transcriptions of Interview B. It shows that the overlapping texts of Ms Eden and Ms Fleck across these three categories were similar to those for the three Japanese teachers of this inquiry. In contrast, Ms Deanne’s text did not show much overlap. This difference may indicate that Ms Deanne had a clearer view of plan–implement–evaluate steps of teaching and was able to discuss these teaching steps separately, unlike the other two teachers. Ms Deanne said that
once she set her learning and behavioural goals she did not modify her plans because she was very confident about what strategies worked for particular needs of the children with ASD. When observations started in Term 2, she had already completed her planning. In contrast, Ms Eden, a novice teacher, appeared to be more intuitive. She struggled to find what was best for the children in her class and welcomed advice from other staff (e.g., teacher aides and therapists) throughout the term. Ms Fleck was an experienced teacher who tried to explore the individual needs of the children in her class and modified her plans as her new class started in Term 2. These findings highlighted the personal component in the Australian case study.

Table 5.8

Australian Results of Initial Analysis of Interview B Transcripts according to Three Ecological Categories of Group Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological category</th>
<th>Ms Deanne</th>
<th>Ms Eden</th>
<th>Ms Fleck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning a group lesson</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a group lesson</td>
<td>52.19%</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
<td>85.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a group lesson</td>
<td>19.65%</td>
<td>29.08%</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher used transcriptions of Interview A as a supplemental data source to address the first and third categories of planning and evaluating. Given individual differences, the researcher’s ongoing observations and reflection interviews showed that all Australian teachers were engaged in clearly separated steps of planning, implementing, and evaluating a lesson, in contrast to the Japanese teachers viewing these steps as a sequence. Unlike the Japanese participating teachers, earlier observations and reflection interviews showed that the Australian teachers were explicit about what they were doing at the beginning of the term. In addition, for the Australian teachers, teaching documents such as timetables, unit plans, IEPs or educational adjustment profiles (EAPs), and school reports were also important sources to address group instruction (see Appendices P3 and P4). These documents detailed the learning goals, strategies in use for the child with ASD, and learning outcomes from the teachers’ viewpoints.

Table 5.9 shows three themes of group instruction identified as relevant to address RQ2 in this Australian case (i.e., curriculum as vehicle, skills-based learning, and clear assessment). It also indicates primary and supplementary data sets used to inform each theme. What the Australian teachers said during two types of semistructured and reflection interviews were cross-checked with lesson observation data. Examples selected from this cross-checking activity provided snapshots of how these teachers delivered a lesson to the class and supported children with ASD in the presence of extra adults during the lesson. Also, a combination of the teachers’ reflection interviews, the researcher’s reflection logs, and observation data revealed how these Australian teachers dealt with the gaps between what they planned for the day and what they were able to do on the day.
Table 5.9

Data Sources Used to Address RQ2 in the Australian Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Instruction</th>
<th>Semistructured Interviews</th>
<th>Structured Interviews</th>
<th>Reflection Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Observations</th>
<th>Lesson Observations</th>
<th>Reflection Logs</th>
<th>T Documents</th>
<th>SA Interviews</th>
<th>SA Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum as vehicle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o²</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-based learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o³</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
<td>o⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓: Documents; T: Teaching documents; SA: Interviews; o: Situational Analysis Interviews; SA: Situational Analysis Documents; ✓: Primary data source; o: Supplementary data source.

First, this section of RQ2 explains how the Australian teachers produced comprehensive plans for classroom lessons and valued “good quality” plans. Second, it outlines the actual practice of how these teachers worked with teacher aides to deliver a lesson. Third, it shows how these teachers assessed child outcomes for the specific learning goals articulated in their comprehensive plans. Overall, each Australian teacher used various types of group activities with specific learning foci (Table 5.10), although their lesson structures were similar (i.e., introduction, group activity, and conclusion). Ms Deanne used more repetitive activities for the same learning type (e.g., free play and craft) as she believed that younger children needed to build their foundational skills through focused learning contexts.

What I do for Anne is a foundation; so I actually didn’t adjust. I planned how I taught and [made] arrangements in curriculum as a foundation for Anne. So [what I’m doing] isn’t so much adjusting on [planning]. And I guess, really that’s probably why she’s in our school, in a small group of children, because it’s not about adjusting to make curriculum fit her but it’s about her foundation. (AT1’s Interview B)

Table 5.10

Lesson Types Observed in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms Deanne</th>
<th>Ms Eden</th>
<th>Ms Fleck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craft (fine motor)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOSE (Craft: fine motor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free play (PECS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOSE (Game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross motor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOSE (Maths)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast with Ms Deanne, Ms Eden and Ms Fleck used more varied learning activities and content for every lesson, although the learning goals were the same within a particular unit of lessons (e.g., SOSE and cooking). However, Ms Eden said that she also used more repetitive activities when she wanted Ben (AA1) to do numeracy and literacy learning, which he resisted. Ms Eden also reported that repeating the same activity is essential for Ben to gain targeted knowledge with more cognitive focus.

My current student is at the very first grid of the timeline and probably will be there for a while. But I’m learning that I need to plan more and stretch out before [introducing] the biggest Maths concepts in early Maths context: colours, shapes, and all of these concepts, which are already on a continuum in the middle year context. Teaching these young kids, they can’t move from counting one to ten and then start learning two digit numbers and price values. I need to make
sure that kids understand this is small and this is big, before going anywhere with Maths. So firstly, I have to teach where they are at. (AT2’s Interview B)

The three Australian teachers also considered planning for variety, as part of motivational strategies to increase children’s task engagement. Throughout this section of RQ2, the term “lesson” is used, although one Australian teacher (AT1) considered the term inappropriate for her practice. During the early weeks of field research, Ms Deanne preferred to use the term “learning experience” because in her view the Early Years Curriculum, which was new to her at the time, focused strongly on holistic aspects, which made it different from the primary school curriculum (i.e., QCRAF). However, Ms Deanne’s comments during Interview C showed that this focus did not affect her way of evaluating outcomes for a child with ASD or her practice, which is detailed in the later section. Moreover, Ms Eden’s view of the meaning of “lesson” revealed that she held both conventional and contemporary views of learning and teaching. Ms Eden’s comments highlight how unique classroom teaching is for the teachers even within the same school.

I know, this was what other people said, “No, that is not a lesson. This is a learning experience.” I know that other people think that, for example, craft is an activity, not a lesson. I guess in a way it is. But it depends, and to me personally, as far as I am concerned it is a lesson. You know, before in the first interview, we talked about that I am expecting specific things from each student … I am expecting far more than craft in the craft lesson. I am thinking that everything I do is a lesson, except choice time. Even though sometimes during choice time, I actually get a chance to teach a little bit. But I’d hope that every plan is a lesson, because a lesson means to me that learning is happening. And I hope that learning is happening in every experience that they have. (AT2’s Interview B)

In addition, Ms Deanne, who appeared to be uncomfortable with using the term “lesson” when she talked about her classroom teaching, actually came to accept the term after the researcher offered a specific term definition in ObWk4 (see Chapter 3). During Interview B conducted in ObWk5, Ms Deanne claimed, “To me, a lesson is a focused teaching and learning experience”, indicating she had shifted her focus away from her concern about the terminology. Afterwards she became better able to talk about her classroom teaching. This instance underscores the general need for researchers to clarify important terms in interview questions when conducting a cross-cultural case study.

Planning a lesson

The Australian teachers stated during Interview B that they normally engaged in formal planning only at the beginning of the year and did not change their plans throughout the first two terms of the year (i.e., first semester). When they were asked during reflection interviews in early observation weeks about improvements in their plans, they continued to say that they did not change their plans. Careful analysis of interview texts revealed that they actually distinguished “planning lessons” from “everyday planning.” That is, these Australian teachers “programmed” classroom learning that led the teachers and teacher aides to work toward consistent learning goals, while they “decided” what they were going to do on this day or the next day through “dealing with behaviours.” To distinguish these aspects, in this chapter on the
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Australian case study, planning related to classroom programming (e.g., class schedules and unit plans) is called “class curriculum development”, while thinking ahead for everyday activities is called “everyday planning.”

I wouldn’t change the plan much in the paperwork because this is an outline, not day-to-day. But in my head, I would change more. It is more like, when I planned this unit I originally thought about how everything is. I actually had a clear view of what kind of things I’d like to look at. (AT3’s Interview B)

The theme emerging from text segments coded for “planning” suggested that all Australian participating teachers used “curriculum as a vehicle” for their classroom teaching. This theme indicated two aspects of their approach to their classroom teaching: (a) relating their programming (i.e., class curriculum) to the state curriculum, and (b) aligning learning activities with their class curriculum. For example, Ms Fleck referred to the state curriculum for primary level (i.e., QCRAF) when she developed her classroom curriculum, but she developed content for the children’s learning levels rather than following the age-appropriate contents specified in the state curriculum.

With students with special needs, I utilise curriculum as a vehicle, but we don’t teach the curriculum [for] their age levels. Students have intellectual impairments at some degrees. Therefore our student body doesn’t follow the mainstream curriculum … We need to adjust what we teach them … We are still working on the area of curriculum, but then the content is not necessarily age-related. (AT3’s Interview B)

The other teachers used Early Years Curriculum indicating broader and holistic learning goals, because their children needed to build foundational skills essential for engaging in more comprehensive learning. Ms Eden also referred to the state curriculum for primary levels, but she was likely to use Early Years Curriculum (i.e., P-3 Years Curriculum) for her programming. Ms Deanne, using Early Years Curriculum as her primary model, decided not to use IEPs, which were used regularly for children with special needs at the site school.

At the point [of starting my programming], I said to the principal that I am going to run prep curriculum this year—first time ever. And I said to her, “May I not have IEPs? What do you think?” And she said, “Yep, if you think that you can do it, go for it.” (AT1’s Interview A)

After discussion with the school principal, Ms Deanne used EAPs for each child. These EAPs were being applied by Education Queensland for children with special needs in inclusive settings and were new to the special school at the time. Ms Deanne, as an experienced teacher, showed initiative in using EAPs. She said that her decision not to use IEPs and systematic assessment for her class was made with parents through meetings. She expressed surprise that no parent wanted IEPs for their children in her Prep class.

With IEPs and EAPs, the Australian teachers specified targeting goals in each key curriculum learning area. Within the IEPs, Ms Eden and Ms Fleck used Goal Attainment Scale (GAS) for achieving levels (i.e., from +3 to -3) to be used for assessment at the end of Term 2 (see Appendix P3). The teachers set specific learning goals for both the class and individual children with ASD, and prepared individual arrangements for instructions and support. These aspects of individual and class needs and arrangements appeared in what the teachers said about curriculum development during Interview B. For example, Ms Fleck said that she developed
unit plans, brief lesson procedures, and supports based on needs for the class and individual children.

All of those adjustments that I write in the unit plan … are what I am pretty sure I am going to make. So they will be written into unit plans. So I fall off the face into air if someone comes in the middle of a continuing unit. [The unit plan] will show their major adjustments, which were individualised for each child. So it is not general adjustments. I would write up variations of adjustments that I might have during the lesson. So one of these is a broad one and shows directions and needs given in short statements as well as processing. These are what all kids need. The information sources need to be visually stimulating but not busy. If there is too much going, the children will miss the points. These ones are general. (AT3’s Interview B)

Document review of Ms Fleck’s unit plans confirmed this notion (see Appendix P5). That is, she summarised targeted learning goals and activities for each lesson within the unit of work, including lesson procedures and resources for the class and detailed individual adjustments. Reviewing her unit plans also clarified that the focused learning goals of the unit were aligned with the children’s IEP learning goals. Ms Eden used a similar format. Ms Deanne did not use unit plans but documented individualised support in each child’s EAP. For example, Ms Deanne arranged the environment for Anne to feel safe and comfortable to increase her task engagement in the activities and deliberately selected topics based on Anne’s interests to allow her to experience her nonpreferred activities.

Looking at environments is really important for Anne. It includes seating arrangement, room configuration, and also themes of what I may be doing. These are very important. I can sell the activities that she might not like to do by using things that she is interested in. So I use her obsessions as a gateway in her experiencing things that she may feel really awkward about or not like at all. (AT1’s Interview B)

These environment arrangements and use of the children’s interests to inform class curriculum were common among the Australian participating teachers. These methods were also consistent with the strategic emphasis of the speech therapist. Ms Eden’s comments showed that these Australian teachers tried to understand needs and strengths (e.g., interests and preferences) of the children with ASD, first through reviewing documentation of the child’s history (i.e., previous IEPs) and then through actual interactions with these children.

My planning is informed firstly by students’ IEP goals, secondly by school curriculum, and thirdly by department documents including those in the Early Years Curriculum Framework. So my planning is coming from what I want my specific students to know. I will occasionally adjust things if the things don’t work as I am going. (AT2’s Interview B)

This example also shows that Ms Eden actually adjusted her teaching strategies progressively, which was confirmed during the observations. For example, after Ms Eden found that Ben tended to react to a certain instructional phrase and to protest at what he was asked to do, she changed the phrase. More specifically, when she said to him at a Morning Circle Time, “We are singing with [deputy’s name]”, Ben didn’t like the phrase and screamed. She changed the phrase and said, “singing with Cate (AA3)”, instead. After a few weeks, when Ben appeared not to want to sing with Cate anymore, she then changed the phase again to “Oh, singing [a song of] Spider into a microphone.” A similar preventative strategy was used consistently by other teachers to redirect the children with ASD to maintain their focus on the targeted learning.
They also scheduled learning activities that were aligned with state curriculum as well as with classroom curriculum. One example shows that Ms Deanne knew what to do with the class in advance because she developed a timetable of class activities with understandings of the learning foci of each activity. This example also shows her confidence in her practice, which appeared to be consistent with her later interviews.

I planned the activities in advance. So I got this timetable, and each thing on the timetable matches to part of curriculum. [This] prep curriculum . . . is new to me. It’s a really big curriculum. So I really have to be careful about coopting each element [of learning areas] into the timetable. So I know well in advance about what to do each day. (AT1’s Interview B)

Another example demonstrates that Ms Fleck’s teaching was child-centred and skills-based. She prioritised and targeted a skill for a child with ASD through functional assessment of children. She then planned her teaching with knowledge about effective strategies for developing the particular skill.

First, how I work with them is to look at the skills that I want them to develop. So I start with skills based on what I want them to have. For example, I want them to have skills to talk quietly. And then, I work out what are other good ways to teach those skills. (AT3’s Interview B)

To develop their class curriculum and choose instructional strategies, these Australian teachers worked with various people (i.e., therapists, guidance officers, administration staff, other teachers, and teacher aides). For example, these teachers received practitioner’s advice on their everyday practice. Moreover, Ms Fleck spoke about class liaison for her cooking and literacy activity with another teacher of middle school, because her children from mainstream schools had better comprehension and more advanced academic skills than the junior children of the other two teachers.

**Implementing a lesson**

A theme “skills-based learning” emerged from thematic analysis of Interview B and also appeared in transcriptions of the other semistructured interviews and reflection interviews. This theme was then found in lesson observations and document reviews. As mentioned in the previous section, these teachers designed learning activities based on what they most wanted a child with ASD to achieve. Two subthemes emerging within the text segments grouped for “skills-based learning” indicated that the Australian teachers were concerned with supporting individual children with ASD and delivering a group lesson for the class (see Appendix P6).

During Interview B, the Australian teachers discussed similar supporting strategies addressed in the RQ1 section (see Table 5.11). These teachers used consistent strategies to address frequently occurring needs of children with ASD across a school day. For example, one strong theme found in Interview A, “dealing with behaviours”, also appeared in Interview B and was then observed by the researcher during the teachers’ lessons. In relation to this theme, the three Australian teachers agreed that the children with ASD need to learn social rules about things they must do at school.
### Table 5.11
Supporting Strategies Addressed During Interviews A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting strategies</th>
<th>Dealing with behaviours</th>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Prompting</th>
<th>Positive reinforcement</th>
<th>Clear steps / instructions</th>
<th>Choice-making</th>
<th>Preventive strategies</th>
<th>Confirmation</th>
<th>Nonverbal support</th>
<th>Scaffolding</th>
<th>Consistent strategies</th>
<th>Environment arrangement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of how Ms Fleck dealt with Cate’s out-of-seat behaviours illustrates that Ms Fleck ignored Cate’s inappropriate behaviour (i.e., standing up and walking around) while praising other children’s appropriate behaviours (i.e., staying in their own seat) with positive reinforcement (i.e., lollies). At a later stage, Ms Fleck discussed to the other children the inappropriateness of Cate’s behaviours in the class and praised the children who did not react to Cate’s behaviour (see Video Sample 1 in Appendix P7).

To deal with behaviour, the Australian teachers used a lot of preventative strategies (i.e., redirecting the children away from the issues, rephrasing, reading a child’s intent from their behaviours), and motivational strategies (i.e., challenges followed by the child’s preferred activity or event). These Australian teachers also reported their use of clear instructions and environmental arrangement, which the researcher observed during their lessons. They said that children with ASD need clear instructions on what task they have been asked to do and when they need to end the task. These teachers agreed that they need to be well prepared for these children to avoid potential risks and to maximise learning time.

We try not to get into the situation where she uses her behaviours to express “I can’t cope with this today.” So we are very careful about reading [her intent]. So I guess that’s the way that I adjust [my teaching]. So for Anne, the conclusion is “Good, you have done your job”. It’s quite clear that we are the ones who tell her that she has finished. She’s not directing to us. She’s not in the position that she uses her behaviours to hold the class to learn [what I planned for the day]. (AT1’s Interview B)

With Ben, my daily planning is about what I’m thinking I am going to do with him for the day and especially about fitting him into a group, who I am pairing him with, who I am getting him to work with, how I am going to motivate him to work, how I am going to make him feel safe to work, and also how I am going to set up the specific tasks. “OK, you have this task, and this task, and then computer”. You need to be very very specific about which tasks he needs to do in what order before having his computer. (AT2’s Interview B)

In relation to clear instruction for dealing with behaviours, Ms Deanne and Ms Fleck also talked about learning consequences of behaviour. For example, Ms Deanne responded to Anne who threw a paper on the floor by saying, “Oh, a paper is on floor. You need to pick it up” to teach Anne that she must pick up things that she threw on the floor, and she waited until the child had picked the things up. Moreover, after the moment illustrated in Video Sample 1 (Appendix P7),
Cate went out during the lesson and did not come back until the very end of the lesson. During that time, Ms Fleck continued the lesson with the rest of the class, while her teacher aide dealt with Cate outside the classroom. After Cate came back to the classroom, Ms Fleck asked Cate, after the rest of the class left for lunch, to stay with Ms Fleck to complete the planned activities, which Cate had not completed.

Cate didn’t get any free time in the morning because she didn’t finish her reading. We are now trying to get a pattern for her on how we work in school. For example, she kept her behaviour up to free time. But she still needed to do reading before she got her free time. She understood that David had free time. So she asked me for her free time. But I said to her “No, you need to do reading first, and then you can do what David is doing.” (AT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk2)

Table 5.11 also shows that the Australian teachers emphasised intensive and consistent verbal prompting or encouragement as well as nonverbal support (e.g., visual cues and body language) during Interview A (daily practice) but not during Interview B (group instruction). However, the researcher observed frequent use of these strategies during lessons. Similarly, none of the participating Australian teachers mentioned choice-making strategies, although the researcher observed that all three teachers consistently gave the children choices during the lessons. It may be that because the teachers used these strategies regularly in their everyday practice, the strategies did not attract their attention when they talked about group instruction. This suggests that only self-reporting during interviews is not enough to describe the actual practice of the teachers.

On the other hand, some strategies were not mentioned but were used by all participating Australian teachers. For example, Ms Fleck used “confirmation” to make sure that the children with ASD correctly processed teachers’ instructions and their learning contents because Ms Fleck focused more on Key Learning Areas (KLAs) in the primary curriculum (see Figure 2.7 in Chapter 2). In contrast, Ms Deanne and Ms Eden emphasised scaffolding essential communication and social skills because the focus of their lesson was more on foundational skills than on curriculum content. This suggested that these teachers selected instructional strategies appropriate to the children’s needs.

Because the teachers were “dealing with behaviours” or responding to the child’s needs, they talked about day-to-day adjustments that they made when they delivered a lesson. One example suggested that Cate’s mood impacted on Ms Fleck’s teaching day. The researcher’s progressive observations revealed that Cate frequently engaged in behaviours destructive to class learning, and Ms Fleck often needed to remove Cate from the class.

When we are setting a focus for Cate, it’ll be [dealing with] her mood. To [deal with] her mood, we determine to adjust, on the spot by hearing her in relation to her mood, whether we need to separate her from the group or bring her back to the group. (AT3’s Interview B)

This case analysis of group instruction suggested that the Australian teachers prepared multiple options to respond to the needs of children with ASD. For example, Ms Deanne said that she always has a backup plan to respond to everyday situations. The reflection interview and lesson observation of her using free play and PECS in ObWk3 illustrated Ms Deanne’s decision about
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how she would respond to Anne’s behaviour. This example suggested that at the specific moment of the lesson, Ms Deanne assessed that Anne was very tired and was ill, and so decided to downgrade her day’s plan from introducing new PECS skills to maintaining Anne’s current skills. Ms Deanne said that she should allow Anne to be in her “comfort zone” and feel confident and comfortable because pushing Anne to do what Ms Deanne originally planned did not provide “best” learning outcomes for Anne. Ms Deanne’s comments in the same reflection interview also highlighted that her class was able to learn with teacher aides what she planned for, while Ms Deanne was dealing with Anne’s behaviour.

I actually had to abandon all ideas about the lesson working with Anne. And with Anne, I had to go right back to what she knows very very well and what she feels comfortable with. She actually did not go forward but she did not go backward. And the team was able to just pick the lesson that I had planned and just took over that for the rest of the kids. So it is a good team. (AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk3)

The direct impact of key outside-classroom stakeholders (i.e., principal, deputy principal, and speech therapist) on the teachers’ classroom teaching emerged from analysis of SA interviews and Interview B. Evidence from observations showed that what the teachers did was consistent with advice from these stakeholders. For example, Ms Eden and Ms Deanne used smaller peer groups to teach focused social language skills. The scope for using smaller groups was consistent with the strategies recommended by the school speech therapist. All participating teachers valued advice from the speech therapist, as many of the children, including those with ASD, had high needs in communication skills.

Similarly, the researcher’s direct observations indicated the significant role of teacher aides (i.e., inside-classroom stakeholders), which was also noted in the first section of this chapter (RQ1). Observations showed that the three Australian classroom teachers were more focused on keeping a lesson flowing so that each child in the class could complete tasks to their best, while teacher aides focused on individual children with ASD and worked closely to provide step-by-step support to the children to complete the tasks. Because extra supporting adults were available, the Australian teachers were able to observe the whole class and detect and deal with the most difficult behaviour or the most important learning moment of individual children in the class. One example also suggested that these teachers emphasised using consistent strategies among all adults who worked with the child with ASD, through informal conversations with teacher aides.

So we talk about how we can make him focused on his activities. We do so to make sure every single time is the same person and same activity for the academics, and his favourite activities following. We have been talking about that lately because we want him to start adding. When he gets distressed about adding, we start saying “adding and then music and triangle!” We talk about whether or not we keep him in the same routine or we make little changes. We talk about this all the time. (AT2’s Interview A)

This consistency of supporting strategies between the Australian participating teachers and teacher aides was also highlighted in interviews with the teacher aides. For example, Ms Eden said that she selected instructional phrases to transition Ben for his nonpreferred time (e.g., mealtime, break time, and group activities) in order to reduce his anxiety level. The SA
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interview with her teacher aide referred to the same strategies, and the researcher observed that Ms Eden and this teacher aide used the same strategies during everyday classroom situations.

Ben is also anxious about saying “playground.” He seems not to like being at playground much, although he’s enjoying himself alone out there. So we just say “go and chill out” instead of “go with the other children.” He seems to be happy with the strategies. (Adult3)

“Lesson delivery for skills-based learning” was the second theme emerging from thematic analysis of Interview B transcriptions. The text coded into this theme suggested that the Australian teachers used adult-facilitated group-based learning activities in order to enable the children with ASD to learn specific skills and lesson content. In their contexts, peer groups were more likely to be considered as learning environment for the teachers to deliver a focused lesson to the class at the same time, rather than as an opportunity for the children with ASD to interact with peers. The Australian participating teachers talked about benefits of group settings for the children with ASD to improve their social tolerance by doing things in the same space and to learn social rules (e.g., turn taking, listening and following the teacher’s instruction). Although these teachers somehow valued social relationships and interactions during their interviews (e.g., “one of the goals for Anne is about working with others”), the researcher rarely observed that the teachers encouraged active interactions among children either with or without ASD.

Instead, children with ASD were more likely to sit in an individual space within the group setting during the group lessons (see typical classroom settings in Appendix P8).

Although some lessons allowed children to move around the rooms (e.g., free play), the individual space for children with ASD remained especially for younger classes (i.e., Prep, Junior). For example, Anne played with playdough at one round table with one teacher aide, while the rest of the class sat in front of a computer with Ms Deanne for literacy lessons. In contrast, Ms Fleck’s class (the oldest children, i.e., Junior/Middle) was more interactive during cooking lessons. However, lesson delivery was still adult-facilitated: Ms Fleck or her teacher aide (Adult5) led the class to make vegetable pies by instructing the class and individual children in a step-by-step procedure and encouraging children to take a turn to complete the cooking steps.

For example, Ms Deanne used a social opportunity to teach Anne to wait for her turn and choose something different during a lesson of free play (see Video Sample 2 in Appendix P7). The example also shows that Anne interacted with Ms Deanne but not with another child, Fran. The researcher’s progressive observations of group lessons showed that Ms Deanne did not encourage peer interactions but used social opportunities to teach Anne rules during the observed lessons. Moreover, the Australian participating teachers agreed that they worked on classroom management (i.e., managing a class as a group) only at the very end of the school year. Hence, classroom management was not a priority for their practice.

Class is a formal group of students who are put together for the specific school time. It’s not actually constant for the year because it is always changing. And then, class usually requires so much planning at the end of each year. Everybody tries to get together, and trust forms the class. There is so much planning in terms of classes where students work together. They have similar abilities and are in a similar age group. (AT2’s Interview B)
Comparing what the teachers said about their practice at the beginning of the field research and then later showed that these teachers were gradually talking more about peer relationships. For example, during reflection interview in ObWk6, Ms Fleck talked about facilitating David to consider what other children may want to eat when he was asked to choose ingredients from the fridge during cooking lessons. However, the researcher did not observe the situation illustrated in this comment. In contrast, Ms Fleck’s notion about confirming whether David or Cate understood what they were asked to do was observed consistently during both cooking and SOSE lessons. An example indicates that Ms Fleck appeared to focus on peer awareness and interactions less than other aspects of her practice (i.e., lesson content).

David and Cate need to be focused to the speaker while I’m asking them questions, because they don’t focus and their attentions are always attached to something else. So particularly David and Cate must need to focus on the questions being asked and understand the questions; otherwise, their answers will be odd. (AT3’s Interview B)

In terms of group participation, Ms Eden also described her way of moving from highly individualised to more group-based settings. The researcher observed with Ms Eden more instructions on peer awareness and relationships in the later weeks. For example, Ms Eden started encouraging the children to look at each other’s crafts but not to lead active interaction (e.g., Ms Eden showed Ben a craft item and said, “Ben, look what Kathy made!”). Another example shows that Ms Eden used peers as learning materials for teaching a concept of tall and short (see Video Sample 3 in Appendix P7). Body tracings of each child used in the example were created in an earlier week as part of a SOSE lesson (i.e., JT2’s ObWk2.LO2). In the observed lesson, Ms Eden asked each child to lie down on the body-sized paper and she drew a line around the child with teacher aides, while other children waited for their turn.

This example (Video Sample 3 in Appendix P7) also shows the supporting strategies commonly used by the Australian participating teachers. Ms Eden used a lot of visual materials as well as nonverbal support (e.g., body language and sign language) to teach the children about the concept of short and tall. Teacher aides sat close with individual children to encourage them to engage in the lesson activity and respond to the teacher’s instructions. The role of connecting between the classroom teacher and children was consistent with findings from an American study on the role of paraprofessionals in mainstream classrooms (Reszka, Odom, & Hume, 2012). In addition, during this lesson there were two teacher aides (i.e., Adult6 and Adult8) who were not regularly present in the class. During the reflection interview at the end of this observation day, Ms Eden said that her lesson delivery was not ordinary as she needed to give more instructions to these teacher aides who did not know the class routines.

Similarly, Ms Deanne mentioned benefits of having regular teacher aides throughout a year, because the class of young children required “consistent tweaking” of what she planned to do on the day. For example, it was observed that Anne, who usually slept for the second half of Session 1 during the school day, started sleeping from morning tea to the first break time and needed to eat her morning tea during Session 2-A (see Table 5.6). Consequently, Ms Deanne
supported Anne while she had her morning tea, while teacher aides took other children to the toilet. After teacher aides came back to the class, one of the more experienced teacher aides (Adult1) started delivering a literacy lesson to the rest of the class because Ms Deanne was still with Anne having her morning tea. The next example shows what happened after Anne finished her morning tea (see Video Sample 4 in Appendix P7).

This teacher aide (Adult1) was actually leading the class, while Ms Deanne was facilitating Anne to choose one of three activity cards, place the card on the sentence board, and make a request verbally to Adult1. This communication role playing was observed not only during the literacy lessons but also throughout the school day whenever occasions of choice making occurred for Anne. Moreover, Ms Deanne said that Anne was engaged in this role playing within intensive one-on-two context (i.e., one child with two adults) when introducing the new skill to Anne at the beginning of the year. Although the researcher did not observe that Ms Deanne used intensive one-on-two role playing during field research, earlier lesson observations (i.e., ObWks 1 and 2) showed that Anne was engaged in this role playing within a less intensive context of one-on-one before moving to group instruction, as illustrated in Video Sample 4 in Appendix P7.

When I first started teaching PECS, you have to be very very focused. So I have one student and two adults … a facilitator and a support adult. It’s very very focused. Now, the children know how to use it. So it becomes very loose. Now, I can do it as a group, whereas in initial stage I was focused on individuals. So that’s important for me to get the balance right. You need to know when to be focused and when kids need to learn about and from each other.

(AT1’s Interview B)

Ms Deanne’s comment suggests that she was explicit about what she wanted to teach in individualised and group settings. She insisted that “although the dynamic is good because kids can learn from each other, what they learn from each other may not be what you think you are teaching them”; therefore, she had to use intensive individualised instruction to make sure that children are actually learning focused content or skills that she wanted them to learn. Within individual context, Ms Deanne used the strategies illustrated in a photocopy of a book for PECS, which was filed in her class curriculum (Appendix P9). These strategies included (a) maintaining powerful reinforcers, (b) staying silent, (c) being patient, (d) creating immediate exchange, and (e) fading the prompts away. Some of the strategies were not mentioned by Ms Deanne during interviews but were observed during her lessons. These strategies were also similar to those used in PRT.

Similar to Ms Deanne, the other two Australian teachers also talked about and used scaffoldings of important skills for children with ASD by reducing direct instructions and support accordingly with children’s achievements, which were also addressed in the literature related to SST and PRT. For example, Ms Eden created steps to make Ben’s group participation:
First, we let him sit in his bean bag and he did not need to sit in his chair at all at the start of term. He just needs to sit on his bean bag, with which he could have something around him. But we now take his bean bag away and make him sit in his chair for morning greeting and good byes. And he has his choice between the chair or bean bag but not anything else. (AT2’s Interview A)

This notion was consistent with evidence of the researcher’s observations showing that when Ben confronted involvement in a group activity, he was given a choice of bean bag or chair for him to sit within the group during a lesson in ObWks 1 and 2, while Ben was able to sit in his chair during the remaining weeks (see the detail in the next section of RQ3). A strategy of giving choices to children was frequently observed during the lessons as a way of reducing children’s anxiety and giving them control to calm down when they protested at some activities. It was also aligned with one of the school’s emphases on decision making.

**Evaluating a lesson**

The Australian teachers assessed child outcomes according to the children’s learning goals and produced a report for each child. The teachers then uploaded these reports to the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) website. The three participating teachers, who worked with different age groups, used different formats for these reports accordingly. For example, Ms Eden and Ms Fleck used and updated an IEP for each child and produced a report with clear assessment on each nominated learning goal. In contrast, Ms Deanne did not use an IEP for Anne but produced folios of work as part of individualised programming as well as an individual report.

Ms Eden and Ms Fleck talked about systematic data collection in terms of assessment. They used forms to assess specific learning goals addressed in IEPs and to produce quantitative data summaries based on their GAS chart specified for each child in their IEPs (see Appendix P3). Ms Fleck specifically said, “I may take notes about each child’s literacy and numeracy as well as about some of Cate’s behaviours. So assessment is actually collecting data” (AT3’s Interview A). With the extracted example from Ben’s IEP (Appendix P3), Ms Eden produced the GAS chart in Figure 5.1. Ms Eden’s example was chosen because the analysis of her classroom ecologies suggested that the age group, needs, and learning focuses of her class were most equivalent to those of the Japanese classes.

The short term goal addressed in Appendix P3 was one of the three priority learning goals under the social skills category for Ben (i.e., group participation, nonpreferred/new experiences, and calm-down strategies). The researcher’s observations and interviews with Ms Eden showed that Ms Eden addressed these goals during SOSE lessons as well as throughout the school day. The terminology used to specify the supporting strategies for the learning goal in Ben’s IEP confirmed that Ms Eden was explicit about her practice, with the literature-based terminology (e.g., social stories, reward chart, and visual prompt). Monitoring instructions were then developed for the targeted skills by breaking down the skills into seven scales (i.e., +3 to -3).
One example suggests that Ms Eden used a more intuitive and reflective approach earlier in the school year in order to set her teaching with specific learning goals for the rest of the year. Ms Eden also said that setting specific learning goals enabled her to assess all children in the class with teacher aides because these goals were clear to the teacher aides in terms of what they needed to look at for each child with whom they worked during the lessons. Observations confirmed that Ms Eden asked her teacher aides, who worked with Ben during a group lesson, about how Ben performed his task.

I do a lot more of the things that didn’t work and reflect how I can get this to work. And I think that, or hope that, by the end of Term 2, I can find what works on these children, and will keep those things that work for them for the rest of the year. So I don’t have to do anymore changes. If they make improvements, I no longer need to do the activities and need to move on ...

Because their learning goals are so specific, I probably do not spend much time on assessing. (AT2’s Interview A)

In contrast, Ms Deanne said that she was engaged in more holistic ways of assessing Anne. Reviewing her teaching documentations—Early Learning Records (ELR)—confirmed that she looked at all learning areas outlined in the Early Years Curriculum (see Figure 2.7 in Chapter 2). In the ELR, Ms Deanne addressed Anne’s achievements in a brief description with photos for the “thinking” part of the active learning processes (see Appendix P10). Her assessment was based on the four phases of learning identified in the Early Years Curriculum Guidelines (i.e., becoming aware, exploring, making connections, and applying) to clarify the position on Anne’s current abilities and achievements (QSA, 2006). However, the focus of her assessment was very specific about what she wanted to look at for Anne in the way that Ms Deanne used observation matrix to monitor Anne’s learning achievements according to the level of her task-engagement and support (see Appendix P11).

Ongoing monitoring appeared to be critical for Ms Deanne, to make sure that Anne was able to learn what she planned for this child across all learning areas during the term. This was because, as discussed earlier, Anne tended to miss one or two learning sessions as a result of her health requirements. For example, Ms Deanne reported that she found that Anne had no idea about cutting, reading her personal assessment notes, and double-checking with scrap book where she kept Anne’s individual work: “Three bits of
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evidence had told me that she has been missing out” (AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1).
After this discovery, Ms Deanne adjusted her weekly schedule to move a craft activity earlier in
the day in order for Anne to have craft activities before she went to sleep. In other words,
finding a gap between what she planned and what she actually implemented with Anne was Ms
Deanne’s important role in delivering balanced learning for Anne.

I also look at how she read before. I can see little gaps appearing and make sure that these are
all covered for the next week. Sometimes when she slept or engaged in behaviours, she missed
some learning blocks. So I make sure that they are included in the next week and that they
aren’t going to be missed. (AT1’s Interview B)

Other teachers also reflected on these gaps between curriculum intent and enacted curriculum
because the unique needs of children with ASD required day-to-day adjustments. Moreover, the
Australian teachers monitored children’s learning progress throughout the term in order to
increase expectations upon the specific child and provide more challenges necessary for the
child. During Interview B, a prompting question about changes in their last-term and current-
term practice revealed the teachers’ expectation shifting towards children with ASD.

I probably taught David differently at the beginning of this year, comparing to David now. He’s
now a big boy who is very confident. He states what he wants. The focus was about building
trust with David at the beginning. (AT3’s Interview B)

In addition to the summative assessment at the end of Term 2 (also Semester 1), these teachers
used functional behaviour assessment to identify needs and strengths or interests of each child
with ASD, because their skills-based practice required understandings of why the child engaged
in the behaviour (i.e., triggers) and of what the teachers can use as positive reinforcements or
individual adjustments to motivate the child to engage in nonpreferred tasks during lessons. A
summary of what the teachers said about how they understand children, as well as document
reviews, suggested that these teachers implemented functional assessment at the beginning of
their teaching class: Term 1 for Ms Deanne and Ms Eden, Term 2 for Ms Fleck.

For example, in the last term (i.e., Term 1), I have done a lot of experiments to see if this
person does things like this. I collected a lot of baseline data about where people are at, who
works with who, and who doesn’t work with who. I remember that the lesson went wrong and
Adult3 said “that was awful!” and I said “Adult3, it is good thing. We have learnt so we will
never do it again.” (AT2’s Interview B)

Ms Fleck counted the frequency of Cate’s inappropriate behaviours and their contexts (or
possible triggers) in order to set up learning for this child who was new to this school in Term 2
(see Appendix P1). This was consistent with what Ms Eden said about what she did during
Term 1, and with applied behaviour analysis (ABA), one of the most highly recommended
practices in the literature. In addition, the interviews with both the speech therapist and the
teachers suggested that therapists helped the Australian teachers to undertake quality assessment.

Furthermore, perspectives about informal conversations with other teachers appeared to
differ among the three teachers. For example, Ms Deanne said that she hardly talked about her
teaching to other teachers and didn’t see herself receiving advice from other teachers. She said
that instead, as a senior teacher she gave advice to other teachers. In contrast, Ms Eden valued
advice from Ms Deanne and other senior teachers. One example showed another view of Ms
Fleck where she tried to debrief her own practice through daily conversations with other teachers. This example also highlights her view on a longstanding goal for Cate (i.e., appropriate behaviour during group lessons).

I talked to other people but it’s more debriefing than advising … It’s debriefing in the conversation about what is going on, what we did, and how what we’ve done did work, or sharing what didn’t work. But it is more like debriefing than advising, because Cate’s goal is for the long term. (AT3’s Interview B)

**RQ3: Valued Outcomes**

This section examines findings related to the third research question:

*What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction?*

The process of thematic analysis for RQ2 was similar to that for the Japanese case: (a) thematic analysis of Interview C, focusing on valued outcomes conducted with the ecological framework (i.e., valuing a child with ASD, the teachers, and the school); (b) thematic analysis of two previous teacher semistructured interview texts (i.e., Interviews A and B); and (c) thematic analysis of reflection interviews. Table 5.12 shows that other sets of data sources were used for each category. Similar to the Japanese case, the Australian teachers talked about valued outcomes particularly for a child with ASD when they described or explained what they were doing. This implies that in the Australian case too, educational values for the children were closely aligned with the teachers’ daily practice, group instruction, and weekly reflection (see Appendix P13)

**Table 5.12**

*Data Sources Used to Answer RQ3 in Australian Case Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued Outcomes</th>
<th>Semistructured Interviews</th>
<th>Reflection Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Observations</th>
<th>Lesson Observations</th>
<th>Reflection Logs</th>
<th>T Documents</th>
<th>SA Interviews</th>
<th>SA Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child with ASD</td>
<td>o √ o o o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td>o √ o √ o √ o √ o √</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some features of the Australian teachers’ work in relation to outcomes were different from those of the Japanese teachers. These teachers were required to produce a school report (i.e., OneSchool Report) at the end of Term 2. Therefore, the Australian teachers were explicit about what the children in their classes achieved according to their learning goals when Interview C was implemented. Overall percentage of valued outcomes for children with ASD in Interviews A and B transcripts were higher in the Australian case than those in the Japanese case. This was consistent with the Australian teachers’ approach to their teaching. That is, they
identified key learning needs, and then decided what strategies or methods they needed to use in order to address the needs during a school day and lesson (i.e., EBP). The Australian teachers also assessed children’s achievements based on the child-specific learning goals; therefore, their views of learning outcomes were concrete.

Reflection interviews did not involve video-clip examples. However, conducting these reflection interviews soon after the lesson observation (on the same day of the lesson observation) appeared to help the teachers talk about what they planned to achieve and what they actually achieved. These reflection interviews were useful to distinguish between what they believe is important and what they actually did during the lesson observed. For example, some notions about peer interactions appeared to be mismatched between what they said during their interviews and what they were doing during their lessons. Ms Deanne said that she highly valued peer interactions during interviews, but she did not encourage peer interactions during the lessons. During her reflection interview, a prompting about her valuing peer interactions indicated that she believed peer interactions are important but, for her class of younger children, social tolerance is a foundational skill for having peer interactions. The immediate follow-up interview seemed to help Ms Deanne to realise a contradiction about her sayings and doings on the same day and to provide her with an opportunity where she was able to further explain herself on the topic. This example also shows that Ms Deanne’s developmental view of Anne’s social interaction.

Interviewer: I see. So actually is your group lesson aiming at peer interaction as well?
Ms Deanne: Yes, yes.
Interviewer: I see.
(Silence for three seconds)
Ms Deanne: Having said that, someone with autism … I am not expecting that Anne interacts. At this point, [the aim] is tolerating being with other children [and] sharing the same learning experiences. [Peer interaction] is quite huge for her, because Anne just turned five. So it’s quite huge to [interact with her peers]. I try to get to the point step by step.
(ATT’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1)

As presented in the previous section of RQ2, data gathered by the teachers provided a clear view of the teachers’ valued outcomes. The results of analysing lesson observation videos as well as field notes and reflection logs were then used to reconstruct representative stories in terms of valued outcomes for the children from the teachers’ points of view. Moreover, educational values addressed by inside- and outside-classroom stakeholders and written in school documentations were relevant to what the Australian teachers valued as learning outcomes for children with ASD and how they approach their teaching (i.e., schoolwide PBS).

Valuing the child with ASD

Overall, thematic analysis of the teachers’ three semistructured and ongoing reflection interviews revealed that the Australian teachers valued learning aspects for children with ASD that were similar to those valued by the Japanese teachers: (a) social and communication skills, (b) engagement, and (c) independence. However, careful analysis of what the teachers said
revealed different views on these aspects. These differences appeared to come from a more individual-focus for social inclusion. For example, the school principal’s interview highlighted the significance of social inclusion through individuals’ skills-building and behaviour management for the children’s happy life in the future as part of community, which appeared also in school documents: “The school focus is on values-based service where life quality and educational outcomes are priorities” (School Annual Report). This view of skills-building for children’s future living was also found in the three teachers’ interviews.

The main value of this school is for the students to have the maximum opportunity to have post-school options. To have the most post-school options, they need to develop the best way to have skill sets. (AT1’s Interview C)

During their interviews the Australian teachers consistently talked about general perspectives of teaching children with ASD (e.g., “a kid like Ben”). It indicates that their understandings of needs and targeted skills were based on their knowledge of ASD-specific information. At the same time, their comments about supporting strategies that they used for the class in general (e.g., “similar to other children”) suggest that they also talked about children’s learning outcomes in general as children with and without ASD shared the same outcomes.

Figure 5.2 illustrates key outcomes valued for a child with ASD by the Australian teachers. It shows that foundational skills were essential for academic and more focused learning. Academic learning outcomes were valued by Ms Eden and Ms Fleck, but were not valued by Ms Deanne for the age group of her class. In particular, Ms Fleck highly valued learning of lesson content for David. When Ms Fleck talked about valued outcomes for this child, she was more focused on curriculum content because she said that David had established his foundational skills essential to learning subjects. Ms Fleck’s comment showed her personal view of “group instruction” in special education settings. Her comment highlighted that Ms Fleck valued individual learning outcomes but did not value group learning outcomes. This finding was highlighted in evidence of lesson observations showing that Ms Fleck redirected Cate to sit in her chair when Cate attempted to help peers during a lesson (AT3’s LO.ObWk2). Ms Feck’s comment also reflected educational emphasis in the new national curriculum: curriculum access with reasonable adjustments (e.g., Education Queensland, 2009, 2013a).

I guess, as a special education teacher, I don’t think that we value outcomes from group instruction. It is different from mainstream teachers. I just think that how we work on to get [outcomes] is different. The strategies that we use are also different. But I don’t think that the outcomes, what we want kids to have, differ. (AT3’s Interview C)

Unlike the Japanese teachers, these Australian teachers were explicit about what they valued most for each child with ASD during Interview A when the researcher asked the teachers to pinpoint the moment when they were most concerned about supporting each child with ASD. For example, during Interview A, the researcher worked with Ms Fleck to create her daily schedule, placed a transparent sheet on the schedule, and asked Ms Fleck to highlight the moments when she was most concerned about supporting Cate (in red) and David (in green). This field note confirmed Ms Fleck’s individualised focus across the day: behaviour and group
participation for Cate and skills-building and confidence for David’s independence (see Appendix P14).

Figure 5.2. Outcomes valued by the Australian teachers for a child with ASD.

Four foundational skills were valued by all Australian teachers although how much they focused on each skill varied according to the individual needs of the child. These teachers were concerned most about each child’s behaviours because the behaviours often indicated children’s needs for foundational skills. First, the Australian teachers said that the child with ASD needs to understand self. Ms Deanne most valued this self-understanding for Anne, who was a young child with ASD and did not have ideas about how her body works and how she can use her body as a tool. In addition, all Australian teachers tried to teach children with ASD self-awareness and self-understanding in order for the children to deal with negative emotions in a socially appropriate manner.

I think that self-understanding is the key. Being able to understand how one feels, what it looks like, and how to best express it in a safe manner. (AT1’s Interview C)

… in school, there are some things where “Yes, you have to do it.” But you do need to learn appropriate ways to communicate your negative feelings. So communication is most important, as well as social skills and relationships with your peers. I think that group participation and communication skills are my two most important learning goals. (AT2’s Interview C)
Second, in terms of social and communication skills, the Australian teachers explicitly talked about the “power of communication.” That is, the teachers understood the mechanism whereby children with ASD used behaviours as a means of communication. Therefore, the teachers trained the children to use specific techniques to deal with social situations (e.g., taking a deep breath to calm down when they encountered a social conflict).

When Anne started this year, she did not have any functional language at all. She had echolalia but no functional language, no ways of requesting anything, no ways of saying that she wants to finish, and no ways of communicating rather than throwing or getting someone’s hands to lead them over whatever she wanted. So we have to start at square one. So for Anne, it is about power of the communication world. It really opened the whole world for her once she got ideas. (AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk6)

The Australian teachers also valued that the children understand social rules and expectations in the school environment (e.g., doing own jobs, staying in a chair or class, and keeping hands to self). These teachers mentioned that they valued social relationships and interactions among children. For example, Ms Deanne repeatedly reported the same episode that Anne spontaneously came to the peer groups and sat with the peers (Interview C; Reflection Interviews in ObWks 1 and 5). The repeating indicates that Ms Deanne valued Anne’s social initiative. However, the researcher’s direct observations showed that these everyday interactions with the children with ASD were not for the purpose of peer relationships. Rather, the teachers highly valued social tolerance for the children because it was a key skill for further classroom learning. For example, Ms Fleck talked about how Cate changed her behaviour from leaving a class to staying in class.

Like yesterday, she was out of the room, but we didn’t chase her. She thinks that we would chase and create a game. But ... because of the behaviours. She just cannot be part of the class unless her behaviour is safe. (AT3’s Interview A)

Third, the Australian teachers valued independence for children with ASD. These teachers’ views of independence were similar to those of the Japanese teachers as they wanted the children with ASD to have daily life skills. Autonomy was also valued by the Australian teachers and facilitated through choice-making strategies across the day. The teachers said that the children with ASD gained confidence throughout a term and years of schooling because they understood classroom routines and expectations. They valued self-confidence in the children in relation to the children’s lesson engagement.

David’s independent work becomes different for Cate. You get her to say it in a sentence and you will help her write it out by sitting with her. So I spend a lot of time with Cate, while David can do independent try. It can help David build confidence that he can have a go and understand that he can make mistakes. You can build anxiety in these children with ASD. So I get him through that and teach him to take some risk sometimes. (AT3’s Interview A)

The fourth outcome valued by the Australian teachers was engagement. Unlike the Japanese teachers who highly valued the working process (i.e., having fun and working hard), the Australian teachers appeared to value task engagement and completion. In the views of these
Australian teachers, children with ASD need to engage in learning activities to obtain specific skills and lesson content. For example, Ms Deanne, who emphasised Anne’s needs in self-understandings during motor activities, said that she tried to stretch the boundary of Anne’s body movement gradually. Ms Deanne also said that her relationship of trust with Anne made it possible for her to push Anne’s boundary. Her approach to Anne’s motor skills was based on her understanding of a general view of young children with ASD: These children have no idea about how their bodies work and do not want to move their bodies in ways different from how they move usually due to fear. Therefore, Ms Deanne valued that Anne actually did what she planned specifically for Anne.

Moreover, the Australian teachers valued group participation as a part of a child’s lesson engagement. For example, Ms Eden set group participation goals for every child in her class and provided each child with necessary support in order that “everyone can have some success” (Ms Eden’s Interview A). Figure 5.3 shows how Ms Eden gradually helped Ben achieve his “group participation” goal. This example shows that Ms Eden shifted Ben’s learning environment from individual, to small group, and then to whole class. At the same time, Ms Eden reduced individualised modifications for Ben: (a) choice making between a bean bag and chair, (b) with negotiations about how Ben completed his task (i.e., glueing three stickers and then having five-minutes break), and (c) with teacher aides. In addition, Ms Eden taught Ben specific coping skills when he encountered difficult situations. One example indicates that Ms Eden, who was a disability service officer prior to her teaching career, emphasised quality of life and tried to equip Ben with essential skills and knowledge (e.g., communication, relationship, and literacy and numeracy).

I gave [Ben] the coping skills of taking big breaths when he doesn’t like it, because he needs to be able to do that to have quality of life: to have coping strategies when he's not coping and to have strategies to calm down and help him cope. All of the IEP goals that we chose for Ben are towards quality of life, developing communications, relationship, literacy and numeracy for those socially valued roles he's going to need, and the quality of life. (AT2’s Interview C)

Figure 5.3. An Australian view of developing children’s group participation (Ms Eden).
In order for the children to achieve “best possible outcomes”, the Australian teachers provided scaffoldings of specific skills across the term or year. Similar to Figure 5.3, Figure 5.4 illustrates how a teacher trained a child with ASD for skills in using PECS from intensive one-on-one to a group instruction setting for Anne’s functional language development. Video analysis of lessons showed that all Australian participating teachers used a similar systematic approach for skills building and managing children’s behaviours. The researcher’s ongoing observations revealed that this approach appeared to help all children with ASD to increase task engagement and reduce destructive behaviours.

I use picture exchange. Anne’s focuses are to use PECS and move to functional language. So [I will be] using PECS framework to develop some functional language. For most of the other children, it is PECS plus signing [sign language]. But signing is not appropriate for Anne. The language structure is “I want a ball” or “I want a red ball” … [Anne’s focus is] building in that way. (AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1)

The teachers also highlighted that achieving these foundational skills is a long-term effort. In particular, as discussed earlier, Ms Deanne expressed her preference for using Early Years Curriculum because the school’s traditional way of identifying short-term goals with specific descriptions of achievements (e.g., IEPs and GAS chart) had little relevance for her Prep class. Moreover, Ms Fleck said that she did not expect rapid improvement in Cate’s behaviour because for her behaviour improvement, Cate needed to understand class expectation and rules at school through her everyday learning. In contrast, Ms Fleck said that she acknowledged David’s learning outcomes (i.e., being? becoming? independent) quickly because he had been in the school for a long time and had established foundational skills much earlier in his experience.

During Interview C, all Australian teachers acknowledged child achievements throughout Term 2 and discussed further learning goals for the following terms. These

---

**Figure 5.4.** Scaffolding of Anne’s PECS skills across Terms 1 and 2.

The teachers also highlighted that achieving these foundational skills is a long-term effort. In particular, as discussed earlier, Ms Deanne expressed her preference for using Early Years Curriculum because the school’s traditional way of identifying short-term goals with specific descriptions of achievements (e.g., IEPs and GAS chart) had little relevance for her Prep class. Moreover, Ms Fleck said that she did not expect rapid improvement in Cate’s behaviour because for her behaviour improvement, Cate needed to understand class expectation and rules at school through her everyday learning. In contrast, Ms Fleck said that she acknowledged David’s learning outcomes (i.e., being? becoming? independent) quickly because he had been in the school for a long time and had established foundational skills much earlier in his experience.

During Interview C, all Australian teachers acknowledged child achievements throughout Term 2 and discussed further learning goals for the following terms. These
achievements were written clearly in their reports for each child with ASD. The teachers’ responses to the final prompting questions of semistructured interviews (If you can use a magic wand, what would you like to improve?) and reflection interview questions about changes revealed that these teachers were satisfied with their current practice. Unlike the Japanese teachers emphasising more heavily what they could do better, the Australian teachers appeared to be confident about their practice. Their teacher aides also appeared to be very satisfied with the children’s current learning outcomes. Both the teachers and teacher aides said that they want to continue what they are doing currently because they could see positive outcomes.

*Interviewer: What would you like to change in the lesson for the next week or next time for Anne?*
Ms Deanne: Um, probably nothing … It’s working OK for Anne.
(Adult1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk3)

*Interviewer: What improvements would you like to have?*
Adult1: Just do more of what we are doing, really. Keep doing and doing. (Adult1)

Observing the classes across different age groups showed that these Australian teachers prioritised learning goals according to the needs of a child with ASD. For example, Ms Fleck used “confirmation” because her lesson was focused more on curriculum contents, while other teachers did not use the strategy because the children of their classes were not ready to learn curriculum content and required foundational skills. Ms Eden taught SOSE to her class about body, but her primary focus for Ben was skills-building related to group participation. This aspect of age- or developmentally-appropriate activities was consistent with inclass stakeholders’ comments. However, these teachers also said that they sometimes need to go back to the basics (e.g., Ms Deanne: one earlier stage of PECS, Ms Eden: earlier Mathematics concepts prior to “adding”, and Ms Fleck: basic PowerPoint skills prior to presentation skills). It indicates that they made the learning content fit with the cognitive levels of their class.

I am learning that I need to plan more and stretch out before the biggest Maths concepts in early Maths context: colours, shapes, and all of these concepts, which are already on a continuum in the middle year context. Teaching these young kids can’t move from counting one to ten and start learning two digit numbers and price values. I need to make sure that kids understand this is small and this is big, before going anywhere with Maths. (AT2’s Interview B)

**Valuing the teachers**

Overall, all Australian participating special educators were engaged in developing their individual skills and knowledge as “specialists of teaching children with ASD”, which is consistent with the inschool stakeholders’ views of the teacher’s role (RQ1). This role expectation was clear in Ms Eden’s comment about her further professional improvement, which differed from other experienced teachers who were more confident about their current practice. Ms Eden viewed a good teacher as who could accomplish her teaching duties perfectly.
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I guess there are lots of things [for my improvement] … When I read my unit plan again before sending to you, I thought that I want to change it. I want to be more precise, far more on top of this paperwork, which I’m not at this moment. When I come back from my holiday, I want to be awesome and wonderful, take everyone’s breath away, and I am going to have my substitute teacher file. If I get a magic wand, I want to use it on my time management because it is a problem for me. So I like to be able to organise myself. When Ms Fleck came to my classroom and asked me about [something] … I was like “I have to finish this. I really do not have time for you”, but I should have spent time with her. So it is about my time management. (AT2’s Interview B)

Ms Deanne commented that in her past teaching experience as a novice teacher her view was similar to Ms Eden’s. This example indicates that she became more skilled, intuitive, and observant after her years of teaching. She also highlighted the importance of being relaxed and accepting one’s own mistakes.

Looking back when I first started teaching, I was considered a really good graduate … I probably was one of the best graduates of my year. When I came out from university, I thought “Alright, I'm OK [and ready to teach].” But there was so much that I didn’t know. I was like, I didn’t know that I didn’t know. I am not sure if that makes any sense. But I’ve become a lot more skilled in my abilities. I’m more intuitive than I was back then. I'm probably more observant. And I'm probably more relaxed. I would be more relaxed and I'm more willing to acknowledge mistakes. I think that new graduates or perhaps teachers who teach alone focus on mistakes. I’ve learnt to just put them [my mistakes] aside, look at what went wrong, fix them up, and don’t dwell on mistakes I’ve made, because, in the past, which is a long time ago, I made quite serious mistakes but I’ve learnt from these mistakes. (AT1’s Interview C)

Figure 5.5 illustrates the Australian teachers’ views of essential skills and knowledge for teaching children with ASD in their small classes. Just like the school documents and stakeholders emphasised curriculum development, the Australian teachers highlighted three skills for developing class curriculum. These skills include (a) assessment skills for child’s needs, strengths, and interests, (b) decision-making skills about effective strategies addressing these needs, and (c) programming skills for integrating individual and class needs into their everyday teaching. The teachers also valued being reflective and responsive to individual needs when they teach a lesson to the class. Figure 5.5 shows ongoing engagement of independent professional development and team-working skills of the teachers to work with other people for improving teaching through schoolwide PBS.

First, all Australian participating teachers talked about the importance of assessing a child with ASD when they developed class and individual programs. They said that they used available information (e.g., IEPs and previous teachers), assessed current levels of the children with ASD, identified the most needs through functional assessment, which was summarised in their teaching documents. They valued collecting quantitative data to guide their teaching. This data-driven approach for improving teaching was highlighted in the stakeholders’ views of teacher role (RQ1). The Australian teachers searched suitable resources for conducting the assessment. Therefore, the Internet and computer skills appeared to be vital for the teachers in this site school.
Second, all data sources suggested that the teachers’ decision making about what strategies to use for supporting children with ASD was based on their own assessment. The Australian teachers’ concrete and confident talk about supporting strategies during their interviews differed from the Japanese teachers’ abstract talk. Careful analysis of the Australian teachers’ expressions in their talk showed that these teachers related their ASD-knowledge (e.g., anxiety is common in children with ASD) to their decision making about strategies (e.g., building confidence in these children). Moreover, the teachers’ decisions were based on knowledge of “best” practice in the literature, which was also supported by the stakeholders.
I think that it is true that I’ve been teaching a long time as well and I know a lot … Because Anne is a typical little girl with autism, once I set her behavioural goals, my approach makes sense because I know what strategies work well for particular behavioural goals. (AT1’s Interview C)

Third, the Australian teachers valued quality class programs and said that they spent a lot of time and effort in class curriculum programming. Teaching documents showed that their programs integrated multiple components across some key learning areas (see Figure 2.7 in Chapter 2), and their unit plans showed class and individual needs identified though functional assessment and listed key strategies to address these needs during the lessons. Ms Fleck’s comment showed her view of teacher roles in curriculum development based on skills-buildings. This example also shows that she developed curriculum understandings.

We write our curriculum but it is not a set curriculum. But the Australian curriculum is not rich specifically about what you need to teach. It says more broad and global things or skill sets, which you should be developing. It does not say what you need to teach. It’s not a content-delivery curriculum. It’s a skill-delivery curriculum. (AT3’s Interview A)

When you come in, you probably see us doing many of the same things, but the underlying philosophy is different. So visually we’ll look the same, but the underlying things are different. So how I teach hasn’t changed that much although there is more focus on choosing activities. There is more focus on free play. And because of the age of the children, I don’t have learning activities where they are sitting at their desks in rows. (AT1’s Interview C)

Ms Deanne also highlighted her curriculum understandings and emphasised philosophical differences between Early Years Curriculum and QCARF (i.e., primary years). This example indicates that her understanding of Early Years Curriculum guided her programming of learning goals and activities for her class. It also illustrated her developmental perspective on child’s learning from Prep to Primary.

What I have had to do is very carefully get the balance [between individual and class needs] right because, on one hand especially kids like Anne, she does have to learn that these are a set of behaviours that are required at school. So I’ve had to get that balance right and I think I have the balance okay. If I let her do whatever she wants, it wouldn’t be doing her any favours because, in a couple of years time, she should be in a class and might be expected to sit at a table. So what I have to do is get the balance right between the play experience of exploring and the expectations of what we have to do at school. (AT1’s Interview C)

This comment of Ms Deanne also underlines her view of essential skills for balancing individual and class needs when she developed her class program. The other two teachers also talked about the same skills when they explained their unit plans during Interview B. Ms Eden and Ms Fleck said that they specified common strategies for supporting all children in the class and individualised strategies for a specific child with ASD in their unit plans. Therefore they were able to deal with individual needs during a group lesson. “Balancing individual and group needs” appeared to be an important theme in the Australian case in terms of essential skills for group instruction, which was used to analyse the Japanese data one more time to reveal a similar theme that appeared to be embedded in the Japanese peer-oriented view of group instruction. More details about the Japanese and Australian views of individual–group balancing are discussed in the next chapter.
Let’s have a look at the unit plan. There are actually notions about individual adjustments. If I’m looking at this part of the unit, I will look at what things I need to do. For example, if it is about David, it might be that I need to make sure that we question him, rather than let him read texts. The good example in the unit of work that I sent you was that there are always adoptions for physical needs for one child on wheelchairs. It means that I needed to do visual scanning all the time. (AT3’s Interview B)

I would like you to see that even if I am working with one particular kid, I am really listening to other children and planning all of the experiences for everyone. For example, during a literacy session, even though I’m working with particular children, I usually try to get a little bit of interaction with other children. During literacy with the speech therapist, individual children are doing different tasks … Even though you came in and the lesson looks like I’m just working with one child more, I’m still setting up and plan all of those learning experiences for everybody else. (AT2’s Interview B)

This theme of “balancing individual and group needs” also appeared to be part of skills for teaching a lesson. All Australian participating teachers stressed their ongoing engagement in reflecting on and monitoring a child’s learning progress, which was documented in their paperwork. The Australian teachers said that they made adjustments during a lesson, day, and week to deal with a child’s behaviours and to maintain the programs planned for Term 2 (RQs 1 and 2). Ms Deanne’s adjustment for the class schedule earlier in Term 2, described in the second section of this chapter (RQ2), was a good example that Ms Deanne found a gap between what she planned and what she actually implemented through reflecting on Anne’s fine motor skills during a lesson and monitoring Anne’s learning engagement (RQ2; see Appendix P11). For these Australian teachers, responding to individual needs appeared to be fundamental to delivering a balanced lesson.

I always think of each person and then try to make it work for each person. But you make changes when you are doing a lesson. You know, during a lesson, I may find that [teaching] is not working and that [teaching] is working. You make changes even during you are doing. (AT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1)

Fourth, the Australian teachers highlighted effective communication with other people, which was consistent with other stakeholders, particularly teacher aides and speech therapist (RQ1). A finding in the first section of this chapter showed all three teachers worked with various people for improving teaching (see Table 5.7). During interviews, these teachers expressed their appreciation and respect for others in relation to their specialist knowledge and showed willingness to share information with them. Ms Fleck’s comment highlighted this positive way of working with other people for maximising outcomes for a child with ASD.

We are depending on each other. That means that we have a harmonious team. And that means that we need listening to each other. Not necessarily do we have to agree, but to listen to what people have to say. Take what you can from it, but don’t put down what you can’t take … It aims to have a positive way of sharing and giving so that people are willing to ask you and people are willing to share with you … What we are doing here is that we are trying to give Cate the maximum options … I think collaboration with the speech therapist has had a real positive impact for building skill sets for her. (AT3’s Interview C)

Both teachers and teacher aides in the Australian case valued the respectful and open relationships with each other. For example, all participating teachers said that working with teacher aides who were experienced with different teachers at the site school for long periods provided the teachers with different instructional ideas. Hence, the teacher aides were mediums...
of knowing what other teachers do with particular classroom situations or the needs of specific children with ASD. In addition, the comment of one teacher aide (Adult3) showed that Ms Eden’s respectful attitude encouraged this teacher aide to share her experience and knowledge with Ms Eden.

Teacher aides—some of the teacher aides—have been here longer than the teachers. And also some of the teacher aides have been [working with the same children with ASD] for two years with two different teachers. So often they have longitudinal feelings with the child that the teacher doesn’t. So they can give you insights into things that they’ve seen. (AT3’s Interview C)

Because I have been here for seven or eight years and worked with other teachers, I really do have different ideas, and we quite openly try them. We usually tried Ms Eden’s idea first. If the idea does not work, she’s quite happy and open to listen to my ideas and trust in me to try it out. For example, it is very simple that we let Ben take his shoes off. And quite often, we resolve the situation and calm him down to be able to do some work. (Adult3)

The importance of teachers’ communication skills for working with school therapists was discussed already in relation to the speech therapist’s view of a special educator’s role in the first section of this chapter (RQ1). These skills included the teachers’ explicit views of individual children’s needs, interests, and strengths, and their efforts in following up on what the therapist suggested. In addition, the teachers valued maintaining regular contact with the allied specialist outside of the school to confirm whether the teachers’ current practice was on the right track.

Because my main focus of this year is for curriculum development, I’ve been touch-base with the guidance officer. Even though I didn’t get new advice from her, it was a bit of collegial support that tells me “Yes, I’m on the right track. It is going well. And Anne has done so well.” I think that being touch-base with the guidance officer was good. (AT1’s Interview C)

Finally, all participating teachers highlighted the importance of engaging in their own professional development. These teachers said that they used many resources to develop their specialist knowledge and skills for improving teaching. They worked with different people; however, unlike the Japanese teachers’ group implementation, the Australian teachers appeared to be independent in terms of improving teaching. Engaging in professional development appeared to be more important for the early career teacher, Ms Eden. Her comment suggests that she critically reflected on her teaching to improve her teaching.

As far as reflecting, I’m probably reflecting more on how I’m going to give more clear pictures. You know, sometimes, I still use too many words. Sometimes, when I say something about what we are doing, I start my words running. I just need my words to be clear out and precise and do not use too many words … Certainly I reflect and reflect, and try to refine and refine. And it seems to be how best I can use group instruction. (AT2’s Interview B)

Ms Fleck also talked about improvements in her teaching. However, her view of improvement was rather in terms of finding “best” practice for Cate through functional assessment. Ms Fleck appeared to be confident in this approach. In contrast, during Interview C, Ms Deanne did not mention improvements in her current teaching when she was asked about improvements in her teaching during Term 2. Instead, Ms Deanne shared a story from her early career. Her story shows that knowing PBS changed her perspective of learning and teaching in special education and had shaped her current practice. Ms Deanne also said that, from the moment of being
introduced to the notion of PBS, she has continuously attended PBS workshops to update her knowledge. It seems that because EBPs are progressively being advanced in the literature, ongoing professional development was closely aligned with the school value of “best” practice.

About 15 years ago, I first did my initial training of PBS. But over the years, I’ve done a lot of workshops. I’ve really tried to absorb as much as I can … It’s really about that whole different way of looking at teaching and learning environment and context and looking at life from a different perspective all together … When I did the initial workshop, my whole idea of teaching and learning just spun around. [The alignment of her understanding about learning and teaching was totally changed]. I guess, that’s been my main shaping-up of how I work now. (AT1’s Interview C)

Valuing the school

Similar to the Japanese case, key findings regarding valued outcomes for the school were informed by analysis of SA documents and interviews in addition to the teachers’ interview talks. Unlike the Japanese case, all Australian participating stakeholders had a clear knowledge of special education and strategies for teaching children with ASD. The school curriculum and website showed that the school used schoolwide PBS to facilitate a consistent use of positive supporting strategies (i.e., focusing on strengths rather than problems), which was discussed by inschool stakeholders (i.e., school principal and deputy principal). The Australian teachers did not talk directly about valued outcomes for the school. However, the last question of Interview C focusing on alignments of school educational values and their teaching helped these teachers discuss the school system in general. All data sources pointed out that the schoolwide PBS guided these teachers’ systematic ways of improving teaching and provided a wider network with specialist practitioners in the field of ASD and curriculum development.

The School Annual Report for this school indicated high expectations for the teachers to be skilled in data-driven practice in order to improve quality planning and teaching and school performance. This notion is consistent with the English-language literature about teacher accountability (discussed in Chapter 2). SA interviews with school administration staff stressed that for the accountability of teachers, these staff supported the teachers by providing updated information about “best practice” and guidance on practical strategies for the particular needs of a child with ASD. The school principal said that when a teacher called her for help about a child’s behaviour, she came down to the classroom and gave instruction to the teachers rather than having the teacher send the child to her office.

Advice from school administration staff was also valued by these teachers. Unlike the Japanese case, these staff had professional knowledge about special education for teaching children with ASD. Ms Eden’s comment indicates that the school emphasis on PBS enabled her to build her knowledge. Ms Deanne said that as she was a senior teacher in the school, she was more likely to receive advice from the principal who had extensive knowledge of the literature.

Certainly, this is a PBS school, and the Deputy knows so much about PBS. His mind alignment is just so good. And, of course, the Principal is here at this school too. (AT2’s Interview C)
I have been in a position where I have not been really able to get much information about my kids from other teachers. But having said that, if I have ever been in a problem, I have often gone to the principal and said, “What do you think?” Although she does not much know about the problem itself, she is really clever. She has read more widely than what I am reading. So I found that she is probably where I get collegial support from more, or the therapists. (AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk3)

Other two participating teachers agreed that they talked to the school administration staff as they experienced problems in their classrooms. For example, Ms Fleck reported one problem that happened in the morning during the ObWk1. This situation demonstrated that the school responded quickly to the needs of a child (Cate). This example also highlighted collegial emotional support. It indicated that the supportive school community catered for the needs of the child and teacher in this school.

I had general conversation with [another teacher] about Cate’s behaviour and how it was going. Kids like her usually gave teachers stress, you know. So just talking about it reduces stress. Mainly, checking what is going OK or not OK with other teachers, because the Arts teacher usually takes the kids away for her lesson. I had a chat with the other teachers, principal, and deputy principal about issues. So now, we have extra teacher aide time every morning before catching Cate. Yesterday, she was caught in the middle of road. Because I brought this issue up to the principal, she was able to put a teacher aide on duty to cover Cate’s safety. (AT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk1)

During Interview C and reflection Interviews, the Australian teachers addressed the benefits of working with other people, including teacher colleagues, school staff, teacher aides, allied practitioners, guidance officers, and parents. The teachers highlighted that learning outcomes of children with ASD were facilitated through every stakeholder “staying on the same page”. For example, Ms Eden said that she valued parents’ efforts in following up toilet training at home. This example also showed her clear view of her specialist role, which was stated in the School Annual Report as “differentiated leadership.”

What outcomes do I value with parents …? I would like for us to be on the same page. Most parents know that it is my job that I want the best for your child, I want your child to improve, and I want to do exactly what’s best for your child. We work together and we talk about … Both of us know that you are doing your job, and you are doing your job. [If parents] would still like to check in and know what I’m doing, it’s awesome. You know your job, and I would do similar things at home. It’s working really well with the toilet training … Because we only have the kids for six hours, if the rest of the time they are in nappies, it’s not going to be successful. Because they are on the same page, their toilet training outcomes are going to be more successful and be achieved more quickly. (AT2’s Interview C)

School teams—leaders, teachers, therapists, support staff, and parent leaders—work together to foster a learning community, a strong school reputation, focused advocacy to garner support for our work, and continual improvement of relationships, leadership, management, curriculum, teaching and learning opportunities, facilities, and resources. (School Annual Report)

SA interviews with the school principal and teacher aides showed that the site school offered professional development workshop about PBS not only for the teachers but also for teacher aides. This provision of inservice workshops supported the notion of “foster a learning community” in the school. As mentioned earlier, the teachers valued working with teacher aides who had knowledge and experiences of working with children with ASD. These findings together indicated that building a learning community benefited the teachers by improving their class teaching.
The theme of “staying on the same page” appeared again in the teachers’ comments about teacher aides. For example, Ms Deanne highlighted the use of consistent strategies and language to Anne in order for her to develop an understanding of class rules. Observations showed that all participating teachers instructed the teacher aides about specific strategies when they were new to the class. The teachers not only talked about ways of using the strategies but also talked about reasons for using these strategies. The researcher’s observations highlighted the teachers’ specific instruction to the teacher aides. It indicated that the teachers had a clear understanding of what they are doing and had a technical language to communicate effectively with teacher aides. Use of such languages shared by all stakeholders appeared to contribute to their ways of staying on the same page.

Ms Deanne’s comment in Interview C shows that she had a more sophisticated view of her specialist role. She acknowledged a rapid change in the field of teaching children with ASD with advanced technologies (e.g., Internet) and her role of contributing to a wider professional network of supporting children with ASD. She talked about special educators’ contribution from practical perspectives of teaching a particular group of children with ASD at the school. This role of special educators was also found in SA document and interviews. These findings showed that the school and teachers made efforts to address any emerging issues related to linking theory to practice.

Annual report for the school “documents the strategic and operational focus of the school during the 2010 school year, providing data and explanation to inform Government, the wider community, staff, and current and future parents/carers of students of [the school]” (Australian School Annual Report)

**Synthesis**

This section summarises key findings relevant to the nine ecological aspects to address the three research questions.

**Teacher’s role.** Findings of the Australian case study showed a clear perspective on the specialist professional role of teachers and on the involvement of other people who worked with special educators to support children with ASD. The Australian teachers had a strong identity as specialist educators, which was referred to by various stakeholders as primary persons who programme and implement evidence-informed “best” practice suitable for individual children with ASD in their classrooms. This practice was closely aligned with the school emphasis and parent expectations. The school administration expected the teachers to be “specialist”, provided essential resources, and guided all staff to take the same direction (i.e., schoolwide PBS through ongoing professional development and staff mentors). The speech therapist expected the
teachers to provide accurate profiles of children’s needs and specific instructional foci that guided her therapeutic approach. She also referred the teachers to appropriate resources, and provided the teachers with intensive training sessions around communication needs. The teacher aides highlighted their open and trusting relationships with the teachers and gave direct focused support for the children with ASD during classroom lessons and daily routines.

**Working through a day.** The Australian teachers worked closely with teacher aides in their everyday work. There was a gap between the teachers’ perspectives on working with others and the actual amount of interactions with others for improving teaching. It indicates a different perception of collaboration with others. That is, the Australian teachers had a clear professional role as special classroom teachers who were expected to be independent and competent in developing learning programs for the individual children with ASD and the class. These specialist skills and knowledge were obvious in how they managed and organised their everyday classroom teaching, as well as how they talked about what they are doing.

**Working with a child with ASD.** The Australian teachers viewed the immediate solution to a child’s behaviour as essential in order to make the day most productive for the class. They used many strategies from recommended practice for dealing with behaviours and facilitating communications for children with ASD through natural interactions in the classrooms. The teachers gave teacher aides instructions on how to manage or deal with the behaviours of children throughout a school day.

**Planning a lesson.** Findings exposed two different perspectives about planning classroom teaching. The Australian teachers talked about programming or class curriculum, into which they put a great effort early in the school year (i.e., usually during Term 1, but Term 2 for Ms Fleck’s new class). Progressive observations and reflection interviews revealed ongoing adjustments to everyday planning, which the teachers distinguished clearly from programming. In their class curriculum and individual plans, the teachers specified learning goals for each child, which were aligned with state curriculum, incorporated into their class timetables and unit plans, and guided everyday teaching. Individual arrangements for support and instruction were also specified in these timetables and unit plans.

**Implementing a lesson.** The Australian teachers delivered a lesson to the class with teacher aides’ intensive support for individual children with ASD. These teachers were proactive in preventing or dealing with a child’s behaviour because they considered the behaviour as a sign of the child’s need at a specific moment. Their lessons involved various activities that were adult-facilitated and group-based, with focused learning goals. During group activities, the Australian teachers used a variety of supporting strategies that were recommended in the literature.

**Evaluating a lesson.** Although formats and methods of assessment were varied among them, the Australian teachers conducted summative assessment on the child’s achievement in relation to learning goals. Because these teachers clarified baseline data or reflection in written
documents, clear assessment on child achievements was obtained. In addition, having specific
goals appeared to overcome one issue of assessing multiple children at the same time within
group settings, because it enabled teacher aides to contribute to their assessment.

Valuing a child with ASD. Unlike the Japanese teachers, the Australian teachers
appeared to be confident about their current teaching. They talked clearly about what the
children actually achieved, and produced paperwork showing child achievements that were
systematically assessed. The school and the teachers valued successful social inclusion for the
children with ASD, which was focused around skills building. This skills-building focus
reflected the teachers’ valued outcomes for children with ASD. Their understandings of
outcomes were based on ASD-specific knowledge. These teachers regarded child engagement
as staying in a group and completing their tasks with individualised modifications. Behaviour
management and skills buildings were significant in the teachers’ view of child outcomes
because these aspects are required for further academic learning. The teachers’ developmental
views of teaching children with ASD were also found.

Valuing the teacher. The specialist skills and knowledge of the special educators were
highlighted across all data sources. In the Australian case, the teachers valued curriculum
development, which required them to assess individual needs, strengths, and interests, select
effective strategies systematically, and develop class programs according to individual and
group needs. They also considered responsiveness to individual needs to be an essential skill for
teaching a lesson. As personal knowledge about effective strategies is limited, the teachers
valued other people who had specialist knowledge relating to supporting children with ASD.
Therefore, the teachers valued positive relationships for teaming with others. To update their
specialist skills and knowledge, the teachers engaged independently in professional
development activities.

Valuing the school. The schoolwide PBS approach appeared to support the teachers’ use
of evidence-informed strategies in their classrooms. It allowed the teachers to communicate
effectively with other people about teaching. Consistent ways of teaching and supporting
children with ASD were found across all stakeholders. The supportive school community
enhanced communication between the teachers and school administration staff and improved
teaching for children with ASD. The advanced view of a special educator’s role in contributing
to a wider community for supporting children with ASD highlighted that the school and
teachers addressed a gap between theory and practice.

Conclusions

Effectiveness of using case-specific methods was highlighted in this case study in contrast to the
Japanese case study. Unlike the Japanese case, the frequency of the researcher’s observations
was not consistent. Observing more lessons of the same teachers in a week was suitable for their
working contexts: more variations of lessons in contrast to the Japanese case. Observing the
Australian teachers’ lessons with different learning foci highlighted common strategies used in their classrooms. The researcher did not use video-clip examples to ask the teachers about the specific moments during the lessons in this case study. However, these Australian teachers had explicit and specific understandings of what they are actually doing and why they are doing it in terms of teaching strategies and valued outcomes for children with ASD. Therefore, the researcher’s implementation of weekly reflection interview at the end of the day she observed a lesson was reasonable replacement for the application of video-clip examples.

Similar to the Japanese case study analysis, the Australian case study analysis addressed that the teachers’ view of educational values that were consistent with the state and school emphases guided the teachers as to how they talked about their teaching and what they were doing with children with ASD in their small classes. The teachers’ practice was aligned with their inservice and preservice teacher training that were based on the EBPs literature. This alignment between practice and training was similar to one in the Japanese case study. The next discussion chapter presents findings from cross-case analysis by comparing between the Japanese and Australian cases. It also synthesises these cross-case findings across the research questions, outlines conceptual and methodological contributions of this inquiry, and draws final considerations.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This discussion considers what this descriptive inquiry contributes to understanding how these special educators work with children with ASD in their small classes. The work and practice of the three special educators in both cases could reasonably be characterised as sound. At the same time, the case-specific aspects of this two-case inquiry also indicated that alternative ways of working as a special educator could reasonably be viewed as sound. The rich analyses of information presented in Chapters 4 and 5 that were generated from multimethod sources of data about each case indicated genuine instructional strengths in each case.

There are four main sections of this chapter. The first section offers a condensed account of the findings about these special educators. Tabling of thematic descriptions of cross-case and case-specific findings summarise the main points relevant to each of the research questions. Synthesising these findings, in order to form a composite description of practical strengths of their case-based ways of delivering and improving group instruction, highlights interrelations among the research questions and shows the overlap between what these teachers say, do and value. As an extension of the first section, the second section offers various perspectives linking the present findings to previous conceptualisations of the complexity of teacher work discussed in Chapter 2. Findings emerging from this inquiry added a special education point of view to the complex nature of teaching.

The third section offers methodological reflections on the use of three cultural lenses as research tools for examining actual teaching work and practice. The special educators’ intracultural lens described their own practice as they talk about it, the multimethod lens tested their talk about their work in relation to their actions and valued relationships, and the researcher’s intercultural lens guided and adjusted the conduct of this inquiry and the interpretation of practice in each case. This intercultural lens contributed a methodological advantage to this two-case inquiry. This lens acted as a tool to reveal the ecological basis of the work and practice of these special educators, particularly where the data sources presented nonaligned findings both within each case and across the two cases. Finally, the fourth section considers limitations of the two-case inquiry for understanding these special educators, considers what special educators in one case can learn from those in another case, and sets out some implications for future research.
Overview

This descriptive inquiry into special educators, who were coming to terms with the presence of children with ASD in their small classes, offers a rare focus on what practices were used by these teachers as they dealt with the many duties and myriad issues in their everyday work. This inquiry extends the few studies documenting the range of duties performed by special educators (e.g., Vannest & Hagan-Burke, 2010). It addresses the occasional expressions of concern about whether and how special educators use research-recommended practices (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). It complements the prevailing and expanding research enterprise of many studies that documented and classified specific and, mainly behavioural, evidence-based practices (EBPs) mostly derived from experimental research environments (Odom, 2009; Odom, Boyd, et al., 2010). Reasonable recommendations for the education of children with ASD and for the higher education and professional registration of specialist practitioners to provide both clinical and school-based education for these children need to take account of the actual exigencies of teaching these children in a group in a natural class.

It will be argued in this chapter that this descriptive inquiry made several original contributions to the literature with respect to the actual day-to-day work of teaching in special education in specialist classrooms settings, the practices typically employed by special educators in teaching lessons to children with ASD in naturalistic small group settings, and the perceived valuing of work and practice by special educators and others involved in the education of children with ASD in two sites. These contributions were informed and enriched by (a) the in-depth and ongoing methods of inquiry used in each case into the organisation of daily work over time, the progressive teaching of formal lessons to the class as a group, and the reflective cycling of valued goals to outcomes over the course of a formative class term; (b) the conceptual review of the culturally specific operation of work and practice in this field and its implications for future practice of special educators and for research on that practice; and (c) the practical problem solving undertaken to align the two cases through data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

The synthesis of cross-cultural case inquiry about the set of three research questions from the various methods adds another dimension to the management and distillation of the massive amount of information generated during this inquiry. In Chapters 4 and 5, the first consideration of the findings gave equal weight to the analysis of findings on each question in the sequence asked. A second consideration that was given more attention at that time concerns the cross-referencing and integration of findings across questions for each case. A basic point is that each of the three research questions provides complementary insights into the work and practice of these special educators. That is, findings about Research Question (RQ) 1 provided a naturally informative context in the interpretation of findings about RQs 2 and 3; findings about RQ2 received the most focused coverage of teachers’ inclusion of a child with ASD in formal
lessons to the class group; findings about RQ3 concerned the participants’ efforts gradually to forge relationships and cultivate skills in their classrooms and to direct their efforts to what was considered most valuable to children, the teachers themselves, and school. With respect to discussion of RQ3, it is recognised that the mix of objective and subjective input to this question involved inherent limitations arising from the lack of direct data about child performance outcomes and from the extrapolation from grade-to-grade information to developmental gains in these outcomes.

Case-specific strengths throughout the three major themes, identified for each research question respectively, also indicate the operation of a systemic contextual adaptation to their respective educational systems and to their specific school sites. That is, the Japanese teachers displayed different strengths on each of the coded categories of data analysis to those of the Australian teachers. Within their respective educational systems and within the classroom ecology of work and practice in each system, the participating teachers’ management of curriculum development indicated a different balance of practice deduced from ideas and social theory and practice induced from modes of data and evidence gathering (ten Have, 2004, see also, Figure 2.6 in Chapter 2). Furthermore, dissimilarities in the Japanese and Australian teachers’ approach to self-improvement of teaching indicated that the differences identified as the suite of strengths in teaching strategies for children with ASD within the class involved different ways of resolving the balance of teacher attention to individual children and class group in classroom instruction. This finding about group instruction involving both individual and group facets appears to be fairly consistent with a recent review of individualism–collectivism as side-by-side dimensions that both operate in social situation rather than either- or aspects of cultural systems (Györkös et al., 2013).

One contribution of this inquiry is that the evidence of Western–Japanese systemic differences in regular education documented in the English-language literature also applies to special educators. In some respects, the findings indicated that special educators share some similarities to regular teachers in their respective educational systems as they engage in daily activities, conduct lessons, and relate their work to valued instructional outcomes. In the Japanese case, for example, the wider school culture of the primary school and its professional development collaborations around lesson study activities could be seen to shape the specialist training of these special educators. The presence of systemic approaches to the complex and dynamic nature of everyday teacher work, as practiced by specialist practitioners in these two cases, illuminated the unconscious and implicit effect of systemic influences on a teacher’s selection of strategies of practice.
Special Educators

The focus of this inquiry is to learn more about the work and practice of special educators who are teaching children with ASD in a small class. Tables 6.1 to 6.3 provide summaries of findings about the three research questions that guided this inquiry. Key aspects of teacher work and practice were highlighted by cross-checking what a special educator had said about this work in set interviews and ongoing reflections, with observations of what that teacher did in the classroom and with all data pointing to what the educators valued as improvements in this work (Kemmis, 2009). Common and case-specific aspects of their practice were explored through comparing and contrasting these Japanese and Australian cases in which a child with ASD was a member of a class of children with intellectual disability (ID). Cross-case similarities suggested the presence of universally important aspects of teaching children with ASD. In contrast, cross-case differences revealed features of teaching these children in a given context (e.g., school and classroom settings of a teaching day, instructional programs and resources for group lessons, and relationships with other people).

Ecological features of teaching were recognised as data analytic categories that structure the tabular summaries of findings for the two cases. Relatively brief comments in this section noted specific contributions. Through this section, findings from different data sources identify aspects of the work of these special educators in both cases and uncover mismatches. Unspoken and unnoticed aspects of work in teachers’ talk, in particular, suggest routine and ordinary givens in one or another case.

Synthesis of these findings involved recognition of the interrelations among the research questions, first noted in the initial framing of the research questions. In particular, teasing out valued outcomes for the special educators and schools required a joint consideration of similarities and differences together because all findings and thematic relationships across three research questions contributed to information about these outcomes. Interrelated aspects of work contributed to conceptualisation of everyday skills for special educators working in small classes and time-based supports for practice improvement of group instruction for children with ASD.

Daily practice: the working day

Table 6.1 shows summaries of RQ1 thematic findings related to three ecological categories (i.e., key subthemes) of daily practice: teacher role, everyday structure, and everyday approach. Because there has been little formal research on this everyday aspect of special educators, this part of the inquiry makes a contribution particularly to the documentation of “everyday structure.” Because the special educators in both cases tried to use consistent strategies and methods to teach children with ASD and a whole class throughout a working day and during a formal group lesson, “everyday approach” is also considered part of group instruction, and more
# Summary of Key Similarities and Differences in RQ1: What Makes up the Daily Practice of Special Education Teachers Working with Children with ASD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Categories (Ecological Features)</th>
<th>Cross-Case</th>
<th>Japanese Case-Specific</th>
<th>Australian Case-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher role (Linked to RQ3)</strong></td>
<td>Specialist special educators in the school</td>
<td>Extended social role; responsible for the child’s life outside the school (No break)</td>
<td>Specialist role; clear boundary of responsibilities (Formal break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social inclusion</td>
<td>Children’s happy life in future</td>
<td>Through positive peer interactions and relationships</td>
<td>Through skill-training and behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School organisation</td>
<td>School-wide approach driving teachers’ approach to improve teaching; Linked to preservice education</td>
<td>Lesson study approach</td>
<td>Positive behaviour support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher skills</td>
<td>Ongoing engagement in professional development to improve their teaching related skills and knowledge</td>
<td>Lesson skills and classroom management (“Class as Community”)</td>
<td>Specialist knowledge and skills and program skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Everyday structure</strong></td>
<td>Very structured days with routines and visual cues</td>
<td>Least changes in schedules</td>
<td>Frequent changes in schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variations of activities</td>
<td>Variety of learning activities across a day including academic and non-academic</td>
<td>More interactive group activities and more daily chores</td>
<td>More variations of focused learning activities and more free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom staff</td>
<td>One classroom teacher</td>
<td>One classroom teacher throughout a day</td>
<td>Various people throughout a day; instructing teacher aides about the instructing strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Daily duties</td>
<td>Variety of teaching related duties (i.e., a cycle of teaching and learning activities) across a day, week, and term</td>
<td>Duties completed at school; staying at school till late (individual desks at staff room); poor work-life balance</td>
<td>Duties completed at home (no individual desks at staff room); better work-life balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration with various people to improve teaching</td>
<td>Broad definition; working with teacher colleagues, school admin, and university professors</td>
<td>Concrete definition; working with other specialist practitioners and less with teacher colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Everyday approach (Link to RQ2)</strong></td>
<td>Flexibility and responsiveness to individual needs</td>
<td>Through day-to-day interactions</td>
<td>Through a set of systematic strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key strategies across a day</td>
<td>Consistent strategies across a day: Visual cues and schedules, praise and encouragement, verbal and nonverbal prompts, and close monitoring of child’s response/behaviour</td>
<td>“Doing things together” between the teacher and the child, the teacher and the class, and the child and peers</td>
<td>Systematic motivational strategies (e.g., rewarding chart) and prevention strategies (e.g., redirecting attentions, choice-making) to “deal with behaviour” constructively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
details about teaching strategies are discussed in relation to RQ2. Although “teacher role” in the working day is briefly discussed, it is also discussed further in relation to RQ3 because it was closely related to what the teachers valued.

Cross-case findings

Teacher role. In both cases, the teachers were considered “specialist” special educators in the school. This role description emerged from inschool stakeholders’ comments about their expectations toward the special educators. They were expected to have specific skills in teaching children with ASD for the children’s successful social inclusion. The educators were also expected to follow the school’s decision about ways of engaging in school improvement and to participate in ongoing professional development for further improvement of teaching.

Everyday structure. Working days were very structured. A lot of visual support, activity routines, and instructional support for daily life skills were acknowledged by these special educators as part of the generic special education program for children with ID (i.e., “similar to other children”). The teachers also said that they engaged in related teaching duties across the day (e.g., writing Class–Home Communication Books and supervision for playtime and bus, and paperwork), while the children of their classes experienced a variety of learning activities (e.g., unpacking and packing their school bags, morning group time, circle time, academic or nonacademic lessons, meal time, break, and toileting). Careful observation of each teacher for one full day in both cases confirmed these variations of class activities and teaching duties.

One interesting data mismatch in both cases occurred during the first semistructured interview (Interview A) about daily practice. The teachers said that they rarely interacted with others for lesson improvement. However, other data sources, particularly reflection interviews about collaborative interactions during ongoing weeks, revealed frequent interactions with other people that helped them develop or improve their practice. Ongoing reminders for the teachers to record their collaborative interactions also changed the teachers’ perceptions of these interactions. That is, during the third semistructured interview (Interview C) about valued outcomes, they were able to discuss benefits of these interactions (i.e., collaboration).

Everyday approach. Daily and weekly adjustments were highly valued. The capacity to make appropriate adjustments in daily routine and lessons in line with educational values could be seen as a sound professional claim. All teachers emphasised their capacity to make appropriate adjustments in lessons and daily routines in line with their educational values. Inschool stakeholders’ interviews (i.e., relatings) also highlighted this professional activity. In semistructured and reflection interviews, all participating special educators expressed this point about the nature of daily practice.

Beyond teacher talk, multimethod observations clearly confirmed that these teachers worked within closely planned curriculum (i.e., everyday structure), but made adjustments across a school day and week. The researcher’s progressive observations during field studies
provided more insights into how these teachers worked across weeks. These teachers were observed to prepare multiple options for dealing with everyday variations.

In both cases, these special educators showed awareness of the specific needs of children with ASD for communicative supports and made visible efforts to employ ASD-relevant instruction to these children across the day. They used a visual schedule to confirm the day’s plan at the beginning of the day. Through this routine, the child with ASD was able to increase predictability about the day, and therefore, to improve independence and reduce anxiety. Consistent prompts and praise were also used across the day to allow this child to follow the daily schedule in both cases.

In both cases, the teachers highlighted good preparation as a key to having a “good day”, and they prepared for the day prior to the time that children arrived at the school. This daily preparation included organisation of classroom environments and of learning tools and materials to be used during the day. Also, they communicated with other teachers in the morning about the day’s schedule when they had multiclass activities or when they had arranged for other regular and special education teachers to deliver a lesson to their classes.

**Case-specific findings**

Key different emphases in subthemes between two cases suggested that different working conditions or expectations (viz., their relating confirmed through situational analysis) framed the special educators’ views (viz., their sayings confirmed through interviews) and ways of teaching (viz., their doings confirmed through observations) and working across a day and week (see Table 6.1). The Japanese special educators said that they valued interpersonal relationships among their class and between the teacher and the children as parts of classroom management (expressed as creating “class as community”) that was also linked to the school emphasis on peer relationships within this particular school (i.e., across regular and special education classrooms).

As ways of supporting this everyday aspect, the Japanese teachers repeatedly said that they were “doing things together”, which was also confirmed during direct observations. These teachers had no break and remained with the class across the school day including cleaning time, break time, and lunch time. This working condition required completing duties (e.g., paperwork, phone calls, and meetings) after school hours or over weekends. These teachers also attempted to encourage the children to do things together as a group across the day (e.g., going to toilet, preparing, eating, and packing school lunch, and cleaning the room). In addition, the Japanese teachers valued the children’s predictability in everyday schedule and strove to ensure clarity upfront and to minimise occasions for anxiety across the school day and beyond. In RQ1, this emergent value appeared simply to be minimisation of unpredictable occasions for anxiety across the school day. However, it appeared to be a part of instructing strategies for facilitating peer-mediated support during a lesson (see the following section for RQ2, group instruction).
In contrast, the Australian special educators valued flexibility in curriculum implementation, which was also confirmed by progressive observations showing more unpredicted events happening in classrooms (e.g., changing number of children in the classroom and irregular changes in the day’s schedule). There appeared to be two reasons for this changeability. First, these teachers negotiated schedules with other allied professionals for specialist support (e.g., speech therapist, physiotherapist, and guidance officer) and with other teachers for the class’s professional teaching session (e.g., arts, music, and home) or for the teachers’ scheduled noncontact hour. Second, the teachers adjusted their class schedules for “dealing with behaviours” of the children with ASD. These Australian teachers were concerned about managing children’s mood and behaviours that interfered with the learning of other children and the children themselves. Therefore, these individual aspects were needed to be preempted or dealt with immediately. These teachers mentioned and used applied behaviour analysis (ABA) skills training (e.g., rewarding chart, motivational strategies, and preventative strategies) to encourage the children to follow daily schedules and to tolerate unscheduled events. Inschool stakeholders’ comments were consistent with their use of these strategies, which also featured in the data on group instruction in RQ2.

Moreover, more variations of learning activities during a week and among classes were present in the Australian case. Specifically, the three class schedules of a “typical day” could not be summarised into one table as in the Japanese case. A clear boundary between engaging in teaching, doing other duties, and having a break suggested that life–work balance was more established in the Australian site. Distinctive ways of improving teaching in the two cases also appeared to reflect two different schoolwide approaches of lesson study and positive behaviour support (PBS). That is, the Japanese teachers worked with teacher colleagues and spent more time on evaluation–improvement activities, while the Australian teachers worked with other allied practitioners and spent more time on planning activities. These different aspects are consistent with Lewis’s study of Japanese and American regular teachers’ activities (Lewis, 2011; see also Figure 2.17 in Chapter 2) and appeared to affect the analysis of group instruction discussed in the next section.

**Group instruction: teaching a child with ASD in a classroom**

Table 6.2 outlines summaries of key findings related to three themes reflecting a formal cycle of planning, implementing, and evaluating group lessons. The main contribution of this major part of this inquiry concerns the special educators’ case-specific approaches to curriculum management. Because the Australian special educators were conscious about and engaged in three clear steps in teaching life-skills lessons to the whole class, these three themes displayed clear separation. The distribution of RQ2 data across themes in this Australian case, moreover, was unequal and biased towards planning. Because the sequence of plan–implement–evaluate–improve activities was embedded in the everyday application of the Japanese lesson study and
### Table 6.2
**Summary of Key Similarities and Differences in RQ2: How do Special Education Teachers Use “Group Instruction” to Teach Children with ASD?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Categories (Ecological Features)</th>
<th>Cross-Case</th>
<th>Japanese Case-Specific</th>
<th>Australian Case-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td>Plan developed around a child’s needs and for the class</td>
<td>“Ideal” lesson plan with descriptive learning goals: Ongoing lesson improvements in shaping classroom interactions and learning</td>
<td>“Best” program plan with explicit learning goals: Identifications of the most critical needs and effective strategies used throughout the first and second terms by using functional assessment based on data collection and a child’s history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson forms</td>
<td>• Sets of activities written in unit plans</td>
<td>• Repeating one group activity for weeks but revising it progressively</td>
<td>• Delivering a variety of lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning &amp; supporting materials</td>
<td>• Development of learning/supporting materials</td>
<td>• Innovative materials according to class discussion and class observation</td>
<td>• Materials identified effective for children with ASDs (e.g., PECS, social stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson focus &amp; meaning of a “lesson”</td>
<td>• Long/short term goals to plan a lesson</td>
<td>• Sharing positive experience with peers/an ongoing process of live interaction during an extended time or period; focusing on more interpersonal skills than specific skills and content (i.e., group involvement, group cooperation, and group contribution)</td>
<td>• Completing a task/concrete lesson written on paper; focusing more on specific skills and content (learning-related skills) for each lesson form than interpersonal skills (e.g., PECS assisted communication skills, fine/gross motor skills, body, ICTs, Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement</strong></td>
<td>Supporting a child in a group during a lesson</td>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>Adult support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson structure</td>
<td>• Activity-based learning</td>
<td>• Interpersonal and relationship-oriented activity</td>
<td>• Skill-based and task-oriented activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson delivery</td>
<td>• Introduction, body, and conclusion</td>
<td>• Focusing a child’s logical thinking/understanding of learning process (no interruption from outside classroom)</td>
<td>• Focusing a child’s task-completion (frequent interruptions from outside classroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategies</td>
<td>• Praise, verbal/nonverbal prompts, modelling, role play, clear instruction, visual cues and instruction (TEACCH)</td>
<td>• Interactive techniques: Manipulating the group situation to create social situations (e.g., peer model, peer prompt, peer praise, peer instruction)</td>
<td>• Systematised strategies: Maintaining individual space in a group and selecting strategies based on “best practice” in literature (e.g., positive behaviour support, social skills training, pivotal response training, rewarding, PECS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2

Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Categories (Ecological Features)</th>
<th>Cross-Case</th>
<th>Japanese Case-Specific</th>
<th>Australian Case-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Task of teacher during a lesson</td>
<td>• Balancing individual and class needs; instructional efficiency</td>
<td>• Learning facilitator, social model, and connector between peers</td>
<td>• Lesson deliverer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task of extra adult</td>
<td>• Support for the teacher</td>
<td>• Learning “materials”</td>
<td>• Learning facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child-centre philosophy</td>
<td>• Proactive and responsive to the child’s learning situation and provide the child with choice</td>
<td>• Focus on child’s initiative and decision-making for the lesson creation (e.g., class discussion)</td>
<td>• Focus on individual skills-development and individual choice-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of targeted outcomes</th>
<th>Reflection-based assessment: Not clear assessment of targeted learning outcomes:</th>
<th>Data-based assessment: Clear assessment of targeted learning outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Meaning of “evaluation”</td>
<td>• Ongoing reflection on and monitoring the child’s progress</td>
<td>• Summative assessment: Something that happens after the series of lessons at the end of term; ongoing reflection and monitoring used for making sure that the child is on-track or finding what the child missed from the planned program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formative assessment: Immediate reflection on children’s learning or immediate feedback (praise) given from the teacher/peer to other child; ongoing reflection and monitoring used for facilitating learning experience for the child and interactions between the child and peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtaining systematic data (specific focus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation</td>
<td>• Ongoing observations about the child’s learning</td>
<td>• Independent implementation with support from other practitioners (evidence-based practice): Deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycle of lesson development</td>
<td>• Describing a lesson “scene”: Classroom inquiry (holistic focus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group implementation (lesson study): Inductive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
repeated across the unit of lessons, plan–evaluation themes could not be separated in the Japanese case. More specifically, the Japanese special educators engaged in ongoing lesson development through repeating these activities and did not view these activities as separate. The distribution of data showed that more than 50% of texts coded as evaluate-node were also coded as plan-node. This finding confirmed the blending of themes. This different data-distribution between the Japanese and Australian case could be linked to their views of everyday and weekly adjustments in RQ1 and also appeared to contribute to the teachers’ case-specific efforts to improve teaching in RQ3.

The strong thematic relationship between RQs 1 and 2 (i.e., group instruction and daily practice) was shared in the two cases. This relationship indicates that the teachers’ decision-making about ways of dealing with an individual child with ASD during group lessons was aligned with everyday practice. More specifically, observations of full teaching days and lessons showed that supports for daily life and social skills were embedded in all teaching and learning activities across a day. In both cases, these teachers used the lessons as focused learning opportunities and trained the child with ASD to use the skills learned during the lesson in other class contents (i.e., break time, meal time, and other lesson contexts).

With respect to the first theme of lesson planning, the Japanese and Australian special educators used written documentation to prepare for their lesson for the class and a child with ASD. However, their views of planning in the two cases differed in that the Japanese teachers spent more time on ongoing reflections about a lesson and replanning the lesson, while the Australian teachers spent more time on developing a comprehensive program. With respect to the second theme of lesson implementation, the special educators in both cases were teaching activity-based learning lessons, which were consistent with pedagogy for children with developmental disabilities. While the teachers in the Japanese and Australian cases employed some similar instructional strategies, they made different use of peer- or adult-mediated supporting contexts. Finally, the educators in both cases engaged in ongoing reflection to evaluate their lesson outcomes and improve teaching. However, their focus of reflection is distinctive. The Japanese educators focused their reflections about their lessons on their abstract and holistic views of whole-person education, while the Australian educators focused their reflections specifically on using functional assessment and monitoring child progress against their learning goals. Thus, the findings of this third theme were closely linked to findings for RQ3 (i.e., valued outcomes).

Cross-case findings

Planning. All special educators engaged in a cycle of lesson development across weeks. All teachers had long-term and short-term goals for the class and for individual children. Their primary focus shifted across a formal cycle of planning, implementing, and evaluating. For example, during early semistructured and reflection interviews, the teachers in both cases were
focused on understanding the needs of the class and individual children, and they were exploring better ways of addressing these needs. In later observation weeks, the teachers then moved to provide more comprehensive learning experiences for the children as the children showed learning progress. All teachers produced written plans for teaching and prepared learning or supporting materials for the class and the individual children with ASD. These planning activities comprised traditional teacher planning activities.

Implementing. Lessons that were chosen to be observed in this inquiry were activity-based learning in both cases. The common and traditional sequence of activities (i.e., introduction, body, and conclusion) was found across all data sources in both cases. These teachers also progressively increased the time of one learning session as the children became able to cope with longer hours.

The teachers in both cases viewed every aspect of school life as learning, stayed proactive and responsive to unique needs of individuals with ASD, and employed consistent prompting strategies during a lesson. As a result of everyday variations arising from a child’s changing needs and unpredicted classroom events addressed in RQ1, they all made progressive efforts to manage gaps between what they planned for the day or lesson and what they could do for that day or lesson. These efforts became apparent through repeated reflection interviews about “changes” that they had made from their plans. This ability to negotiate a plan–implementation gap appeared to be an essential skill for the teachers in both cases, because moods or health conditions of children with ASD influenced how much the teachers implemented what they had originally planned.

Balancing individual and class needs appeared to be the main task of the special educators during a group lesson (see Figure 6.1), which also featured in RQ1 findings. To make this balance “right”, the teachers in both cases developed plans that included both class and individual learning goals and supports. These teachers agreed that good planning focused on the needs, strengths, and interests of a child with ASD is the first step to support the child with ASD when they delivered a group lesson to the class. Their teaching documents spelled out supports for both these individuals and the class in lesson plans (Japan) or in class program or unit plans (Australia). Observations also showed that these teachers employed “group instruction strategies” to deliver a lesson that could help all children in the class with shared needs and individualised strategies that could support individual needs of children with ASD during the lesson. Their use of group and individualised strategies to balance individual–group needs in group instruction is somewhat consistent with an emerging topic in inclusive education. That is, a notion of instructional efficiency in effective teaching strategies has urged teachers to find more economical ways (viz., consuming less human and fiscal resources) to accommodate the unique needs of children with disabilities while dealing with other class members (Konrad et al., 2011).
Figure 6.1. A balance between individual needs and classroom teaching.

Both cases feature some common instructional strategies (e.g., praise, verbal and nonverbal prompts, modelling, role play, clear instruction, and visual cues and instruction). Moreover, the mix of not only empirically proven strategies but also unproven strategies employed by special educators in both cases is consistent with American research about strategies used by special educators (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). For example, the teachers in both cases said that they facilitated generalisation, increased spontaneity, reduced adults’ prompt dependency, and increased motivation of the children. Observations confirmed use of these strategies that appeared to be similar to those used in pivotal response treatment (PRT; e.g., Koegel & Koegel, 2006; Suhrheinrich, 2011; see also Chapter 2). In both cases, scaffolding techniques built essential communicative skills within and across years of schooling. Children with ASD were taught social initiations, which had been identified as a method to increase generalisation of achieved skills (Bellini et al., 2007).

Some key strategies from social skills training (SST; e.g., Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009; Krasny et al., 2003) were used in both cases. Teacher’s use of these strategies was confirmed through interviews, observations, and field notes, with teaching instructions examined against the principles of group social skills curricula outlined by Krasny et al. (2003, see Chapter 2). For example, these special educators provided structure and predictability by following routines, scaffolded language skills with visual support, programmed developmentally appropriate learning experiences in progressive manners, and fostered self-awareness and self-esteem.

Evaluating. Ongoing reflection and monitoring of child and class learning were emphasised by special educators in both cases and confirmed in teaching documents (e.g., changes noted in Japanese lesson plans or in Australian assessment sheets). Reflection interviews and observations suggested that the teachers in both cases closely observed children’s responses to learning and acted to meet their needs. Achievements of the children with ASD during the term were self-reported by the teachers during Interview C and reflection interviews in both cases. These outcomes were then found in summary reports for the children with ASD at the end of Term 2 in the Australian case. In the Japanese case, however, only templates of these reports were available to the researcher due to the school’s concern about the child’s privacy. Therefore, video analysis using Classroom Matrix for peer support (see Chapter 4) provided confirmation of child outcomes in the Japanese case.
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Case-specific findings

Planning. Concepts of “planning” found in the Japanese and Australian cases indicated different ways of designing a lesson. These different concepts of planning emerged during Interview B and reflection interviews, when the teachers in both cases talked about changes made in a lesson after the previous planning of a lesson. Hence, the opportunity to monitor special educators as they taught their classes in this extended time frame of this inquiry was an important contribution to understanding differences in the approach to group instruction in these two cases.

The Japanese special educators viewed “planning” as what they thought ahead for their teaching (every day, weekly, or term-long). They said that they first identified year-long goals for the class and then for the individual children, which were aligned with an SNEU and schoolwide lesson study topic. Document reviews confirmed the alignment of learning goals between the class, SNEU, and school. Progressive observations and reflection interviews show that the Japanese special educators worked on progressive improvements for a lesson to achieve the goals across weeks (“improve practice tomorrow”). As they repeated one group activity, they revised it every day through critical inquiry into classroom interaction and learning events. In contrast, the Australian teachers viewed “planning” as curriculum and program development, which they completed at the beginning of the year and continued to use to guide lessons through to Term 2; they separated this forward planning meaning from planning everyday adjustments (i.e., everyday planning). The Australian teachers designed multicomponent programs (i.e., class programs and IEPs specifying learning aims and support for each curriculum area; see Chapter 5) at the beginning of the year to set term-long goals for the class and for individual children, and they maintained the programs to the end of Term 2.

Different concepts of the term “lesson” found in these two cases suggested different views of teaching a lesson. For the Japanese teachers, “lesson” appeared to mean every aspect of interaction among children, teacher, and learning content. When the Japanese teachers were asked about a lesson during reflection interviews, they often used holistic terms, such as bamen or “scene” and child’s sugata or “image” (see Chapter 4), to describe “everything” that they observed during the lesson (e.g., events, interaction, expression, talk, and behaviours). These terms, also used during lesson study teacher meetings and in teaching documents, appeared to be necessary for the Japanese teachers to discuss a lesson with colleagues within the framework of their abstract lesson focus and emphasis on a child’s internal learning experience (e.g., children’s fun and successful experiences with peers). For the Australian teachers, “lesson” appeared to mean something that they planned for the class and children to complete during a session. When they were asked about a lesson, they talked about activities or instructional steps and about the child’s responses to them. This case-specific approach to lessons among these special educators is consistent with American reports about different lesson concepts of Japanese and American regular educators (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009, p. 143, see Chapter 2).
The Japanese special educators prepared lessons in which they can encourage children to interact with each other during the learning activity. They also spoke about designing teacher–child and child–child interactions in the lesson prior to the activity and then estimating the likely effects during the activity. These findings were also similar to findings from research based on Japanese regular education (Crockett, 2007). These special educators described how they attempted to build supportive environments during lessons that fostered relationships with each child, and they frequently referred to interaction and encouragement (i.e., “creating a social situation”) when they talked about supporting strategies for children with ASD. On the other hand, the Australian special educators prepared lessons in which they engaged children in a specific learning experience. These teachers spoke about incorporating multiple learning topics of programs into a unit plan, specifying individual tasks that they want each child to complete (i.e., differentiating amounts or levels of tasks), and identifying supporting strategies to address individual needs that were considered most essential for the child with ASD. These strategies are consistent with recommended practice outlined in the research literature.

**Implementing.** One distinctive structural difference in classroom teaching of 4-6 children between the Japanese and Australian cases involved the adult–child ratio (i.e., 1–5 or 1–1.87 respectively). More specifically, the Japanese teachers delivered a group lesson alone, while the Australian teachers worked with one or two teacher aides to deliver a group lesson. Clearly, higher needs in the Australian special school classrooms (e.g., wheelchair and severe ID) contributed to this more intensive staffing. A related structural difference during this inquiry was the stable enrolment in the Japanese classes versus the changes in group membership in the Australian classes.

These staffing differences, and related differences in class enrolments, also appeared to contribute to the greater emphasis on interpersonal and relationship-oriented teaching practice in the Japanese case and on skills-based and task-oriented teaching practice in the Australian case. These different educational emphases were similar to those found in focus group discussions among Japanese and Australian special educators, highlighting interactions and relationships or skills-building in the Japanese and Australian conversations respectively (Kikkawa, 2007; Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). The Japanese special educators managed a “class as community” when dealing with individuals as a practical reality. Their primary methods for supporting children with ASD were repeating revised group activities almost every day for four to five weeks. As children with ASD became more confident about these activities, the children were more able to afford to pay attention to peers. These teachers discussed a role of schooling as giving learning opportunities in which children have successful experiences with peers. They consistently encouraged children with ASD to observe peers who were doing the same activities and assigned a “buddy”, with more skills and understanding, to children with greater needs during a group lesson. They used structured social-learning situations created for their lessons in their life-skills unit of work to make the class function without the teacher’s direct instruction.
and support. At the same time, this practical situation provided more opportunities for the children with ASD to interact with peers, develop social and communication skills, build positive relationships with peers, and learn social rules through real life experiences.

On the other hand, the Australian special educators trained the child with ASD to achieve specific skills and knowledge through task completion as part of a systematic approach to each child’s learning process. They often divided a class into small groups and assigned teacher aides to provide individualised support and variation in learning activities. Because teacher aides stayed close to support children with ASD through each step of lesson activities (e.g., cutting, gluing, or writing) and encourage them to stay on the task, the teachers were able to monitor how every child was doing the task and assist the children who most needed support.

These Australian teachers also discussed a role of schooling to teach the child with ASD to be part of the community. However, they emphasised child skills in participating in the class group rather than peer-to-peer interaction. That is, they valued the child’s staying in a group or showing social tolerance as a first step to engage in more focused learning of functional academics. Observations showed that the Australian teachers maintained individual space in a group for each child’s focused learning (see Appendix P8 in Chapter 5). Moreover, the focus on skills-building of individual children for group performance was consistent with the occurrence of changes in class membership several times throughout a year, which was confirmed in follow-up conversations and visits with the teachers after fieldwork.

Moreover, teacher aides in the Australian case were often observed dealing with the children’s frequently occurring behaviours that, otherwise, may have disturbed classroom learning if the teacher had to respond to them all of the time. Hence, the Australian special educators were able to focus on delivering a lesson during which the children gained knowledge related to the lesson content, and they gave instructions only to children with the most difficult behaviour. To build the most effective classroom team, the Australian teachers said, and also were observed to do so, that they instructed the teacher aides about effective strategies and about their rationales for using strategies that were well systematised and conceptualised in available literature. Therefore, the supporting strategies used for each of the individual children with ASD were consistent across all adults in the Australian classrooms.

Given some similar classroom strategies used in both cases, actual ways of using these strategies appeared to be distinctive. It was found that video analysis of lesson observations could not use the same codes in the two cases. Similar instructional categories in the two cases required different descriptions or functional features of instructing during a group lesson. For example, prompting strategies listed in the early childhood literature for children with ASD (Harjusola-Webb & Robbins, 2011; see Chapter 2) were observed during the Japanese and Australian lessons. The Japanese teachers used these strategies in peer-initiated learning situations in order to facilitate peer interaction and awareness, while the Australian teachers used them in adult-initiated learning situations in order to train the children with ASD to use
communicative skills. These functional differences in ways of prompting appeared to be aligned with different values that are detailed in the next section of findings for RQ3.

In the Japanese peer-initiated learning situations, the teachers used children’s strengths or interests to create a “lesson world” in which the children develop their interpersonal abilities through sharing experiences with peers. In their agenda to make the world ideal to the children, these teachers highlighted the importance of having a class discussion after every lesson and gaining ideas from children. They said that the closer the lesson came to the children’s image, the more motivated children became. Through repeating a similar activity almost every day for several weeks, some of the children became familiar with the situation, understood what to do (i.e., activity procedures), and built confidence to work independently. Once some key children became capable of dealing with extra work, the teachers added social aspects to the lesson focus and encouraged the key children to help other children who still struggled with the task. At the beginning, the teachers consistently prompted the key children to help friends, and then they reduced these prompts as the key children provided this help. At the same time, the teachers encouraged the struggling children to be aware of the friends who interacted with and supported them during a lesson.

In the Australian adult-initiated situations, the teachers employed children’s strengths and interests to select learning topics with which the children could learn various skills and knowledge. These teachers said that they used various motivational strategies, which were also confirmed with observations. They said that choice making and task variations prevented difficult behaviours and that children’s preferred activities rewarded and motivated those with ASD to complete a task. The teachers also clarified their expectations of how much a specific child with ASD needs to do (e.g., “five more minutes”) and indicated clear steps for the child (e.g., “glue four pieces, and then take a break”). The teachers also said that they introduced new tasks to the child with ASD with sufficient support (e.g., one-on-one or two-on-one instruction), new rules (e.g., stay in a group), and least environmental modifications (e.g., bean cushion). Once the child understood the concept and obtained skills or abilities, the support or modification was faded. Progressive observations during field research confirmed more support and modifications in earlier weeks and less in later weeks. At the same time, it was observed that the child was encouraged to use similar skills and abilities in different contexts and with different people.

Interpersonal or skills-building foci were also found in the way that the teachers used time delay strategy. The effect of this strategy had been highlighted in the early childhood literature on naturalistic intervention (Harjusola-Webb & Robbins, 2011). The Japanese teachers were observed to use time delay to encourage peer interactions (i.e., peer support in the Japanese context) and to form children’s social initiatives. A good example was illustrated in Figure 4.6 of Ms Ando’s class becoming independent and supportive. She waited for children to help Bunta come to a group discussion after being reinforced with behaviour-specific praise.
about one child calling his name (see details in Chapter 4). Peer mentoring was recommended for children with ASD in inclusive education settings, in which typically developing peers serve as peer mentors in the group and receive training before participation (Bohlander et al., 2012). In the lessons of the life-skills unit, children within the SNEU classes became peer mentors to help another child with ASD or other disabilities. Moreover, some children with ASD, who had more functional skills and cognitive abilities among SNEU peers, were nominated as group leaders and encouraged to take the initiative to assist their peers during the lessons. In contrast, the Australian teachers’ ways of using this time delay strategy appeared to encourage a child with ASD to practice communicative skills during a lesson. Ms Deanne’s example illustrated in Figure 5.5 showed that she waited for Anne to approach her and request the next activity and then expanded Anne’s communicative sophistication (i.e., “bubble” to “I want to bubble”) with Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS) visual support (see Chapter 5). In addition, within the Japanese classroom situation of one class teacher, the children with ASD were more likely to encounter unsupervised situations in which they naturally had inconsistent teacher prompts and therefore had more peer prompts or engaged in problem-solving with peers (i.e., “delayed contingencies” in Crosland & Dunlap, 2012, p. 255).

SST-type of learning was the primary focus in the Japanese context but was the secondary in the Australian context. Observation shows that the Japanese teachers spent the majority of school time on teaching social related skills, while the Australian teachers allocated focused SST time to circle time in the morning and then encouraged the children to use the skills during lessons that had other primary foci throughout a day. The Australian teachers programmed such opportunities when they developed their classroom curriculum.

Different peer-adult foci were again found in the ways that the teacher of younger children in both cases employed role play in which the children practised related communicative and social skills. In the Japanese teacher’s whole-class role play, children with ASD learnt social rules and interpersonal skills through fun experiences enhanced by their favourite cartoon. In contrast, in the adult–child role play used by the Australian teacher, children with ASD performed the two-way communication skills of requesting and responding.

Different patterns of managing the unique needs of children with ASD in a group setting appeared to reflect different ways of balancing individual–class needs in the teacher practice of these two cases. Figure 6.2 illustrates the Japanese and Australian ways of supporting children with ASD in classroom settings. In the Japanese case, the teachers, who focused on “cultivating a child’s heart (kokoro)” (see in Chapter 4), prepared relationship-oriented lessons to take control of individual–class balancing. Therefore, peer support was needed in their lessons. In the Australian case, the teachers wanted a child to obtain specific skills and prepared task-oriented lessons. Adult support was needed in their lessons in order to allow skills-building of individual children. Careful analysis of lesson observation videos together with the teachers’ reflection interviews showed that the Japanese special educators were more likely to connect
individual and group needs when they taught a group lesson and that teacher–child interactions were more likely to happen at moments critical for social relationships. In contrast, the Australian teachers were more focused on individual needs, and their interactions with children occurred at moments critical for individual skills-building.

![Figure 6.2. Different ways of balancing between individual needs and classroom teaching.](image)

Insofar as a social situation, such as teaching a small class, cannot be explained in black-or-white, individualist-or-collectivist behaviours (Györkös et al., 2013), a complex social situation requires understanding and recognition of relationships between elements of each dimension (i.e., attitudes and values) and the balance of dimensions. More specifically, collectivism was stronger than individualism in the Japanese case. The special educators engaged in managing classroom interactions from the outset of the school year, which appeared to capitalise on the teachers’ expectation of stable class memberships and thus, the opportunity to build class community over time. In contrast, signs of strong individualism but relatively weak collectivism were found in the Australian case. A question about the meaning of “class” in Interview B revealed that these Australian teachers did not prioritise classroom management until later towards the end of the year. In addition, an observation of Ms Fleck’s full day provided an opportunity to attend a weekly staff meeting, where the school principal explained that the girl with an oral sensory problem in Ms Eden’s class was being moved from junior to middle playground during break time because she tended to bite younger peers. The principal said that the decision gave the “best” possible outcomes for all individual children; not only for the other children’s safety but also for the child’s transitioning to Ms Fleck’s junior/middle class.

The findings of this inquiry are consistent with literature reviewing focused intervention strategies for communication and social skills (see Figure 2.13 in Chapter 2; Brunner & Seung, 2009). These Japanese special educators used strategies with more social tension (e.g., scaffolding a child’s kokoro to work with others in the class) and less cognitive focus, while the Australian special educators used strategies with more cognitive focus (e.g., scaffolding each
child’s individual social skills to perform academic tasks in the group) and less social tension. These case findings thus suggested that the learning of interpersonal skills requires more social tension with relative looseness of task-learning contents, and that the learning of specific social and communication skills required more cognitive focus with less social tension.

_Evaluating._ Another meaning mismatch of “evaluation” was found when the Japanese teachers were asked about how to “evaluate” a lesson. An original Japanese question in Interview B used the word _hyoka_ for evaluation that, in translation, appeared to express the same meaning as summative assessment, which teachers conducted after their teaching to place value on subsequent instruction (Crockett, 2007). However, these teachers spoke about how they gave immediate reflective feedback and positive reinforcement to the child with ASD who performed a targeted learning goal.

In contrast, the Australian teachers found it easy and straightforward to discuss the assessment procedures they used at the end of a term. Teaching documents showed that these special educators in this special school used systematic data-based assessment—either Goal Attainment Scale (GAS) or Early Learning Records (ELR)—to evaluate child overall achievements. Such assessment was not undertaken by the Japanese teachers who used reflective assessment to focus more on the everyday experiences of the child.

These different views of “evaluate” appeared to be related to the different types of learning goals used in these two cases. For example, descriptive learning goals (i.e., ideal _sugata_ of a child) were used in Japanese planning. The Japanese special educators tried to understand everything about the child (i.e., to evaluate the “actual condition” of a child) through estimation of everyday interaction with the child and through formal and informal discussions with teacher colleagues. They then designed a lesson through which the child becomes the ideal child by sharing positive experiences with peers. This holistic view of a child was aligned with the national and school emphasis on whole-person education. In contrast, explicit learning goals based on functional assessment about the child’s needs were used in Australian planning. The Australian teachers read school documents about the child’s learning and life history and built on the information to develop comprehensive programs. Then, they planned a lesson through which the child can work towards further improved behaviours and development of skills and knowledge. This approach was aligned with the state and school emphasis of using PBS.

**Valued outcomes: relationships among teacher work components**

Table 6.3 presents summaries of findings related to valued outcomes for the child with ASD, the special educators, and the school. The contribution from these findings was the alignment of these valued outcomes with the two previous research questions (i.e., daily practice and group instruction) in both cases and also the alignment of valuing with the “relate” aspect of the Kemmis model of teaching. Across the mix of NVivo-assisted content analysis of all interviewing texts, situational analysis, and teachers’ background information, these special
Table 6.3

Summary of Key Similarities and Differences in RQ3: What do Special Education Teachers Value as Outcomes from Group Instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories (Ecological Features)</th>
<th>Cross-Case</th>
<th>Japanese Case-Specific</th>
<th>Australian Case-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A child with ASD</td>
<td>Happy life in future as part of community</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills through positive experience with peers</td>
<td>Learning related skills (cognitive) through skill-building and behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social inclusion (Primary goal)</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of child achievements</td>
<td>Holistic, abstract, and descriptive learning outcomes (viz., “Zest for Life”)</td>
<td>Specific and measurable learning outcomes based on understandings of ASD-specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social and communication skills</td>
<td>Understanding of class expectations/development of communication skills</td>
<td>“Social nature”: Social willingness and initiation, social morality, and empathy; group involvement, cooperation, contribution</td>
<td>Power of communication (e.g., use of PECS, sign language), social tolerance, and social rules; group participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning engagement</td>
<td>Lesson participation</td>
<td>Learning process: “Try own best”</td>
<td>Learning success: Task engagement and completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independence and self-determination</td>
<td>Daily life skills</td>
<td>Observational learning skills: “Live within a group”</td>
<td>“Stay focused without support”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher</td>
<td>Acquisition of essential skills and knowledge</td>
<td>Lesson skills</td>
<td>Specialist knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class plan</td>
<td>Ability of planning for the class; understanding of developmental aspects</td>
<td>Creation of a “ideal” lesson world</td>
<td>Comprehensive program development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual support</td>
<td>Ability of decision-making about supporting strategies for individual children</td>
<td>Inductive arrival at effective strategies: Ongoing improvement for “better practice”</td>
<td>Deductive arrival at effective strategies: Updated knowledge and skills about current “best practice” and ASD-specific learning characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation</td>
<td>Reflective abilities</td>
<td>Holistic and critical views to see a child as a whole and a lesson moment as a whole</td>
<td>Monitoring skills to see child’s learning progress against term plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with others</td>
<td>Collegial skills</td>
<td>Willingness to accept colleague’s critique and advice</td>
<td>Team work with other professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school</td>
<td>School improvement through school-wide approach</td>
<td>School-wide lesson study for action research theory-making for whole person education</td>
<td>School-wide positive behaviour support for theory-implementation for ASD-specific learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher support</td>
<td>Guidance for teachers</td>
<td>Inductive group implementation (lesson study): Group inquiry into classroom teaching</td>
<td>Deductive independent implementation of program development with evidence-based practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning community</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary aspects</td>
<td>Group and school-wide inquiry across different curriculum areas on the same topic</td>
<td>Network with best practitioners in the fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation</td>
<td>Reporting of outcomes</td>
<td>Lesson study conference report</td>
<td>School annual report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educators’ valuing of their teaching was aligned appropriately with those of all respective stakeholders in the two cases, their respective school policy, and their respective preservice and inservice training, which were also aligned with their national or state curriculum frameworks. Thematic integration of valued outcomes with daily practice and group instruction also displayed the strong influence of these respective case-specific educational emphases on the teachers’ ways of teaching the children with ASD in the classrooms. Preservice teacher preparation and schoolwide approaches also supported teaching approaches.

Extraction of case-specific findings about valued outcomes, particularly for the teachers and schools, required further inquiry into thematic relationships among key case-differences across three research questions. These thematic relationships appeared to explain reasons behind the practice and approach of the teachers in each case and, therefore, revealed essential skills (i.e., valued by teachers) and support for the teachers (i.e., valued by schools). These two aspects of valued outcomes (i.e., the teacher and school) highlighted case-specific strengths in terms of instructional improvement (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009).

Figure 6.3 depicts relationships among key findings across the three research questions for these special educators in the Japanese and Australian cases. The model points to case-specific valued outcomes that are the respective strengths of their teaching. In this section, teacher practice is interpreted as “teaching strategies” used to teach and support children with ASD in their classrooms (i.e., essential skills for teaching a lesson), while teacher work is considered as the “teaching approach” used to improve their everyday practice (i.e., essential skills for improving teaching). Educational values and professional expectations and training sharpen case-based strengths of teaching strategies and approach.

The kinds of improvements that the teachers valued for teaching a child with ASD in a group, when extracted from all data sources, involved valued outcomes for the child with ASD, for the school, and for the teachers’ own practice. Valued child outcomes were clearly discussed during Interview C and also frequently mentioned during Interviews A and B, as well as during weekly reflection interviews in which the teachers linked their teaching strategies to their educational focus for the children with ASD. However, the teachers did not directly mention instructional self-improvement during Interview C and other interviews. During Interview C, employment of lists for the teachers’ collaborative interactions that were progressively recorded during fieldwork was found useful to ask the teachers what self-instructional benefits they obtained from these interactions. Identification of valued outcomes for the schools (i.e., school organisation) was harder than those for the teachers. The teachers’ views of how the school supported the teachers were again gathered across all data sources.
Figure 6.3. Case-based strengths of teaching strategies and approach that guide instructional self-improvement.

With respect to RQ3 (valued outcomes for child with ASD), clarification of case-specific views of "child engagement" (i.e., "trying own best" in the Japanese case and "task engagement and completion" in the Australian case) helped to understand other differences in teaching practice (RQs 1 and 2). That is, the Japanese teachers’ holistic educational focus on helping children with ASD learn interpersonal skills with class peers (i.e., friends) was related to a preference for relationship-based and group-oriented practice, while the Australian teachers’ focus on skills-building favoured various activities designed for each skill and delivered with teacher aides. Moreover, Japanese schoolwide lesson study assisted the teachers to develop "ideal" lesson plans through group implementation for lesson development, while the Australian schoolwide PBS helped the teachers develop "best" program through working with various practitioners.

In other words, in both cases, the school assisted the teachers (valued outcomes for the school) to improve teaching (valued outcomes for the teachers), and therefore, the child with ASD achieved their learning goals (valued outcomes for the child). A teacher’s relationships with the school, colleagues, and children thus underpinned their value preferences (Kemmis, 2009). These special educators could clearly articulate the values involved in their relationship with a child in their class, which was consistent with their professional identity. However, the educators displayed limited capacity for spontaneous discussion about the valued outcomes of their relationship with colleagues and their school. These relationships became evident through observation.
Cross-case findings

A child with ASD. The special educators in both cases used national or state curriculum and school policy as a guide to plan a lesson for their classes, and curriculum flexibilities allowed the special educators to address the needs of individual children with ASD. All teachers indicated a greater concern to address individual needs than to follow a set of learning aims predetermined in the national or state regular education curriculum. They engaged in profiling the current learning situations of each child in order to plan their lessons with a focus on foundational skills.

Social inclusion of a child with ASD was the primary goal for the teachers in both cases. This goal was shared by teachers, other stakeholders, and the school. To achieve successful social inclusion, the teachers in both cases said that they valued three common outcomes: social skills and communication, learning engagement, and independence and self-determination. These outcomes were also found in teaching documents (e.g., lesson plans, unit plans, class curriculum, and IEPs). All participating teachers wanted children with ASD to understand class expectations and to acquire communicative skills. They also encouraged these children to participate in learning activities and to practise daily life skills. Sharing of these values across the two cases indicated that these three aspects were typical needs of children with ASD in schools. These teachers reported a child’s achievements during reflection interviews across the term-long period of fieldwork. Across ongoing reflection interviews, the gradual shift in teachers’ focus on what they wanted the children to achieve for life-skills lessons suggested that this monitoring of a child’s progress contributed to lesson improvement.

Their teaching was also developmental in both cases in that they programmed the scaffolding of skills and abilities relevant to the respective age groups of their classes. In this respect, children with ASD in these small classes could experience authentic learning for their future throughout their school years. Age-related teaching content and materials were consistent with developmental approaches in the English-language literature (e.g., Greenspan & Wieder, 2006; Heflin & Isbell, 2012; Wieder, 2012). The main outcomes for a child with ASD involved social and communication skills rather than engagement, independence, and other related skills in both cases. Observation at the three levels of class in each case, with their rising age levels, confirmed developmental adjustments in teaching children with ASD across primary schooling years (e.g., the older children demonstrated more social and communication skills in both cases).

The teacher. During Interview C, experienced teachers in both cases said little or nothing about improving their instruction. For example, Ms Deanne admitted that she used to work more consciously on improving her teaching but became less conscious about instructional improvements as she learnt from past teaching experiences. In a similar vein, Mr Banba said that the teachers required skills to teach a “good lesson” without writing all details in plans for all lessons because it was not practical to write a lesson plan for every lesson. This
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shared view suggested that the more experienced teachers considered that they needed to give little attention or time to plan a lesson. Early career teachers in both cases (i.e., Ms Chiba and Ms Eden) said more about their active engagement in making improvements of their own teaching when they were asked about what had improved in their teaching.

Particular skills and knowledge mentioned by the school stakeholders (i.e., principal and deputy principal) as essential for the special educators were also discussed by the teachers or observed by the researcher. Field notes about collegial conversations in both cases, together with video analysis of the Japanese lesson study meetings, showed that the more experienced teachers provided early career teachers with advice for further improvements. The topics of these advices suggested that skills and knowledge essential for the teachers included planning for the class at appropriate learning levels, making decisions about ways of addressing the individual needs of a child with ASD, reflecting on a child’s learning, and working collaboratively with other people. In concert with previous discussion about skills in relation to daily practice and group instruction, it appeared clear that the teachers developed these skills and knowledge throughout their everyday work and practice.

The school. In this two-case inquiry, schoolwide approaches in both cases guided the teachers and, therefore, helped school improvement. School reporting of achievements in each school referred to participation in schoolwide activity. For example, the Japanese school summarised findings of lesson study groups across all subject areas, and the Australian school reported annual progress of using EBPs in their schools. This documentation highlighted the interdisciplinary aspects of improving group instruction in terms of multiple subject points of view in Japan or different professional points of view in Australia.

Case-specific findings

A child with ASD. There were case-specific differences in the shared descriptions of what the teachers valued for social inclusion and for three child outcomes (i.e., social and communication skills, engagement, and independence). The strong emphasis of the Japanese special educators on interpersonal skills was observed in their ways of instructing a child with ASD to create positive experiences with peers. Their concern for holistic and abstract learning outcomes (e.g., “social nature”, “trying own best”, and observational learning skills) was evident in their long and descriptive talk about what they viewed as the child’s achievements. In contrast, the Australian special educators said that they valued skills and abilities that required the children to engage in learning activities, which appeared in their ways of training the child for skills-building and for behaviour management. They based specific and concrete learning outcomes (e.g., social tolerance, task completion, and “stay focused without support”) on their formal understanding of ASD-specific needs (e.g., understandings of the power of communication and abilities of using visual communication tools) in addition to a child’s unique individual needs.
These different descriptions appeared to align with the educational emphases in their national or state curriculum. The Course of Study for special needs education used by the Japanese teachers outlined broad learning objectives (i.e., three developmental phases; see details in Chapter 2) for children with ID, with alignment to regular education curriculum addressing more detailed learning objectives for each subject area. Unit and lesson plans of these Japanese special educators and lesson study reports by the school and SNEU highlighted key issues around how to address the abstract national emphasis of “Zest for life” within each curriculum subject (e.g., special needs education and mathematics). Similarly, the Australian teachers used age-related sets of state curriculum for their respective classes, which extended to include preparatory grade. Ms Eden and Ms Fleck employed Queensland Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Framework (QCARF: primary years curriculum), while Ms Deanne used Early Years Curriculum.

The English-language early childhood literature (Lim, Rodger, & Brown, 2010) had distinguished learning-related skills from interpersonal skills: skills required for maintaining friendships and for obtaining positive classroom behaviours respectively. In this aspect, this two-case inquiry revealed that the Japanese focus was interpersonal skills while the Australian focus was learning-related skills. In relation to social and communication skills, these Japanese special educators focused on inner achievements (i.e., kokoro), such that the child with ASD became aware of and willing to interact with friends (i.e., group involvement), became considerate about a friend’s feelings to work together (i.e., group cooperation), and wanted to help friends (i.e., group contribution). They valued the child’s happy and fun experiences of interacting with and working for friends because they believed that these experiences either facilitated the “social nature” of the children with ASD or motivated these children to interact with others in future. The Japanese teachers stressed a role of school as the social space giving opportunities for the children with ASD, who had limited success in their everyday living, to work “successfully” with friends and in a team engaging in activity routines. The Japanese teachers also said that the value of their respective life-skills unit was that repetition of similar activities allowed these children to experience success. Then, scaffolding experiences of more complicated interactions with peers allowed the children to develop relatively improved skills and knowledge.

In contrast, the Australian special educators often focused on behavioural improvements as one measurable indicator of knowing whether a child understands a concept of communication and emotion. The Australian teachers systematised the learning process of child learning and trained the child to achieve a targeted skill. These Australian teachers also discussed a role of school as training the child with ASD to become part of the community. However, their focus was on skills for group participation, rather than skills in peer interactions, as important for children’s further learning. These Australian teachers said that they valued the child’s staying in a group or social tolerance as a first step to engage in more focused learning.
The value placed on the teacher–child relationship and the target of social initiation training also differed in these two cases. All teachers in both cases valued their trust relationship with the child with ASD and worked on improving social initiation skills. Social initiations highlighted in naturalistic interventions (e.g., Koegel, Vernon, & Koegel, 2009) were directed to child–child interaction in the Japanese case and to adult–child interaction in the Australian case.

In the Japanese case, this teacher–child relationship was a platform from which the child with ASD improved their joint attention with the teachers and peers and became able to interact with peers. In the Australian case, the relationship provided a safe place for the child with ASD to engage in their learning activities with confidence. For example, Ms Ando (Japanese Teacher 1: JT1) and Ms Deanne (Australian Teacher 1: AT1) used play-based learning activities with their young students. However, Ms Ando viewed her role in playing as a medium to orient a child with ASD to peers. Her purpose of encouraging more dynamic play among the children was for the children to learn play skills though playing together and to have positive group experiences. Video analysis of Ms Ando’s class, which showed an increase in peer support over time, indicated that she was achieving her descriptive learning goal. This Japanese view of teachers’ role in the social interactions of children was somewhat similar to the English-language early childhood literature (e.g., Stanton-Chapman, Denning, & Jamison, 2012; Stanton-Chapman & Hadden, 2011; Stanton-Chapman & Snell, 2011). In contrast, Ms Deanne interpreted her role as a facilitator to encourage a child with ASD to use a targeted skill (e.g., make a request) or extend the child’s boundary (e.g., stretch the body a little more). Her Education Adjustment Profile (EAP) revealed this notion of this achievement in a child.

Second, child engagement meant “trying own best” in the Japanese case and “task engagement” in the Australian case. Whereas the Japanese teachers valued the learning process, the Australian teachers valued successful skill performance. For example, Ms Chiba (JT3) said that, if the children did not care and felt sad about the friend, who made a mistake and were sad, and continued their tasks, her group lesson became meaningless. Therefore, Ms Chiba stopped the activity in the middle of the lesson and encouraged the other children of her class to see what was happening in their classroom and to think hard about solving a friend’s problem together. On the other hand, Ms Eden (AT2) said that Ben (Australian Child with ASD: AA2) understood that he needed to do his work in a group before receiving access to his rewarding activity. This outcome was somewhat confirmed in the environmental change for Ben. His social tolerance was gradually improving through sitting in a small group of his favourite peers, in a class with his beanbag, in a class with his chair (see Figure 5.3 in Chapter 5).

The valued aspect of the engagement behaviour also appeared to differ in these two cases. The teachers in both cases directed praise to the children engaging in activities and used this positive feedback at the moment when the child with ASD displayed an expected behaviour during a lesson. However, the Japanese teachers praised an engaged child in order to acknowledge a child working hard in the class, to facilitate motivation in the child and the class,
and to build peer awareness and recognition in the class. They also frequently used praise to a child helping a friend or being kind to a friend as part of peer-modelling strategies. Therefore, their use of praise was directed mostly to peer-to-peer engagement (e.g., “Look! Daichi is working hard!” or “Everyone enjoyed the activity”). In contrast, the Australian teachers praised task engagement and motivated the child to complete a task. Although Australian teachers also praised the social behaviours of a child with ASD, the focus of their praise targeted the individual child (e.g., “Good work!”) rather than group interactions.

Third, independence and self-determination, which was also valued by the Japanese and Australian teachers, appeared to involve different ways of making choices. In the Japanese case, choice making provided opportunity for the class or peer group to work as a team to decide what they wanted, to improve it, and to evaluate it. In the Australian case, however, choice making was for individual children with ASD to stay focused on their tasks. This individual focus was highlighted in supplemental Australian interviewing about their view of an application of the Japanese life-skills unit to their own classes. That is, the original idea of setting one key child in the peer group as a leader for class community building did not fit in the Australian case. Ms Fleck commented that having one child as a leader may cause a conflict among the children in the class as all of them wanted to be a leader. She suggested rotation of the key child and also commented that repeating the same activity would make the children bored and reduce motivation. One explanation for her comments was that the children in her class were higher functioning than those in the Japanese classes. However, this individual focus in the class was consistent with the Australians’ talk and with their observed use of teaching strategies and approach.

In relation to the outcome of child independence, learning from others appeared connected to classroom management by achieving functional class activity without teacher support in the Japanese case. The Japanese special educators frequently mentioned observing others as an essential learning skill for the children with ASD in their future living. They highly valued copying what peers are doing as an important learning process. This active valuing of imitative skills in the Japanese case had been documented as a foundational skill in one Japanese practice for children with ASD (i.e., daily life therapy; e.g., Gurry & Larkin, 1990). It is also consistent with the recent English-language early childhood literature (Ledford & Wolery, 2011) and with another recent English-language study of effective strategies to help children with ASD in inclusive education, which included teaching sustained attention to peer models (Taylor & DeQuinzio, 2012; Tekin-Iftar & Birkan, 2010).

Figure 6.4 shows one scene in which two children, one with and one without ASD, were trying to set up their visual class schedule after being asked by a teacher who was busy with another child at a morning group time. In the scene, these children did not discuss how to set up the schedule but looked at each other’s face and tried to set it up together. This version of “observational learning” skills highlights the value of attending closely to peers.
Figure 6.4. Observational learning skills demonstrated by the Japanese children.

In addition, the Japanese site location within a regular education school provided a different perspective to that of the Australian special school. That is, the schoolwide emphasis on peer relationships created a culture of inclusion, such that typically developing children were welcoming and supportive to peers with ASD. The Japanese special educators mentioned that this peer-supportive school culture was specific to this particular Japanese school, compared with other schools in the prefecture. Observations showed that many children from regular education classes visited the SNEU children on many occasions for their *han* (peer group) initiatives. The many schoolwide group activities in this school allowed everyone at the school to “do things together” and provided opportunities for children with ASD to interact with different people and to have peer support and recognition. These activities increased children’s leadership and initiative to plan, implement, and evaluate activities. Kikkawa and Bryer (2013b) documented several touching aspects of social life in this school site based on friends, *han*, class community, and heart (see also Appendix O9 in Chapter 4).

The teacher. The closing question of Interview C (i.e., “If you have a magic wand, what would you like to achieve more?”) highlights different views of professional skills held by the Japanese and Australian special educators. All Japanese teachers answered that they wanted to make their lesson better through viewing a child and class as a whole in order to encourage the children to have better experiences. The Australian teachers expressed satisfaction with current outcomes of the children as stated in initial planning.

Between the two cases, skills and knowledge valued for the special educators differed. In the Japanese case, “lesson skills” were valued by both special educators and other stakeholders. These teachers were expected to create “ideal lessons”, and they put much time and effort into articulation of specific children’s learning experiences and into collaboration with colleagues as a team, in order to reflect on their everyday teaching experiences. Observations of lesson study teacher meetings indicated that these teachers engaged in schoolwide lesson study focused on improving what they are doing with the children. In other words, they identified effective strategies through an inductive process of real-life experimentation involving intensive observation, formative assessment, and collaborative reflection about classroom experiences.
In contrast, the Australian teachers and other stakeholders valued “specialist skills and knowledge”, and these teachers were expected to outline and program “best practice” for individual children with ASD through their own professional development enhanced with specialist support. They put their time and effort into this programming. Teaching documents confirmed that these teachers identified effective strategies based on their comprehensive understanding of ASD-specific characteristics, of the effects of these characteristics on the child’s learning and understanding of the world, and of the best available methods to address more specific and measurable learning goals for individual children with ASD. These teachers continuously engaged independently in professional development to update their ASD-specific knowledge and strategies transferable to new classroom situations. These teachers said that this systematic approach allowed the teachers to apply consistent practice in the classrooms by training teacher aides who had more interaction with the children with ASD. Their notion about systematising strategies for the classroom was aligned with the instructional efficiency highlighted in the English-language literature about classroom teaching (Konrad et al., 2011).

Knowledge and skills about effective teaching strategies valued by these special educators differed in the two cases. Different balances of social and cognitive tensions of group instruction between the cases were associated with the valuing of different adult- and peer-mediated outcomes (see the earlier discussion of RQ2 findings). In terms of instructional efficiencies mentioned in the earlier section about RQ2, adult-mediated support in the Australian case required less training time for a child with ASD. It used more human resources (i.e., teacher aides) but provided less social opportunity for children with ASD to interact with peers. It appeared to be effective when the teacher targeted more specifically focused learning. Although this more expensive support pathway was time-efficient when the teacher targeted skills-building, it gave a child less help to improve interpersonal skills. These Australian special educators tried to communicate effectively about the day’s schedule given to the child at those specific moments that these teachers recognised as important for the child’s targeted learning. The teachers’ view of appropriate learning environments (see Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5 in Chapter 4 and Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4 in Chapter 5) also highlighted the importance of decision-making skills in the teachers about what constitutes developmentally appropriate instructions.

Table 6.4 presents PRT strategies described by Suhrheinrich (2011) and demonstrates examples from all categories in the Australian case. Individual coaching with observation and feedback were valued strategies in that study of categories critical to the teachers’ mastery of PRT. Schoolwide PBS provided inschool training workshops, school therapists provided specialist hands-on sessions, and senior teachers or school administrators mentored the novice teacher to understand these classroom strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples from data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child attention</strong></td>
<td>(a) Obtain child attention</td>
<td>(a) When Ben looks away during Ms Eden’s group instruction, Ms Eden calls Ben’s name to maintain his attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Redirect child attention</td>
<td>(b) When Anne becomes aggravated, screams, and refuses following instruction, Ms Deanne redirects her attention by asking her “Anne, what is this?” Anne answers the question and stops her behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear and appropriate cues</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide cues supporting a child to respond in an appropriate way</td>
<td>(a) When Ben says “happy” at circle time, Ms Eden asks him “Could you say it in sentence please?” He says, “I am happy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Use activities that the child has selected</td>
<td>(b) During the small group activities for craft lessons, Ms Deanne asks Anne, “Would you like to do playdough or shaving cream?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child choice</strong></td>
<td>(a) Use materials the child has selected</td>
<td>(a) When the class has craft time, Ms Fleck asks Cate, “What colour would you like?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Use activities that the child has selected</td>
<td>(b) During the small group activities for craft lessons, Ms Deanne asks Anne, “Would you like to do playdough or shaving cream?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct reinforcement</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide reinforcement that is directly related to the child’s appropriate behaviour</td>
<td>(a) When Ben completes his first task, Ms Eden says, “Good work! Now you can have 5 minutes break before working another one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingent consequence</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide consequences immediately following a child’s behaviour</td>
<td>(a) When Cate stands up during group instruction, Ms Fleck says to the class, “Boys, each one of you can have a lolly because you are sitting very nicely.” Cate comes back to sit in her chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinforcement of attempts</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide reinforcement after most of the child’s reasonable goal-directed attempts</td>
<td>(a) When Anne is engaged in craft activity, Ms Deanne says “Good Work! It is lovely.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn-taking</strong></td>
<td>(a) Provide opportunities for turn-taking for a child and train the child to practice</td>
<td>(a) When Anne takes a toy from another child during PECS literacy group, Ms Deanne says, “Anne is waiting for her turn” and physically assists her to wait.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, peer-mediated support in the Japanese case involved ongoing training time for both a child with ASD and peers. Peer interactions were increased without access to teacher aides. Therefore, this support appeared to be effective when the teacher wanted the child to learn interpersonal skills. However, this cost-effective support pathway was not useful when the teachers wanted the child to learn more focused skills and acquire cognitive knowledge. For example, two Japanese teachers intensively taught cooking skills at the beginning of the cooking unit. Thereafter, they switched to peer-mediated learning. In this two-part pathway, the teachers worked to build a class that could function eventually as a self-maintaining community without the teacher’s direct support.

Table 6.5 shows effective strategies used by the Japanese teachers for “classroom management”, which were also mentioned in RQ2. In the extended fieldwork with the Japanese teachers, commitment to progressive scaffolding of interpersonal skills through the six years of
elementary school can be highlighted. Improvements in these skills observed among children with ASD/ID in the older classes appeared to justify the intense focus of these special educators on direct classroom interaction with other children. This culturally valued approach provided an alternative to ABA-based teaching of social skills to an individual child for use in social situations.

Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples from Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching classroom rules</td>
<td>(a) Set clear classroom expectations for social behaviours and teach them to the class and the child with ASD</td>
<td>(a) Ms Chiba’s class makes a poster of their classroom goal: “from myself (initiation), with friends, for friends.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Display a pictures paired with the expectation for supporting child’s understandings</td>
<td>(b) Ms Ando displays pictures of social models for playing in playroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a set of behavioural strategies</td>
<td>(a) Determine the best course of action to take, when a key moment of learning occurs</td>
<td>(a) When Osamu drops his egg on floor, Ms Chiba says to him, “What do you need to do?” and to the class, “Look! Your friend is in trouble.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing independence</td>
<td>(a) Clarify what the children should do during the time period</td>
<td>(a) Ms Chiba prepares classwide and individualised step-by-step guides for her cooking activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing class community</td>
<td>(a) Assign more capable peer to model/support the child</td>
<td>(a) Mr Banba asks Chiaki to look after Daichi as a member of his group during a lesson. Chiaki takes Daichi’s hand to escort him when Mr Banba is busy with another group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Encourage peer-monitoring system</td>
<td>(b) Ms Chiba assigns Eji as a shop manager, and he monitors the class progress during cooking activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Praise immediately on display of the targeted appropriate behaviour</td>
<td>(c) Mr Banba says to the class, “Look! Ichi is working hard now!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Label the appropriate behaviour of the class members</td>
<td>(d) When Ichi calls Bunta to join the class, Ms Ando says to the class, “I was very happy. Did you hear that Ichi called Bunta nicely?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Wait for the class to help friends spontaneously</td>
<td>(e) Ms Ando quietly sits and waits for the class to gather in a group, and the children call each other to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Maintain contingency and continuity (Crosland &amp; Dunlap, 2012)</td>
<td>(f) Ms Ando always praises a child who helps friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Create fun environment for the class to share happiness</td>
<td>(g) Mr Banba gives the children high five to cerebrate success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 presents examples of the Japanese teachers’ responses during Interview C and suggests that the Japanese teachers were inclined to reflect critically on their practice through ongoing inquiry into everyday practice and were willing to learn from each other through colleagues’ critiques of the lesson or daily school scenes. Ongoing critical reflections, desire for self-improvement of lessons, and self-doubting about current teaching efficacy appeared to enable the Japanese teachers to develop further skills and knowledge to address abstract
learning goals. Access to progressive observations and reflection interviews in the present inquiry offered a more grounded interpretation of the apparent uncertainty among specialist Japanese teachers during a focus group discussion (Kikkawa, 2007; Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013a). These findings about what these teachers were doing revealed a strong everyday focus on what they could do to improve on “today’s” lesson that complements verbal hedging and critical self-analysis as part of an established process of professional learning. In the English-language literature on teacher self-efficacy, Wheatley (2002), for example, pointed out that teachers’ doubts about their self-efficacy (i.e., internal conflict between personal expectation and sense of efficacy) may cause reflection and may motivate teachers to learn. In contrast, the Australian teachers tended to emphasise how their professional autonomous use of “best” practice improved outcomes of a child with ASD, and they independently engaged in their lesson and curriculum development while consulting with “best practitioners” in allied fields (e.g., speech therapist, occupational therapist, physiotherapist, and government guidance officer).

Case-specific purposes of interactions with other educators implied alternative meanings of collaboration (i.e., “sharing experience” versus “working together toward common goals”). Teachers in both cases considered collaboration essential and engaged with other educators every day for their work through casual and informal communications. In the Japanese case, the teachers discussed their children and their lessons with other teachers in order to improve their lessons for “tomorrow”. They shared details of what happened in the classrooms during a lesson and on the day as part of schoolwide lesson study practice. These teachers also used formal forms of group discussions, to which they invited outside-school stakeholders (e.g., senior special educators previously working in SNEU, university professors, and education government officers). To these Japanese teachers, everyday interaction was collaboration. In contrast, the Australian teachers considered communication with other educators as emotional support and did not hold formal discussions about lesson or practice improvement. They stated clearly that they worked independently as a classroom teacher for planning at the school, consistent with their ideas about professional autonomy. They viewed collaboration as concrete activities and duties (e.g., co-delivery and co-planning), and they said that they collaborated with teacher aides to deliver a lesson and with other professionals to develop comprehensive programs.

The school. School-specific features were highlighted as their school cultures in the teachers’ talk in both cases when they compared their own schools to other schools in the country. Two different role expectations found in RQ1 (see Table 6.1) guided the teachers in different directions. Within the holistic and inductive Japanese approach, the special educators improved group instruction in the school by articulating their ideas about “ideal child” and “ideal lesson” to other teachers. They valued multiple observer eyes to understand child learning together with the teachers’ personal process of making sense of a child and a lesson scene. The collaboration with several teachers appeared to create an “intersection of experience and belief”
In contrast, within the specific and deductive Australian approach, the teachers updated themselves about the most recent skills and knowledge of best practice for children with ASD, which is consistent with the current issue in the English-language literature of bridging the research to practice gap (Dingfelder & Mandell, 2011; Earles-Vollrath, 2012).

In the Japanese case, there appeared to be no clear answer about how to teach. According to these special educators, a good teacher has lesson skills that enable that teacher to create a good lesson for the specific class, and creating a good lesson involves a collegial process of progressive and critical inquiry in order to improve group instruction in future. This view of the Japanese teachers, also found in the talk of the other stakeholders together with the teachers’ conversation during lesson study meeting, and the teachers’ intensive progressive engagement in lesson improvement, appears to be consistent with practice recommended in the special educators’ guide to the life-skills unit for children with ID in the Japanese educational literature (Kimura, 2006). The alternative view shared by the Australian teachers, to set comprehensive programs that have the “best” fit to the class and to the child with ASD/ID, was consistent among other stakeholders and evident in the teachers’ ways of monitoring the child’s progress through planned programs.

Each case offered distinctive ways of contributing to the wider community of teaching, which were consistent with their respective schoolwide teaching approaches. The Japanese school, as an organisation that was a leader of in-school research, combined each teacher’s classroom inquiry and each lesson study group’s inquiry into everyday practice, articulated the relevant policy and curriculum, theorised their day-to-day practice around the children, and documented historical practices. School documents related to lesson study showed that the educational goal (or lesson study topic) and approach to improve current teaching was coherent among different age groups of children, subject areas, and individual classrooms. Teacher meeting observations showed that the Japanese special educators tried to make sense from what they observed during a lesson and attempted to find answers on the lesson study topic (e.g., child can feel learning satisfaction). The school lesson study conference report showed that other regular education teachers focused on answering the same topic from respective subject points of view. In this way, this schoolwide lesson study contributed to theory making for whole-person education though groups of teachers focused on specific subject areas and schoolwide inquiry into classroom teaching and learning. This school contribution to practitioner-based theory-making (i.e., practice into theory) appears to be similar in an American view of lesson study addressing teacher-led action research in regular education (Lewis, Perry, et al., 2009). Moreover, the contribution of special–regular educators’ collaboration on lesson development appears to be linked to an emerging topic in the English-language literature on collaboration as merging the disciplines for facilitating inclusive education (Pugach & Blanton, 2009, 2011; Pugach, Blanton, & Correa, 2011).
In contrast, the Australian school, as an organisation supporting EBPs in other special and regular education schools, offered a wider network of practitioners in ASD-related fields that helped the teachers integrate professional knowledge based on the needs of children with ASD in their classes. Schoolwide activity documented teachers’ systematic practice and contributed to finding ways of implementing research-informed theory into everyday classroom practice for ASD-specific learning goals (i.e. theory into practice). This approach was highlighted in a recent Australian review of EBPs for children with ASD that called for ASD-specific programs (Prior et al., 2011). This systematic approach helped the Australian teachers train paraprofessionals to work effectively with children with ASD, because the clear description of what they are doing enabled the Australian teachers to communicate with others about their practice; therefore, a consistent approach could be applied across the school.

**Teaching strengths: synthesising all findings**

Throughout the first section of this chapter, the findings were outlined for the three research questions, and cross-case analysis was used to consider key elements of group instruction for a child with ASD in the Japanese and Australian cases. In the last part of the first section, the similarities and differences of the two cases are considered together to extract the teaching strengths of each case and to gather important knowledge about teaching a group lesson and improving teaching for children with ASD in general. Both common and case-specific features of the Japanese and Australian cases for the three research questions contributed to the development of two models of essential skills for special educators to improve group instruction. Observation of the use of these two sets of strategies in both cases indicated that these strategies are essential for special educators to teach children with ASD in class in general. Models of teaching strategies and teaching approaches (Figure 6.5 and Figure 6.6) contributed to a conceptualisation of effective classroom teaching for children with ASD from the special educators’ case-specific points of view.

*Essential skills for teaching a lesson*

Figure 6.5 highlights the balancing of individual–class needs during group instruction as the important skill for teaching a lesson for children with ASD in a group. For example, the teachers in both cases stayed reflective and responsive to maintain child and class learning through making adjustments. Cross-case findings in RQ2 indicated that both support pathways involved the same supporting strategies effective for teaching children with ASD, which is illustrated in the green box. Similarly, findings in RQs 1 and 2 showed the importance of “group instruction strategies” highlighted in both cases. These general strategies used for the class are illustrated in the grey box.
**ADULT-MEDIATED SUPPORT PATHWAY**

- Less training time, fewer social opportunities, more focused learning
- Establish collaborative team
- Have frequent conversations to stay on the same page
- Support positive relationship between the child and teacher aide
- Train teacher aide to use consistent classroom strategies for the child
- Child-adult role play

---

**PEER-MEDIATED SUPPORT PATHWAY**

- More training time, more social opportunities, less focused learning
- Establish inclusive class management
- Maintain positive peer-mediated, modelling relationships between the child and peers
- Maintain high and consistent positive reinforcement for appropriate social behaviours and choice-making of a class member in front of everyone
- Train a class/buddy to observe “everyone” and to support one with needs
- Teach observational learning skills to the child with ASD
- Child-child or whole-class role play

---

**GROUP INSTRUCTION: BALANCING INDIVIDUAL-GROUP NEEDS**

---

**GROUP INSTRUCTION STRATEGIES FOR THE CLASS**

- Well-preparation for the lesson and day (e.g., environment, instruction, materials)
- Clear instructions for everyone
- Visual cues and support for class wall, whiteboard, or blackboard
- Maintenance of high and consistent positive reinforcement for appropriate social behaviours and choice-making of a class member in front of everyone
- Control of classroom instructional dynamics (peer/adult/child-content-teacher)

---

**Figure 6.5.** A model of two pathways of delivering a group lesson: teaching strategies.
Figure 6.5 illustrates peer-mediated and adult-mediated support pathways based on the Japanese and Australian findings, respectively, emerging from this two-case inquiry in relation to Figure 2.13 introduced in Chapter 2 (Brunner & Seung, 2009). In addition to the general strategies of group instruction, the special educators in each case displayed different ways of dealing with this balance in their respective contexts. Each pathway was focused on different learning goals and, therefore, involved different ways to support children with ASD when teaching a lesson to the class. Strategies used in each pathway were discussed in relation to RQ3 (see Table 6.4 and Table 6.5). The peer-mediated support pathway used by the Japanese teachers was time-consuming but cost-efficient for fostering interpersonal interaction of children with ASD. This pathway is suitable for learning social-related skills through peer interactions. In contrast, the adult-mediated support pathway used by the Australian teachers required more human resources but was time-efficient for individual skills-building of children with ASD. This pathway is suitable for cognitive learning in an individual space within a group.

**Essential skills for improving teaching**

Figure 6.6 illustrates key findings relevant to essential skills for improving teaching (i.e., professional development). It also highlights the role of school organisation for supporting special educators. Findings in RQ3 suggested that effective group instruction benefited from access to a schoolwide approach such as those used in the two sites for this inquiry. Schoolwide supports assisted three different professional development activities for the special educators: curriculum, educational theory, and EBPs (i.e., colour-coded units in the figure). Each activity shows the nature of the essential network and pathway. In other words, each school was providing strong support for its teachers with these three activities.

Curriculum development, in the left blue unit of Figure 6.6, concerns the teachers’ knowledge of subject matters, instructions relevant to the whole class, and appropriate materials for learning content. Findings of RQs 2 and 3 made it clear that the teachers in both cases prepared lessons and programs to teach contents of several subjects (e.g., arts, literacy, numeracy, SOSE, life-skills unit, and music). In particular, the Japanese lesson study approach enabled the special educators to work with other educators across subjects. Inputs from educators who had specialised in one or two subjects helped the Japanese teachers to incorporate subject understanding and instructional techniques into their ideal lessons. Working with other educators on curriculum study helped the teachers and the school articulate each area of curriculum. This unit informs effective ways of addressing curriculum in classroom environments.

The teaching experiences and qualifications in the typical background of these Japanese teachers contributed to curriculum development. Decreasing numbers of children are making full-time teaching very competitive in Japan. To get a teaching position, similar to that of these participating teachers, many teachers in Japanese primary schools have teaching qualifications
Figure 6.6. A model of three professional development pathways for improving group instruction: teaching approach.
for junior and high schools as well as for special education. The junior and high school teaching qualifications prepared the teachers to be specialised in one or more particular discipline; therefore, these teachers had curriculum understanding for specified areas. This trend makes it possible for all teachers to join one or two lesson study groups in primary education.

Educational theory, in the middle green unit of Figure 6.6, concerns the teachers’ need for a developmental understanding of children’s learning processes. This unit, which was informed by findings about RQs 2 and 3 in both cases, suggested that special educators who work with children with ASD, who also have ID, need to know many instructional variations to respond to unique needs. The Australian teachers talked about their adjustments of learning contents according to the cognitive level of each child with ASD. Moreover, the Japanese lesson study approach provided the teachers with opportunities to discuss interpersonal learning needs of children with ASD. Through teacher group observation and inquiry, the Japanese teachers attempted to articulate a critical moment of a lesson, theorise these abstract needs, and document findings and the process of their inquiry. In addition, the long-term learning goals of a school contributed to authentic learning outcomes for children with ASD in both cases. Because these goals helped the teachers to design progressive and coherent lesson plans, the children with ASD could achieve scaffolded skills and capacities throughout a school year. Observation of three different age groups in each case indicated that the teachers for older age classes actually addressed more comprehensive cognitive levels of performance with more social tensions in both cases.

The right orange unit of EBPs (i.e., evidence-based practice) concerns the teachers’ knowledge of common needs and strengths of children with ASD and of effective strategies or materials to meet particular needs. This unit of EBPs was particularly informed by findings of RQs 2 and 3 in the Australian case. These teachers chose a range of strategies by working with allied practitioners in several fields relevant to ASD and other needs, and they integrated that specialist knowledge with their individualised programs.

Figure 6.6 also shows essential skills for the teachers to deliver effective group instruction mentioned in findings of RQs 2 and 3 in both cases. These skills are related to the three units in the figure addressing professional development activities. Ongoing engagement of professional development is a feature of work and practice shared by the two cases. Critical reflection on one’s own teaching contributes to a teacher’s motivation for ongoing engagement in self-development of professional teaching skills. Ongoing inquiry into classroom teaching in the Japanese case informed these different aspects of improving classroom practice. More specifically, the Japanese lesson study approach helped the teachers articulate their ideas (i.e., elaborate tacit knowledge) through group discussion and helped the school develop explicit institutional knowledge about implementing national whole-person educational values into practice and practice-informing theories.
Findings of RQs 2 and 3 in both cases indicated that maximising team outcomes required the teachers to show their willingness to accept collegial inputs and critiques and to have conversational skills to communicate effectively with other staff about their problems, practice, and new ideas. The Australian speech therapist also said that, if a teacher was specific about the learning needs for a particular child with ASD, she could provide the teacher with precise support. The Japanese vice principal also said that teachers of that school needed conversational skills to detail their lesson study inquiry into an ideal lesson as the school needed to inform their lesson study outcomes to outside of the school. This statement was consistent with the emphasis in the Japanese school on teachers’ expectations to have lesson development skills (i.e., abilities to create “good” lesson through lesson study) rather than to achieve specific teaching outcomes (e.g., a completion of one ideal lesson).

Moreover, the role of other people in curriculum development and instructional improvements were highlighted in findings of RQ3 in this inquiry, which was somewhat aligned with collaborative relationships illustrated in Figure 2.16. First, schools had an important task in documenting all classroom examples (curriculum ideas, resources, activity examples) and making them available to all teachers. Schools also established relations with the wider community within, across, and outside of schools in order to support teachers so that they could access information useful for their teaching. Second, allied practitioners had roles in providing appropriate resources and training to teachers from their respective professional points of view about ASD. Insofar as these stakeholders have deeper and more comprehensive understandings of the needs of children with ASD and effective strategies for these needs, their advice to classroom teaching is cost- and time-effective.

Complexity of Teacher Work

In this second section of this chapter, the present findings are linked to previous conceptualisations of the complexity of teacher work in Chapter 2. Four figures in Chapter 2 illustrated the case-specific balancing of elements of complexity comprising the three dimensions of teacher work (Noffke, 1997), instructional triangle (Ball & Forzani, 2007), teachers’ sayings, doings, and relatings in action research (Kemmis, 2009), and an idea–experience construction of teacher work (ten Have, 2004). Consistent with these various conceptualisations, similar structural elements of work and practice could be detected, and these ecological frames for coding work and practice contribute support to these representations of complexity. However, the different functional balancing of relationships among these elements in the two cases also showed flexibility, within the respective ecologies of special educators’ work and practice regarding these conceptualisations. Moreover, these balancing dynamics posed questions about the transportability of teaching approaches and strategies across cultural borders.
Personal, professional, and political balance of special educators’ work

The special educators in each case balanced political, professional, and personal dimensions of teacher work but often seemed unaware of the interrelationships among dimensions (Noffke 1997; see Figure 2.1). Teachers’ personal view of their work and their preference about what they wanted the child to achieve contained a strong political influence from national or state education on school emphasis. Moreover, appearance of these political influences across three semistructured interviews and reflection interviews suggested that values affected teacher choice of strategies to teach the child with ASD. In particular, Ms Fleck’s highlighting of differences between the special and regular schools suggested effects of system differences on teaching. For example, Ms Fleck said that environment of the site school as special school (i.e., having locked gates) enabled the teachers to ignore Cate’s attention-seeking behaviour (i.e., running out of the classroom), which was an effective strategy for this type of behaviour.

Different perceptions of the special educators’ roles in these two cases contribute to describing how school systems affect teacher views and practice.

Moreover, continuous engagement in professional development within the schoolwide cultures around these special educators suggested that the professional dimension is stronger, or at least more visible to the teachers, than the political dimension in both cases. Institution-specific perceptions of the educators’ roles became clear when the educators and school stakeholders compared their schools with other schools. These institutional or professional decisions about ways of addressing national and state educational emphases in their schools appear to influence teaching in the classroom.

Furthermore, this two-case inquiry suggested a case-specific personal–professional balance in the Japanese and Australian cases. The personal dimension appeared to be more dominant in the Australian case than the Japanese case. The Australian teachers were more independently engaged in curriculum development and professional development. In contrast, the professional dimension seemed more dominant in the Japanese case than the Australian case. The Japanese teachers engaged in group implementation of curriculum development as part of their professional development. For example, the Japanese teachers invited other teachers who had previously worked in the SNEU and asked for their advice to improve their lessons. This practice helped the teachers understand the school tradition with its emphasis on peer relationships and the child’s inner engagement, and, at the same time, the collegial pressure from the other professionals in these teams led the teachers to follow the tradition. This professional influence on personal practice may contribute to the slow introduction of EBPs into Japanese schools despite its acknowledged its effectiveness by the Japanese researchers.
Instructional triangle balance of special educators’ work

Instructional interactions among three classroom anchors (the teacher–child–content) in cross-cultural inquiry appeared to contribute another layer of teaching complexity for these special educators (Ball & Forzani, 2007; see Figure 2.4). Figure 6.7 illustrates modifications of instructional emphases of each case with dense arrows and models related to teacher reflections on classroom interactions. The Japanese teachers tended to emphasise child–child rather than teacher–child interactions and highlighted environmental influence on the child’s learning content through their manipulation of social situations in class lessons. In contrast, the Australian teachers tended to emphasise child–adult interactions and highlighted direct instruction of appropriate learning content and strategies for the child with ASD (see Figure 6.5). This two-case inquiry suggested that all teachers’ ways of balancing class dynamics involved all anchors and environment. However, these class dynamics during a lesson were uniquely controlled by the special educators’ teaching intentions. The presence of extra adults in the Australian classrooms added an extra complexity to the educators’ decisions about teaching children with ASD in their classes.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 6.7. Different ways of balancing teacher–child–content dynamics in Japan and Australia.*

Say–Do–Relate balance of special educators’ work

Cross-checking multimethod data showed how special educators’ decisions about improving teaching contributed to the complexity of teacher work (Kemmis, 2009; Figure 2.3). During interviews about teacher approach to teaching with children with ASD, all teachers said that they engaged in planning by using relevant information (e.g., curriculum and understandings of a child) and working with others and in delivering a lesson to the class. Figure 6.8 presents an internal cycle of thinkings, doings, and relatings (e.g., relevant information and conditions) beneath teacher talk.
Figure 6.8 shows a finding in RQs 1 and 2: a gap between what teachers planned and what they actually implemented during a day. The teachers in both cases referred to this plan–implementation gap as everyday variations arising from the unique needs of children with ASD during a lesson and across a day and week. This gap appeared to be the most concerning aspect shared by the teachers in both cases, because these teachers believed that they must be sensitive and responsive to these children’s needs in order to have a successful lesson, day, and week. However, this type of gap appeared to demand a large investment of teacher time and resources for the Japanese teachers, but not for the Australian teachers. Further inquiry into the gap with multiple perspectives from multimethod data provided a clearer explanation of the nature of this difference than has been available previously. That is, a plan–implementation gap informed a long time line for lesson development in the Japanese case, whereas it informed daily adjustment in the Australian case.

Figure 6.8. Teacher sayings highlighting gap between planning and doing.

Figure 6.9 and Figure 6.10 show the results of further cross-case analysis on the plan–implementation gap. These figures illustrate different ways of using thinkings (T) and relatings (R) to inform their plans (P) and the respective impact of plan–implementation gaps to doings (D) in the Japanese and Australian cases. While the presence of different approaches to curriculum development has been detected previously in relation to two different meanings of “planning” in RQ2, Figure 6.9 and Figure 6.10 show more explicitly the different kinds of mechanism that the special educators in the two cases employed when they were talking about teaching a small group of children.

These figures contribute to a better understanding of these featured approaches to improve teaching from a pedagogical view of curriculum (Letts, 2013). The Japanese teachers’ approach to everyday variations could be considered as emergent curriculum in contrast to the Australian approach as outcomes-focused curriculum. More specifically, a plan–implementation gap was progressively narrowed in the Japanese lesson plan through their classroom inquiry and was regarded as everyday adjustments to complete all tasks articulated in the Australian plan.
(i.e., class curriculum and individual plans). Figure 6.9 illustrates the incorporation of a planning–implementation gap by the Japanese teachers into their next lessons. It indicates that relatings and thinkings change over time and contribute to improve doings (Kemmis, 2009). The Japanese teachers valued something that they did not intend or plan for their learning during a lesson and attempted to “improve practice tomorrow” by adding that “something” to their next planning. Their initial view of learning goals (i.e., “ideal child”) gradually changed across weeks of teaching a lesson as they articulated clearly what “ideal child” they want children with ASD to become.

In contrast, Figure 6.10 shows that the Australian teachers completed comprehensive programming in the beginning of the school year to set specific term-long goals for the class and individual children and maintained scheduled programs to the end of the term. It indicates that relate–think components are fixed once initially determined and guide doings. Task completion was highly valued, and daily activities were adjusted within the overall planning according to the child’s needs or organisational needs (e.g., schedule change for a therapist’s
visits). The set of learning goals did not change to the extent that systematised learning steps had been identified.

Figure 6.10. The Australian teachers’ view of doings in their teaching approach, clarified through plan–implementation gaps identified across data sources.

Figure 6.9 and Figure 6.10 also confirm the presence of two dimensions of independent–cooperative teaching approaches in both cases, but the balance of individual–group activity differed in the two cases. In particular, an inspection of the impacts of other people in relation to the plan–implementation gap suggested different coordination of group and individual responsibilities to achieve a teaching goal in these cases. In the Japanese context, group efforts were vital for clarification of the “ideal child” and for examination of the class interactions to identify the gap. Teaching a lesson was an individual responsibility for the Japanese classroom teachers, but group efforts contributed to all activities around teaching (i.e., a cycle of plan–implement–evaluate–improve) to support special educators’ delivery of a good lesson. The Australian teachers handled social conflict occurring in classrooms through the personal strengthening of their teacher capacity by team-working with other people who had specific roles in education for children with ASD. These teachers worked independently for programming lessons, delivering the lessons, and assessing outcomes for the children with ASD as individual responsibilities with specific support from other people.

Social theory and evidence balance of special educators’ work

This different balance between social theory and evidence in these two cases is consistent with the notion that practitioners can construct their work flexibly by combining information from theory and data (ten Have, 2004, see Figure 2.6). All participating teachers engaged with curriculum development through incorporating the desired social theories and classroom reality. Both developed group instruction plans through planning, implementing and evaluating their
practice across the term. However, the Japanese and Australian special educators selectively used inductive and deductive approaches to arrive at a set of strategies that they considered effective for children with ASD (see Figure 6.11). This evidence that distinctive approaches in the classroom could be considered good and “right” ways to teach a child with ASD is compatible with the wide range of strategies that have been proposed as interventions for children with this developmental disorder.

These different approaches reflected different professional skills that the special educators in each case achieved through their everyday experience, preservice training, and schoolwide approach. These different professional skills also aligned with the teachers’ views of current practice. All Japanese teachers wanted to make their lessons better through inductive viewing of a child and class as a whole, in order to encourage the children to have better experiences. In contrast, the Australian teachers were satisfied with current outcomes achieved by the children through deductively developed programming. Figure 6.11 showed the different constructions of social theory and evidence for the Japanese and Australian teacher practice and described these differences in essential skills for the teachers in the two cases (see Figure 6.6).

Inductive and deductive ways of improving teaching also filters into teachers’ explanations of their use of similar strategies. For example, the Japanese teachers used visual cues based on Treatment and Education of Autistic and Communication related handicapped Children (TEACCH) program but did not clarify the origins of these strategies. In contrast, the Australian teachers clearly linked their strategies to available literature of ABA principles. They not only used more varied visual supports such as visual cueing, sight word instruction, and PEC but also offered explicit ideas about the reasons for using these methods for the child with ASD.

Moreover, opportunities for teacher collaboration arising in the all-pervasive Japanese culture of the educational work environment may contribute to the operation and development of relationship-oriented teaching approaches in the Japanese school. The Japanese special educators often used their “free time” to support their children outside of the school and to complete obligations for professional development (i.e., obtain collegial feedback on their teaching). Sarkar Arani and Matoba (2006) referred to a history dating at least from the 1980s about the busy, tiring, and stressful nature of teaching in Japan and about most Japanese teachers’ persistent concern about their work outside school hours. In this inquiry, the Japanese special educators in this case referred to their stress but seemed to accept the conditions of their work as a part of being a social model of “hard-working” use of time. On the other hand, allocation of noncontact hours was a valued aspect of the Australian teachers’ implementation of EBPs for programming and evaluating outcomes according to specific goal settings, functionally defined for individual children with ASD (viz., “smart or efficient” use of extra preparation time).
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IDEAL LESSONS FOR THE CHILD
Everyday real-life experiment on "conditions"
- Careful observation
- Reflection on children’s inner thinking
- Seeking better practices than “today”

Australian Case
Professional training shapes the process of applying ABA-informed literature to their teaching

Evidence-based practice
- Understandings of ASD and effective practices developed by accessing ABA literature
- Reference to a wide range of research-based literature

Holistic educational values
- Philosophical understandings of teaching developed historically by senior teachers
- Reference to professional literature (e.g., government documents, lesson study report, books)

Japanese Case
Professional approach of lesson study is embedded in the entire process of their teaching

Systematic assessment on children’s needs
- Functional assessment
- Data analysis

Everyday real-life experiment on children’s “conditions”
- Careful observation
- Reflection on children’s inner thinking
- Seeking better practices than “today”

Figure 6.11. Case-specific construction of special educator strategies of practice and approaches to improving group instruction.
Cultural Lens as a Research Tool

This third section offers methodological reflections on the application of three cultural lenses as research tools for examining actual teaching work and practice: (a) the teachers’ intracultural lens on their own practice as they talk about it, (b) the multimethod lens that tests their words in relation to their actions and valued instructional relationships, and (c) the researcher’s intercultural lens in using prior experience in both educational systems to adjust methodology and interpret data on work and practice in each case. These lenses revealed gaps between what the teachers said in earlier and later phases of field research, between what they said and what they actually did in teaching and interacting with their classes, and between the Japanese and Australian case studies.

The special educator’s intracultural lens

A participating teacher’s perspective or intracultural lens revealed what these teachers were most concerned about in teaching children with ASD in their small classes. All aspects of work and practice through this lens were visible to the teachers and other stakeholders; therefore, they were able to talk about it during interviews. The series of semistructured interviews about aspects of work and practice and ongoing reflection interviews about lessons were allocated across the extensive period of field research. Therefore, the combination of these methods helped to identify features that changed across the unit of work and other classroom activities. As the special educators’ focus of their practice shifted across a cycle of teaching and learning, description of the plan–implementation gap addressed earlier was a finding of using this intracultural lens. However, this lens was potentially subject to case bias and neglect of features that were common sense to the participants (e.g., basic strategies used by the teachers) within their respective cultures and educational systems.

Multimethod lens

A multimethod lens tested what the teachers said about practice. Figure 6.12 illustrates how different data sources inform the reality of work and practice. In many examples, cross-checking between what special educators believed they do (i.e., teaching strategies during a group lesson and teaching approach to improve practice) and what they were actually doing provided extra description of what they were talking about, which could confirm what they said. However, this lens also can reveal a gap between their sayings and doings.

In many examples throughout this inquiry, the multimethod lens confirmed findings of the intracultural lens and improved the description of the teachers’ practice from multiple perspectives of methods and actors of each case (i.e., special educators, other educational stakeholders, and researcher). For example, situational analysis interviews provided overviews
of work and practice. In both cases, school leadership members (e.g., principal and deputy principal) provided clear and expansive views of teaching emphasis in the school that helped synthesise findings from each teacher to show practices evolving in different age groups. Moreover, comments from administration staff and specialist practitioners with relevant professional knowledge about ASD helped link teaching strategies to the literature. For example, the Japanese SNEU head also clarified the teachers’ use of TEACCH, while the Australian speech therapist specified communication strategies in use.

Figure 6.12. Cross-checking multiple data sources for alignment of sayings and doings.

Moreover, the multimethod lens helped to reveal features of teacher work and practice that were invisible to the participating teachers in each case but became visible through cross-checking different data sources and stakeholder points of view. This point elaborates the early discussions about qualitative cross-cultural inquiry (e.g., Gómez & Kuronen, 2011). For example, teaching documents provided information about practice that was routine to the teachers and, therefore, was not mentioned in interviews. For example, photocopied articles and book pages filed within Ms Deanne’s class program paperwork showed the materials that she used to decide her instructional strategies for her class (e.g., PECS and communication facilitator). The information provided detailed explanations of instructional strategies observed in her lesson and confirmed her use of EBPs.

Furthermore, this lens also revealed contradictions between teacher’s sayings and what they were doing (i.e., doings). The say–do gap emphasised features clearly visible in other data sources but unmentioned by the special educators. An example was collegial interactions observed among teachers. Tracking records of collegial interactions contradicted teachers’
comments about minimal professional exchanges with other people and suggested frequent interactions with others that helped them develop or improve their practice.

Moreover, the video-clip method provided a dialogic space where the teacher and researcher could communicate effectively (see, more detailed, Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012a). Particularly for the Japanese special educators, the use of video-clip examples in reflection interviews helped overcome the teachers’ say–do gaps. More specifically, it helped the Japanese teachers articulate their peer-oriented practice as shown in the video-clips. This type of practice was reported in the researcher’s previous master’s study. However, vague statements made by the Japanese teachers often raised questions from research supervisors (e.g., “What do the teachers actually mean?”). Discussion around a concrete video example of their actions shared between the special educator and the researcher clarified the meaning of the teachers’ expressions during interviews and helped the teacher describe their practice in detail.

The effectiveness of sharing a concrete “image” of what they were doing in interviews also suggested the reason why the Japanese teachers used the lesson study approach to improve holistic teaching practice. That is, group implementation of lesson development provides multiple perspectives from different people who observe the lessons, which helps to visualise or “embody” lesson scenes and thus work towards an ideal lesson. In the Japanese case, direct observation of the research lesson seemed to be essential to communicate effectively with others about their practice. The practice of effective communication skills highlighted in the Japanese vice principal’s interview was consistent with this argument.

The researcher’s intercultural lens

The intercultural lens in this cross-cultural inquiry exposed case-specific features, as practice was observed in a two-way direction between the Japanese and Australian case points of view. Activation of this intercultural lens occurred only when one particular practice or concept did not cross the border between the two cases (i.e., did not have meaning in both cases). Reflection logs provided signals to activate this lens. Logs that were maintained by the researcher during field research—with notes recording methodological difficulties faced in this inquiry, concerns expressed by the participants, and feedback provided by cross-translation contributors—helped further inquiry into the Japanese–Australian conceptual gaps (see Appendix N). Although the subjective position of the single researcher using the intercultural lens and using an occasion-by-occasion refining process to keep the methodology on course remained concerning in documenting the relative strengths of each case, the documentary trail of decision making in the reflection logs helped to pinpoint clashing boundaries of teacher work.

Figure 6.13 shows three steps in using an intercultural lens. Each case was unique and transparently very different. That is, if the researcher looked at these cases as they were, then no crossing bridge was available to identify. The most observable aspects of the teachers’ everyday activities in each case made it hard to find “case-specific findings” (i.e., the most representative
findings addressing the research questions in a respective case). For example, a comment recorded in reflection logs in the Australian Observation Week 1 (see Chapter 3) indicated that detailed differences narrowed the research focus and blinded the inquiry to these case-specific findings.

Two different shapes of triangle and square in Figure 6.13 illustrate that the most obvious differences in the Japanese and Australian teacher work and practice created strong boundaries between the cases. The lens then needed to be zoomed out from the particulars or the most visible differences between the cases until common aspects or ecologies between the cases were found. Similarly, two fruits, such as apple and orange, can be compared by their smell, colour, or taste. In the present inquiry, such shared aspects or topics became “feature-categories” with which the two cases were able to interact with each other. These cross-case interactions on the shared aspects revealed differences about teacher work and practice between the cases (see

**Figure 6.13.** Visibility of case-specific findings through intercultural lens: steps to intercultural border crossing.
more details in Kikkawa & Bryer, 2012b). The inquiry into thematic relationships among these differences explored case-based reasons behind the practice and approach of the teachers in each case and extracted teaching strengths (i.e., essential skills; see Figure 6.5 and Figure 6.6) in each case.

**Final Considerations**

The focus of this inquiry was extensive description of the special educators’ views about their everyday practice, group teaching for children with ASD, and valued outcomes of their group instruction. Their views were cross-checked with direct observation of class lessons, professional meetings, and guided reflections over the term. This final section first considers the limitations of this inquiry. It also presents some practical implications of this inquiry for special educators in both cases. Some ideas for further research in the field of teaching children with ASD are then discussed.

**Limitations**

There are numbers of limitations to this descriptive inquiry. First, the small scale of this qualitative cross-cultural case study, with three special educators teaching one of three levels of a class in one school in each country, is a major limitation to generalisation. Conclusions drawn from these particular cases may not apply elsewhere in the respective host country, and the descriptions of work and practice of these special educators are not generalisable only to the extent that these cases are representative of the wider field in each country. Moreover, the extensive nature of these inquiries means that some sampling may be specific: for example, aspects of change in teacher work and practice related to the cross-sectional data on teaching in single examples of age-related classes.

Second, replication of this time-consuming inquiry, with its naturalistic and case-specific methods and the singularities encountered in finding a site for each case that met the criteria would be challenging. The data gathered through case-specific methods were case-specific and, therefore, these data were analysed specifically for each case. Findings about the teachers’ reality, extracted via slightly different methodology paths, were case-specific and may only be applicable to similar cases. For example, the overview of findings had to accommodate different time frames of field research for each case and data from different locations of primary school unit classes (i.e., regular and special). Moreover, although reflection interviews monitoring what the teachers did during the week kept track of changing activity, data on only one or two lesson observations weekly may have been insufficient to capture some critical moments of everyday teaching. Video-clip examples were not used for reflection interviews in the Australian case as the special educators did not welcome this form of interviews. Hence, interpretations of Key Moments from the Australian teachers’ point of view lacked immediacy.
and depended on postevent recall, even though questions in their reflection interview were adjusted for the Australian teachers to identify and discuss the Key Moments soon after the lesson was observed.

Third, the intercultural lens applied by the researcher was a limitation, especially for interpretations of case-specific findings. Multiple methods used to suspend the personal cultural lens of the researcher and extensive data collection by these methods assisted objectivity and awareness of assumptions. It must be acknowledged, however, that the researcher’s subjective feeling may influence narrative descriptions in each case (Stake, 2006). In particular, the unsuccessful search for a contributor with intercultural competence meant that the inquiry lacked an independent contributor for coding information to help validate analyses. Alternative solutions included use of Leximancer-assisted content analysis to test the reliability and validity of the manual analysis for interview texts (but not for video analysis) and asking the teachers to pinpoint their views of Key Moments to identify the most representative examples of practice.

Finally, this inquiry did not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of practice in relation to child outcomes. Direct inclusion of children and quantitative testing of their actual diagnosis and learning progress exceeded the scope and capacity of this inquiry. Because the children’s outcomes were not followed up, the actual impact of children’s school experience in interpersonal or skills training on the child’s subsequent school life and long-term satisfaction was not the concern of this inquiry.

**Implications of the inquiry**

The implications of this inquiry are discussed at two points outlined in the teaching strengths of each case: practical ideas for improving teaching strategies and approaches. Irrespective of the presence of situational specifics of teacher qualifications and class level, all participating teachers made strong and vigorous efforts to teach children with ASD in their small group classes and displayed energies, thoughtfulness, and passion towards their work and practice.

The detailed description of special education teaching in small groups in this inquiry makes the point that it is no small matter to make a wholesale conversion to mainstreaming and inclusion of children with ASD/ID in regular classes. Work and practice in these cases was complex over and above the complexities of regular teaching.

In relation to teaching strategies, this cross-cultural inquiry suggested possible ways of teaching children with ASD that can be useful for other schools within the same system. The sites obtained for this inquiry provided the opportunity to describe practice of high quality. These special educators already engaged in mentoring and modelling of practice for children with ASD in their educational region.

Some aspects of teaching strengths in one case may provide new ideas for special educators in the other educational system. The Japanese interpersonal practice may be useful for the Australian teachers, as personal and social capabilities are highlighted in the new Australian
curriculum (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2013a, 2013b). In contrast, the Australian skills-based practice may be useful for the Japanese teachers, as the Australian school was more advanced in teaching children with ASD. Whereas ASD was well-established as an independent diagnostic category in the Australian unit (Education Queensland, 1993), it was more recently accepted as a formal category eligible for special educational support in the Japanese unit (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology: MEXT, 2005b). More cross-cultural awareness of alternative approaches to intervention may encourage staff to think outside their own educational system and its culturally approved practices.

The “naturalistic” observations of teachers’ practice in both cases, which were conducted in everyday classroom contexts, provide practical insights into teaching children with ASD. The Australian case highlighted an effective and efficient approach to teach those children with ASD systematically with teacher aides, and the Japanese case highlighted ongoing lesson development to use peer support to help teach a child with ASD within interpersonal interactions rather than with teacher aides. A combination of these two different support pathways (i.e., peers or adults) may help teachers and schools maximise use of available resources. Figure 6.14 makes the point that special educators need to include peers and interpersonal content and adults and cognitive content and not exclude whole areas of possibility for improved instructions.

![Complexity of classroom dynamics in a combination of peer and adult support.](image-url)
Based on the findings of this inquiry, a program for preservice education for special educators needs to address the balancing of individual and group needs. To increase instructional efficiency, the teachers need to make sure whether they aim at teaching patterns (cognitive) or enhancing ability (interpersonal) at each instructional moment. This would require comprehensive and practical training in working with teacher aides in classrooms and using peer interactions as part of teaching strategies. Teachers needed these skills to make decisions according to real life classroom situations, to establish measurable goals, and to maintain a reflective perspective on lesson improvement as an individual and as a member of a collegial support group. Building these skills is likely to be more meaningful in special education practicum, in addition to knowledge acquired through lectures.

In relation to teaching approaches, it seems that any schoolwide approach that is geared to support teachers in their classrooms can be beneficial to improve teacher work and practice. The role of the school in organising and maintaining these schoolwide approaches, highlighted in this inquiry, is to help the teachers improve teaching. With Japanese lesson study, teachers can work together to incorporate different learning areas into one set program for a child with ASD. With schoolwide PBS, the school can provide a wider community of practice around children with ASD. Integration of these two approaches may help to deliver inclusive curriculum to regular education settings where all teachers have comprehensive understandings of the national curriculum, developmentally appropriate learning of different age-groups, and effective teaching and supporting strategies for children with ASD.

Inclusive curriculum development has been an emerging issue in current education for children with ASD (Copeland & Cosbey, 2008; Crosland & Dunlap, 2012; Ferraioli & Harris, 2011; Koegel, Kuriakose, Singh, & Koegel, 2012; Moores-Abdool, 2010; Ryndak, Moore, Orlando, & Delano, 2008; Smith, 2008; Taylor & DeQuinzio, 2012). This issue has been attracting policy interest, particularly in English-speaking societies, and mostly applies to children with moderate levels of disability. It also features in current Japanese discussions for supporting children with high incident needs in regular education classrooms. The two cases were special education settings involving small numbers of children with somewhat similar learning needs (i.e., emphasis on foundation learning rather than academic skills) and allowed the teachers time and effort to prepare individual support. However, inclusive classroom instruction requires more complex dynamics than teaching in special education settings involving lower child–adult ratio, illustrated in Figure 6.14. Therefore, schoolwide approaches are essential to support teachers to deal with this complexity.

Moreover, a university–school partnership such as that occurring in the Japanese case may be beneficial to the professional basis of schoolwide approaches. Many regular education schools may not have principals and senior teachers, who are special education professionals such as in the Australian case. Extra special education professionals, who are available to observe class teaching, report critical events of child learning, and facilitate the teacher learning
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based on their class teaching, can provide educational advice and learning opportunities to help teachers improve differentiated instructions with large class groups.

Finally, the methodological procedures and methods used in this inquiry suggest a systematised way for conducting a qualitative cross-cultural case study. Application of ecological features helps researchers cross a bridge between different cases across nations. The four models used to compare the two cases (Ball & Forzani, 2007; Kemmis, 2009; Noffke, 1997; ten Have, 2004) may be transferable across cultures as they are consistent with the development of ecological coding categories in this inquiry.

Further research

This research suggests areas requiring further examination in terms of cross-cultural research, EBPs, and school improvements. First, surveys for larger sampling scale could examine the representative of case-specific findings in the two countries. Quite recently, cultural understandings of teacher practice specifically for children with ASD have emerged in the literature as essential aspects of decision making about teaching strategies (e.g., Daley, 2002; Lee, 2010; Matson, Worley, et al., 2012). Particularly, social and interpersonal abilities are found to be valued differently in various cultures (Lewis, Koyasu, et al., 2009; Matson et al., 2011; Matson, Worley, et al., 2012). Surveying of the actual range of teaching strategies and approaches found in this inquiry may help policy makers and professional development agents to be sensitive to culturally preferred ways of teaching these children with ASD in different countries.

Second, the effectiveness of using the Japanese and Australian teachers’ practice with children with ASD needs to be assessed. The brief trial of lesson study in the Australian class in this study indicated some barriers (e.g., expectations of taking turns at being leader versus accepting the leadership of a peer). Long-term interventions require long-term data on child outcomes to warrant widespread adoption (Koegel, Koegel, & Camarata, 2010). Particularly, longitudinal quantitative measurement of changes in interpersonal skills and social and communicative abilities of the children with ASD is needed to investigate the effects of different ways of teaching on the later life of these children and their transition from school to postschool life in the community. Perhaps, Japan is an appropriate country in which to undertake an initial round of naturalistic assessment of interpersonal and communicative child progress through class levels. Even though there is variation in school emphasis on peer interaction within Japanese education, the overall valuing of cooperation provides a broader basis for sampling. Such studies will help address a lack of generalisation of social intervention effects highlighted in the English-language literature (Bellini et al., 2007; Koegel, Kuriakose, et al., 2012).

Finally, a teacher professional development model comprising the three pathways outlined in Figure 6.6 needs to be examined in school settings. Education for children with ASD
in both countries has moved forward dramatically and needs further examination about effective teaching. Secondary education in Australian has moved towards using ASD-specific programs to accommodate children with high-functioning ASD and Asperger syndrome (Aspy & Grossman, 2012). However, the Australian primary education system has continued to use more generic programs designed for children with special needs (Prior et al., 2011). Similarly, the Japanese education system has struggled to find ways of addressing the needs of those children with ASD in regular education classrooms. Some Japanese researchers have expressed a readiness to publish translated books about schoolwide PBS (e.g., Crone & Horner, 2003; translated in Japanese by Noro, Mitachi, Ohkubo, & Sato in 2013) as Japanese schools are becoming more welcoming to ABA-type practice (Ohkubo, 2013). Because each school has its own strengths, investigating how a school can improve requires case-specific action research, while maintaining good practice already in use. The result will contribute to school improvements, particularly for teaching children with ASD.

**Conclusion**

This descriptive inquiry examined special educators’ work and practice for teaching children with ASD in their small classes in a Japanese and an Australian special education setting through intracultural, multimethod, and intercultural lenses. This present inquiry added to the corpus of literature on naturalistic inquiry into “real life” classroom practice for children with ASD. Particularly, this study contributed to the limited evidence about how special educators work with children with ASD in everyday classroom teaching.

Moreover, this inquiry supported the value of cross-cultural study of teaching children with ASD. More specifically, it helped clarify that the Japanese special educators also used lesson study approach to teaching children with ASD and that the Australian special educators used PBS with a combination of SST and PRT as secondary intervention strategies. Direct observations of these teachers’ teaching highlighted the do-ability of group-based social skills training in classroom settings to help children with ASD learn essential skills (Carter, 2010). This inquiry also showed that schoolwide approaches support and guide the teachers to formulate ways to improve the teaching of children with ASD in classrooms.

Furthermore, these two cases also stressed the fact that understanding teacher practice is not simple because special education teaching, like regular teaching, is constructed as the teachers perform teaching in personally, professionally, and politically balanced working conditions. Teachers transform their teaching as they deliver a lesson within their desired balance of class dynamics and improve teaching through classroom-based learning and incorporation of theory and everyday classroom evidence. This cross-cultural inquiry provided a case study research model that used ecological similarity in classroom structures but adjusted methods in order to deal with case-specific functioning within those structures.
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研究の目的

この研究は2校の日本の小学校で特別支援教育に携わる教師（もしくは special education teachers）が自閉症（スペクトラムを含む）を持った生徒の集団に対して、レッスンスタディ（授業研究）の循環過程を通してどのように教師としての仕事を行っているのかを調査するものである。日本とオーストラリアの両国ともに、学校・教師は教室で自閉症を持った生徒がいるクラスに対してどのように教育を行うか試行錯誤している。自身の修士論文では、自閉症を持った生徒に対して、日本の教師の実践は全体論的で集団社会性重視であった。それに対し、オーストラリアの実践は集団の中で行う実践ではあったが、対象かつ個人性重視であった。しかしながら、日本言語の持つ文化的特有の意味が日本の教育実践の本質とそれがどのように働くのかを隠し、オーストラリアの研究者には明らかではなかった。また、教師の自己報告で得られたデータは、教師が実際に日常の教室で何を行っているのかを明らかにはできなかった。

また、この研究は特別支援教育の場で教師がどのようにレッスンスタディを利用して、自閉症を持った生徒に教育を行っているのかを調査するものである。レッスンスタディは日本の初等教育において昔から使われてきた教師主導の協力的職能開発であり授業研究とよばれている。本研究では、日本で伝統的に行われてきた実践を「授業研究」、西洋の論理を含んだ考え方を「レッスンスタディ」と呼ぶ。国際的な研究者や教師、特にアメリカからの注目を浴び、英語で書かれたレッスンスタディの文献はここ10年で急激に増えてきているが、レッスンスタディが教師という仕事にどのように機能し、どのような役割があるのかについては、あまり書かれていない。特に、日本の特別支援教育に携わる教師が日常的にレッスンスタディを彼らの職務に適用してきている
にもかかわらず、英語で書かれた special education の文献はない。

この研究の目的は、自閉症を持った生徒のための集団を生かした教師の仕事とその方法を描写し、率先した授業研究の実践を行っている日本の小学校で、その教師の仕事と特別支援教育で行われているレッスンスタディの循環過程との関連性を明らかにすることである。オーストラリアの小学校で行う次の研究段階では、オーストラリアの教師がレッスンスタディの経験をどのように考察し、どのように感じるかについて調査する。また同時に、日本の集団を生かした教育のやり方とレッスンスタディが、異なった文化環境（オーストラリアのインクルージョンの教育現場）の中でどのように機能するかを調査する。

この提案された研究はオーストラリアのグリフィス大学の博士課程の一環として行われる本大学研究生、吉川の研究である。この研究を通して、集団を生かした特別支援教育で行われているレッスンスタディの理解が、オーストラリアの学校で行われているインクルージョン教育に大いに役立つことが予想される。

研究の参加と研究活動について

この研究の主な参加者は、2010年度に自閉症を持った児童を担当する教師です。しかしながら、今回は自閉症を持った児童を現在担当している教師が研究活動に参加し、学校管理職に携わっておられる先生方も同じく参加することになります。貴方の参加はボランティアであり、いかなるときも研究参加を取り消すことができます。

今回の訪問は、吉川と参加する学校と教師との間に友好的な関係を築くことを目的とし、データ収集の為に吉川は後日、同学校を訪問します。この研究は自閉症を持った児童に対する教師の教育実践に焦点を当たっており、クラスルーム実践と教職会議を後の研究活動で観察し記録します。後から行う活動に対しての詳細は後日、吉川がデータ収集を行う前にお知らせします。

グリフィス大学は National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Researchに基づきリサーチを行っています。この倫理要領は貴方のアイデンティティを保護します。集められたすべてのデータは内密に扱われ、本人の同意がない限り第三者に開示されることはありません。参加者の回答を含んだ原本は、コード化した後、破棄されます。コード化されたコピーは他の研究目的に使われることがありますが、貴方の匿名性はいかなるときも保護されます。本研究について詳しい情報が必要な場合、研究吉川までご連絡下さい。本研究の倫理行為において懸念や不満がございましたら、研究倫理責任者に電話(+ 61-7-3735-5585)もしくは電子メール（research-ethics@griffith.edu.au)にて直接連絡を取ることも可能です。

本研究の完了とともに、参加者の身元を確認できる情報はすべて破棄されます。参加校と参加者には今回の訪問で得た情報を含んだ本研究の最終計画書を電子メールにて報告されます。
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また、この研究は特別支援教育の場で教師がどのようにレッスンスタディを利用し、自閉症を持った生徒に教育を行っているのかを調査するものである。レッスンスタディは日本の初等教育において昔から使われてきた教師主導の協力的職能開発であり授業研究とよばれている。本研究では、日本で伝統的に行われてきた実践を「授業研究」、西洋の論理を含んだ考え方を「レッスンスタディ」と呼ぶ。国際的な研究者や教師、特にアメリカからの注目を浴び、英語で書かれたレッスンスタディの文献はここ10年で急激に増えてきているが、レッスンスタディが教師という仕事にどのように機能し、どのような役割があるかについては、あまり書かれていない。特に、日本の特別支援教育に携わる教師が日常的にレッスンスタディを彼らの職務に適用してきているにもかかわらず、英語で書かれた special education の文献はない。

この研究の目的は、自閉症を持った生徒のための集団を生かした教師の仕事とその方法を描写するものである。
率先した授業研究の実践を行っている日本の小学校で、その教師の仕事と特別支援教育で行われているレッスンスタディの循環過程との関連性を明らかにすることである。オーストラリアの小学校で行う次の研究段階では、オーストラリアの教師がレッスンスタディの経験をどのように考察し、どのように感じるかについて調査する。また同時に、日本の集団を生かした教育のやり方とレッスンスタディが、異なった文化環境（オーストラリアのインクルージョンの教育現場）の中でどのように機能するかを調査する。

この提案された研究はオーストラリアのグリフィス大学の博士課程の一環として行われる本大学の研究者、吉川の研究である。この研究を通して、集団を生かした、特に日本の小学校教師が自閉症を持った児童に対して行っている教育実践の国際的解釈を高めることが期待される。また、日本の特別支援教育で使われているレッスンスタディの理解得ることは、オーストラリアの学校で行われているインクルージョン教育に大いに役立つことが予想される。

研究の参加と研究活動について

この研究の主な参加者は2010年度に自閉症を持った児童を担当する教師です。しかしながら、今回は自閉症を持った児童を現在担当している教師が研究活動に参加し、学校管理職に携わっている先生方と同じく参加することになります。

今回の訪問は研究生吉川と貴方のお子さんが通っている学校と先生との間に友好的な関係を築くことを目的とし、データ収集の為に吉川は後日、同学校を訪問します。本研究は直接貴方のお子さんに焦点を当てたものではありませんが、後日の研究活動でクラスルームでの教育実践の観察記録を行います。後から行う活動に対しての詳細は後日、吉川がデータ収集を行う前にお知らせします。

今回の訪問で行われる活動は貴方のお子さんを直接参加させるものではありませんが、お子さんを受け持っている教師が本研究計画のプレゼンテーションと意見交換に参加します。その際に、参加する教師はお子さんに関連する彼らの仕事について、また本研究計画について意見を求められます。この活動では、吉川の日本語特有の専門用語や表現の理解を高め、これから先の研究計画をスムーズにすることが目的です。

グリフィス大学はNational Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Researchに基づきリサーチを行っています。それは間接的に研究に関わるかもしれませんが、お子さんの両親への研究の説明を行うことを義務づけています。教師のクラスルーム実践を含んだ本研究も同様に両親からの研究同意が必要としています。この倫理要領は貴方のお子さんのアイデンティティを保護します。集められたすべてのデータは厳密に扱われ、本人もしくは保護者の同意がない限り第三者に開示されることはありません。参加者の回答を含んだ研究はコーディケーションされ、保護される。保護されたデータは他の研究目的に使用されますが、お子さんの匿名性はいかなるときも保護されます。本研究について詳しい情報が必要な場合、吉川までご連絡ください。本研究の倫理行為において懸念や不満がございましたら、研究倫理責任者に電話（+61-7-3735-5585）もしくは電子メール（research-ethics@griffith.edu.au）にて連絡を取ることも可能です。

本研究の完了とともに、参加者と彼らの生徒の身元を確認できる情報はすべて破棄されます。参加校と参加者には今回の訪問で得た情報を持たね本研究の最終計画案を電子メールにて報告されます。
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（保護者）
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### ブレインストーミング 1-2-3 シートパート 1：教師の構成要素

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>構成要素</th>
<th>影響</th>
<th>教師としての自身の仕事</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>政治行政的 構成要素</td>
<td>外部的影響</td>
<td>教師としての自身の仕事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 文部科学省</td>
<td>- あなたの仕事に影響を与えるパスポートはありますか？</td>
<td>- どのような影響をあたえていますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 都道府県教育委員会</td>
<td>- 政治行政的な情報の供給源は何ですか？</td>
<td>- 誰を教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- カリキュラム（学習指導要領）</td>
<td>- インターネットで一人で調べる</td>
<td>- 特別支援教育法は通常に影響を与えたか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 学校のポリシー</td>
<td>- 校長先生から</td>
<td>- 何を教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- WHO</td>
<td>- マスメディア</td>
<td>- どのように教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 国際連合</td>
<td>- 研修</td>
<td>- ICFはどのように子供を見ているかを変えたか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 政治的動向（政策交代で法律が変わる；教育資格の再試験）</td>
<td>- どのように教えるか</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>専門的、職能的 構成要素</td>
<td>教職会議</td>
<td>専門的役割</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- レッスンスタディ、授業研究</td>
<td>- 教職会議は貴方の仕事にどのように影響をあたえていますか？</td>
<td>- 誰を教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 具体的とも考えられる機会</td>
<td>- 児童のニーズを知る</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- その他の職能開発</td>
<td>- 他の教師と話し合う機会</td>
<td>- 何を教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 学校間交流</td>
<td>- 具体案・スキル</td>
<td>- 気づきから必要なことがわかる</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 土日の大学の臨時クラス</td>
<td>- 教師の実践は貴方の仕事にどのように影響を与えていますか？</td>
<td>- どのように教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- OB</td>
<td>- やる気の向上、自分ももっとかなと思うように影響を与えたか？</td>
<td>- 教師のアドバイスを使う、教室のアレンジを一緒に変える</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 批判はプラスになる</td>
<td>- 日常的な会話から突発的に起こることが多い</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 日常の教師間の会話が大きい</td>
<td>- いつ教えるか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>個人的構成要素</td>
<td>クラスルーム</td>
<td>教室での教師の仕事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 信念・考え方（教師とは、生徒の学力向上、生徒の身体的発達、評価すべき成績など）</td>
<td>貴方の信念や考え方は貴方の仕事にどのような影響をあたえていますか？</td>
<td>貴方の信念や考え方、日々の経験や気づきは以下の事柄にどのような影響をあたえていますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- OB</td>
<td>貴方の日々の経験や気づきは、貴方の仕事にどのような影響をあたえていますか？</td>
<td>- 誰を教えるか</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | - 生徒に対する願い | - 教育経験を本当につけなくてはいけないが、実践的に時間がない。書く時間があったら、その時間を教材の準備にあて、もっと productiveなことに時間を見つけるよ。 | - 日々の子供の様子、願い、思い、よさの気づき、またそれを考えて時間を見つける。
|      | | 教師の日常は計画を立てることから突発的に起こることが多い。 | - 何を教えるか |
|      | | - いつ教えるか |

*Red font means the teachers’ responses during a group discussion.*
### Brainstorming 1-2-3 Sheet. No.1
(Multiple contexts of being a teacher: PD, method, own teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>(a) Professional development</th>
<th>(b) Observing methods</th>
<th>(c) Own teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political component:</td>
<td>External influences:</td>
<td>Big picture of your work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- MEXT</td>
<td>(a) What are you concerned about when you plan your lessons?</td>
<td>How do you work with a group of students with ASD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prefecture</td>
<td>(b) What resources help you teach?</td>
<td>What outside forces influence your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curriculum</td>
<td>(c) Who gives you political information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional component:</td>
<td>Teacher meeting</td>
<td>Professional roles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lesson study</td>
<td>observation:</td>
<td>• How does your lesson study group help you teach groups of students with ASD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other professional</td>
<td>(a) How do you monitor main themes focused during teacher meetings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>(b) What do you do for your next lesson after meetings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) What do you anticipate from others’ work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal component:</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Classroom teaching:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beliefs (your teaching,</td>
<td>observation:</td>
<td>• What do you try to do during a lesson with a group of students with ASD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students’ achievements, and</td>
<td>(a) What do you do to evaluate student outcomes within a class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development)</td>
<td>(b) What do you do to evaluate your own teaching?</td>
<td>• What do you want to happen in your classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-study</td>
<td>(c) What do you do when you observe your colleagues’ lessons?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Language (monitor, evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A2c. Teacher Background Information Sheet (Pilot)

Please tick appropriate boxes and add comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your school name:</th>
<th>☐ School A</th>
<th>☐ School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your date of birth:</td>
<td>(DD/MM/YY):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you teaching in:</td>
<td>☐ Special education unit</td>
<td>☐ Regular education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you be here in 2010?:</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Your qualification of teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Year Diploma (Year of completion: )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Year Bachelor (Year of completion: )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate (Year of completion: )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Your experience of teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular education (Total year: )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education (Total year: )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The grade of the class, which you teach now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASD (Number: )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASD with II (Number: )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASD with other disability (Number: )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II without ASD (Number: )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other disabilities without ASD (Number: )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments about students and their mix of disabilities:
Appendix A3. A Summary of Piloting Activities (Japan)

Procedures for the initial school visit (18/2/2010-5/3/2010)

There were two elementary schools that were attached to two different national universities. First, I contacted to the professors of each university and talked to them first. It helped the professors understand what the research was about and also helped me articulate the research in Japanese. And then, I could get ready to talk to the participating teachers; and the professors could support me when I talked to teachers. It was essential that I had insiders to talk to schools; otherwise they will not accept my study. One school administrator was very firm and expressed his unwillingness about school participation in this study. Once a professor told him that the research may be useful for both countries and for the school, they became positive and accepted the proposal.

Two schools had different processes to obtain initial agreements for the study. For School A, I explained a brief summary of proposal at meetings with various people including a vice-principal, head of regular education, special education coordinator, and two special education classroom teachers. The meeting was to obtain an initial agreement from the school for the study starting the beginning of May in 2010. And then, I had time to present the proposal, conduct brainstorming exercises, and discussion with potential participating teachers of the later study. The school was concerned most about how I would interact with the children in classrooms during the later study period. It implied that I would be required to participatory classroom observations at the school.

For School B, I met a head of special education unit first to explain a brief summary of the study. Second, I talked to the special education coordinator who was responsible for children with special need at regular education classrooms. The coordinator talked about her experience with children with ASD (not diagnosis) and school focus for supporting children with special needs at regular education classrooms. According to her, support was likely to be provided to children who had learning difficulties rather than social skill difficulties because of a lack of human resource. I tried to gain information about if it is possible for me to observe them at regular education classrooms. However, the coordinator advised that it would be greatly difficult, because the special support for particular children has usually been disclosed and observation may cause a risk that other children would identify which children were focused. It was linked to a privacy issue. Third, I had a meeting with potential participating teachers to present the proposal, implement brainstorming activity, and discuss further ideas.

Overall summary

Both schools agreed research proposal partially. However, both schools were very concerned that the researcher would observe children with ASD at regular education classrooms and refused her observation at any whole-school meetings and subject lesson study meetings; although they agreed that she would observe special education classrooms and special education teacher meetings. The school visits revealed current educational struggles in Japan.

Summary of brainstorming exercises

Overall, all teachers expressed confusion or difficulties of brainstorming sheets. Apparently these three sheets had too much information on one page and some key concepts were overlapped. The two groups of teachers answered the questions of three brainstorming sheets differently. School A teachers were preferably conducting the exercises as a group rather than individuals. They were very motivated to answer the questions through group-interactions. And the presenter took the role to write down their conversations on the sheet. In contrast, School B teachers also talked about their ideas across brainstorming. However, they liked to answer the questions individually and all teachers wrote their own answers on their separate sheets. Additionally, School A group had more time available for the presenter to explain some questions to the teachers, while School B group had less time available for her; therefore, she could not explain the questions as much as she did for School A group.

Brainstorming Sheet 1: multiple contexts of being a teacher

There were some similarities in their answers in two schools. First, they agreed the examples of political components prepared as prompts (e.g., MEXT, prefecture, curriculum, school policy) and
added political movement as they experienced its influence recently. That is, a change of government brought a change of law that required all current teachers to take re-examination for their extension of teaching qualification. Both teacher groups indicated that they valued other classroom teachers from different schools as professional influences. These teachers attended at open school lesson study conferences presented by other schools; it has brought a great benefit to their everyday teaching. Both groups were also agreed that teacher meetings have been beneficial for them in own professional development, encouraging them to share their experiences and ideas, and specifying their lesson plan and skills.

However, more differences than similarities were found in this exercise. First, the function of School A teachers was more likely to be interpersonal or relationship-orientated, while School B teachers were more likely to be professional orientated. School A teachers, for example, valued teacher meetings as an interactive opportunity with other teachers and a motivation to work hard. The practical system of data collection and storage has been inductive and daily-based rather than structured processes in School A schools. Also School A teachers were more focused on children’s internal thoughts or wishes. Daily discoveries on children’s situation, wish, thought, and strength were greatly valued by School A teachers. They also told that they had sudden teacher meetings, not scheduled. In contrast, School B teachers valued teacher meetings as instructional improvement including merits in better understanding of content and methods for lessons, of the effective ways to interact with their children, and of learning materials. At School B, teachers have systematic processes of reflection, data collection, and storage (e.g., own practical notebook, scheduled teacher meetings).

**Brainstorming Sheet 2: lesson study and groups of teaching**

Both groups agreed that the flexibility in special education framework allowed them to focus on individual children in contrast to regular education. They also all indicated that lesson study is a process of sharing their experiences and knowledge. Both teachers were opposed to use the term “teach”, when they talk about their practices. They used the terms, which have the meanings of more child-centred learning (e.g., do, study). School B teachers valued “honest critiques” during teacher meetings as same as School A teachers that they mentioned in the first exercise. Although there were some similarities among two teacher groups, professional versus interpersonal or relationship orientations also appeared in this second exercise.

School B teachers addressed merits from lesson study for their professional skill development including analysing situation and providing adequate support. The class division was based in the developmental level of children (similar to developmentally-appropriate practices) in School B; therefore, they used developmental approach and focused on “maximise” the quality of lesson to “maximise” child learning potentials. In contrast, School A teachers used interpersonal approach that emphasised “interaction” with and among children. Their primary focus was to increase independence and life-skills in children. They also addressed that routinely changed their classroom environment. At School A, teachers used “team name” applying their belonging unit and indicated strong emotional bonds among the teachers in the same team. It was assumed from the result of the first exercise that the emotional bond was also as outcomes for these teachers from lesson study, though they did not address when asked about.

Moreover, School B teachers addressed that they shared similarities of their lesson study cycle with regular education, while School A teachers had no examples. They listed the elements of fundamental educational philosophy of Japanese policy (e.g., child-centred education, instructional aims of each academic subject, lessons that enable all children to learn). While School A teachers were focused on interaction in general, School B teachers were focused on learning material development.

Additionally, School A teachers could make a comment on how they preferred to be asked when I interviewed them about their practices. They suggested me to ask them briefly with specific examples. For example, appropriate questions were “how will you do when planning?” or “How was your lesson?” The context of specific situations seemed to be very important for them to answer any questions about their daily practices. In contrast, School B teachers could not make any comment on interview questions, because of time limitation.

**Brainstorming Sheet 3: teaching children with ASD and groups of children**

Both teacher groups revealed a strong sense of “emotional bond” among children as well as between children to their group. Some specific Japanese terms that teachers used implied “emotional
bond” in their meanings. “Nakama”, for example, can be translated into “friend” or “team member”; however, the deep meaning of the term “Nakama” will be ignored once it is translated into English word. The cultural meaning appeared to be embedded in the word of “Nakama”, which entailed a strong emotional bond among the group members as well as from the individual to the group that she/he belonged to. Both groups talks about “doing together with everyone.”

Moreover, both teacher groups tried to read children’s minds or thoughts. School A teachers talked about children’s “negai” or “wish.” They integrated their interpretation of children’s thought or mind into their everyday teaching. School B teachers addressed that they considered that a child was participating a class, if the child was “watching” what was happening in a lesson. Non-verbal or unintentional reactions seemed to be purposeful for these teacher groups. Additionally, both groups tried to maintain classroom environments. The identification of children with ASD was based on medical diagnosis in special education units, but on teachers’ intuitions depending on symptoms of the children (e.g., obsession, strong interests, and echolalia) in regular education settings.

### Summary of teacher survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>P-JT1</td>
<td>P-JT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at the initial visit</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Bachelor degree (University A)</td>
<td>Bachelor degree (University A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Regular education)</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Special education)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade of their children</td>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>Year 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with ASD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School A became site school for this study; University A is a host university of School A; University B is a host university of School B; University C is another university rather than A and B.

### Conclusion

Three brainstorming exercises were very useful for my further research framework, although teachers expressed some confusion in questions. Especially suggestions about interview questions from School A school teachers had made points: Interview questions should have a brief framework to allow teachers to talk more with a context of specifics situation or events. Moreover, the results from these exercises confirmed that some elements of “group-orientation” were embedded in their practices. Furthermore, the institutional differences appeared in two schools although they were both the special education unit of elementary schools attached to national universities in Japan.
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Appendix B1a. Teachers (Australian Pilots)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Classroom teacher for special education)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team

The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Why is the research being conducted?
This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese primary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with ASD, their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with autistic spectrum disorders (ASDs) and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover a short trial as a part of the study.

The Queensland Education has been moving toward to inclusive education. It makes it difficult to find the school which has special education unit (SEU) or classes. Your school was chosen because it has a SEU where the children with ASDs actually take some classes. Moreover, one of my supervisors has conducted previous research with your head of special education and had a contact to the school.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different way of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

What you will be asked to do
The primary participants of this research will be classroom teachers who teach a student group including one or more with ASD. The main purpose of this trial is to check the appropriateness of classroom observation tools and procedures. I will conduct classroom observation focusing on how you manage classroom activities and interactions with your class children (2 hours). You will be asked afterwards to reflect how the children respond in the class during the lesson.

A second issue is to review interview questions developed in Japan and to consider what might need to be altered for an Australian setting. Any inputs from your point of views
will be greatly valuable to this study. With your permission, voice-recording and perhaps video-recording will be helpful to keep track of discussion. The possibility of research activities for next year will also be discussed face to face. The group discussion will take 30-60 minutes.

**Your confidentiality**
Your responses will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the audio or video data as well as original documents and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed.

**Your participation is voluntary**
Your participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school and Griffith University. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

**Feedback to you**
Your school and you will be provided with a brief report about data from the observations and group discussion by e-mail.

**Your questions**
For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact to myself and/or one of my local academic supervisors, Dr Fiona Bryer or Dr Wendi Beamish.

**Ethical conduct**
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

**Privacy Statement**
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this trial, please complete the attached Consent Form (*Classroom teachers for special education*) indicating your approval. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours Sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus
CONSENT FORM
(Classroom teacher for special education)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participating in classroom observation trial and/or group discussion;
- I understand that classroom observation will be conducted by using a coding system;
- I understand that the group discussion will be audio-recorded (video optional);
- I understand that only the research team will have access to this audio-tape;
- I understand that the audio-tape will be erased following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact Ms Kikkawa and other local research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B1b. Other Potential Participants (Australian Pilots)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Other potential participants)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Why is the research being conducted?
This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese primary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with ASD, their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with autistic spectrum disorders (ASDs) and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover a short trial as a part of the study.

The Queensland Education has been moving toward to inclusive education. It makes it difficult to find the school which has special education unit (SEU) or classes. Your school was chosen because it has a SEU where the children with ASDs actually take some classes. Moreover, one of my supervisors has conducted previous research with your head of special education and had a contact to the school.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different way of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

The study is not directly focused on you but will indirectly involve you. First, the team will observe and code teaching in classrooms while you are present. Second, the classroom teachers in your school will be invited to a group discussion. During the session, they will talk about their work relating to their school and colleagues. If your school agrees to participate in the study for the next year, you will receive more information.
Your confidentiality
Your information will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the information from the observation and group discussion and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed. No data about you will be recorded.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this trial is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

Your questions
For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact myself, one of my local academic supervisors, Dr. Fiona Bryer or Dr. Wendi Beamish, and/or your school special education unit coordinator.

Statements required for ethical practice
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your child’s identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your child’s anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this trial, please complete the attached Consent Form (Other potential participants) indicating your approval. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus
CONSENT FORM
(Other potential participants)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special Education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special Education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: +xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that there will be my indirect involvement in this research (classroom observation trial and teacher’s participation in a group discussion);
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can contact Ms Kikkawa, other local research team, and my child’s special education unit coordinator or classroom teacher;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix B1c. Parents (Australian Pilots)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Parents)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

About this research
This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University. I have studied how teachers work with a group of children in special education classes in Japan. I have been studying how teachers work when the group contains one or more children with autistic spectrum disorders (ASDs), as children with ASDs have been recognised only recently as a category for additional educational support. I want to compare how Australian teachers do this kind of teaching and how they work with teacher colleagues to plan lessons. There may be cultural differences in how teachers do their daily work, how they try to improve social skills during group lessons, and how they set learning goals for teaching children that may be used to improve teaching in both countries.

The Queensland Education has been moving toward inclusive education. It makes it difficult to find the school which has special education unit (SEU) or classes. Your school was chosen because it has a SEU where the children with ASDs actually take some classes. Moreover, one of my supervisors has conducted previous research with your head of special education and had a contact to the school.

Your consent is requested for your child to take part in a short trial of the observational tools used on Japan. This consent will cover your child’s participation in this trial, to check how well the tools and procedures work when observing Australian lessons, before the end of this school year. The teacher’s instruction in the natural setting will be observed during the lessons at a special education class (2 hours). There will be no change in the everyday teaching or in your child’s engagement in learning activities. This trial is not directly focused on your child. All data collected will be focused on how a teacher teaches a group of children and how the children interact with learning tasks and with each other during lessons. The teacher will be asked afterwards to consider how your child and other children in the group respond during the lesson as part of her normal reflection on her teaching. The teacher of your child will also be invited to a group discussion with other teachers (30-60 minutes). During the session, teachers will talk about their work relating to your child and provide some information about your child (e.g., age, diagnosis). The teachers’ conversation during the discussion will be recorded by audio and perhaps video. However, the classroom observation will not be recorded by audio or video. If your school agrees to participate in this study for the next year, you will receive more information.
Confidentiality of your child
Your child’s information will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the information from the observation and group discussion, and this information will be securely stored. On the completion of the trial, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed.

Your child’s participation is voluntary
Participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school. If, at any time, you or your child wish/wishes to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal. Any children, who do not have parental permission to participate in the trial, will work in a small group with a special education teacher aide. They will implement their speech and language program and early literacy skills program at a SEU withdrawal room.

Your questions
For more information and/or any concerns about this project, please do not hesitate to contact to myself, one my local supervisors Dr. Fiona Bryer or Dr. Wendi Beamish, and/or your special education coordinator and classroom teacher.

Ethical conduct
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access, and/or use of your child’s identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your child’s anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree for your child to participate in the trial, please complete the attached Consent Form (Parents) indicating your approval. Please return to the signed form to your special education coordinator. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus
CONSENT FORM
(Parents)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-x-x-x-x-x
Contact Email: xxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-x-x-x-x-x
Contact Email: xxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-x-x-x-x-x
Contact Email: xxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-x-x-x-x-x
Contact Email: xxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: +xx-xx-x-x-x-x-x
Contact Email: xxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing the form on the back, I confirm that I have understood the information sheet and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that there will be an involvement of my child in this research (classroom observation and teachers’ participation in group discussion);
- I understand that this trial will observe how my child reacts to teachers’ instruction;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me and my child from participation in this research;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can contact Ms Kikkawa, other local research team, and my child’s special education unit coordinator or classroom teacher;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to the participation of my child in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B2. A Summary of Piloting Activities (Australia)

Summary of a conversation with a HOSE (School A)

Date: 30/11/2010

Daily schedule in SEU Year 1-2
- Morning: 2 hour group activities (e.g., mat time, reading, cooking): Focused on communication, literacy and numeracy learning
- Afternoon: Mathematics, music, science

Daily schedule in Junior
- Afternoon: Group activities (e.g., plays)

Duty of SEU classroom teachers
- Case management
- Assessment
- Developing visual cues resource (e.g., PECS) for each child
- Photographic evidence on children’s progress
- Making and adjusting Criteria sheet for each child’s learning

Moderating tasks

About a current role of SEU teachers in Australia
- In the inclusive settings, SEU teachers need to have a good understanding of curriculum. And then, they will be able to integrate special education elements into the curriculum.
- Special education school teachers may have less knowledge of curriculum.

Children placement
- Mainstreaming with no support
- Mainstreaming with teacher aides (in-class support)
- Having some classes in SEU (partly withdrawn)
- In SEU (completely withdrawn)

Other possible sites for the next phase
- xxxxx School
- xxxxx Special School
- xxxxx Special School

Sample of reflection log (Pilot 2)

School: School A
Participant: Pilot Australian Teacher 2 (P-AT2: classroom teacher)
Week: Pilot 2
Date: 08/12/2010
Day: Wednesday
Session type: Piloting a lesson observation at a SEU Classroom and having a quick question
Number of children: 4
Number of children with ASD: 1 (P-AA2)

Overview
There were only a total of four children today and one targeted child with ASD was absent. Because of the low number of children, teacher aide was not in the classroom. The classroom teacher was alone to teach the class.

The group time started with a mat time (e.g., singing songs, listening to a Christmas story). The children had a morning tea after the mat time and then started having cooking activity. The P-AT2 explained what to do to the children. The children had not much interaction with their peers during the activity and more interaction with P-AT2. The P-AT2 did not try to encourage the children to interact each other at all. All instruction from P-AT2 was for explaining what to do or for responding to children’s behaviours.

After cooking activity, the class came back to the classroom and made Christmas decorations or cards. During this activity, the children also had not much interaction with their peers. P-AA2 always sat next to P-AT2 or followed her. When she got bored to put a string through a card, she asked another child to finish it off for her. It was a natural interaction, which was not encouraged by P-AT2. No group work was found across the group time.
After the group time, P-AT2 was asked about questions regarding her group lesson. First, I used a question of “What is the aim of your group lesson?” to P-AT2. She told that her group time was for literacy learning including words, sounds, and letters. She told me that she did not push the children to write more because it was the end of school year. She did not mention about group work or social skills.

Second, I used a question of “What is the advantage of using a group to teach the children with ASD?” to P-AT2. Again, she did not talk about group work or social skills. She told me first about disadvantage of teaching a group. She told that the children at her class were very individual and it was difficult to deal with each individual child in a group. She also pointed one advantage of using a group. She told that teaching a group is good because she can introduce a concept of learning to the whole class one time at the beginning of the lesson. The advantage of group work was not addressed at all by this teacher.

I was able to have only a couple of minutes to talk to the teacher after the class. It seemed difficult for me to talk to the teacher during their school time. I might need to organise time with teachers for their reflections after the class.

Sample of reflection log (School B, Pilot 1)

School: School B 
Participant: Pilot Australian Teacher 3 (P-AT3) 
Session type: Piloting the first semistructured individual interview (Daily Practice) 
Week: Piloting preparation week 
Date: 01/03/2011
Day: Tuesday

Setting
The interviewer and interviewee sit next to each other and used tables for writing a list of the teacher’s activities.

Resources
Interview Sheet (given to the teacher prior to the session), Prompt Sheet, a listing sheet, a sheet of examples of US teachers’ activities, two transparent sheets, colour permanent pens, and a bar and pie chart sheet

Overview
This session was held before I observed her classroom. I met her only once last week and had a little knowledge about her classroom and lessons. She was very talkative and could tell her story about her daily activity without much prompts. The time was exceeded since she was willing to talk more about what she does. She seemed very motivated and proud of her role. She did not pause before answering the question. She was very confident to talk about what she did and what she wanted. She talked more about non-classroom duties. They included a coordinator of junior and lower middle school and of staff conference, as well as a ICT training teacher for teacher aides and curriculum development assistant of literacy and numeracy in the school. In the middle of session, phone rang in the classroom. I waited for her to finish her conversation.

First, she spoke about her morning with her targeted child with ASD (P-AA1). I asked her to give me a general framework of a day first before talking about the specific child. After she told me general framework, I asked her about how she spend her time on each activity. She told me that academic instruction, supervision, and supporting daily-life skills were what she spent most on. On the other hand, planning was what she spent least on. However, she told that she usually worked on her planning at home. She mentioned that she did not have enough time at school because the school was closed at 5 pm and no one was allowed to stay back at school after the time. She said that she preferred to stay at school until 6 or 7 pm to complete her work and go home, without stopping at the middle of tasks.
Sample of reflection log (School B, Pilot 2)

School: School B  Participant: P-AT3  
Week: Piloting a teaching day observation  Date: 01/03/2011  Day: Tuesday
Setting: Classroom
Number of children: 6-5  Number of children with ASD: 1 (P-AA1)

Overview
After completing an interview with P-AT3, I started my observation. She was very willing to share her experience and she explained me what she was going to do next. As she told me at the interview, she had many interruptions in the middle of learning sessions. For examples, other teachers dropped in her classroom and asked her some questions, and other classroom children brought their product to sell as a part of their learning program. Most surprisingly, P-AT3 had a lot of incoming and outgoing phone calls which did not directly relate to her children’s learning. It was very different from the Japanese site where all participating teachers hardly had any interruption which was unrelated to their children’s learning experience. It was assumed that P-AT3 had a lot of other duties out of classroom and could not work them out after school because staying at school after 5 pm was prohibited. There were six children at the beginning of the day, but one child went home because she was sick. P-AT3 had one full-time and two part-time teacher aides today.

P-AT3 used a lot of praises throughout a day. She usually had two breaks when children were at break time. The children went to playground with other teacher on duty and some teacher aides. It was also different from the Japanese site where all teachers were on duty throughout a day. However, she used her breaks to prepare for teacher training conference held on this afternoon today. She told that she usually prepared for the next session. She told that there used to be four teachers who prepared for that conference, but now only two teachers. Therefore, she needed extra work for the preparation.

During the morning session, while children sat on their chair, they engaged in turn-taking activities focusing on literacy and numeracy. I found that P-AT3 used more advanced technology to teach her class than the Japanese teachers. She used a whiteboard linked to her laptop computer with touch screen and used a literacy and numeracy learning software called “Click 5.” She used praise for the children who did right things in order to remind all children of what they were expected to do at the time. She gave a turn to the child who waited for his turn nicely without begging a turn or standing. Also she asked the child who finished his/her turn to choose the next child to do. However, at the middle session, P-AT3 chose the children to take a turn during the entire session.

An iPad was used as a reward as well as a tool for a group turn-taking activity. All children loved it and were very motivated to sit in a group. Afternoon, two middle school students (i.e., one female and one male) visited her class and support the children. P-AT3 used her iPad for the assist students to take a control on her children. P-AT3 told that the female student planned to go working experience at childcare next year and her classroom teacher asked P-AT3 to have her at the classroom for her experience. On the other hand, the male student was there to improve his behaviours. P-AT3 said that one or two of such students usually visited her class on Tuesday.

P-AT3 shared some duties with her full-time teacher aide (e.g., filling in communication book). It was also different from the Japanese site where only one part-time teacher was available for the entire unit and all classroom teachers needed to complete their communication books. The full-time teacher aide also helped P-AT3 prepare the teacher training conference held at this afternoon (e.g., cutting veggies and cakes). The conference was held at the conference room within the school and one school occupational therapist facilitates the session. The conference participants were not only the staff of the school but also from three different special schools.

She used clear voice to talk to the children. Forced alternative (i.e., a choice of two options) was another strategy that P-AT3 used frequently throughout a day. She used it as support for the student to complete academic tasks as well as behavioural intervention. For children’s’ behaviour, P-AT3 told the child to choose (a) following her instruction or (b) going to the office. Throughout a day, P-AT3 reminded P-AA1 to go to toilet. While school lunch was provided at the Japanese school, each child brought their own lunch to the Australian school. While mealtime was only lunch time unless they had cooking activities at the Japanese school, the Australian children had two mealtimes (i.e., lunch and afternoon tea). Moreover, the Australian children used school buses to go home, while the Japanese children used public transport.
Throughout a day, not much child interaction was observed, and P-AT3 did not try to encourage them to interact. She acknowledged children’s behaviours or achievements in front of the class as a prompt of appropriate behaviours (peer-modelling). The Japanese teachers also used this strategy in the same purpose. However, the Japanese teachers used the strategy also in order to involve the children in a group of classmates (i.e., formation of unity).

Sample of reflection log (School B, Pilot 3)

School: School B  Participant: P-AT3
Week: Pilot 3  Date: 02/03/2011  Day: Wednesday
Session type: Piloting a lesson observation
Number of children: 5  Number of children with ASD: 1 (P-AA1)

Overview
When I came in the classroom, I found one male teacher of the middle school and P-AT3 had a chat. They seemed very relaxed and told me that they worked together as a team. He got a job interview this afternoon and might work there from the next Monday. This is another difference between the Japanese and Australian schools. The Australian teachers can choose which school to work for, while the Japanese teachers could not choose.

Today, I asked P-AT3 to test my observation sheet because I was not allowed to use video/audio recorders at the classroom where two children had care. Once I started my direct observation coding, I realised some issues in my codes which was developed originally for the Japanese life-skills learning lessons. Group instruction means different in two contexts.

Throughout a day, P-AT3 used a lot of praises and clear voice to give instruction to the children. However, P-AT3 was often away from the classroom or on phone today, her full-time teacher aide operated the first part of the morning session. It also caused issues in my coding. Unlike the Japanese school, there was one full-time teacher aide who was always at the classroom and interacted with the children and P-AT3. I will need to modify my observation sheet as well as codes.

Unlike yesterday, P-AT3 had a playground duty this afternoon. She went to playground with her children and other three classroom children as well as two teacher aides. She played with the children at a sandpit. At the time, one of her children hit her peers. She asked her to sit for a while to calm and to come to her later to say sorry. Another strategy used often by P-AT3 was to ask the student to redo a particular action. For example, when a student ran to the classroom from playground, P-AT3 asked him to go back to the playground and to walk back nicely to the classroom. After the student followed the instruction appropriately, she praised him. After school, P-AT3 had a training in Brisbane city (leadership) and left the school around 3.30 pm.
Appendix C.
Procedures of Finding Study Sites and Ethical Consent
Recruitment and consent procedures for site school and participants in Japan

The researcher visited potential school sites between February and March in 2010 before scheduling and designing the Japanese school field research as a part of situational analysis. The cultural expectations also required her to build a good relationship with them in order to make this intensive field research doable. This initial school visit revealed contextual differences among the Japanese sites including enrolment procedures and class divisions of children, recruitment of teachers, and school expectations toward researchers from outside of the school.

Two potential participating schools were affiliated with the faculty of education at national universities in Japan. The researcher contracted with the Japanese professors of these universities, and the professors became her external supervisors and supported her to recruit the school and participants. As requested by the schools, The researcher visited both schools prior to her school field research and had a presentation of her research proposal and group discussion with the potential participating teachers about what the researcher could plan for the following phase. The table below provides the brief summary of recruitment and consent procedure of the site schools and participants in Japan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Researcher contracted with two Japanese university professors as external supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Researcher obtained an ethical clearance for pilot visits from the Griffith University Human Research Ethical Committee (GUHREC: EBL/03/10/HREC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Researcher implemented pilot visits at two Japanese universities and the SNEUs (Japanese Schools A and B) attached to their universities (i.e., presentation and feedback).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Researcher selected one school for the study based (Japanese School A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Researcher obtained an ethical clearance for a school field research from the GUHREC (EBL/22/10/HREC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Researcher had a group meeting with three participating teachers, one external supervisor, one administrative teacher, and a head of special education unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Researcher obtained a formal consent from the school for the school field research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A head of SNEU informed parents and children that I was going to be around during the field research through a newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Researcher obtained a formal consent from each parent of the child who was enrolled in SNEU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After communicating with the schools through the professors, following the Japanese piloting activities, one of them was chosen for the Japanese site. Then, the researcher visited the participating school again one week before starting the Japanese field research and explained the finalised research plan and obtained final consent from the school, three special education teachers, and other school staff including the school principal (i.e., “kouchou”), vice-principal (i.e., “fukukouchou”), deputy vice-principal (“kyoutou”), senior teacher (i.e., “shukan-shunin”), chef teacher of SNEU (i.e., “tokubetsushien-bu-shunin”, head of SNEU in the text), and part-time support teacher (i.e., “koushi”). The English translation was referred to Murata and Yamaguchi (2010). Some additional activities were conducted in order to fit the researcher into their cultural expectation at the school (e.g., volunteer teacher aide for the class).

For the children of SNEU, the researcher was introduced to the children face-to-face at the unit group time in the morning one week prior to starting the field research. Also the researcher was briefly introduced to parents through oral and written format, and the head of SNEU introduced her to them face-to-face at the parent-school meeting. At the meeting, the researcher explained her research to the parents and they signed consent forms.

Two professors from the host university of the school (i.e., SNE professors) and one representative from the prefecture SNE school (i.e., the school principal), the prefecture teacher board (i.e., the chief of the department), and the MEXT (i.e., the chief of elementary SNE) were invited for individual interviews for situational analysis. These participants were contacted by the researcher’s site supervisor to obtain informal consent, and then signed consent form after she explained her research at the interview day.
Recruitment and consent procedures for site school and participants in Queensland, Australia

Procedures of selecting one site school were more complicated and involved multi-steps in Australia. The researcher tried to find the most relevant site school and participants to the Japanese site (i.e., see the details in the section of selection criteria in the text). Emerging issues in inclusive education have extended the context and variation of teacher work and practice in general. The table below presents the procedures of selecting and recruiting site school and participants as well as obtaining consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal supervisor contacted to Queensland state schools, which had a SEU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Researcher obtained an ethical clearance for the first pilot testing from the GUHREC (EBL/81/10/HREC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Researcher implemented the first pilot testing at the SEU (Australian School A) in the South West of Queensland. The Head of SEU suggested visiting special schools rather than SEUs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal supervisor contacted to Queensland state special schools in the South West of Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Researcher met and discussed with the school principal at one of special school in the South West of Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Researcher obtained an ethical clearance for the second pilot testing from the GUHREC (Variation 1 for EBL/81/10/HREC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Researcher implemented the second pilot testing at one special school (Australian School B) in the South West of Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Principal supervisor contacted to Queensland state special schools in the Southern suburbs of Brisbane City district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Researcher had a group discussion with potential participating teachers in one of the special schools in the Southern suburbs of Brisbane City district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Principal supervisor contacted to a Queensland state special school (Australian School C, becoming the site school) in the Eastern suburbs of Brisbane City district. The principal informed the teachers at a school meeting and potential teachers showed their expression of interests in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Researcher obtained an ethical clearance for a school field research from the GUHREC (Variation 2 for EBL/81/10/HREC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Researcher met and discussed with each teacher who was interested in participating the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Researcher implemented pilot testing (a part of Preparation Week).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Researcher obtained a formal consent from the school and participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Each classroom teacher sent information package to their child home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Australian site, pilot testing were completed at three different schools prior to the school field research. During these visits, the observation instruments and interview questions were tested with the teachers at the schools. The fourth school was chosen for the study site in Australia as it shared key features with the Japanese school (i.e., connection with university, leading role in the community, intellectual impairments as the primary enrolment category) and the participating teachers matched to selection criteria (i.e., having special education qualification and at least one child with autism in their classrooms).

Until the researcher found the final site school, her principal supervisor contacted many potential schools across Queensland (i.e., City of Ipswich and City of Brisbane), and the researcher conducted pilots as a part of Situational Analysis. The final site school was chosen as the best school matching to the selection criteria and as showing interests in my study. First, the researcher obtained school approval for her study from the school principal, and then, the researcher recruited the teachers. Once upon agreement, the teachers signed consent forms and sent information packages to each child home for parents’ consent. Formal consents from their parents were obtained prior to the field research. For in-school stakeholders, the researcher approached to the potential participants during the field research and arranged interviews on the convenient time for each participant (i.e., school principal, deputy principal, school occupational therapist, and three teacher aides).
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Background Information Sheet
Background Information Sheet
(Special education classroom teachers)

Please tick appropriate boxes and add comments.

Your name (will be coded): ________________  DOB: ________________

Teaching qualification:

☐ Diploma:
   Name of institution: ___________________  Year of completion: _________
   Name of qualification: ___________________

☐ 4 Year Bachelor:
   Name of institution: ___________________  Year of completion: _________
   Name of qualification: ___________________

☐ Postgraduate:
   Name of institution: ___________________  Year of completion: _________
   Name of qualification: ___________________

☐ Others relevant qualification:
   Name of institution: ___________________  Year of completion: _________
   Name of qualification: ___________________

Teaching experience:

☐ Regular education:  (Total years: ______ )
☐ Special education:  (Total years: ______ )
☐ Other education related careers (please specify):
   ___________________________________________________________________
   (Total years: ______ )

Your class
The grade: ___________ Total number of students: ____________________

The number of students according to their diagnosis in each age group of your class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of ASD/II</th>
<th>Number of II</th>
<th>Number of Other impairments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your email address (If you would like to receive the research report): ________________

Thank you for your cooperation.
Background Information Sheet
(Others)

Please tick appropriate boxes and add comments.

Your name (will be coded): ___________________________ DOB:________________________

Your present role: ________________________________________________________________

Teaching qualification (if applicable):

☐ Diploma: Name of qualifications: ________________________________

☐ 4 Year Bachelor: Name of qualifications: ________________________________

☐ Postgraduate: Name of qualifications: ________________________________

☐ Others relevant qualification: Name of qualifications:________________________

Other qualification (if applicable):
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

Teaching experience (if applicable)

☐ Regular education: (Total years: ___)

☐ Special education: (Total years: ___)

☐ Other education related careers (please specify):
________________________________________________________ (Total years: ___)
________________________________________________________ (Total years: ___)
________________________________________________________ (Total years: ___)

Your email address (If you would like to receive the research report):_______________

Thank you for your cooperation.
Appendix E.
Ethical Consent Materials
Appendix E1. Information Package (Japanese Field Research)
Appendix E1a. Teachers (Japanese Field Research)

研究案内書（教師用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける自閉症児に対する教育

リサーチチーム

第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-xx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

外部指導教官：
池谷尚剛教授
岐阜大学教育学部
電話番号：xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：xxx-xxxx-xxxx（日本）もしくは+61-xx-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビューッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-xx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

何のための研究？
本研究は日本とオーストラリアの小学校で授業を計画発展させるサイクルを通して、特別支援教育のクラスで児童グループを指導する教師の実践を調査するものです。また、教師が特別支援教育の現場でどのように協力して自閉症児を指導しているかを探索します。日本とオーストラリアの両国ともに、教師は教室で自閉症スペクトラム児が共に在籍するクラスを指導するために試行錯誤していますが、そのグループインストラクション（集団指導、集団の学び）は国によってその目的も方法も異なっています。

本研究の目的は、日本とオーストラリアの小学校で、自閉症児と共に特別支援教育に携わる教師の日常的な実践を明らかにし、対象児童のためにその教師がどのようにグループインストラクションを用いて授業を計画・実行しているのか、そして、そのグループインストラクションから得られる児童、教師、そして学校にとっての価値ある成果を明らかにすることです。研究対象となる日本の小学校は授業研究の進んだ実践を行っており、他校の手本となる役割を担っています。オーストラリアの小学校でのフィールドリサーチは2011年に行われます。

本研究はオーストラリアにあるグリフィス大学の博士課程の一環として行われる学生の研究であり、日本とオーストラリアの特別支援教育で小学校教師が自閉症児の指導で用いるグループインストラクションの国際的視点から貢献するものです。多様なグループインストラクションの方法をより理解することで、自閉症児に対するサポートをよりよいものにしていくことができます。また、特別支援教育に携わっている教師がクリニックではなく、日常的な環境でどのように授業計画を発展・展開しているのかを理解することは教師、学校、そして法律立憲者にとって大変価値のあるものです。

研究活動について
本研究の主な参加者は自閉症児を含むクラスを指導している特別支援教育の担任教師です。あなたは、1週間の準備期間の後、9週間のフィールドリサーチを通して行われる複数の活動参加に招待されます。このフィールドリサーチでは、あなたは以下の活動に参加します:

(a) 一連のインタビュー：それぞれ20〜30分にわたる3回の個別インタビュー（準備期間・観察5週目・観察9週目）で、あなたがクラスでどのように自閉症児を支援しているかに関して、日常における実践、グループインストラクション、その成果について；10〜15分の授業研究に関する部会の後のフォローアップ・インタビュー；10〜15分の毎週金曜日に実行されるあなたの実践に対するフィードバック

(b) 3種類の観察記録（各担任教師）：毎週2時間のグループ指導に焦点を当てたクラスルーム観察；2回のあなたのタスクと活動に焦点を当てた一日観察記録（観察2週目・9週目）；授業計画のプロセスに焦点を当てた教職会議の観察記録

(c) エスノグラフィック文献・記録考察：リサーチチームは自閉症児の指導に関わる文献、記録を収集し、考察します。

(d) 補佐的計測活動（観察1週目・5週目・9週目）：歩数チェックリスト、児童の満足度スケール

(e) 教師のバックグラウンドアンケート調査

本研究は、自閉症児に対する支援に関してのあなたの日常的な実践活動、グループインストラクション、成果に焦点を当てています。ビデオ録画、音声録画はあなたの同意のもとで、活動(a)(b)に使われます。この活動に加えて、本研究はあなたの学校と日本の幅広い文脈的構成を理解するために、フィールドリサーチ期間中に様々な第三者の説明者に個別インタビューを行います。

グリフィス大学はNational Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Researchに基づきリサーチを行っています。これにより研究者のアイデンティティを保護します。集められたすべてのビデオ、音声、文章データは内部に扱われ、個人の同意がない限り第三者に開示されることはありません。参加者の同意を含んだ原本は情報・プライバシーリサーチにコード化され、貴方の匿名性はいつでも保護されます。本研究は、貴方の匿名性を保護するために、貴方のアイデンティティを保護します。研究倫理責任者に電話(61-7-3735-5585)もしくは電子メール(research-ethics@griffith.edu.au)にて直接連絡を取ることも可能です。

本研究の完了とともに、参加者の身元を確認できる情報はすべて破棄されます。リサーチチームは参加校と参加者に対し、本研究の第一研究報告書を2011年中に、オーストラリアのデータを含む最終報告書を2013年に吉川が博士論文を提出後、その要約を日本語に翻訳したのち、電子メールにて報告します。
研究同意書（教師用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける自閉症児に対する教育

リサーチチーム

第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-x-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-x-xxxx-xxxx（日本）もしくは+61-x-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビーミッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-x-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

外部指導教官：
池谷尚剛教授
岐阜大学教育学部
電話番号：xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

玉村久仁彦教授
奈良教育大学教育学部
電話番号：xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

この本文下に署名を行うことで、私が研究案内書を読んで理解し、以下に挙げられた留意点について確認したことを証明します。

- 本研究に参加が一連のインタビュー、3種類の観察記録、エスノグラフィック的文献・記録考察、補佐的計測活動、そして教師のバックグラウンドアンケート調査への参加を含むことを私は理解します。
- 研究に対する疑問に対して満足のいく回答を私は得られました。
- 研究に伴うリスクを私は理解しています。
- 本研究の参加が私の直接利益につながらないことを私は理解しています。
- 本研究の参加がボランティアであることを私は理解しています。
- もし補足質問があれば、研究チームに連絡をすることができることを私は理解しています。
- 批評や罰則をこうむることなく、いつでも研究参加を取り消すことができることを私は理解しています。
- もし本研究の倫理行為について懸念がある場合、グリフィス大学倫理委員会（Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee）の研究倫理責任者に電話(+61-7-3735-5585)か電子メール(research-ethics@griffith.edu.au)を通して直接連絡ができるということを理解しています。
- 本研究に参加することに私は同意します。

氏名（ローマ字表記）
署名
日付
研究案内書（教育関係者用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける自閉症児に対する教育

リサーチチーム

第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-x-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：xxx-xxxx-xxxx ( 日本 ) もしくは +61-x-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビーミッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx
電 話 番 号：+61-x-xxxx-xxxx

何のための研究？
本研究は日本とオーストラリアの小学校で授業を計画発展させるサイクルを通じて、特別支援教育のクラスで遊がグループを指導する教師の実践を調査するものです。また、教師が特別支援教育の現場でどのように協力して自閉症を児を指導しているかを探究します。日本とオーストラリアの両国ともに、教師は教室で自閉症児が共に在籍するクラスを指導するために試行錯誤していますが、そのグループインストラクション（集団指導、集団の学び）は国によってその目的や方法も異なっています。

本研究の目的は、日本とオーストラリアの小学校で、自閉症児と共に特別支援教育に携わる教師の日常的な実践を明らかにし、対象児童のためにその教師がどのようにグループインストラクションを用いて授業を計画・実行しているのか、そして、そのグループインストラクションから得られる児童、教師、そして学校にとっての価値ある成果を明らかにすることです。研究対象となる日本とオーストラリアの両国小学校は授業研究の進んだ実践を行っており、他校の手本となる役割を担っています。オーストラリアの小学校でのフィールドリサーチは2011年に行われます。

研究成果について
本研究はオーストラリアにあるグリフィス大学の博士課程の一環として行われる学生の研究であり、日本とオーストラリアの特別支援教育で小学校教師が自閉症児の指導で用いるグループインストラクションの国際的視点に貢献するものです。多様なグループインストラクションの方法をより理解することで、自閉症児に対するサポートをよりよいものにしていくことができます。また、特別支援教育に携わっている教師がクリニックではなく、日常的な環境でどのように授業計画を発展・展開しているのかを理解することは教師、学校、そして法律立憲者にとって大変価値のあるものとなります。

研究活動について
本研究の主な参加者は自閉症児を含むクラスを指導している特別支援教育の担任教師です。あなた
たは、その教師にとっての重要な第三者として30分ほどの個別インタビューへの参加をお願いされます。本研究は特別支援教育に携わる教師の自閉症児のための支援に関する日常的な実践、グループインストラクション、その効果に焦点を当てています。あなたのインタビューは参加校もしくは日本の幅広い文脈的構成の深い理解を貢献するものです。インタビューは自閉症児への支援に関するあなたの役割と特別支援教育と通常学級における対象児童の支援に関する特別支援教育に携わる教師への期待について質問されます。インタビューはあなたの同意のもとビデオ録画され、その後のトランスクリプト作成と会話分析に生かされます。

グリフィス大学はNational Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Researchに基づきリサーチを行っています。この倫理要領は貴方のアイデンティティを保護します。集められたすべてのビデオ、音声、文章データは内密に扱われ、本人の同意がない限り第三者に開示されることはありません。参加者の回答を含んだ原本は情報をコード化した後、破棄されます。コード化されたコピーは他の研究目的に使われることがありますが、貴方の匿名性はいかなるときも保護されます。本研究について詳しい情報が必要な場合、研究生吉川までご連絡下さい。本研究の倫理行為において懸念や不満がございましたら、研究倫理責任者に電話（+61-7-3735-5585）もしくは電子メール（research-ethics@griffith.edu.au）にて直接連絡を取ることも可能です。

本研究の完了とともに、参加者の身元を確認できる情報はすべて破棄されます。リサーチチームは参加者に対し、本研究の第一研究報告書を2011年に、オーストラリアのデータを含む最終報告書を2013年に吉川が博士論文を提出後、その要約を日本語に翻訳したのち、電子メールにて報告します。
研究同意書（教育関係者用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける自閉症児に対する教育

リサーチチーム

第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

外部指導教官：
池谷尚剛教授
岐阜大学教育学部
電話番号：xxxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-xxxx-xxxx（日本）もしくは+61-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビーミッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号：+61-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

外部指導教官：
玉村久仁彦教授
奈良教育大学教育学部
電話番号：xxxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール：xxxxxx@xxxxxx

この本文下に署名を行うことで、私が研究案内書を読んで理解し、以下に列挙された留意点について確認をしたことを証明します。

- 本研究に参加が30分の個別インタビューであることを私は理解します。
- 研究に対する疑問に対して満足のいく回答を私は得られました。
- 研究に伴うリスクを私は理解しています。
- 本研究の参加が私に直接利益につながらないことを私は理解しています。
- 本研究の参加がボランティアであることを私は理解しています。
- もし補足質問があれば、研究チームに連絡をすることができることを私は理解しています。
- 批評や罰則をこうむることなく、いつでも研究参加を取り消すことができることを私は理解しています。
- もし本研究の倫理行為について懸念がある場合、グリフィス大学倫理委員会（Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee）の研究倫理責任者に電話(+61-7-3735-5585)か電子メール（research-ethics@griffith.edu.au）を通じて直接連絡ができるということを理解しています。
- 本研究に参加することに私は同意します。

氏名（ローマ字表記）
署名
日付
研究案内書（保護者用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける特別支援教育

リサーチチーム

第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: +61-xx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: xxx-xxxx-xxxxx（日本）もしくは
+61-xx-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール: xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビーミッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: +61-xx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

外部指導教官：
池谷尚剛教授
岐阜大学教育学部
電話番号: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

玉村久仁彦教授
奈良教育大学教育学部
電話番号: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx

何のための研究？
本研究は日本とオーストラリアの特別支援教育のクラスで児童グループを指導する教師の実践を調査するものです。また、教師が特別支援教育の現場でどのように協力して指導しているかを探究します。研究対象となる貴方の学校は授業研究の進んだ実践を行っており、他校の手本とされる役割を担っています。オーストラリアの小学校でフィールドリサーチは2011年に行われます。

本研究は児童に直接焦点を当てたものではありませんが、間接的に関係するものです。まず、本研究ではクラスルームの観察を行います。その際、対象の担任教師と貴方の同意の下、ビデオと音声録音を行います。また、児童の担任の先生方には、一連のインタビューと文書記録の分析に協力していただきます。この活動の中で、担任の先生方は貴方のお子さんに関係する実践とお子さんについて話していただくことになります。

本研究はオーストラリアにあるグリフィス大学の博士課程の一環として行われる学生の研究であり、日本とオーストラリアの特別支援教育で小学校教師が指導で用いるグループインストラクションの国際的視点に貢献するものです。本研究は貴方のお子さんの個人情報の収集、アクセスまたは利用を含みます。集められたすべてのデータは内密に扱われ、本人もしくは保護者の同意がない限り第三者に開示されることはありません（政府、法律、その他の規制当局などの要因は除きます）。身元が分からなくされたデータのコピーは、その他の研究に使われることもありますが、お子さんの匿名性は維持され

リサーチチームだけがビデオ、音声、そしてオリジナル文書にアクセスすることができる。本研究の完了とともに、参加者と彼らの生徒の身元を確認できる情報はすべて破棄されます。より詳しい情報が必要な方は、吉川、池谷教授、特別支援教育主任、または担任の先生にお尋ねください。貴方の学校は2011年中に第一期レポートを受け取り、2013年3月ごろ吉川が論文を提出したときに最終レポートを受け取ります。このレポートは貴方の学校でアクセスが可能です。
同意書（保護者用）
日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける特別支援教育

Research Team
第一責任者（第一指導教官）：
フィオナ・ブライヤー博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: +61-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxx@xxxxxx

学生：
吉川 依里子
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: xxxxxxxx（日本）もしくは+61-xxxx-xxxx（オーストラリア）
電子メール: xxxxx@xxxxxx

連帯指導教官：
ウェンディ・ビーミッシュ博士
グリフィス大学教育専門学（オーストラリア）
電話番号: +61-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxx@xxxxxx

外部指導教官：
池谷尚剛教授
岐阜大学教育学部
電話番号: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
電子メール: xxxxx@xxxxxx

裏面のサインをすることで、私が研究案内書の内容を理解し、特に下記に明記されている事項について理解したことを証明します。

- 私は自身の子供がこの研究に間接的に関わっていることを理解します（クラスルーム観察、担任教師へのインタビュー）。
- 私はクラスルーム観察がビデオ・音声録画されることを理解します。
- 私はこのリサーチチームだけがこのビデオと音声のデータにアクセス出来るということを理解します。
- 私はすべてのビデオ・音声データは研究活動と分析が終わり次第破棄されると言うことを理解します。
- すべての質問は満足のいく回答を得ました。
- 私は予想できるリスクを理解します。
- 私はこの研究から私と子供に直接利益が得られないと理解しています。
- 私はもし質問があったら、吉川さん、池谷先生、特別支援教育主任または担任の先生に尋ねることができると理解します。
- 私はコメントも処罰もなしに、いつでも自由に私の同意を退けることが出来ると理解します。
- 私はもしもこのリサーチの倫理的施行に対し、心配事や不満があった場合、グリフィス大学の人間リサーチ倫理委員会（Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee）のリサーチ・エシックス（Research Ethics）に電話+61-7-3735-5585（もしくは電子メール research-ethics@griffith.edu.au）を通じて責任者に連絡できると理解します。
- 私はリサーチに参加協力することに同意します。
同意書（保護者用）

日常的な実践、グループプロセス、価値ある成果：
日本とオーストラリアにおける特別支援教育

研究の説明を受け、裏面の詳細に同意したことを証明します。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>児童名（Child Name）</th>
<th>貴方の署名（Your Signature）</th>
<th>日付（Date）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E2. Information Package (Australian Field Research)

Appendix E2a. Teachers (Australian Field Research)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Special education classroom teacher)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team

The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special Education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special Education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: xxx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxxxxx

Why is the research being conducted?

This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese elementary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD), their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with ASD and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover the Australian phase as a part of the study.

An Australian school is needed to compare and contrast teacher practice with Japanese site. Your school was chosen because it shared critical features. First, your school caters a number of children with ASD. Second, the potential participating classroom teachers at your school are trained in special education. Finally, the potential participating classroom teachers are distributed across primary grades.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different way of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

What you will be asked to do

The primary participants of this research will be special education classroom teachers who teach a student group including one or more with ASD. You are invited to participate in several activities across a field research period at the first and second term in 2011. For the field research, you will be invited to participate in the following activities:

(a) Two types of interviews: Three semi-structured individual interviews of 30 minutes in the first, middle, and last week of the field research will ask you about daily practice, group instruction, and valued outcomes in relation to how you support children with ASD in your class; and 10-15 minute weekly update for a brief reflection about your teaching week on your non-contact hour during weekdays;

(b) Two types of classroom observations: One classroom observation of your targeted lesson weekly with a focus on group instruction and valued outcomes (Classroom Lesson Observation Matrix); and two observations of your whole teaching day with a focus on your tasks and activities (ABC Whole-day Observation Sheet).
(c) Observations of collegial teacher meetings specifically for planning lessons;
(d) Ethnographic document review: The research team will collect all written documents in relation to teaching children with ASD;
(e) Supplemental measurement activities: Step counter checklist and student happiness scale in during your whole-day observation; and teacher immediate reflection on student’s engagement and interaction attached to each Classroom Lesson Observation Matrix;
(f) Teacher Background Information Sheet.

This study is focused on your daily practices, group instruction, and valued outcomes in relation to supporting children with ASD. Video-recording and voice-recording will be applied for activities (a) with your permissions in order to help me transcribing conversations; for classroom lesson observations of activities (b) with permission from you, children, and their guardians in order to check the accuracy of coding during lessons and to use as visual prompts for your weekly update; and for activities (c) with permission from you and all of other meeting attendees in order to help me transcribing conversations. In addition to these activities, this present study will include individual interviews with various stakeholders in order to understanding the broad context of teacher work in your school and in Japan during the field research period.

Your confidentiality
Your responses will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the audio or video data as well as original documents used for activities (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) and those collected for activity (d) and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be erased or destroyed.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school and Griffith University. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

Feedback to you
Your school will be provided with a preliminary report about your school within 2011 and with final report about this study including both Australian and Japanese data by e-mail. All report will be available for you at school or by email.

Your questions
For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact to myself and/or one of my local academic supervisors, Dr Fiona Bryer or Dr Wendi Beamish.

Ethical conduct
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this study, please complete the attached Consent Form (Classroom teachers for special education) indicating your approval. If you would like to receive report copies personally, please indicate your contact detail in your consent form. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours Sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus
CONSENT FORM
(Special education classroom teacher)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team

The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participating in two types of interviews, two types of classroom observations, observations of collegial teacher meeting, ethnographic document review, supplemental measurement activities, and completing Teacher Demographic Sheet;
- I understand that classroom lesson observation will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that all interviews and teacher meetings will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that only the research team will have access to these video/audio-data;
- I understand that the video/audio-data will be erased following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact Ms Kikkawa and other local research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

Your name: _______________________ Your email: ___________________ (If applicable)

Your signature: ___________________ Date: ___________________
Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Why is the research being conducted?
This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese elementary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD), their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with ASD and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover the Australian phase as a part of the study.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different way of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

What you will be asked to do
The primary participants of this research will be special education classroom teachers who teach a student group including one or more children with ASD. However, you are invited to participate in a 30-minute individual interview as important stakeholders of these teachers. This study is focused on special education teachers’ daily practices, group instruction, and valued outcomes in relation to supporting children with ASD. Your interview will contribute to a deep understanding of the broad context of teacher work in the participating school, Queensland, and Australia. During the interview, you will be asked about your role in supporting children with ASD and your expectation toward special education teachers for supporting these children in special and regular education settings. The interview will be video/audio-recorded with your
permission in order to help me transcribe and analyse your talk. Additionally, you will be asked to complete Situational Analysis Participant Background Information Sheet to contrast to Japanese site.

**Your confidentiality**

Your responses will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the video/audio data as well as original forms used for interviews and background check and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed.

**Your participation is voluntary**

Your participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with Griffith University. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

**Feedback to you**

You will be provided with a preliminary report about your school within 2011 and with final report about this study including both Australian and Japanese data by e-mail. Please indicate your email address in your consent form.

**Your questions**

For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact to myself and/or one of my local academic supervisors, Dr Fiona Bryer or Dr Wendi Beamish.

**Ethical conduct**

Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

**Privacy Statement**

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this study, please complete the attached Consent Form (Situational analysis participant) indicating your approval. Please indicate your contact detail in your consent form to receive report copies. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.

Yours Sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus
CONSENT FORM
(Situational analysis participant)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: +xx-xx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participating in a 30-minutes individual interview and a completion of background information sheet;
- I understand that the interview will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that only the research team will have access to this video/audio-data and original background information sheet;
- I understand that the video/audio-data will be erased following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact to Ms Kikkawa and other local research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

Your name:__________________________________________________________

Your email:_____________________________________________(To receive reports)

Your signature:______________________________________ Date:____________________
Appendix E2c. Other Potential Participants (Lesson Observation, Australian Field Research)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Other potential participants during classroom observations)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Why is the research being conducted?
This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese primary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with ASD, their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD) and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover the Australian phase as a part of the study.

An Australian school is needed to compare and contrast teacher practice with Japanese site. Your school was chosen because it shared critical features. First, your school caters a number of children with ASD. Second, the potential participating classroom teachers at your school are trained in special education. Finally, the potential participating classroom teachers are distributed across primary grades.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different way of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

The study is not directly focused on you but will indirectly involve you. First, I will observe and code teaching in classrooms while you are present. Video/audio-recordings will be used for the classroom lesson observation with permission from you, classroom teacher, children, and their guardians. Second, the classroom teachers in your school will be invited to interviews. During the session, they will talk about their work relating to their school and colleagues.
Your confidentiality
Your information will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the video/audio recordings and information from the observation and teacher interviews and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed. No data about you will be recorded.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

Your questions
For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact myself, one of my local academic supervisors, Dr. Fiona Bryer or Dr. Wendi Beamish, and/or your classroom teachers.

Statements required for ethical practice
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this study, please complete the attached Consent Form (Other potential participants) indicating your approval. If you would like to receive report copies personally, please indicate your contact detail in your consent form. Please return to the signed form to your classroom teachers. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you,
Yours sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus
CONSENT FORM
(Other potential participants during classroom observations)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team

The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81 xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that there will be my indirect involvement in this research (classroom observation, teacher’s participation in interviews);
- I understand that classroom lesson observation will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that only the research team will have access to these video/audio-data and other original information collected;
- I understand that the video/audio-data and original documentation will be erased or destroyed following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can contact to Ms Kikkawa, other local research team, and my classroom teacher;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

Your name: ________________________ Your email: ____________________ (If applicable)

Your signature: ________________________ Date: ____________________
Appendix E2d. Other Potential Participants (Teacher Meetings, Australian Field Research)

Griffith UNIVERSITY

INFORMATION SHEET
(Other potential participants during teacher meeting observations)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team

The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiro Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Why is the research being conducted?
This proposed study will investigate the work of classroom teachers working with a group of children in special education unit in a Japanese primary school and in a related Australian situation. The aim of this study is to describe daily practice of classroom teachers with children with ASD, their group instruction for planning and teaching lessons for these children, and valued outcomes from their group instruction in both countries. In special education classes in Japan and Australia, teachers work with a group of children that includes one or more with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD) and work with their colleagues in developing curriculum. However, there may be cultural aspects of the purposes and ways that teachers use group instruction with children and the ways that teachers work together for planning. This form is only to cover the Australian phase as a part of the study.

An Australian school is needed to compare and contrast teacher practice with Japanese site. Your school was chosen because it shared critical features. First, your school caters a number of children with ASD. Second, the potential participating classroom teachers at your school are trained in special education. Finally, the potential participating classroom teachers are distributed across primary grades.

This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree at Griffith University in Australia. This study will extend international understanding of group instruction for children with ASD, which primary teachers in both countries use to work with children with ASD in their schools. The more we understand the strengths of different ways of doing group instruction, the more we will be able to improve support for children with ASD. Also, the understanding of lesson planning processes used by teachers working with those children in natural environments will have benefits for teachers, schools, and policy-makers.

The study is not directly focused on you but will indirectly involve you. First, I will observe collegial teacher meetings for planning lessons while you are present. Video/audio-recordings will be used for the observation with permission from you and other meeting attendees. Second, three classroom teachers attended in the meetings will be invited to interviews. During the session, they will talk about their work relating to their school and colleagues.
Your confidentiality
Your information will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the video/audio recordings and information from the observation and teacher interviews and they will be securely stored. On the completion of the study, any data that may identify any participant will be destroyed. No data about you will be recorded.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school and Griffith University. If, at any time, you wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal.

Your questions
For more information about this project and consult, please do not hesitate to contact myself, one of my local academic supervisors, Dr. Fiona Bryer or Dr. Wendi Beamish, and/or your classroom teachers.

Statements required for ethical practice
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy Statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree to participate in this study, please complete the attached Consent Form (Other potential participants) indicating your approval. If you would like to receive report copies personally, please indicate your contact detail in your consent form. Please return to the signed form to your classroom teachers. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus
CONSENT FORM
(Other potential participants during teacher meeting observations)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiko Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone:+xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that there will be my indirect involvement in this research (teacher meeting observation, three teacher’s participation in interviews);
- I understand that teacher meeting observation will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that only the research team will have access to these video/audio-data and other original information collected;
- I understand that the video/audio-data and original documentation will be erased or destroyed following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can contact to Ms Kikkawa, other local research team, and my classroom teacher;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

Your name: _________________________ Your email: ___________________________ (If applicable)

Your signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________
Appendix E

Appendix E2e. Parents (Australian Field Research)

INFORMATION SHEET
(Parents)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:
Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiro Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: +xx-xxxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxx@xxxxxxxx

About this research
This present research is student research conducted as a part of doctoral degree of Griffith University. I have studied how teachers work with a group of children in special education classes in Japan. I have been studying how teachers work when the group contains one or more children with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD), as children with ASD have been recognised only recently as a category for additional educational support. I want to compare how Australian teachers do this kind of teaching and how they work with teacher colleagues to improve lessons. There may be cultural differences in how teachers do their daily work, how they try to improve social skills during group lessons, and how they set learning goals for teaching children that may be used to improve teaching in both countries.

An Australian school is needed to compare and contrast teacher practice with Japanese site. Your school was chosen because it shared critical features. First, your school caters a number of children with ASD. Second, the potential participating classroom teachers at your school are trained in special education. Finally, the potential participating classroom teachers are distributed across primary grades.

Your consent is requested for your child to take part in school field research. This consent will cover your child’s participation in this study for classroom observation. The teacher’s instruction and the children’s task engagement and interaction in the natural setting will be observed (one lesson weekly) and use video/audio recordings with your permission. The teacher’s whole-day activities will also be observed to see how they interact to children during a school day (twice during this study). There will be no change in the everyday teaching or in your child’s engagement in learning activities. This study is not directly focused on your child. All data collected will be focused on how a teacher teaches a group of children and how the children interact with learning tasks and with each other during lessons. The teacher will be asked afterwards to consider how your child and other children in the group respond during the lesson as part of her reflection on her teaching.

The teacher of your child will also be invited to 30-minute individual interviews focusing on their daily practice, how they teach and improve their lessons, and what they achieve for their teaching. They will also be invited to have a short conversation (10-15 minutes) about their changes or improvements weekly. During the session, teachers will talk about their work relating to your child and provide some information about your child (e.g., age, diagnosis). The teachers’ conversation during all discussion will be recorded by audio and video. Additionally, all documents
related to their teaching will be collected including IEP of your child, school report, classroom/school newsletter, and teacher’s field notes. All information which can be identified about your child will be erased and coded.

**Confidentiality of your child**
Your child’s information will be confidential. Only the research team will have access to the original data and information from the observation, teacher interviews, and document collected. This information will be securely stored. On the completion of the trial, any data that may identify any participant will be deleted or destroyed.

**Your child’s participation is voluntary**
Participation in this study is voluntary and your decision will in no way impact upon your relationship with the school. If, at any time, you or your child wish/wishes to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, without penalty and without explanation for your withdrawal. Any children, who do not have parental permission to participate in the observation activities, will work in a small group with a special education teacher. They will implement similar program of their class at a withdrawal room.

**Feedback to you**
Your school will be provided with a preliminary report about your school within 2011 and with final report about this study including both Australian and Japanese data by e-mail. All report will be available for you at school or by email.

**Your questions**
For more information and/or any concerns about this project, please do not hesitate to contact to myself, one of my local supervisors Dr. Fiona Bryer or Dr. Wendi Beamish, and/or your classroom teacher.

**Ethical conduct**
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are able to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

**Privacy Statement**
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access, and/or use of your child’s identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your child’s anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan/pdf/personal-information-privacy-plan.pdf or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

If you agree for your child to participate in the study, please complete the attached **Consent Form (Parents)** indicating your approval. If you would like to receive report copies personally, please indicate your contact detail in your consent form. Please return the signed form to your child’s classroom teacher. This information letter is for your reference. I recommend you to keep a copy.

Thank you.
Yours sincerely,

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD Candidate, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt campus
CONSENT FORM  
(Parents)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes: Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

Research Team
The senior investigator (Principal supervisor):
Fiona Bryer, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Research Student
Yoriko Kikkawa
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

Associate supervisor
Wendi Beamish, PhD
School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University
Contact Phone: xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Naotaka Iketani, Professor
School of Special education
Gifu University
Contact Phone: +81-xx-xxxx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

External supervisor, Japan
Kunihiro Tamamura, Professor
School of Special education
Nara University of Education
Contact Phone: +xx-xxx-xx-xxxx
Contact Email: xxxxx@xxxxxxxx

By signing the form on the back, I confirm that I have understood the information sheet and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that there will be an involvement of my child in this research (classroom observation, teachers’ participation in interviews, document review);
- I understand that this study will observe how my child reacts to teachers’ instruction and other children;
- I understand that classroom lesson observation will be video/audio-recorded;
- I understand that only the research team will have access to these video/audio-data and other original information collected;
- I understand that the video/audio-data and original documentation will be erased or destroyed following research activities and data analysis;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me and my child from participation in this research;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can contact to Ms Kikkawa, other local research team, and my child’s classroom teacher;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to the participation of my child in the project.

Your name:_________________________ Your email:_________________________ (If applicable)

Your signature:_________________________ Date:_________________________
INFORMATION SHEET
(Students)

Daily practice, group processes, and valued outcomes:

Teaching children with ASD in Japan and Australia

I would like to come in your class to watch your teacher and how she/he teaches you and others in your class together as a class.

I will also watch your class all day some times in the weeks to come.

Please say that is OK with you to have me watch your class.

Tell your teacher if it is OK and sign the form on the bottom of this page.

Thank you.

Yoriko Kikkawa
PhD students at Griffith University

Please write your name and sign below:

Your name: ________________________________

Your signature: _____________________________ Date: __________________
Appendix F.
Situational Analysis
## Appendix F1. List of Key Documentations Involved in Situational Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basic Act on Education</td>
<td>• (Not relevant at the time of this study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course of Study (Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course of Study (SNE for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children with ID) and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide book for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to implement life-skill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning unit: Past and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State/Prefecture Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Board of the Prefecture website</td>
<td>• Educational provisions for students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University program</td>
<td>• P-12 Curriculum Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum Guideline for Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School curriculum</td>
<td>• School curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School website</td>
<td>• School website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report published in public</td>
<td>• Report published in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson study related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School values reflected</td>
<td>• School values reflected state curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national curriculum.</td>
<td>• A strong sense of evidence-based practice was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson study was set as a</td>
<td>embedded in the school and university program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong system within the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school and university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F2. Situational Analysis Interview Timeline and Participants

Interview timeline for situational analysis participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-Adult</td>
<td>Part-time teacher</td>
<td>5 July</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>Unit/classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Head</td>
<td>Head of SNEU</td>
<td>14 July</td>
<td>37 Mins</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-VP</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
<td>13 July</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-DVP</td>
<td>Deputy vice-principal</td>
<td>13 July</td>
<td>27 mins</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Professor</td>
<td>University professor</td>
<td>21 July</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Japanese case (Academic Year 2010)

Australian case (Academic Year 2011)

A-Adult1 | Teacher aide 1 | 22 June | 15 mins | Class (Prep) |
A-Adult3 | Teacher aide 3 | 7 June  | 15 mins | Class (Junior) |
A-Adult5 | Teacher aide 5 | 17 June | 20 mins | Class (J/M) |
A-Therapist | School speech therapist | 16 June | 33 mins | Classes |
A-P | School principal | 6 June  | 36 mins | School |
A-DP | Deputy principal | 21 June | 20 mins | School |

Background information of situational analysis participants

Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>The role in the school or department</th>
<th>Qualification relating to special education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-Adult</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Part-time special education teacher</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Head</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of special needs education unit and special education coordinator in the school School vice principal (also Gifu University professor teaching undergraduate and postgraduate students)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-VP</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-DVP</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School deputy vice principal</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Gifu University professor teaching undergraduate and postgraduate students and working as lesson study supervisor with the teachers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>The role in the school or department</th>
<th>Qualification relating to special education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Adult1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher aide working with AT1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Adult3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher aide working with AT2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Adult5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher aide working with AT3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>School principal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-DP</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School deputy principal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Therapist</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School speech therapist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F3. Sample of Situational Analysis Interview Sheets

Appendix F3a. School Administration Staff Interview Sheet (Japan)

教育関係者インタビュー: 校内(副校長、教頭、養護主任)

このインタビューでは3つの質問をします。その焦点は自閉症児の支援に関して、あなたの現在の役割、特別支援教育に携わる現場教師に対する期待、将来の見解です。インタビューは30分程度を予定しています。

あなたの現在の役割:

特別支援教室における自閉症児の支援に関して、あなたの役割は何ですか？

特別支援教育に携わる現場教師に対するあなたの期待:

特別支援教室における自閉症児の支援に関して、あなたが現場の教師に対して期待することは何ですか？

将来の見解:

もしあなたの学校で、通常教室で(高機能)自閉症児を支援する必要がある時:

あなたの役割はどのように変わりますか？
自閉症児に対する支援はどのようなものになると思いますか？また教師に対する支援はどのようなものになると思いますか？

Appendix F3b. School Administration Staff Interview Sheet (Australia)

Interview: School administration staff

This interview will ask you about three questions focusing on your present roles, your present expectations of special education teachers, and inclusive perspectives in relation to supporting children with autism. It will take approximately 30 minutes. This sheet shows the main themes.

Your present role

How do you see your role in relation to supporting children with autism in your school?

Your present expectation of special education teachers

What are your expectations for special education teachers in relation to supporting children with autism in your school?

Inclusive perspectives

How has your role changed in recent years? (A lot of children with “ASD” have been enrolled in regular education schools: units and classrooms )
How has the support for children with “ASD” changed in recent years?
Appendix F4. Sample of Prompt Sheets
Appendix F4a. School Administration Staff Interview Prompt Sheet (Japan)

Situational Analysis Prompt Sheet: Inschool Stakeholders (Japan)

Interview Date: ___________________________ Time Duration: ________________

Participants: ___________________________ Position: ___________________________

Introduction to the participant
本日はお時間を取っていただきまして、ありがとうございます。本インタビューは30分程度を予定しています。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of this interview</th>
<th>インタビューの焦点: 日本における自閉症児の教育・支援について</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3つの質問:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- あなたの現在の役割</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 特別支援教育に携わる現場教師に対するあなたの期待</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 将来の見解</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the interviewer
本インタビューはあなたの学校における自閉症児の教育・支援について焦点を当てています。特にあなたの現在の役割、特別支援教育に携わる現場教師に対するあなたの期待、将来の見解についてお聞きします。

この3つのテーマについてお聞きするのですが、自閉症児の教育・支援に関して重要だと思われることに関して何か思われましたら、ご自由にお話ください。

Resource during the interview:
Prompt sheet, interview question sheet, and pens
### Present role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present role</strong></td>
<td>本校の養護学級もしくは特別支援教室における自閉症児の支援に関して、あなたの役割は何ですか？</td>
<td>本校の養護学級もしくは特別支援教室に在籍する自閉症児に対してどのような役割を担っているとお考えになりますか？</td>
<td>养護学級もしくは特別支援教室に在籍する自閉症児に対して実際にご自身はどのような取り組みをされていますか？それは何故ですか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>どのくらいの頻度で養護学級の教室に行きますか？</td>
<td>通常学校の養護学級もしくは特別支援教室に在籍する自閉症児に対しての支援・教育をより改善するために何をすべきだと思いますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>通常学校の養護学級もしくは特別支援教室に在籍する自閉症児に対しての支援・教育他になにかこれは重要だと思われたことは何かありませんか？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Your expectations of special education teachers at special education unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your expectations of special education teachers at special education unit</strong></td>
<td>本校の養護学級もしくは特別支援教室における自閉症児の教育・支援に携わる現場教師に対して期待することは何ですか？</td>
<td>养護学級の現場教師が実際にどのような支援もしくは活動を行っていますか？</td>
<td>現場教師の行っている自閉症児の教育・支援についてどのように思われますか？（教師の役割）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>現場教師の行っている自閉症児の教育・支援についてどのように思われますか？（教師の役割）</td>
<td>大学付属の学校という立場からお答えください。本校で行われている養護学級もしくは特別支援教室における自閉症児の教育・支援に携わる現場教師は何をすべきだと思いますか？（具体的な活動）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>養護学級もしくは特別支援教室における自閉症児の教育・支援の理想的な形はどのようなものだと思いますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>養護学級もしくは特別支援教室における自閉症児の教育・支援に関して、他になにかこれは重要だと思われたことは何かありませんか？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future perspectives</strong></td>
<td>もしご、本校の通常教室で高機能自閉症児を支援する必要があるとき。－あなたの役割はどのように変わりますか？</td>
<td>特別支援教育が始まり、これまで通常教室に在籍していた高機能自閉症児に対する支援が公的に求められるようになりました。</td>
<td>現在、本校では通常教室に自閉症児はいないということですが、もしもこの先、高機能自閉症児を通常教室で支援する必要が出てきた場合、あなたの役割はどうように変わるともおまいですか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>－あなたは具体的に何をすべきだと思いますか？</td>
<td>あなたは具体的に何をすべきだと思いますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>－対象児童の支援はどのようなものになると思いますか？</td>
<td>もしご通常教室における高機能自閉症児を支援する必要があるとき、特別支援の現場教師に期待することは何ですか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>－現場教師に対する支援はどのようなものになるべきだと思いますか？</td>
<td>あなたは現場教師に対してどのような支援をするべきだとおもいますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>通常教室で高機能自閉症児を支援する理想的な形はどのようなものだと思いますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>通報教室で高機能自閉症児を支援に関して、他になにかこれは重要だと思われたことは何かありませんか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>最後に何かコメントしておきたいことはありませんか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ご協力ありがとうございました。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F4b. School Administration Staff Interview Prompt Sheet (Australia)

Prompt Sheet: School administration staff (Australia)

Interview date: __________________________ Starting time: ___________

Participant: _____________________________

Introduction to the participant
Thank you for your time today. This interview will ask you about three questions and will take up to 30 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational analysis for inschool stakeholders</th>
<th>For the interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For each participant (Participants have this information.)</td>
<td>This interview focuses on supporting children with ASD in your school. I would like to ask you three main questions about your present roles, present expectations of special education teachers, and inclusive perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview focus: Supporting children with autism in your school</td>
<td>Please note that you can talk about your thoughts freely if you think that they are important for supporting those children in you school, in addition to these three questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three main questions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you see your role in relation to supporting children with autism in your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are your expectations for special education teachers in relation to supporting children with autism in your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How has your role changed in recent years and how has the support for children with “ASD” changed in recent years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource during the interview:
Prompt sheet, interview question sheet, and pens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Participants’ responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Present role                 | How do you see your role in relation to supporting children with autism in your school? | What role do you have in relation to supporting children with autism in your school?  
- Pairing teachers with a teacher mentor (e.g., AT1 and AT2)  
How often do you visit classrooms?  
What would you like to do more in order to improve support for those children in your school? |                                                                                                                                  |                         |
| Your expectations of special education teachers at your school | What do you expect special education teachers to do in relation to supporting children with autism in your school? | What do special education teachers actually do in your school in relation to supporting children with autism?  
How do you view current practice of special education teachers in your school? What are their roles in relation to supporting those children?  
Is there anything more or different that you expect these teachers to do?  
Is there anything else that you think that is important for supporting children with autism? |                                                                                                                                  |                         |
| Inclusive perspectives       | How has support for children with “ASD” changed in recent year?  
How has your role changed in recent years?  
How do you think mainstreaming principals should do for supporting children with ASD?  
What would be ideal support for children with ASD? | - A lot of children with “ASD” have been enrolled in regular education classrooms in QLD  
I heard that some of AT3’s children actually came from their previous mainstreaming classrooms in this term. Is this a rare occurrence or happening often?  
What is your role in relation to such a transition.  
- In special education settings  
- In mainstreaming classrooms  
- How to balance who stays in special and regular education settings to give better support  
Would you like to have any comments?  
Thank you for your time. |                                                                                                                                  |                         |
Appendix G.
Teacher Interview
### Appendix G1. Teacher Interview Timelines And Procedures

#### Timeline for semistructured interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Interview-A</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Interview-B</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Interview-C</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT1</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>38 mins</td>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>39 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT2</td>
<td>Mr Banba</td>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>26 mins</td>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>32 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT3</td>
<td>Ms Chiba</td>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>31 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>24 mins</td>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>5 May</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>33 mins</td>
<td>23 June</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>38 mins</td>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AY = Academic Year.

#### Timeline for reflection interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob Wk</th>
<th>JT1 Ms Ando</th>
<th>JT2 Mr Banba</th>
<th>JT3 Ms Chiba</th>
<th>AT1 Ms Deanne</th>
<th>AT2 Ms Eden</th>
<th>AT3 Ms Fleck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>25 May</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>12 May</td>
<td>11 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 mins</td>
<td>11 mins</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
<td>17 mins</td>
<td>19 mins</td>
<td>18 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>18 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>9 mins</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 mins</td>
<td>27 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>8 mins</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>11 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 June</td>
<td>2 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 mins</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 mins</td>
<td>18 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>9 June</td>
<td>8 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 mins</td>
<td>21 mins</td>
<td>17 mins</td>
<td>13 mins</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>13 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30 June</td>
<td>30 June</td>
<td>30 June</td>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>16 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 mins</td>
<td>12 mins</td>
<td>17 mins</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>13 mins</td>
<td>12 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 June</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 mins</td>
<td>6 mins</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 July</td>
<td>8 July</td>
<td>8 July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 mins</td>
<td>13 mins</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Materials used in interviews for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview A</td>
<td>Class timetables; list of teacher activities; blank day timesheet; transparent sheet; and colour pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview B</td>
<td>Lesson or unit plans; blank lesson timesheet; and colour pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview C</td>
<td>List of collaborative activities and interactions that the teacher had with others during the field research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection interviews</td>
<td>Video-clips and collaborative activity follow-up sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional interview</td>
<td>Lesson plan based on the Japanese life-skill learning unit, created by the researcher for each class context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Video-clips were employed only in Japan, although reflection interviews were conducted in both sites.

*Additional interviews were only conducted in Australia.
Pre- and post-interview procedures

Semistructured interview
Checklist before interview:
1. Set up a fixed video camera and prepare all tools
2. Switch on the camera as well as a voice recorder on the desk
Checklist after interview:
3. Turn off the camera and voice recorder
4. Complete a reflection within the interview day

Reflection interview
Checklist before interview:
1. Set up a voice recorder on the desk
2. Prepare video clips (laptop) for the Japanese teachers.
3. Turn on the voice recorder.
Checklist after Weekly Update:
4. Turn off the voice recorder.
5. Collect documentation that teacher used for the week.
6. Complete a reflection within the interview day.
Appendix G2. Items for Interview A

Appendix G2a. Interview Sheet A (Japan)

インタビューシート A：日常的な実践
これから行う合計３回にわたる各３０分の個人インタビューは自閉症児に焦点をあてています。

自閉症児を担当している特別支援教育の教師の日常的な実践を構成しているもの
- インタビューの焦点: あなたが行っている_______をサポートするための一 日一 日の活動
- あなたのクラスで自閉症傾向が強いお子さんは誰ですか?
- 授業研究に関して: 授業案計画を立てるところ

1. 普段よくある一日にあなたが行うことについて教えて下さい。

2. あなたが費やす時間が一番多い活動から少ない活動について教えて下さい。

3. あなたが挙げた活動中に_______とどのように関わっているかを教えてください。授業研究のサイクルとして、_______のためにどのように授業を計画してい るかについて教えてください。

ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix G2b. Interview Sheet A (Australia)

Interview Sheet A: Daily Practice

This first interview is focused on specific students with autism. This interview will take up to 30 minutes. Note. When talking about “students with autism”, the interviewer will use the specific names of students (here described as Student X, Student Y).

What makes up the daily practices of special education teachers working with students with autism?

Interview focus: Your day-to-day activities in relation to supporting specific students with autism

This question is focused on what you are actually doing throughout a day.
- Please share with me what you do throughout a typical day.

This question is focused on how long you take to do these activities.
- Please identify which activities you spend most and least time on.

This question is focused on how you interact with specific students with autism, your colleagues, and other people throughout the day.
- Please share with me how you interact with specific students with autism during these daily activities.

- Please share with me how you work with your teacher colleagues and other people for programming or improving lessons for specific students with autism?

Thank you for your time.
Appendix G2c. Prompt Sheet A (Japan)

Prompt Sheet A: Daily Practice (Japan)

Week: Preparation Week                    Interview Date:______________________        Time:_________~__________

School:_________________________          Participants:_______________________

Introduction to the participant
本日はこのインタビューのためにお時間を取っていただきまして、大変ありがとうございます。これから、フィールドリサーチの9週間の間に、合計3回のセミ・ストラクチャー・インタビューに参加していただきます。この一連のインタビューは自閉症児に焦点を当てています。先生のクラスでは、_______________________に焦点を当てるということになります。それぞれのインタビューは30分ほど予定しています。

Note: When talking about “students with ASD”, the interviewer will use the specific names of students (X, Y).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1</th>
<th>自閉症児を担当している特別支援教育の教師の日常的な実践を構成しているもの</th>
<th>質問者</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>このインタビューの文脈的構成</td>
<td>インタビューの焦点：あなたが行っている_______をサポートするための一日一日の活動</td>
<td>先生の日常の学校生活の流れの中で、グループがどこにフィットするのかを理解するために、先生が実際にいったい何を行っているのかを良く理解する必要があります。このインタビューでは、_______をどのように支援し、どのように関わっているのかに関して、先生の一日一日の活動に焦点を当てます。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 授業研究に関して：授業案計画を立てているところ | 3つの質問：
1. 一日を通してあなたが実際に行っている活動
2. それぞれの活動に費やす時間
3. その一日を通してどのように_______と関わっているか | このシートは本インタビューの主な焦点を示し（インタビューシートを見せる）、また授業研究のサイクルで先生がどこに位置づけられるのかを示しています。先生は今、授業案章を提出され、これから先の授業計画を考えていらっしゃいますね？先生が日常的な一日を通して実際に何をされているのか、その活動にどれほど時間を費やされているか、そして、その日常の一日の中で、_______にどのように関わっておられるのか、についてお話ししていただきます。 |

Resource during the interview:
Interview question sheet, transparent sheet, pie chart sheet (or bar chart), blank timetable for writing a list, normal pens, and permanent colour pens
### Appendix G

#### Themes Main questions Prompts, procedure, and transcript Teachers responses

##### Daily activities

先生が普段よくある一日を行っていらっしゃるところ、活動について教えて下さい。

昨日は特別な行事などなく、普段と変わらない一日でしたか？

(Aの白紙の紙を準備し、先生が言ったことをリストにする。)

朝学校に来られて、まず何をされますか？

児童が登校する時、一番最初の授業が始まる前、1時間目の授業、始まってから、1時間目の授業の間、2時間目の授業、2時間目の授業の間、3時間目の授業、4時間目の授業の間、終食時、お昼休み、掃除時、4時間目の授業、児童帰宅時、児童帰宅後。

別の日に、何か異なった活動を行いますか？

(USA 教師のリストを見せる)：これはアメリカの Special Education に関わる教師が行っている活動の例です。先生が行っている活動と似ていると感じますか？それとも、違うと感じられますか？

このリストに追加したいそのほかの活動はありますか？

ほかに何かコメントしたいことはありませんか？

##### Time-spending

先ほどお話してくださいました活動について、先生が一番時間かけていらっしゃるものを、あまたかけていらっしゃらないものがどれかを大体でいいので教えて下さいますか？

時間の使い方は、先生が同時に複数の活動をされていたり、今日はしたけど、別の日はしていなかったりとされていると思うのですが、簡単にどれだけ使っていると言えるものではないと思います。ので、どれくらい時間をかけていらっしゃるかを考えて見ようと思います。

こちらに準備した色ペンでこれは一緒にやってるって思われる活動を同じ色の○で囲んで見てください。

ここに円グラフを出して大体の割合を書いてもらう

一分多い時間を使われているのはまず、何でしょう？割合的には大体どれくらいですか？

ほかに何かコメントしたいことはありませんか？

##### Focus on X

質問1でお話してくださいました活動時に先生がどのように関わっていらっしゃるかについて教えて下さい。

授業研究の流れの中で、先生はどのように授業を計画されますか？

質問1で書いたリストの上に透明のシートを載せる

この活動の中で、普段いつ先生はどのように関わっておりますか？先生がこれほどよく、または、よく関わっていると思われる、または、よくあるエピソードについて教えて下さい。

その時に、先生はどのように支援されているか？どのように気をつけていらっしゃいますか？

ほかに何かありませんか？

現今、何に気をつけて、授業案を考えておりますか？

ほかの時期と違って、授業案を考えられるときの活動はなんですか？

今後、先生が今までと違った支援、指導ができるとしたら、何をされたいですか？

最後になにかコメントされたいことはありませんか？

お時間ありがとうございました。
Appendix G2d. Prompt Sheet A (Australia)

Prompt Sheet A: Daily Practice (Australia)

Week: Preparation Week   Interview date: ______________________   Starting time: ______________________

School: _______________   Participant: _______________   Children _____________ & _______________

Introduction to the participant
Thank you for your time for this interview today. This interview will take up to 30 minutes. You will be asked to participate in total three of semi-structured individual interviews during my field research. This series of interviews will be focused on specific children with ASD. Up to two of children with ASD in your class will be nominated for this study across the field research. May I have the names of two children with ASD in your class, please?

From now, all of your interviews and observations as well as document collection will focus on _______________ & _______________.

RQ1 What makes up the daily practices of special education teachers working with children with ASD

| Resource during the interview: | Interview Sheet 1, Prompt Sheet (Daily Practice), two transparent sheets, blank timetable, list of activities, pie chart & bar chart, participant’s schedule, normal pens, and permanent colour pens |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each participant (Participants have this information.)</th>
<th>For the interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview focus: Your day-to-day activities in relation to supporting or interacting with _____________ &amp; ___________.</td>
<td>In this interview, I will ask you about three main questions. This sheet shows you the main focuses of this interview (show the interview question sheet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three main questions:</td>
<td>Before starting classroom observations, I need a good understanding of what you actually do in order to find out where the “group instruction” fits into your doing context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Please share with me what you do throughout a typical day.</td>
<td>In this interview, I would like you to share with me what you are actually doing throughout a day, how long you take to do these activities, and how you interact with _____________ &amp; ___________ throughout the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please identify which activities you spend most and least time on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Please share with me how you interact with specific children with ASD during these daily activities, and how you work with your teacher colleague and other people for programming or improving lessons for specific children with ASD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Main questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Daily activities    | Please share with me what you do through a typical day.                         | Let’s start with Question 1. (Interviewer uses Blank Timetable to write what the teacher lists up in front of them)  
This (the teacher’s schedule) is your schedule that you gave me earlier. You can use this for your support. I would like to fill in this sheet with you.  
- Let’s look at your typical day that you spend your whole day with your children. Was yesterday a typical day for you? If so, please tell me about what you did yesterday. If not, please tell me what was different from your typical day and also tell me what you did if it was a typical day.  
(Interviewer will prompt the teacher by indicating time by time) Let’s look at another layer. What did you do:  
- Before children come to the school; at morning session; at middle session; at lunch time and any breaks for children  
- At afternoon session; When children go home; after school hour  
- Are there any other activities in other days (e.g., meetings, non-contact hour, own break time)?  
(Interviewer shows the examples of USA teachers’ activities):  
Let’s look at another layer. This is a prompt sheet indicating an example of what activities USA teachers do. Do you think these are similar to what you do or different from what you do? Would you like to add more activities to your list?  
- Anything else would you like to add? |                                                                                 |                    |
| Time-spending       | Please share with me which activities you spend most and least time on.         | Let’s move onto the Question 2.  
Please tell me, which activities do you spend most time on? (Interviewer circles the activities that the teacher tells).  
Now, which activities do you spend least time on? (Interviewer double-circles the activities that the teacher tells).  
How about the rest of the activities?  
Anything else would you like to comment? |                                                                                 |                    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure, and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Focus on specific children with ASD | Please share with me how do you interact with each of your nominated children with ASD during these daily activities.                                                                                           | Let’s move onto the Question 3. (Interviewer uses another transparent sheet over the completed Timetable and prepare coloured pens)  
- In which activities do you usually interact with or support _________?  
- Please pinpoint events with _________ that you are aware of during a day by highlighting.  
- At the time (indicate the event), how do you interact with or support _______ or what are you concerned about in relation to _____________?  
- How about _______? (Another nominated child)  
- Who do you work together with? What daily activities do you have with other people or how do you interact with other people?  
- What do you focus on when you discuss ___________ & __________ during team meeting?  
- If you could do your practice differently, what would you like to do with these children?  
- Would you like to add anything else about your daily routine?  
Thank you for your time |
### All Japanese teachers

平成24年度

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>時間</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>朝の活動</td>
<td>8:05 ~ 8:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>朝の会</td>
<td>8:25 ~ 8:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:45 ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9:40) ~ 10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20分休み</td>
<td>10:25 ~ 10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:50 ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(11:45) ~ 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>給食</td>
<td>12:30 ~ 13:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>昼休み</td>
<td>13:10 ~ 13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>掃除</td>
<td>13:35 ~ 13:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14:00 ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(14:55) ~ 15:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>終わりの会</td>
<td>15:45 ~ 16:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

げこうじこく

下校時刻

冬季 16:10
(5時間授業) 15:00
### Sample of Australian teachers (AT3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.45 – 9.10</td>
<td>Morning circle</td>
<td>Morning Circle</td>
<td>Morning Circle</td>
<td>Morning Circle</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10 – 9.30</td>
<td>Writing – Coping daily sentences (all) Noah trace over, Cate to write extra sentence with support, David to write two extra sentences without support. Noah and Oliver to do name exercise.</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>Music – Noah and Cate Reading(9.30 – 9.45)/ Art(9.45 – 10.30) David and Oliver</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>David shopping with another teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.00</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Story</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.30</td>
<td>First Lunch – Cate and Noah (Junior Playground) David and Oliver (Middle Playground)</td>
<td>Fine Motor – Noah &amp; Cate PE – David &amp; Oliver</td>
<td>SOSE – AFRICA 11 -12 F block using interactive board</td>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>Literacy – Recipe book using photograph sequencing and writing text captions (Tuesday cooking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td>Drumming</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td>Fine Motor</td>
<td>Fine Motor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 – 12.30</td>
<td>Second Lunch – Cate and Noah (Junior Playground) David and Oliver (Middle Playground)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 1.00</td>
<td>Indoor Activities – Choice activities Puzzles, Role playing, Card Games, fine motor activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 – 2.30</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>David walking with another class.</td>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>Gross Motor 2.00 – 2.30 Art – Cate and Noah</td>
<td>Oliver and David to middle school activity. Cate and Noah junior school activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 – 2.40</td>
<td>Group Session – day revision and farewells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G2f. List of Teacher Activities Based on Vannest & Hagan-Burke (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic instruction</strong></td>
<td>Time spent directly teaching academic skills as required by state standards; can occur in your class or another setting</td>
<td>(a) Presenting academic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Guiding academic student activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-academic instruction</strong></td>
<td>Time spent providing instruction in non-academic areas (i.e., areas not required by the state’s academic standards)</td>
<td>(a) Teaching social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Teaching procedures for classroom activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional support</strong></td>
<td>Time spent providing support to students, with minimal or no direct teaching, during academic or non-academic instruction</td>
<td>(a) Being present and available while another teacher leads the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Time spent responding to students’ problem behaviours; includes any teacher actions that occur as a direct result to student misbehaviour</td>
<td>(a) Writing discipline referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Pulling or changing cards in response to problem behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Time spent monitoring students during non-instructional times</td>
<td>(a) Bus duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating any aspect (social or academic) of student performance</td>
<td>(a) Grading assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Proctoring exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings</strong></td>
<td>Time spent participating in any meeting required under IDEA for a special education student</td>
<td>(a) Emergency IEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Placement change meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paperwork</strong></td>
<td>Time spent attending to any educational paperwork as required by your school, district, state, or federal government</td>
<td>(a) Filling out forms for an IEP meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Recording grades on a spreadsheet or report card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation and collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Time spent communicating with others about students’ educational needs</td>
<td>(a) Phone calls to parents about a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Working with another teacher to plan instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>General meetings, duties, and tasks that do not fall within any other categories</td>
<td>(a) Grade-level committee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Work-related e-mail correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan and prepare</strong></td>
<td>Time spent individually preparing for instruction or planning for instruction</td>
<td>(a) Writing lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Choosing videos to show as part of a science unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal time</strong></td>
<td>Time spent attending to non-work-related issues</td>
<td>(a) Non-work-related e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Duty free lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G2g. Blank Day Timesheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of interviewee: __________________________

Name/s of nominated student/s: __________________________ & __________________________
Appendix G3. Items for Interview B

Appendix G3a. Interview Sheet B (Japan)

インタビューシートB: グループ・インストラクション

今回のインタビューは合計3回にわたる各30分の個人インタビューの2回目です。自閉症児に焦点をあてています。

特別支援教育の教師がどのように「グループ・インストラクション（集団の中での指導と学び）」を自閉症児をサポートするために利用しているか

- インタビューの焦点：____と____をサポートするためのあなたの集団を生かした指導と学び
- 教授研究、PDCDサイクルに関して：指導案・授業の調整中

1. ____と____を生単の授業に関して、クラスの中でサポートするために、実際にどのように指導案・授業を改善させてきたか、また、どのように他教師と一緒に指導案・授業を発展させ、どのように他教師と関わってきただか。
2. 授業中・クラスの中で____と____をサポートするために、また関わるために実際に行っていること
3. 「グループ」（クラス集団）は教師としてのあなたにとってどのような意味がありますか

ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix G3b.Interview Sheet B (Australia)

Interview Sheet 2: Group Process

This second interview is focused on specific students with autism. This interview will take up to 30 minutes. Notes. A lesson is a set/identified period of time with specific learning goals. Other people include other teachers, teacher aides, administration staff, therapists, parents, and others who you work with.

How do special education teachers use “group instruction” to teach children with autism?

Interview focus: Teaching specific children with autism in a group and collaborating with other people.

This question is focused on what you are actually doing to plan your lessons with diverse students in your class:
- How do you adjust your planning to support specific students with autism whilst also teaching other students?
- Do you collaborate with other people for this planning? If so, how?

This question is focused on what you are actually doing to teach your class:
- How do you adjust your teaching for specific students with autism when teaching the class that includes other students?
- Do you collaborate with other people to improve teaching? If so, how?

This question is focused on what specific terms mean to you as a teacher in relation to the word, “group”:
- What is “a class”?
- What is “a lesson”?
- What is “group instruction”?
- What is “group activity”?
- What is “collaboration”?

Thank you for your time.
Appendix G 3c. Prompt Sheet B (Japan)

Prompt Sheet B: Group Instruction (Japan)

Week: Observation Week 5  Interview Date: __________________  Time duration: __________

School: __________________________  Participants: ___________________

Introduction to the participant
本日はこのインタビューのためにお時間を取っていただきました、大変ありがとうございます。このインタビューは合計 3 回を予定しているセミストラクチャー・インタビューの 2 回目です。1 回目のインタビュー同様、このインタビューは自閉症児に焦点を当てています。先生のクラスでは、_________と_________に焦点を当てるということになります。インタビューは 30 分ほどを予定しています。

RQ2 特別支援教育の教師が自閉症児を指導するために、どのように「グループ・インストラクション（集団を生かした指導と学び）」を使っているか

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>各参加担任教師</th>
<th>質問者</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>このインタビューの焦点:あなたが行っている_____と_____を支援し、関するためのグループ・インストラクション</td>
<td>前回のインタビューでは、先生方の日常的な実践について、先生方が一般的に_____と_____を支援するために何をされているのかについてお聞きしました。今日のインタビューは、_____と_____に関わるグループ・インストラクションについて焦点を当てています。このシートは本インタビューの主な焦点を示すインタビューシートを示す）また授業研究のサイクルで先生が今どこに位置づけられるのかを示しています。先生は今指導案を調整しながら授業を発展させていらっしゃいますね？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業研究に関して:指導案の調整を行っているところ</td>
<td>このインタビューでは合計 3 回の質問についてお伺いします。先生が生徒の授業の中で_____と_____のためにどのように指導案（授業）を改善されてきたかについて、また、他の先生方と授業を改善するためにどのように関わってきましたかについて、授業の中で実際にどのように児童と関わっているか、そして、グループ（クラス集団）を使って実際にどのような指導しているのかについておはなししていただきます。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 つの質問:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. あなたが_____と_____を生徒の授業の中で支援するために指導案をどのように改善してきたか。また、他の教師と指導案を計画する中でどのように一緒に関わってきましたか。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 授業の中であなたが_____と_____にどのように関わってきたか。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. グループ（クラス集団）はあなたにとってどのような意味がありますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource during the interview: Lesson plan, interview question sheet, blank A4 paper for writing a list, and pens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group instruction in lesson planning (Teachers)</td>
<td>先生は____や____を集団を生かした授業、生徒の授業に従事（役頭）させるために、また児童間の関わりを促すために、どのように指導案や授業を改善してきましたか？  また、これから児童のように変えていこうと思っていますか？  先生は____や____を生徒の授業に従事（役頭）させるために他の先生方どのように指導案もしくは授業を改善してきましたか？</td>
<td>指導案作成から今の段階まで、____や____のためにどのようなことに注目をして指導案や授業を改善しましたか？授業に加えたものはどういったことですか？  他の児童との違うところは？  ____や____のために他に改善が必要なところは何ですか？何に注目して授業を発展させていると思いますか？  他の先生方どのようにフィードバックをもらっていますか？  先生だけ活発に参加した改善、変更点について他の先生方はどのような手助けをしてくれましたか？  指導草案作成から今の段階まで、____や____のためにどのようなことに注目をして指導案や授業を改善してきましたか？</td>
<td>個に対応しながらクラスとして1つの活動を一緒に行う授業。クラス全体の指導案を見て、個別の対応を展開する。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for teaching the group</td>
<td>先生は____や____を生徒の授業に従事（役頭）させるために他の先生方どのように指導案もしくは授業を改善してきましたか？  先生は____や____を生徒の授業に従事（役頭）させるために他の先生方どのように指導案もしくは授業を改善してきましたか？</td>
<td>先生は____や____を生徒の授業に従事（役頭）させるために他の先生方どのように指導案もしくは授業を改善してきましたか？</td>
<td>他に何かありませんか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group instruction in Classroom (X and other children)</td>
<td>____と____が他の児童と関わるために、また先生と関わるために先生が普段生徒の授業で行われていることはなんですか？ (Let the teachers talk about their lessons)</td>
<td>(Let the teachers talk about their lessons)</td>
<td>他に何かありませんか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Main questions</td>
<td>Prompts, procedure and transcript</td>
<td>Teachers responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of group in group instruction</td>
<td>グループ・インストラクションについての質問です。</td>
<td>先生方はクラスという児童グループを指導するために多くの時間を使われています。先生のクラスを児童グループとして指導するとき、「グループ（みんな）」という言葉は教師としての自分にとってどのような意味がありますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>グループ・インストラクションについて重要なことはなんですか？</td>
<td>クラスを児童グループとして指導する目的は何ですか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(教師のグループに対する考え方と実際に授業でどのように児童と関わっているかについて)</td>
<td>先生のクラスでは______と______がソーシャルスキル（社会性）を身につけるためにどのように指導されていますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>先生方はクラスという児童グループを指導するために多くの時間を使われています。</td>
<td>- ソーシャル・スキルを______と______に教えるときにどのように「児童グループ（クラス）」を利用していますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>グループ・インストラクションの利点</td>
<td>児童をクラスとしてまとめるために何をしていますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 集団のよさを自分の指導案もしくは日々の授業にどのように取り入れていますか？</td>
<td>集団のよさとは何ですか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 先生のクラスで集団のよさが生かされている場面は何ですか？</td>
<td>グループ・インストラクションの利点</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>もしも、先生が理想のクラスを作れるとしたら、どのようなクラスを作りたいですか？</td>
<td>集団のよさを自分の指導案もしくは日々の授業にどのように取り入れていますか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>最後に何かコメントされたいことはありませんか？</td>
<td>先生のクラスで集団のよさが生かされている場面は何ですか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お時間ありがとうございました。</td>
<td>もしも、先生が理想のクラスを作れるとしたら、どのようなクラスを作りたいですか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G3d. Prompt Sheet B (Australia)

Prompt Sheet B: Group Introduction (Australia)

Week: Observation Week 5  Interview Date:  Time duration:  

School:  Participants:  

Introduction to the participant
Thank you for taking part in this interview today. This interview is the second semi-structured individual interview during my field research. As in the first interview, this interview will be focused on your one/two child/children with autism. In your class, these interviews will focus on _______ & _______. 

Each interview will take up to 30 minutes.

Notes. When talking about “children with autism”, the interviewer will use the specific names of children. A lesson is a set/identified period of time with particular learning goals. Other people include other teachers, teacher aides, administration staff, therapists, parents, and others.

RQ2 How do special education teachers use “group processes” to teach children with ASD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each participant (Participants have this information.)</th>
<th>For the interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview focus: Teaching _____ and _____ in a group and collaborating with other people.</td>
<td>At the last interview about your daily practice, I asked about what you actually do to support _____ and _____ across a day in general. Today’s interview is focused specifically on your group process in relation to supporting _____ and ______. I would like you to share with me how you adjust your planning for ____ and ____ in your class that has diverse children. Secondly, I would like to know what you are actually doing to adjust teaching _____ and _____. Thirdly, I would like to know about what specific terms relating to “group” mean to you as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three main focuses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are you actually doing to adjust your planning to support _____ and ______ whilst also teaching other children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are you actually doing to adjust your teaching for _____ and ______ when teaching the class that includes other children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What do specific terms relating to “group” mean to you as a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource during the interview: Unit plans, Interview Sheet B, Blank Activity Sheet, transparent sheet, and pens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group process in lesson planning</strong></td>
<td>How do you adjust your planning to support ____ and ____ while also teaching other children? Do you collaborate with other people for this planning? If so, how?</td>
<td>Planning:&lt;br&gt;- Paperwork; in your head; adjust in the moment&lt;br&gt;How you adjust your planning?&lt;br&gt;What important things do you consider when you plan a lesson for ____ and ____ in your class?&lt;br&gt;From the beginning of this term to now, what have you changed in your planning or lessons so far?&lt;br&gt;What new adjustments would you like to make for ____ and ____?&lt;br&gt;Did you get/give advice or feedback?&lt;br&gt;Did other staff contribute to your planning in any ways?&lt;br&gt;- For ____ and _____. for other children.&lt;br&gt;Anything else?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group process for teaching</strong></td>
<td>How do you adjust your teaching for ____ and ____ when teaching the class that includes other children? Do you collaborate with other people to improve teaching? If so, how?</td>
<td>(Using Blank Activity Sheet)&lt;br&gt;In this question, we work through an activity sheet together. Please pick a lesson/learning experience from this/last week and describe how you support or communicate with ____ and ____ from the start to end of the lesson/learning experience.&lt;br&gt;What applies to everyone?&lt;br&gt;Thirdly, please think back around the beginning of this term. Have you changed how you teach ____ and ____?&lt;br&gt;Do you notice any major/minor changes from what you wrote now?&lt;br&gt;Did you get/give advice or feedback?&lt;br&gt;What themes do you talk about during the junior meeting or conversation with other people in general?&lt;br&gt;Anything else?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Main questions</td>
<td>Prompts, procedure and transcript</td>
<td>Teachers responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of</td>
<td>What do specific terms mean to you as a teacher in relation to “group”?</td>
<td>This is a broad question. I would like to know about Australian perspectives of group teaching and how Australian teachers view groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>What is “a class”?</td>
<td>How does “group instruction” line up with your unit plans and unit of work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is “a lesson”?</td>
<td>How does it help ____ and ____?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is “group instruction”?</td>
<td>Closing prompts (3 minutes):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is “group activity”?</td>
<td>If you could do your practice differently, how would you like to do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is “collaboration”?</td>
<td>Would you like to add anything else?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 本時の目標
自分から「ふわふわホットケーキ」を作りをしようとする。

友たちの様子に気付いて見本にしたり、話し合ったり、調べたり、準備をして、友たちと活動する楽しさや良さを味わって活動する。

### 本時の展開
(37/39)
(非課題/第4次)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>学習活動の流れ</th>
<th>A (3年生)</th>
<th>B (3年生)</th>
<th>C (3年生)</th>
<th>D (4年生)</th>
<th>E (4年生)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>喜元で実験する姿</td>
<td>友だちを伴ったり教えたりして友だちが作れる姿。</td>
<td>全部の実験や友たちの役割を理解し、伝わりやすい姿。</td>
<td>手順表や実験から活動内容を理解し、自分で活動する姿。</td>
<td>ふわふわホットケーキを食べたいという願いをもって自分から活動する姿。</td>
<td>友だちと一緒に活動する楽しさを味わいながら活動する姿。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本日は関係する姿</td>
<td>一緒に活動する友だちを誘ったり、手伝ったりする姿。</td>
<td>みんなのよう。セーラー等も全員に声をかける姿。</td>
<td>手順表から活動を始める姿。</td>
<td>活動に見通しをもって自分から活動する姿。</td>
<td>友だちの役を探して自分に役立つ姿。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 専門
- ロックさんが遠足のビデオを撮る。
- 手を洗い、身支度をする。
- 材料を入れる。
- 材料を調理する。
- 生地を練る。
- トッピングをかけ、切ったりする。

### 研究内容
- A (3年生)：教材・道具の工夫
- B (3年生)：友だちの役を演出し、伝わる姿を手伝う。
- C (3年生)：手順表から活動を始める姿。
- D (4年生)：友だちが提案する活動に参加する。
- E (4年生)：友だちの役を探して自分に役立つ姿。

### 優良の在り方
- 友だちが提案する活動に参加する。
- 友だちが提案する活動に理解し、伝わる姿。
- 友だちが提案する活動に理解し、伝わる姿。
- 友だちが提案する活動に理解し、伝わる姿。
- 友だちが提案する活動に理解し、伝わる姿。

### 結末
- 友だちを呼んだり、おいしさを共有する。
- 体験に参加して、体験に参加して、体験に参加して、体験に参加して、体験に参加して。
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単元名
みんなで たのしく つくろう ～ふわふわホットケーキ～

単元目標
①活動に見通しをもって、自分から「ふわふわホットケーキ」を作る。
②友だちの様子に気付いて見本にしたり、認めたり、順番を守ったり、声をかけたりして、友だちと活動する楽しさや良さを味わって活動する。

学びの実感の段階表

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>人に対する学びの実感</th>
<th>ものに対する学びの実感</th>
<th>ことに対する学びの実感</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>教師と一緒に、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったり食べたりしたことを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>個別に用意された教具を用いて、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったことを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>ふわふわホットケーキ作りについての、見通しが持てる。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>繰り返し活動したり、手順表を見たりして自分で、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったり食べたりしたことを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>様々な教具を用いて、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったことを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>一部の工程において、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったことを喜ぶ。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>同じグループのなかまを見本にしたり、誘ったり、それに応えたりして、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったり、食べたりすることを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>より多くの教具を用いて、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったことを喜ぶ。</td>
<td>最後まで自分でふわふわホットケーキ作りができたことを喜ぶ。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クラスのみんなと、誘ったり、それに応えたりして、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったり、食べたりすることを喜ぶ。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>招待する相手を意識して、クラスのみんなと、ふわふわホットケーキを作ったり、食べたりすることを喜ぶ。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>活動内容</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実際に作ったり食べたりしてみる、活動への意欲を高めたり、見通しをもったりする。</td>
<td>Ⅰ</td>
<td>Ⅰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>繰り返し取り組みながら自分で行う工程を増やし、自分で作ることができる。</td>
<td>Ⅱ</td>
<td>Ⅲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>繰り返し取り組みながら、友だちとよりよくかかわることができる。</td>
<td>Ⅳ</td>
<td>Ⅲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>講師学級の仲間、交流学級の仲間、いろいろなお客様さんを招待する。</td>
<td>Ⅴ</td>
<td>Ⅲ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
めさす授業像：３児

| 学習活動                                      | 皆様の役割 | 友達の役割 | 友達の役割
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>友達全員が考え下ろしたものを</td>
<td>今話すみんなでふるふるにおっかけを作った。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幼児全員への発言を述べる。</td>
<td>はい、皆さんがふるふるにおっかけを作りました。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友達の役割を考える。</td>
<td>おみつおみつおみつおみつおみつ奥様を作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんがふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友達の役割を考える。</td>
<td>おみつおみつおみつおみつおみつ奥様を作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんがふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>友達の役割</th>
<th>皆様の役割</th>
<th>友達の役割</th>
<th>友達の役割</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(人にたのまれて)</td>
<td>はい、そんなにやるよ。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ものにたのまれて)</td>
<td>そう！そんなにやるよ。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ここにみかぼよ)</td>
<td>おお！そんなにやるよ。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>友達の役割</th>
<th>皆様の役割</th>
<th>友達の役割</th>
<th>友達の役割</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>友達の全員に付ける。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友達の全員に付ける。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友達の全員に付ける。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友達の全員に付ける。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>皆さんもふるふるにおっかけを作ってください。</td>
<td>今話すにおっかけを作れ！</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Junior (AT2) – Integrated Unit Plan Term 2 2011

| Unit Title: Who Am I? | Teacher: Ms Eden  
| Teacher Aide: Adult3 and Adult 4 |
| --- | --- |

**Phase 1 Unit Overview:**
Students learn about their bodies: their faces and the five senses.

**Unit Goal:** Students actively participate in group activities and lessons where they learn about their own and others’ bodies.

**Unit Content:**
- **Science** – Students learn their facial features, link these to the five senses, and work scientifically to discover how each of their senses work.
- **SOSE** – Students become aware of other’s faces, and how they each work are the same, or different. Students become self-aware.
- **Numeracy** – Students measure and compare their bodies.
- **Literacy** – Students learn sight words connected with the unit, and learn listening and responding skills within the group.
Appendix G

Links to School Curriculum:

Level One –

Science:

Life and Living
- Recognises and names body parts of humans
- Describes the use of body parts (e.g. wings for flying)

Working Scientifically
- Cooperates with others in a pair or small group for learning and working
- Makes observations about things that are seen, felt, smelled, touched
- Describes observations in simple terms (e.g. big, small, round, fast).

English:

Listening
- Eye contact
- Wait for instructions
- Face speaker
- Stop activity
- Attention
- Environmental sounds

Responding
- Appropriate response
- Follow simple one or two part instruction

Visual Arts:

Media
- Painting and drawing
- Collage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reading skills</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Word recognition – text, symbols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOSE:**

**Social and Emotional Knowledge, Skills and Intelligence**

Self awareness

**Self concept**

- ‘Me’, personal attributes, gender

**Numeracy:**

**Measurement**

**Comparisons**

Links to student IEPs:

- SOSE – participation, coping strategies, task completion, communication
- Literacy – sight words, following instructions
- HPE - oromotor skills
## Scope and Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Students will.....</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>• Read “Sometimes I Curl Up Into a Ball”&lt;br&gt;• Perform the actions with their bodies&lt;br&gt;• Reflect on the actions the way their bodies work&lt;br&gt;• Have an outline of their bodies drawn when lying down&lt;br&gt;• Comment on each other’s outlines</td>
<td>• Storybook&lt;br&gt;• Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>• Examine their faces in the mirror – what are they like? How are they the same/different to classmates (e.g. 2 eyes, but different colours)&lt;br&gt;• Find a mathematical word to describe each of their features (e.g. colour, size, length, shape)&lt;br&gt;• Add a describing word to make a story about their face&lt;br&gt;• Draw their faces onto their body outline&lt;br&gt;• Be taught sight words corresponding to the unit&lt;br&gt;• Measure and compare each other’s height&lt;br&gt;• Make craft projects relevant to the unit&lt;br&gt;• Learn about and use their senses and identify which body part/s are used for each – read storybook for each&lt;br&gt;  o Noses – smell – smelling activities&lt;br&gt;  o Eyes – sight – visual activities&lt;br&gt;  o Mouth – taste – tasting activities&lt;br&gt;  o Ears – hear – listening activities&lt;br&gt;  o Our whole body - touch – feeling activities</td>
<td>• Storybooks&lt;br&gt;• Paper&lt;br&gt;• Pens&lt;br&gt;• Worksheets&lt;br&gt;• Sensory activities&lt;br&gt;• Body outline&lt;br&gt;• Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>• Go on a sensory walk using all of the senses&lt;br&gt;• Share and comment on each other’s work&lt;br&gt;• Reflect on what they have learnt&lt;br&gt;• Be introduced to the next phase of the unit</td>
<td>• Storybook&lt;br&gt;• Completed work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G3g. Blank Activity Timesheet

Name of interviewee: _______________________

Name/s of nominated child/children: __________________________ & __________________________
Appendix G

Appendix G4. Items for Interview C

Appendix G4a. Interview Sheet C (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>インタビューーシート C: 実践の成果</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>本インタビューは自閉症児に焦点を当てた3つのうちの最後のインタビューです。本インタビューは30分ほどを予定しています。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>特別支援教育の教師が認める、グループ・インストラクションから得られる成果。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(中間発表後からの聞き取りと関連しています)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• インタビューの焦点: グループ・インストラクションの成果</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 自閉症児に対する成果:
グループ・レッスン（集団を使った授業）はどのように___と___の助けとなり、有効でしたか？または役に立ちましたか？___と___は単元を通して何を得ましたか？またはどのように成長しましたか？

2. 教師にとっての成果:
授業研究の経験は、これから自身のクラス全体、そして___と___をクラスの中で指導する上でどのような助けとなりましたか？チームとしていろいろな人（他の先生、OB、教授、管理職の先生）と働き、計画-実行-検討を繰り返す過程を通して得られた先生自身の改善面や成長はなんですか？

3. 成果に関わる 3 つの質問:
___と___を集団の中で支援し関わっていくことに関して:
   a) 授業をどのように改善してきましたか？（例：教材教具、言葉かけ、場面設定）
   b) 他の先生とどのように授業を改善してきましたか？
あなたの学校が授業研究（に関連するすべての活動）の経験を通して得たものは何だと思いますか？

ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix G4b. Interview Sheet C (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Sheet C: Valued Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This third interview is focused on specific students with autism. This interview will take up to 30 minutes. Notes. A lesson is a set/identified period of time with specific learning goals. Other people include other teachers, teacher aides, administration staff, therapists, parents, and others who you work with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction?

Interview focus: Valued outcomes from your group teaching and collaboration with other people

| 1. What outcomes do you value when you teach ___ and ___ with his/her classmates? |
| 2. What outcomes do you value from collaborating with others? |
|   - Other teachers |
|   - Teacher aides |
|   - Other school staff |
|   - Therapists |
|   - Others (e.g., parents) |
| 3. How do these outcomes align with the values of your school? |

Thank you for your time.
Appendix G4c. Prompt Sheet C (Japan)

Prompt Sheet C: Valued Outcomes (Japan)

Week: Review Week                     Interview Date:______________________                     Time:_________~__________
School:_________________________      Participants:________________________

Introduction to the participant
本日はお時間ありがとうございました。本インタビューは本研究の最後の 30 分インタビューになります。これまでのインタビュー同様、自閉症児に焦点を当てています。先生のクラスでは_____と____に焦点を当てています。

RQ3 What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction? (discussed after Observation Week 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each participant (Participants have this information.)</th>
<th>For the interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of this interview</strong></td>
<td><strong>インタビューの焦点: グループ・インストラクションの成果</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3つの質問</strong></td>
<td><strong>授業研究のサイクルでは、先生は現在評価とまとめの段階におられます。まず最初に、グループ・レッスン（集団を使った授業）はどのように___と___の助けとなり、有効でしたか？または役に立ちましたか？___と___は単元を通して何を得ましたか？またはどのように成長しましたか？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 自閉症児に対しての成果</td>
<td><strong>授業研究の経験は、これから自身のクラス全体、そして___と___をクラスの中で指導する上でどのような助けとなりましたか？チームとしていろいろな人（他の先生、OB、教授、管理職の先生）と働きながら、計画－実行－検討を繰り返す過程を通して得られた先生自身の改善面や成長はなんですか？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 教師にとっての成果</td>
<td><strong>本インタビューでは、グループ・インストラクションから得られた成果に焦点を当てています。授業研究のサイクルでは、先生が現在評価とまとめの段階におられます。まず最初に、グループ・レッスン（集団を使った授業）はどのように___と___の助けとなったかについて聞いてみます。第二に、授業研究の経験を通して、先生がこれから自身のクラス全体、そして___と___をクラスの中で指導する上でのような助けとなったかについて聞いてみます。そして、最後に、今までどのように先生が授業を改善し、他の教師と協力してきたかを振り返っていただくことによって、_____学校が授業研究（に関連するすべての活動）の経験を通じて得たものについての先生の見解をお伺いします。</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 成果に関する 3つの質問</td>
<td><strong>授業をどのように改善してきましたか？（例：教材教具、言葉かけ、場面設定）</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 他の先生とどのように授業を改善してきましたか？</td>
<td><strong>授業をどのように改善してきましたか？（例：教材教具、言葉かけ、場面設定）</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) あなたの学校が授業研究（に関連するすべての活動）の経験を通じて得たものは何だと思いますか？</td>
<td><strong>あなたの学校が授業研究（に関連するすべての活動）の経験を通じて得たものは何だと思いますか？</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource: Interview sheet, prompt sheet, pens, paper
### Appendix G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valued outcomes for ______ and ______ in classrooms</strong></td>
<td>3週間のフィールドリサーチの期間で先生が注目したグループインストラクション（生活単元学習）における____と____の学びと成長</td>
<td>- 短期目標（単元目標）に関して対象児が得たもの：これまでの生単の授業で各対象児に対して成長、変化を認めたときはいつですか？またはエピソードは何ですか？ - 長期目標（年目標、研究目標）の修正の有無児童の実態に合わせて、これからの授業の展開や学級経営の方向性を変えましたか？改善・レベルアップしましたか？ - 他にどのように対象児は成長しましたか？ - クラスで一緒に何かをする、協力することが、どのように____と____の助けとなり、有効でしたか？または役に立ちましたか？ - 集団で授業を行うことの問題点は何ですか？クラス全体で何かをする授業が及ぼすマイナス点は何ですか？または、困難は何ですか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valued outcomes for teachers themselves from collaborative lesson planning</strong></td>
<td>3週間のフィールドリサーチの期間で先生が注目したグループインストラクション（授業研究のサイクル）における自身の学びと成長</td>
<td>(Give a list of what activities teachers have done across 9 weeks): 他に何か加えたい活動はありませんか？ - ここに書かれている活動は先生にとってどのような助けになりましたか？特に一緒に協力して支援を考えたり、授業を改善することが、対象児にどういったようなプラスになりましたか？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valued outcomes for the school from collaborative lesson planning</strong></td>
<td>____と____を団体の中で支援し関わっていくことに関して： a) 授業をどのように改善してきましたか？ b) 他の先生とどのように授業を改善してきましたか？ c) あなたが授業研究（に関連するすべての活動）の経験を通して得たものは何だと思いますか？</td>
<td>- 今まで授業を改善・発展させてきた活動を振り返ってください。授業を改善・発展するために、具体的に何をしてきましたか？または、何に注目してきましたか？ - 今まで授業を改善・発展させてきた活動を振り返ってください。授業を改善・発展するために、具体的に他の教師、教授、OB、管理職の先生と何をしてきましたか？ - その協力体制、パートナーシップについて先生がプラスもしくはマイナス感じることは何ですか？ - その授業研究に関連するすべての活動の経験を通して養護チームとして得たものはなんですか？ - その授業研究に関連するすべての活動の経験を通して付属小学校として得たものはなんですか？ - もしも魔法を使えたら、先生はどのような成果を一番得たいですか？お時間ありがとうございました。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G4d. Prompt Sheet C (Australia)

Prompt Sheet C: Valued Outcomes (Australia)

Week: Observation Week 7/Review week   Interview Date:______________ Time:______~_______
School:___________________ Participant:______________________

Introduction to the participant
Thank you for taking part in this interview today. This interview is the third semi-structured individual interview during my field research. As in the first and second interviews, this interview will take up to 30 minutes and will be focused on your one/two child/children with ASD. In your class, these interviews will focus on ____ & ____. (The name of a child with autism)

Notes. When talking about “children with ASD”, the interviewer will use the specific names of children. A lesson is a set/identified period of time with particular learning goals. Other people include other teachers, teacher aides, administration staff, therapists, parents, and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ3</th>
<th>What do special education teachers value as outcomes from group instruction?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For each participant (Participants have this information.)</td>
<td>For the interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview focus: Valued outcomes from your group teaching and collaborating with other people.</td>
<td>In this interview, the focus is on what outcomes you value from your group teaching and collaborating with others. I understand that, at the point of your year, you are now engaging in assessing the outcomes for ____ and ____. Please share with me what outcomes you actually value in relation to children from your group teaching, to yourself from collaboration, and to your school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource: Interview Sheet 3, Prompt Sheet 3, pens, video/audio recorders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Valued outcomes for specific children from your group teaching | - Please tell me what outcomes you value when you teach ____ and ____ with his/her classmates during Term 2. | What has _____ and _____ achieved in relation to IEP and term goals?  
When you reflect on Term 2, can you describe any episodes, in which you recognised any improvements or achievements of ____ and ____?  
In what else (e.g., communication skills, social skills, independent skills, friendship, academic abilities) have _____ and _____ improved? |                     |
| Valued outcomes for yourself from collaborating with others       | - Please tell me what outcomes you value from collaborating with others across Term 2. | (Give a list of what activities teachers have done across 6-7 weeks): Are there other activities that you would like to add?  
- Other teachers  
- Teacher aides  
- Other school staff  
- Therapists  
- Parents and others  
How have these activities helped you generally?  
When you reflect on Term 2, do you recognise any changes/improvements in your teaching strategies, materials, or environmental settings?  
How did the collaboration/interaction help you support ____ and ____ in your classroom across Term 2?  
What differences can you describe between working alone and working with others? |                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts, procedure and transcript</th>
<th>Teachers responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valued outcomes for your school</td>
<td>- Please tell me how these outcomes align with the values of your school?</td>
<td>For child (Question 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From collaboration (Question 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic curriculum (positive future, how to fit in society?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and management based on shared values (how to share values?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships that foster life quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transdisciplinary teamwork to promote teaching and learning based on child strengths and interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The key principles of inclusive education and evidence-based practice (examples?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolwide PBS and individual children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data-based tracking of child learning achievements towards long term outcomes via GAS, objective evidence and skilled teacher judgement (how actually to gather data?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research projects to promote leadership in the education and disability sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships with parents, carers, agencies, business, industry, local and international schools, colleges and universities, and local community members within a wrap-around methodology (how do the partnerships help teachers, children, and the school?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you could use a magic wand, what would you like to achieve most?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would you like to add anything else?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G4e. Sample List of Collaboration Activities and Interactions

**All Japanese teachers (excluding everyday interactions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>週</th>
<th>月</th>
<th>火</th>
<th>水</th>
<th>木</th>
<th>金</th>
<th>土</th>
<th>日</th>
<th>備考</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>準備期間</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事前研究案</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察 1 週</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事前研究案指導検針</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察 2 週</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事前研究案指導検針</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察 3 週</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事前研究案／当日配布案指導検針</td>
<td>学年会</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察 4 週</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>当日配布案指導検針</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>週</td>
<td>月（3組X）</td>
<td>火</td>
<td>水（2組X）</td>
<td>木</td>
<td>金</td>
<td>土</td>
<td>日</td>
<td>備考</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察5週</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
<td></td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>（XX 先生）</td>
<td></td>
<td>（XX 先生）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>（XX 先生）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究推進委員会</td>
<td></td>
<td>研究推進委員会</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>勤行状詰め作業</td>
<td></td>
<td>勤行状詰め作業</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究推進委員会</td>
<td></td>
<td>研究推進委員会</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX 先生</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX 先生</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察6週</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>検討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>観察8週</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td>検討</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>OS 指導</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G
### Sample of Australian teachers (AT1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1/May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation Wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prac Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ObWk1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prac Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ObWk2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prac Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>ObWk3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td>Guidance officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prac Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1/June</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ob/Wk4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prac Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ob/Wk5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior meeting (3 pm)</td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td>AT2: Combining classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art teacher; Strategies for Anne</td>
<td>Guidance officer</td>
<td>AT2: Combining classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relief teacher; 2h discussion about the class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s mum on phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne’s mum on phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ob/Wk6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relief teacher; Discussion about the class</td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relief teacher; Discussion about the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only Mon/Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physio Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents of three children including Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ob/Wk7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff meeting (8am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails (Physio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only Mon/Wed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G5. Items for Reflection Interviews  
*Appendix G5a. Reflection Interview Prompt Sheet (Japan)*

**Teacher Reflection Interview Prompt Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Teacher:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

このチェックは先生のクラスのとに関焦点をあてています。

**Question 1: 一週間のまとめ**

この一週間、先週と比べて先生はどのようにクラスの中でとに関わっていましたか？また、先週と比べてどのように養護チームとしてどのように授業を計画、実行、そして改善しましたか？クラス全体として何をしましたか？そのなかで対象児童のために何をしましたか？先週の授業もしくは支援計画に集団授業の中で対象児童を支援するために加えたもしくは変更したことはありますか？それはなんですか？対象児童を支援するために他の先生と一緒にどの様に働きましたか、もしくは関わりましたか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>今週の全体的な感想</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (          ) (何か指導案、支援案に生かせるなと思ったこと)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (          ) (何か指導案、支援案に生かせるなと思ったこと)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

他の教師、その他の教育関係者から得た情報

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>他の教師、その他の教育関係者から得た情報</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2: より具体的に**

このフォームは研究者が先生方との会話を通して作成されます。その週に観察した突起すべき場面についてビデオクリップをもとに質問します。

ビデオクリップを観てあなたがその時何をしているのか、またその理由を教えて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video-clip number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please describe what you were doing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please discuss why you were doing this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ご協力ありがとうございました。
## Reflection Interview Prompt Sheet

### School Week: ____________ Observation Week: ____________ Date: ____________

### School: ___________________ Teacher code: ___________________

*A lesson is a set/identified period of time with specific learning goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General reflection on the week</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was your last week? Was it busier than usual? Did you have any special events? Any difference from the week before?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Weekly reflection on ________________ (The targeted child with autism)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was she/he during this week?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reflection on the lesson* observed

| **How was lesson today? What were the important moments during the lesson? (What did you do well? What worked for everyone? Were you happy about the lesson?)** |

### Reflection on __________ during the lesson*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>(The targeted child with autism)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was she/he during the lesson? What worked for her/him? What was your goal/objective for her/him in today’s lesson? How does what you did with her/him in this lesson line up with your unit planning for this term?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes or discoveries

| **Did you change anything in your planing for her/him, comparing with the lesson last week? From the last week to now, did you discover anything that changes how you taught the lesson that I observed (about the child with ASD, instruction, strategies, and so on)? What would you like to change in the lesson for the next week?** |

### Reflection on collaboration with other people, (other teachers, teacher aides, other staff, therapists, parents, and others)

| **In general, during the last week, how did you interact with other people (e.g., formal meetings, chats, activities, events)? Did you have any information, advice, feedback, or support from them? Did you give any information, advice, feedback, or support to them?** |

---

Thank you for your cooperation.
Appendix G5c. Sample of Collaborative Activity Follow-up Sheet

**Duties and activities in this week**

**Observation Week 1**

School: __________________ Teacher code: ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duties/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Appendix G5d. List of Video-Clip Examples (Japan only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JT1</th>
<th>VC Code</th>
<th>Duration (Min.Sec)</th>
<th>ObWk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC6</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC8</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC9</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC17</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC18</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC21</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC22</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC23</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JT2</th>
<th>VC Code</th>
<th>Duration (Min.Sec)</th>
<th>ObWk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC6</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC9</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC11</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC15</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JT3</th>
<th>VC Code</th>
<th>Duration (Min.Sec)</th>
<th>ObWk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC2</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC4</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC6</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC7</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC12</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC16</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC18</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of VC: 23

See transcriptions of samples for these clips in Appendix O12.
### Appendix G6. Items for Extra Interviews (Australian Only)

*Appendix G6a. Extra Interview Sheet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview: Implication of cross-cultural perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you think about the unit plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Is it doable? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What modifications do you want to make if you implement the life-skill learning unit in your class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Would you like to make any other comments in relation to the unit plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.
Appendix G

Appendix G6b. Sample Life-Skills Unit Plan Created by the Researcher for the AT2’s Class

Unit name: Let’s play at “Forest of Friends”!—“Winnie the Pooh”

Current condition of the class
There are five children in the class. Within the class, one child has a formal diagnosis of ASD. Two require intensive physical support, while one uses a wheelchair. Ben likes the computer and prefers to play by himself, although he likes interacting with his preferred adults. Matilda currently has a strong interest in one of her peers, Isabella, and follows Isabella. Isabella is very curious about her surrounding environments and likes exploring them by touching. Jack is very gentle to younger children and likes being with them although he does not interact with them. Lucas likes watching moving objects (e.g., balls, cars).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male child with ASD who likes being by himself during playtime although he likes interacting with his preferred adults. He has become more tolerant about staying in a group setting. He likes playing triangle instrument and computer. He needs more positive experiences of being with peers to become more interactive to his peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Female child who likes Isabella very much and follows her everywhere. She likes playing playdough. Recently, she started verbalising more with adults. She needs positive experiences of two-way interactions with her peers to further develop her communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male child who requires intensive physical support. He seems to like younger children around him although he does not interact with them. Interactive environments will help him develop further cognitive skills as well as build a relationship with peers in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Male child who requires intensive physical support and likes watching moving objects. Interactive environments will help him develop further cognitive skills as well as build a relationship with peers in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Female child who uses wheelchair. She likes playing with dolls and other manipulative plays. She likes helping teachers and peers. She needs to develop social skills to play with peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of unit plan
The children of this class are likely to play by themselves while interacting with adults in the classrooms. Sometimes, they interact with each other when they are encouraged by adults. Within unit plan, the children will become members of “Forest of Friends” by pretending to be one of characters from Disney movie, Winnie the Pooh. Each child and adult selects own character and dresses like the character (or wears an arm-band with the character sticker) during the lessons. While adults become facilitators, the child will experience playing with peers through this role play. For example, one adult becomes “Pooh bear” and she tries to eat honey in the hole of the tree. As following original story, Pooh bear will be stuck in the hole, and all children need to rescue and pull the Pooh bear from the hole. It will become a group activity of the lesson.

The teacher and the children will discuss the rules in the “Forest of Friends” at the end of each lesson as well as their favourite plays. All equipment or toys will be developed as the children suggested as much as possible in addition to the reflection about how the children experience the series of lessons. The play rules and extra equipment will be added progressively. The key rule will be that “everyone is my friend in Forest of Friends”: To enter in the Forest of Friends, everyone becomes a good friend.
Optional activity: The class may invite another class to their “Forest of Friends” to be their good friends. When children of other classes were invited to the Forest of Friends, they also become their good friends. Because the children will engage in group discussions at the end of lessons and all pieces of equipment are designed based on their ideas, the children will feel proud when other children/adults visit them in the Forest of Friends. The children may make invitations and take the invitations to other classes. This invitation is optional and is not included in the total of the unit plan.

**Learning aims**

The children can enjoy individual plays at the Forest of Friends as well as the group play. Within the unit, they will use their bodies to play actively in the playroom. Also, they will have positive experiences of playing with friends and feel satisfaction and pleasure. Also through completing one group activity, they can accept classmates and have positive experience of engaging in the same activity together with classmates. To achieve the goals, teachers will facilitate children to:

- ☑️ Understand the procedures of each play and take initiatives to engage in their favourite activity;
- ◇ Be aware of classmates, interact with each other, and try to engage in the activity with them.

**Design learning materials and tools**

- Prepare DVD of Winnie the Pooh (Story of the honey tree) and the class watch the DVD at the beginning of every lesson before going to the playroom;
- Create playing equipment so that the children can play with peers (e.g., cardboard box rider that two or three children can ride at the same time);
- Create plays that Angel and peers can play together (e.g., Angel can pull the string to pretend moving the rider for peers);
- Create posters to show how to use the equipment to play with peers; and
- Decorate the room and equipment to motivate the children to play in the room.

**Design environmental settings**

- Set up equipment so that children can physically play together;
- Use music from Winnie the Pooh to facilitate the play;
- Set play themes for each equipment (e.g., cardboard box rider as “Honey Rider”, therapeutic ball pool as “Mysterious Lakes”); and
- Create the big tree hole and prepare seven strings for all friend of “Forest of Friends” to pull Pooh bear together.

**Unit plan (A total of 20 lessons):** One lesson is 45 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Content of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The children will develop their own “Forest of Friends” with teachers. They talk about their favourite plays and related equipment. The teacher will learn their preferences and decide which equipment will remain or be replaced in the room. The children will also learn following the rules and procedures of the play and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The children work as a team to help Pooh bear (one teacher aide) from the hole of the tree. The children will play for the first 25 minutes as they do during Stage 1. After that, one group activity, rescuing my friend, Pooh Bear, starts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning aims: Stage 1: Let’s play at “Forest of Friends”!—“Winnie the Pooh”
◎ Engage in favourite plays at the same place or while interacting with peers.
◇ Be aware of classmates who are in the same room and engaging in the same activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit Goal:</strong></th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the unit</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage Goal:</strong></td>
<td>Realise own favourite plays and be aware of peers at the room</td>
<td>Realise own favourite plays and be aware of peers at the room</td>
<td>Enjoy each play with adult’s support while peers are around</td>
<td>Enjoy each play with adult’s support while peers are around</td>
<td>Realise own favourite plays and be aware of peers at the room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the lesson</td>
<td>Explain the procedures</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**
- Understanding of procedures
- Watch DVD and sing a song, “Winnie the Pooh”
- Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment

**Body**
- Individual plays
- Find own favourite plays
- Understand peers’ favourite plays
- Play as facilitators (role play)
- Invite him to play if required
- Encourage him to be aware of other classmates playing in the same room (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)
- Invite her to play if required
- Encourage her to be aware of other classmates playing in the same room (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)
- Being a medium between him and other children
- Being a medium between him and other children
- Encourage him to look at other classmates around him (e.g., “Look at ~~, he/she is here too”)
- Encourage her to be aware of other classmates playing in the same room (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)

**Closure**
- Packing up all toys
- State what each child did well
- Talk about favourite plays
- Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next
- Prepare picture of each activity as visual
- Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next
- Prepare picture of each activity as visual
- Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next
- Prepare picture of each activity as visual
- Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next
- Prepare picture of each activity as visual
Learning aims: Stage 2: Let’s play at “Forest of Friends”!—“Winnie the Pooh”
◎ Engage in favourite plays at the same place or while interacting with peers as well as engage in a group activity
◇ Be aware of classmates who are in the same room and engaging in the same activities as well as complete a group activity with peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Unit Goal: Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the unit</th>
<th>Stage Goal: Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the lesson</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment including group activity</td>
<td>◎ Enjoy plays as facilitators (role play)</td>
<td>◎ Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a costume for his character</td>
<td>◎ Invite him to play if required</td>
<td>◎ Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear with adult’s support</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear with adult’s support</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a costume for her character</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a tree and act as Pooh bear being stuck in the hole of honey tree</td>
<td>◎ Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment including group activity</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a tree and act as Pooh bear being stuck in the hole of honey tree</td>
<td>◎ Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear with adult’s support</td>
<td>Engage in a group activity of rescuing Pooh bear with adult’s support</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a costume for his character</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a tree and act as Pooh bear being stuck in the hole of honey tree</td>
<td>◎ Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>Enjoy playing at Forest of Friends with peers</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a poster and picture of how to play each equipment including group activity</td>
<td>◎ Prepare a costume for her character</td>
<td>◎ Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G6c. Sample Life-Skills Unit Plan Created by the Researcher for the AT3’s Class

Unit name: Let’s open a Rainbow Café

Current condition of the class
There are four children in the class. Within the class, three children have a formal diagnosis of ASD. This class was new at the start of Term 2, 2011. Cate previously refused teacher’s instructions strongly and had a primary attention of the teacher. Kathy joined the class from Term 4, and she required intensive support to engage in her tasks. Since Kathy joined the class, Cate responded by taking good care of Kathy and showed less behaviours during the school day. She also communicated (by crying) that she wanted to be a part of the class and to participate in the same activity with her peers when she was asked to do her own task different from her peers (i.e., individual tasks).

David and Oliver interacted with each other regularly. Oliver wanted to help staff and often took the initiative to do so. However, he needed to listen to teachers’ instruction carefully and understand what he was asked to do before engaging in his tasks. He has hesitated to ask the teacher to confirm her instruction when he was not sure. David can complete his tasks individually when the instructions were given clearly. He expressed his anxiety when he encountered irregular situations (i.e., out of routines) and engaged in repetitive behaviours (e.g., repeating the same phases on inappropriate occasions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female child with ASD who transferred from her previous mainstreaming school to the school in Term 2, 2011. She needs support to follow instructions. She was a child who took primary attention of the classroom teacher until Kathy joined the class. She needs to understand the concept of group environment and her role in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Female child with ASD who moved from her previous class to current room in Term 4, 2011. She required intensive support. She likes people and is willing to interact with classmates at her previous class. She needs to have positive experiences of completing tasks independently (without teacher’s support but with peer support) to feel happy in her new environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male child with ASD who moved from his previous to current class in Term 2, 2011. He is able to complete most tasks independently and has been working on increasing his self-confidence. He needs to have positive experiences of helping/leading classmates to achieve the classroom activity goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Male child who transferred from his previous mainstreaming school to the school in the middle of Term 2, 2011. He needs time to understand the procedures to complete his task independently. He needs to increase his self-confidence by completing tasks independently by using passive peer modelling as well as by asking a question if required. Also, he needs to accept his classmates positively by helping them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of unit plan

All children like interacting with classmates, and they have experienced cooking since the class started in Term 2, 2011. They love cooking and feel satisfied by eating their own cooking. Moreover, through cooking for customers (i.e., producing lunch box at a school shop), they have experienced a basic concept of working toward a common goal and of serving for their customers. Within the unit, the children will have one group activity: They will open a “Rainbow Café” at their classroom and invite customers from out of the classroom to the café. The unit has two stages: Stage 1 of foundation skill building and working as a team and Stage 2 of opening a café as a team.

At the first stage, the children will make cupcakes independently (i.e., without teacher’s support) and as a team. They will experience sharing feelings of happiness and satisfaction with classmates. Moreover, the children will work as a team to learn social skills and the concept of working together. At that stage, the children will take initiatives to interact with peers in the class and work effectively as a team. At the second stage, they will individualise their own cakes by use of different food colour and will understand that they will succeed in their group activity by working hard and together with classmates and also will feel satisfaction of fulfilling individual roles and responsibilities. At the second stage, the children will have positive experiences of interacting with customers and will be motivated to interact with them. They will understand others’ happiness through the Rainbow Café. Based on reflection about how the children experience the series of lessons, individual roles and tasks will be added progressively, and the learning environments will be adjusted for the children to work independently on their own tasks and with peers to support each others.

For examples,

- David will be given a role of classroom leader to give instructions to the class;
- Oliver will be given opportunity to understand the importance of asking a question if required, in order to achieve the classroom activity goal;
- Cate will be given opportunity to understand individual roles in the class;
- Kathy will be supported by her classmates to complete the task; and
- The class will function as a community (e.g., peer instruction, peer modeling).

Learning aims

The children can feel satisfaction and pleasure by experiencing that they can make cupcakes without teachers’ help but through peer support. Also through completing one group activity (opening Rainbow Café), they can accept classmates and have positive experience of engaging in the same activity together with classmates. To achieve the goals, teachers will facilitate children to:

- Understand the procedures and take initiatives to engage in the activity and to complete their own role in the class; and
- Be aware of classmates, interact each other with them, and try to engage in the activity with them.
Design learning materials and tools
- Individualise all tools by colour stickers (prior to the unit) and hand band of the colour;
- Create posters or individualised guidebooks responding to needs of each child;
- Individualise cupcakes on children’s choice of four colours of icing (e.g., white, red, pink, blue); and
- Prepare cooking tools that each child can use independently (without teacher’s help/prompts).

Design environmental settings
- Set up the desks (or positions) so that children can physically look at each other;
- Change the cooking tables for the activities of (a) measuring, mixing, and pouring; (b) icing and packing cupcakes; and (c) serving cupcakes for customers; and
- Make sure that children can complete the procedures independently (without teacher’s help/prompts but with peer support) by parting children to encourage them to help each other. For example, Lara will be supported by other student if required.

Unit plan (A total of 20 lessons): One lesson is 45 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Content of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Let’s make our cupcakes with friends! The children understand the procedures of cooking cupcakes (with teacher’s support). The learning tools and visual cues will be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Let’s make our cupcakes with friends! The children cook cupcakes with peers (without teacher’s support). While repeating the activities, children interact with classmates in appropriate ways. The children understand how to work together with peers and to help them or to ask for help if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Let’s open a Rainbow Café! The children work as a team to open a Rainbow Café. They will learn the rule or system of serving customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Each lesson of the Stage 2 will be held soon after the lesson of the Stage 1b at the same day.
Learning aims: Stage 1a: Let’s make our cupcakes with friends!
◎ Try to make cupcakes with teachers and understand the procedures
◇ Be aware of classmates who are engaging in the same activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Goal:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the unit</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, try to help B and engage in her individual tasks</td>
<td>Understand the procedures and try to make cupcakes with peers as a team</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, lead the class as a leader</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, work as a team and ask for help if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Goal:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the lesson</td>
<td>Try to understand the procedures and make cupcakes with teachers</td>
<td>Try to understand what she needs to do and follow teachers’ instruction</td>
<td>Try to understand the procedures and make cupcakes with minimum teachers support</td>
<td>Try to understand the procedures and make cupcakes with minimum teacher support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of procedures</td>
<td>★Prepare a poster and picture of how to cook the cupcakes’s</td>
<td>★Prepare her individualised guidebooks of how to cook the cupcakes’s</td>
<td>★Prepare a poster and picture of how to cook the cupcakes’s</td>
<td>★Prepare a poster and picture of how to cook the cupcakes’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making cakes</td>
<td>★Mix all ingredients</td>
<td>★Mix all ingredients</td>
<td>★Mix all ingredients</td>
<td>★Mix all ingredients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking</td>
<td>★Bake</td>
<td>★Bake</td>
<td>★Bake</td>
<td>★Bake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★Help her follow the procedures</td>
<td>★Help her follow the procedures</td>
<td>★Help him follow the procedures</td>
<td>★Help him follow the procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage her to be aware of other classmates doing the same activity (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)</td>
<td>Encourage her to be aware of other classmates doing the same activity (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)</td>
<td>Encourage him to be aware of other classmates doing the same activity (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)</td>
<td>Encourage him to be aware of other classmates doing the same activity (e.g., “Look at ~~, what is she/he doing?”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and reflection</td>
<td>★Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next</td>
<td>★Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson and what she wants next</td>
<td>★Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next</td>
<td>★Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson and what he wants next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for the next lesson</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning (other time)</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
<td>★Tell them to make the same cakes for the next with less teacher’s help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning aims: Stage 1b: **Let’s make our cupcakes!—Rainbow Cakes**

◎ **Being motivated to make the cakes and complete the task independently with minimum support**

◇ **Completing own tasks through active and passive interactions with classmates who are engaging in the same activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Unit Goal: Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the unit</th>
<th>Stage Goal: Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the lesson</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, try to help B and engage in her individual tasks</td>
<td>Make cupcakes with minimum teacher’s support and with peers</td>
<td>Explain the procedures</td>
<td>Mix all ingredients, Bake, Ice cakes, Group four cakes into one product</td>
<td>No closure, continued to the next lesson of “Let’s open a Rainbow Café!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>Understand the procedures and try to make cupcakes with peers as a team</td>
<td>Follow peers’ instruction (especially C) and ask the peer (A) for help</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to interact with peers</td>
<td>Give minimum verbal prompts and remind of visual cues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 C</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, lead the class as a leader</td>
<td>Make cupcakes independently and give group instruction to the class</td>
<td>Prepare her individualised guidebook of how to interact with peers</td>
<td>Prepare measured ingredients by D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 D</td>
<td>While making cupcakes independently, work as a team and ask for help if required</td>
<td>Make cupcakes with minimum teacher support and ask peers for help if required</td>
<td>Prepare a poster and picture of how to interact with peers</td>
<td>Prompt her to look at guidebook to follow the procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix G**
**Learning aims:**

**Stage 2: Let’s open a Rainbow Café**

◎ Being motivated to open a Rainbow Café by completing individual roles in the class

◇ Communicating with customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Goal:**

Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the unit

- Understand procedure of serving customers and engage in own role and help B as a part or Rainbow Café staff
- Understand procedure of serving customers and try to communicate with customers
- Lead the class as a leader
- Understand procedure of serving customers and engage in own roles

**Stage Goal:**

Ideal behaviours and attitudes for the lesson

- Complete own roles in the class as a Rainbow Café and help B
- Follow peers’ instruction (especially C) and serve customers with A
- Give group instruction to the class as a leader
- Complete own role in the class with minimum teacher support and by asking peers for help if required

**Introduction**

- Understanding of procedures
  - Explain the procedures
  - Prepare her individualised procedure book for Rainbow Café (based on her role of serving)
  - Prepare her individualised procedure book for Rainbow Café (based on her role of receiving tickets)
  - Prepare his individualised procedure book for Rainbow Café (based on his role of counting tickets)

**Body**

- Prepare the shop
- Open the shop
- Serve customers
  - Set the table and chairs
  - Using tickets to manage the customers
  - Give minimum verbal prompts and remind of visual cues
  - Encourage her to work with B
  - Encourage her to listen to prompts from C
  - Showing the poster to remind procedures
  - Leading the class as a leader
  - Encourage him to ask his peers for a question if required

**Closure**

- Communication with customers
- State what each child did well
- Ask her what she liked the most in the lesson
- Praise about her completion without teacher support
- Praise about helping peers
- Ask him what he liked the most in the lesson
- Praise about being a leader for the class
- Praise about helping friends
Appendix H.
Direct Observation Activities
### Appendix H. Observation Timelines and Procedures

#### Timeline for teaching day observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>JT1</th>
<th>JT2</th>
<th>JT3</th>
<th>AT1</th>
<th>AT2</th>
<th>AT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>7.30 am</td>
<td>7.30 am</td>
<td>7.30 am</td>
<td>7.30 am</td>
<td>7.30 am</td>
<td>8.40 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>3.30 pm</td>
<td>3.30 pm</td>
<td>3.30 pm</td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
<td>3.45 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Timeline for Lesson Observations (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LO Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Lesson Topic</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>LO Date</th>
<th>Duration (mins)</th>
<th>ObWk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO1</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO2</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thematic Play</td>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO3</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cleaning/play</td>
<td>2 June</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO4</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thematic Play</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO5</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thematic Play</td>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO6</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thematic Play</td>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LSLO</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thematic Play</td>
<td>26 June</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO7</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO8</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cleaning/play</td>
<td>7 July</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1-LO9</td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
<td>14 July</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JT1: Total duration** 394 (6h34m) 39.4 mins/LO

| JT2-LO1   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Farming           | 17 May   | 28              | 1    |
| JT2-LO2   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 25 May   | 37              | 2    |
| JT2-LO3   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 31 May   | 30              | 3    |
| JT2-LO4   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 8 June   | 33              | 4    |
| JT2-LO5   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 14 June  | 34              | 5    |
| JT2-LO6   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 22 June  | 34              | 6    |
| JT2-LSLO  | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 26 June  | 35              | 6    |
| JT2-LO7   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 1 July   | 40              | 7    |
| JT2-LO8   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 5 July   | 41              | 8    |
| JT2-LO9   | Mr Banba  | 1            | Cooking           | 12 July  | 43              | 9    |

**JT2: Total duration** 355 (5h55m) 35.5 mins/LO

| JT3-LO1   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Craft             | 18 May   | 38              | 1    |
| JT3-LO2   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 26 May   | 42              | 2    |
| JT3-LO3   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 30 May   | 81              | 3    |
| JT3-LO4   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 9 June   | 77              | 4    |
| JT3-LO5   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 15 June  | 78              | 5    |
| JT3-LO6   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 23 June  | 87              | 6    |
| JT3-LSLO  | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 26 June  | 85              | 6    |
| JT3-LO7   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 30 June  | 74              | 7    |
| JT3-LO8   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 6 July   | 40              | 8    |
| JT3-LO9   | Ms Chiba  | 1            | Cooking           | 13 July  | 92              | 9    |

**JT3: Total duration** 694 (11h34m) 69.4 mins/LO
### Timeline for teacher meeting observations (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO1</th>
<th>MO2</th>
<th>MO3</th>
<th>MO4</th>
<th>MO5</th>
<th>MO6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>26 June</td>
<td>26 June</td>
<td>26 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Prior to the lesson study conference</td>
<td>Prior to the lesson study conference</td>
<td>At the lesson study conference</td>
<td>At the lesson study conference</td>
<td>After the lesson study conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>80 mins</td>
<td>89 mins</td>
<td>60 mins</td>
<td>60 mins</td>
<td>204 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>SNEU teachers, head, and university professor</td>
<td>SNEU teachers, head, and university professor</td>
<td>SNEU teachers, head, support teacher, university professor, and public visitors</td>
<td>School representatives and public visitors</td>
<td>SNEU teachers, head, and senior teachers who used to work for the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Video/audio recordings</td>
<td>Video/audio recordings</td>
<td>Field notes only</td>
<td>Field notes only</td>
<td>Video/audio recordings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timeline for lesson observations (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LO Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Lesson topic</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>Duration (mins)</th>
<th>ObWk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT1-LO1</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Craft (Fine Motor)/ Free Play (PECS)</td>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>Total of 29 (Continuous lessons)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1-LO2</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Craft (Fine Motor)/ Free Play (PECS)</td>
<td>23 May</td>
<td>Total of 35 (Continuous lessons)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1-LO3</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Craft (Fine Motor)/ Gross Motor</td>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>Total of 34 (Continuous lessons)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1-LO4</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Craft (Fine Motor)</td>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>Total of 24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1-LO5</td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free Play (PECS)</td>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>Total of 60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AT1: Total duration 182 (3h2m) Average is not applicable.**

| AT2-LO1 | Ms Eden | 1 | Craft (SOSE) | 12 May | 21 | 1 |
| AT2-LO2 | Ms Eden | 1 | Craft (SOSE) | 19 May | 34 | 2 |
| AT2-LO3 | Ms Eden | 1 | Craft (SOSE) | 9 June | 27 | 5 |
| AT2-LO4 | Ms Eden | 1 | Craft (SOSE) | 16 June | 34 | 6 |
| AT2-LO5 | Ms Eden | 1 | Game (SOSE) | 20 June | 23 | 7 |
| AT2-LO6 | Ms Eden | 1 | Maths (SOSE) | 22 June | 21 | 7 |
| AT2-LO7 | Ms Eden | 1 | Game (SOSE) | 23 June | 28 | 7 |

**AT2: Total duration 188 (3h8m) 26.8 mins/LO**

| AT3-LO1 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Africa (SOSE) | 11 May | 75 | 1 |
| AT3-LO2 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Africa (SOSE) | 18 May | 75 | 2 |
| AT3-LO3 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Africa (SOSE) | 25 May | 80 | 3 |
| AT3-LO4 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Cooking | 31 May | 88 | 4 |
| AT3-LO5 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Africa (SOSE) | 8 June | 62 | 5 |
| AT3-LO6 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Cooking | 14 June | 80 | 6 |
| AT3-LO7 | Ms Fleck | 1 | Africa (SOSE) | 17 June | 30 | 6 |

**AT3: Total duration 490 (8h10m) 70 mins/LO**
Observation procedures

Whole-Day Observation procedure
Checklist before observation:
1. Prepare Teaching Day Observation Field Note (During a lesson observation, you will use video camera and Lesson Observation Field Note)

Checklist after observation:
2. Ask the teacher to complete a Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet A
3. Complete a reflection within the observation day

Lesson Observation procedure
Checklist before observation:
1. Set up a fixed video camera and give a voice recorder to the classroom teacher
2. Have another voice recorder for yourself and prepare a flexible video recorder
3. Prepare Lesson Observation Field Note

Checklist after observation:
4. Ask the teacher to complete a Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet B and get a voice recorder from the teacher
5. Complete a reflection within the observation day.
6. Code the video

Teacher Meeting Observation procedure
Checklist before observation:
1. Set up a fixed video camera and a voice recorder
2. Prepare Teacher Meeting Observation Field Note

Checklist after observation:
3. Complete a reflection within the observation day.
## Appendix H2. Items for Teaching Day Observations

### Appendix H2a. Teaching Day Observation Field Note

**Teaching Day Observation Field Note**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher Activity</th>
<th>Observer Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Teacher behaviour and teacher interaction with class (Main focus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School:

### Teacher:

### Observation Week:

### Date:

**Time:** 7.30 〜 8.00
### Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Teacher behaviour and teacher interaction with class (Main focus)</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Observer Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic task, seatwork, groupwork, group instruction, activity, students' behaviours etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: Given instruction, support prompts etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: Teaching social skills, communication skills, emotions, alternative behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using visual cues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct instruction, repeating words, role playing, social skill training, discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: Praise, eye contacts, punishment, student indicating behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Researcher Overall Reflection:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---
Appendix H3. Items for Classroom Lesson Observations

Appendix H3a. Lesson Observation Field Note

Direct Lesson Observation Field Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Week:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Teacher behaviour and teacher interaction with the children with ASD and class</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Observer Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
生活単元学習について (授業後の評価)

学校:  
クラス:  

対象児童: &  

週:  日付:  時間:  

児童数:  自閉症児数:  

全体的な感想 (担任教師)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>対象児童:</th>
<th>評価</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>活動の取り組み</td>
<td>取り組まなかった</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>あまり取り組まなかった</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>結構取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>大変取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなたと生徒の関わりの frec度</td>
<td>全くなし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>めったになし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時々</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ほとんどあり</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>常時</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなたと児童の関わりの質</td>
<td>ネガティブ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>どっちでもない</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ポジティブ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>児童の問題行動の頻度</td>
<td>全くなし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>めったになし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時々</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ほとんどあり</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>常時</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>対象児童:</th>
<th>評価</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>活動の取り組み</td>
<td>取り組まなかった</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>あまり取り組まなかった</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>結構取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>大変取り組んだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなたと生徒の関わりの frec度</td>
<td>全くなし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>めったになし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時々</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ほとんどあり</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>常時</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなたと児童の関わりの質</td>
<td>ネガティブ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>どっちでもない</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ポジティブ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>児童の問題行動の頻度</td>
<td>全くなし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>めったになし</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時々</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ほとんどあり</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>常時</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet (Australia)

**Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>RQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of teacher–</td>
<td>all the</td>
<td>most of the</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child interaction</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teacher–</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of engagement</td>
<td>non-engaged</td>
<td>poorly engaged</td>
<td>engaged</td>
<td>highly engaged</td>
<td>very highly engaged</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-engagement frequency</td>
<td>all the</td>
<td>most of the</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>RQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of teacher–</td>
<td>all the</td>
<td>most of the</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child interaction</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teacher–</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of engagement</td>
<td>non-engaged</td>
<td>poorly engaged</td>
<td>engaged</td>
<td>highly engaged</td>
<td>very highly engaged</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-engagement frequency</td>
<td>all the</td>
<td>most of the</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>RQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Appendix H4. Sample of Teacher Meeting Observation Field Note (Japan only)

Teachers from the Junior high school department of this site.
Appendix I.
Teaching Document Review
Appendix I

Appendix I.1. List of key documentation involved in teaching document review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The document the teachers produced during the field research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Lesson plans of life-skill unit (All)  
  *All teachers documented an ideal lesson and worked toward the ideal lesson.*  
  *The plan included classroom contexts, unit aims, lesson procedures, individualised instructional support, and details of predicted classroom actions and interactions.* | • Unit of work (AT2, AT3)  
  *The teachers documented unit aims, lesson procedures, activities, and individualised instructional support.* | →Different approach to lessons |
| | • Early years curriculum materials (AT1)  
  *The teacher documented individualised curriculum.* | | |
| • Weekly class schedules (All)  
  *They were updated every Friday and given to the parents.* | • Weekly class schedules (All)  
  *They became determined by the teacher during the early week of the Term. Once they were set, they were fixed but changed at occasions.* | →One reason of more unpredicted events in the Australian site |
| | • Class–Home communication book (All)/email (JT1)  
  *All parents used them intensively. The teachers were concerned and hesitated to share the content of the books with the researcher, because they thought it would be not respectful to the parents and may lose their trust or discouraged them to share their worries. Therefore, the teachers were asked to complete the checklist according to the themes found in the books.* | • Class–Home communication book (All)  
  *The parents of targeted children did not use them intensively, although some other parents used them a lot. The teachers reported that there were not much to see in the books, and the children hardly brought the book in the school.* | →Individual differences of parents than teacher groups |
| | • Class–Home communicative newsletters (All)  
  *All teachers published the newsletter weekly. The newsletters were placed at the classroom and sent to the home. In addition to the notice about upcoming school or classroom events, The newsletters showed what the class did last week and used a lot of praises. The praises were mainly focused on the children’s working-hardness, good interaction, and happy experiences. They had a lot of photos.* | • N/A | →The newsletters showed classroom contexts and its learning focuses. |
### Japan

- **Individual Instruction Plan (All)**  
  The school was concerned and hesitated to share the documents with the researcher because the parents did not see them.

- **School Report (All)**  
  The school was concerned and hesitated to share the reports with the researcher because of privacy rights. Therefore, the template of the report was reviewed.

- **Personal journal (JT1)**  
  JT1 recorded what she observed during the lessons and across a teaching day (i.e., individual children, peer interactions), decision-making about the lesson (i.e., changes in the lesson procedures or instructional support, improvements in learning environments and materials).

### Australia

- **Individual Educational Plans (AT2, AT3)**  
  The documents included contact details of the parents, history, current needs and learning goals of the targeted children. They were shared with the parents.

- **Education Adjustment Program (AT1)**  
  The documents summarised the child’s needs and support.

- **One School Report (AT2, AT3)**  
  The report was given to the parents as well as shared online source in Department of Education.

- **Early learning record (AT1)**  
  The report was a progressive document across the semester. It included contact details of the parents, history, current needs and learning goals of the targeted children. Also it had the details of what the child achieved (experienced) during the Term with a lot of photos. The report was given to the parents at the end of the semester.

### Notes

- The document given to the teachers during the field research
  - **SNEU lesson study report**  
    The report was prepared for the Lesson Study Conference. They indicated school and SNEU educational emphasis and rationales of the lesson study implemented over three years.
  - **Inschool lesson study newsletter**  
    The information sheets were given to the teachers to update their plans, aims, and objectives in relation to the whole school lesson study.
  - **Monthly teacher schedules**  
    Teacher schedule was updated every month.
### Appendix I2. Sample of Weekly Document Checklist

**For the Japanese case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>週</th>
<th>必要なもの</th>
<th>1 組</th>
<th>2 組</th>
<th>3 組</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>準備</td>
<td>各クラスの時間割</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学校スケジュール</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>児童の名簿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>指導案</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>生活単元学習指導案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>週案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学級通信</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メモ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>連絡帳</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メール（1 組）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>生活単元学習指導案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>週案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学級通信</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メモ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>連絡帳</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メール（1 組）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>生活単元学習指導案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>週案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学級通信</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メモ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>連絡帳</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メール（1 組）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>生活単元学習指導案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>週案（金曜日）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学級通信</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メモ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>連絡帳</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>メール（1 組）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## For the Australian case

### Weekly Document Checklist (Australia)

**Teacher:** __________________

### Preparation Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other report recorded by the teacher (e.g., newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report relating to lessons, PD, or nominated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Week 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other report recorded by the teacher (e.g., newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report relating to lessons, PD, or nominated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Week 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other report recorded by the teacher (e.g., newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report relating to lessons, PD, or nominated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Week 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other report recorded by the teacher (e.g., newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report relating to lessons, PD, or nominated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Week 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs (if any changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other report recorded by the teacher (e.g., newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School report relating to lessons, PD, or nominated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher memos for meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J.
Preliminary Data Analysis
Appendix J1. Sample of the Researcher’s Reflection Logs During Field Research

A reflection was recorded on the same day of or the day after the observation/interview date. Also, any thoughts or ideas were recorded on the process of data preparation. The highlighting was used to identify any key finding prior to data analysis in order to brainstorm how to analysis data (i.e., initial data analysis). The total pages of reflection logs were 180 pages for the Japanese case study and 120 pages for the Australian case study. The comments related to research topics and methodologies were highlighted in different colour: class/work context information in yellow colour, teaching strategies in green colour, valued outcomes in pink colour, and to methodological perspectives in light blue colour. This was useful for preliminary analysis. However, I found that some comments were related to two or more topics; therefore, they were also coded in nodes within NVivo analysis.

For the Japanese case (extract only)

Reflection on interview procedures

During Interview A, Ms Ando (JT1) preferred to talk about a teaching day step by step, time to time. I used time periods of classroom schedule as prompts … Providing the examples worked well to let the teacher aware of what she does unconsciously … The overall interview procedure seemed to work well for this teacher and helped her think concretely. Especially it was adequate to ask her about general overview of a typical day first before asking specifically about children with ASD. The teacher commented on the interview after the session as she felt the interview session was very helpful for her to think of her daily activity. (Preparation Week)

Class as a whole

When the building of cubic house was completed, JT1 gathered all children and asked them if they wanted to break down together. All children wanted to do and JT1 asked all children “jishoni kowasou” (let’s break it down everyone together). The children seemed very excited and said “yes.” JT1 took a call to break it down together and all children rolled two big soft balls over the building. The children were also punching the blocks while saying “anpa-nchi” (a call from the hero of popular television program, Anpanman) … After the activity, JT1 asked children to pack all blocks up and start music on. JT1 instructed Bunta (JA2) to pack up by pointing to one object. He followed what she said and helped packing up with other children.

While interacting with other children, JT1 continued to instruct him step by step.

At the end of the lesson, JT1 gathered all children and talked about what she found during the lesson. It included what “yougo 1 kumi” (i.e., the name of the class) could do well, what each child could do well, and what they will do next. (ObWk1)

Acknowledge of a peers’ working hardness

After the morning group time, SNEU2 children had a short break during JT2 prepared children’ notebook for writing tomorrow schedule. They were used to write the schedule at the end of the day, but JT2 asked children to write it in the morning today. He knew that it would be better for them to write tomorrow schedule at the end of the day in order to allow them to clear perspective about tomorrow. However, JT2 thought children were more likely to be motivated in the morning and they can concentrate more on the task (confirmed by JT2 during a quick postobservation conversation). According to JT2, he shifted the time for writing tomorrow schedule last Tuesday (1/6/2010) … Children wrote tomorrow schedule in different ways according to their literacy skills. Targeted children have also different forms: JA3 wrote it with some kanji and JA4 used hiragana stamps to complete his schedule. At the activity, JA4 repeated his behaviour (stamp on his face while laughing). JT2 took him to toilet to wash his face. After that, JA4 engaged his activity. Some children (JA6 and JC7) went to a playroom (next to their classroom) and JT2 asked them to come back by saying “let’s come back to the classroom because JA4 is still working hard.” (ObWk4)

Multimethod research design suitable for the Japanese teachers
Showing his lesson plans of ObWks 1 and 5 during the interview B also helped Ms Banba (JT2) recognise what he has done or what he changed across the five weeks. It was recognised from direct observation that because JT2 changed the details of each lesson every time, the lesson plan would not indicate everything that he did. It was equivalent to the notion that what teachers actually do in their classrooms usually differs from what they originally planned (e.g., Ball and Forzani, 2007, 2009). I found that the methods of including direct observations for this inquiry addition to documentation and interviews were essential. (ObQk5)

Role of university professor as a lesson study supervisor
JUP1 asked the teachers what advice they had from other senior teachers at the postlesson discussion. JT1 and Head recalled the meetings and summarised the discussion. This session revealed that how or in what manner the teachers take others’ opinions and advice through how they summarised each person’s opinion. JT1 specifically stated “They (senior teachers) will not tell what to do” and Head followed her by saying that they advised on the lessons by giving their perspectives and experiences …

“Flow” seems very important for the teachers to plan their lessons. They focused on the smooth and logic flow of learning experiences of children. That is, the children can learn the best when the lessons were well organised around how the children think or view their experiences. It is also connected to the concept of “bamen” or whole scene. When we watch the two hour movie, it has various scenes and there were not gaps between them. The time flows and the scenes keep changing. The movie director designs the movie with all scenes put together to make it sense for the movie theme. All scenes have reasons to be used in the movie. Similar to this, the Japanese teachers created their lessons with their learning theme. All materials, instructions, and environments were designed to make their learning experiences sense for the children. Every moment is meaningful for the children to learn.

In contrast to another two lesson study teacher meetings, JUP1 spoke more. He talked about further directions of their current study by adding his professional knowledge. Also he gave other school examples of lesson study. JUP1 talked about the different features of lesson study in different schools and said that the schools can do anything for their lesson study. That is, lesson study has originality and creativity according to the school culture and history. (ObWk6)

A change in how the Japanese teachers talked about their practice
In contrast to the first and second sessions of these semistructured interviews, Ms Chiba (JT3) could talk about her practice and thoughts freely. Less prompts and explanations were used for this session. Therefore, I could speak less and she could speak more … Because I asked about what she has done across the 9-week period, she could engage her thoughts with concrete images of her practice as well as her children. However, she had a struggle to talk about valued outcomes for the whole school or special education unit. She could talk about outcomes for individual teachers. She insisted that everything that she had done contributed to the children rather than her … At the end of the session, the question of “what outcomes would you like to have if you have magic wand” seemed to be too broad for her to answer. It was same as JT2. This confirmed that broad questions were not suitable for Japanese teachers and more concrete questions were necessary. (Review Week)

For the Australian case (extract only)

Decision-making about including the Australian Prep class in this inquiry
Today, I was introduced to Ms Deanne (AT1). I explained to her about my study as well as the activities that she would be asked to participate in. She agreed to participate in, and I stayed with AT1’s class as a volunteer for the rest of the school day. There was one child who had ASD (AA1) and were two teacher aides (Adults1 & 2) … Her practice is based on Early Years Curriculum and has a lot of free plays. It would be great to have her class to see more variation of practices in Australian schools. Especially, JT1 had free play activity. I will be able to see how the Australian teacher uses free play to facilitate children’s learning, in contrast to the JT1. (Preparation Week)

Schedule adjustments during fieldwork
Today, I had the first lesson observation and reflection interview with AT1. The timetable was changed for the second session. Therefore, AT1 was teaching her class until the morning tea time. Because Eva (AC1) was absent, there were a total of four children. In addition to two teacher aides (AT1 & AT2), there was a practicum student from a Queensland university. The child–adult ratio...
A change in class members during the school year
It was the third week for Ms Fleck (AT3) to be with her class, and Oliver (AC11) was having his first day of this school. After talking with AT3, I found that Oliver, Cate (AA3), and Noah (AC10) came to this site school from their mainstream classrooms at their previous school. David (AA4) has been at this school for a long time. Therefore, AT3 knows about AA4 well but not much about other three children. The opportunity of observing Ms Fleck seems to give me a sight into how a special educator starts a new class. (ObWk1)

A term of lesson
After finishing all questions of reflection interview today, I asked her about how she wanted me to improve my interview and observation procedures. AT1 told me that using the word of “lesson” made her feel uncomfortable and that she positioned herself as a learning facilitator rather than lesson giver at her prep classroom. This idea was consistent to what JT1 told about her role in free play. The question about how she felt about current research procedure extracted how she viewed her role with children of her class in her classroom. It seemed that I need to consider an alternative of using this term. (ObWk2)

Individual focus in play
The lesson was free-choice play (AT1). It was similar to JT1’s lesson as using “play” activities. However, the focus was different. JT1’s focus was “playing together”, while AT1’s focus was “concentrating on one activity” and skills-building of using PECS to make a request to AT1. (ObWk3)

Clear distinctions among stakeholders’ roles
The deputy principal regarded himself as guide for teachers and teacher aides in regarding to supporting children with ASD in the school. He stated positive behaviour support, applied behaviour analysis, and evidence-based practice as key principles of best practice, which he wanted to achieve for him and the school. Overall, he emphasised “individual children.” For example, he insisted “we can be experts of autism but not of children.” He also told that understanding of each child is most important and the basic knowledge of needs for children with ASD is beneficial. It seemed to be similar to what the Japanese teachers talked about autism features in my master thesis. (ObWk7)

Consistent strategies through a school day
In the morning, the class had a circle time and SOSE lesson. During the circle time, Ms Eden (AT2) announced what they were going to do today. When AT2 told that they were going to do “smelling”, AA2 screamed and said “No.” And then, AT2 changed the phase from “smelling things” to “going to visit at our smelly garden.” When AA2 was told, “Let’s going to visit our smelly garden later”, he was happy and said “Yey!” This happening was consistent to what AT2 talked about how she instructed AA2 to do what he did not like.
Appendix J2. Samples of the Australian Reviewers’ Comments in Proof-Reading Notes

It was found difficult to produce a meaningful translation in English while keeping Japanese senses in the texts.

Point 1: A Japanese word of “kodomo no negai” was initially translated as “child’s wish” in English. However, Australian Reviewer 1 suggested that the meaning was not clear. The word was translated as “child’s preference and interests” at the end.

Point 2: Australian Reviewer 1 told that she would not be able to answer the interview question (How do you use a group during a lesson?). When I frame interview questions to Australian teachers, I will need to prepare explanation for the context of this question.

Point 3: Australian Reviewer 1 did not know the word of “sociality.” She told that she could understand if it was “sociability” instead. She also explained what “social skills” meant to her. She told that when she says that someone does not have social skills, it means that the person does not like talking to others or does not know how to talk to others. She told that if it is not technical, social skill is more like casual conversation. Japanese teachers’ understanding of social skills seemed to be similar to her. The Volunteer A1 did not have special education background. It may mean that the Japanese teacher education for special education may not address much about “social skills” as a technical term in the same way of Australian special education.

Point 4: The labels of each stage across a lesson were initially “introduction”, “development” and “close.” Australian Reviewer 1 told that her university used specific words (i.e., orientating, enhancing, and synthesising) and there are varieties. The mutual words were decided to use for this study.

Point 5: Australian Reviewer 2 was not certain about the meaning of “daily living scenes” (JT2 Interview3). It was the directed translation of original Japanese word, “nichijyou no bamen.” I explained what JT2 talked about by giving examples of “nichijyou no bamen.” Because I used the examples of activities that JT2 had everyday, NV2 suggested the changes from “daily living scenes” to “everyday activity.” Moreover, Australian Reviewer 2 suggested to change from “various scenes” to “various times” in different paragraph (JT2 Interview3). It implied that the word of “scene” has a cultural meaning in the Japanese context. The word of “scene” has meanings of situation, settings, and background and seems to refer to how the Japanese teachers viewed their children. They tried to understand a child as a whole from their everyday experiences by reflecting on “daily scenes” of how the child responded to the situation with a certain setting and background. This holistic view of everyday practice appeared in the teacher’s talks. Therefore, I decided to keep the original translation, which could contain of a cultural meaning.

Point 6: Australian Reviewer 2 was not certain about the meaning of “sharing the same images” (JT2 Interview3: P1:L56). It seemed that the word of “image” has a cultural meaning in the Japanese context. Its original Japanese word was “kyoutsuu no ime-ji wo motsu”, which was often discussed in the Japanese teachers’ talk as a teaching method and outcomes. The word of “ime-ji” or “image” has also a meaning of “concept” or “idea.” The Japanese teachers seemed to use “image” to describe how they embody or give a concrete form of concept or idea to the children to share. Therefore, I decided to use the word “image” but with a Japanese term being introduced in the text.
Appendix J

Appendix J3. Referencing System for Reporting Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referencing example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1’s Interview A</td>
<td>Semistructured Interview A conducted with JT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1’s Reflection Interview in ObWk4</td>
<td>Reflection Interview conducted with AT1 in ObWk4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT2’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5 with JT2’s VC12</td>
<td>Reflection Interview conducted with JT2, using JT2’s video-clip example No. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT1’s LO2 in ObWk2/Intervals:123-127</td>
<td>Lesson Observation 2 conducted with JT1 in ObWk2, NVivo interval entry 123-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT3’s VC5</td>
<td>Video-clip example No. 5 used with JT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO2.Intervals:50-51</td>
<td>Teacher Meeting Observations 2, NVivo interval entry 50-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO1.Interval:64/JUP1</td>
<td>Teacher Meeting Observations 2, NVivo interval entry 6, JUP1 speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT2’s C–H Newsletter No.6</td>
<td>Class-Home Newsletter No.6 produced by JT2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K.
Examples of Manual Data Reduction
## Appendix K1. Manual Data Reduction: Interviews A, B, & C (Japan)

### Interview A (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 and 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of content

**See documents:**
- Interview 1-JT1 step 2
- Interview 1-JT2 step 2
- Interview 1-JT3 step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Reduced codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom activities (e.g., unpacking school bags, morning circle time, lessons, morning tea time, playtime, choice time, lunch time, and packing school bags)—JT1</td>
<td>Day-to-day variations of activities, duties and time spending</td>
<td>Variations of day-to-day activities</td>
<td>Every day is different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEU-RC Interactive activities (e.g., whole-school sport activities, reading activities, multi-age group plays, &quot;lettuce party&quot;)—JT1</td>
<td>Every day is different</td>
<td>A lot of preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties (e.g., paperwork, meetings, bus supervision)—JT1</td>
<td>Variations giving difficulties for teachers to talk about their days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time variations—JT1</td>
<td>Planning and preparing for the variations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different situation—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day is different—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' struggles to talk about their days—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal prompts—JT1</td>
<td>Support for children through ongoing interactions</td>
<td>Support-based learning</td>
<td>Doing things together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things together—JT1</td>
<td>Building teacher-child relationship by doing things together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising all the time—JT1</td>
<td>Importance of preparation for group learning</td>
<td>Importance of relationships with children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being with children all day—JT1</td>
<td>Talking about activities or interactions rather than instructional strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of eating habits—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for fine motor skills—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of peer interaction—JT2 &amp; JT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group participation—JT2 &amp; JT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting-up for group learning—JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences—JT1 &amp; JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD specific needs—JT1 &amp; JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence—JT1 &amp; JT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours—JT1 &amp; JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication book—JT1</td>
<td>Communication with the parents through various resources</td>
<td>Importance of communication with parents</td>
<td>Communicating with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-visit—JT1</td>
<td>Collaborating with other teachers through meetings and daily interactions</td>
<td>Finding time for staff communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-class newsletter—JT1</td>
<td>Finding time to write communication book—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report for each semester—JT1 &amp; JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with parents after school—JT1 &amp; JT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various teacher meetings—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various paper work—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding time to talk to other teachers—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding time to write communication book—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating with other teachers for SNEU-RC interactive activity—JT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix K

### Interview B (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 and 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Reduced codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What teachers want the children to do</td>
<td>Education goals</td>
<td>“Nature” and skills for children’s future</td>
<td>Class as community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“From myself, with friends, doing my best”</td>
<td>Learning steps according to age and individual differences</td>
<td>“Goodness of group”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values of being in a group, being aware of peers, being aware of being a part of group, and considering of peers</td>
<td>“Nature” and skills for children’s future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, individual role, and group contribution</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group effort, doing together with friends</td>
<td>Role of school and class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of skills out of lessons</td>
<td>Contribution to a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Goodness of group” (e.g., learning more than at home, classroom management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“shakaisei” or social competence (e.g., social willingness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun, enjoyment, pleasure, happiness, proud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reasons for changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See documents:</th>
<th>Teacher-leading situation to child-learning situation</th>
<th>Supporting strategies</th>
<th>Creating social situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT1 step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Routine-based activity to encourage peer interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT2 step 2</td>
<td>Peer interaction, peer support, and peer modelling</td>
<td>Role of teachers and peers in group learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT3 step 2</td>
<td>Group learning and group work</td>
<td>Age-appropriate learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine-based activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sequence of activities (e.g., Introduction, Body, Closure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of social awareness of a child in a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age and individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Process of changes (e.g., articulation, visualisation, experiment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See documents:</th>
<th>Ongoing reflection by themselves and through a collaboration</th>
<th>Ongoing reflective process for better practice</th>
<th>Improving practice tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT1 step 2</td>
<td>“Children’s actual condition” (e.g., interests, preference, needs, ages)</td>
<td>Topic of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT2 step 2</td>
<td>Children’s participation of making a lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2-JT3 step 2</td>
<td>Interpretation of children’s intention and thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to and from others (e.g., JHSE, SNEU teachers, RC-teachers, ex-SNEU teachers, university professors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties in finding time for a casual chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration through daily chats and teacher meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing reflection, observing a lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands of peer relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interview C (Japan)

### Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of content</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Reduced codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive experience (e.g., doing things together, interacting with peers, being happy in a group, completing the task independently in the group without direct instruction of teachers, contributing to the group)</td>
<td>Cultivation of “shakaisei” in the children (e.g., being aware of peers, sharing same images, willing to interact with peers, considering peers)</td>
<td>Positive experience by being a part of group</td>
<td>Learning through social experiences</td>
<td>Cultivating “heart”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Step 1 and 2})</td>
<td>Daily living skills, communication skills, independence, confidence, and motivation</td>
<td>“Shakaisei and social competence in the Japanese context”</td>
<td>Generating skills in daily living “scenes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group benefits (e.g., learning opportunity, peer encouragements, peer acceptance, peer modelling, peer coaching)</td>
<td>Learning for children’s future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of setting goals</td>
<td>Reflective assessment on children’s invisible achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills for children’s future: Generating achieved skills in daily living scenes</td>
<td>(\text{Step 3})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection on children in daily living scenes</td>
<td>(\text{Step 4})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective inspection of what is happening during lesson through direct observation (\text{(e.g., children, teachers)})</td>
<td>Different point of views giving various advice and ideas (\text{(e.g., subject point of views, previous classroom teacher’s point of views, other professional point of view)})</td>
<td>Opportunity to know own practice from different point of view</td>
<td>Articulating ideal lessons</td>
<td>Ideal lesson into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Step 1 and 2})</td>
<td>Improvements of supporting and instructing strategies (\text{(e.g., learning materials, environmental settings, prompts, designing lessons)})</td>
<td>Teaching a group requiring multiple eyes</td>
<td>Seeing a whole “scene”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chance to know what others see and think</td>
<td>Critical reflections improving practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risks of teaching alone (\text{(e.g., biased lessons, pressure, contradiction between individual needs versus group settings)})</td>
<td>Endless process of improving practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of communication skills and positive attitudes toward criticism</td>
<td>(\text{Step 5})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation for improving practice</td>
<td>(\text{Step 5})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleague modelling (\text{(e.g., good and bad model)})</td>
<td>(\text{Step 5})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT1 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT2 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT3 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT4 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT5 step 2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT1 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT2 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT3 step 2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT4 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT5 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT6 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT7 step 2})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT8 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT9 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT10 step 2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT11 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT12 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT13 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT14 step 2})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT15 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT16 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT17 step 2})</td>
<td>(\text{Interview 3-JT18 step 2})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K2. Manual Data Reduction: Teacher Meetings (Japan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 and 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of content**

**Teachers engage in:**
- Reflecting on own lesson (i.e., critical reflection on own practice)
- Reflecting on other’s lesson (i.e., critical reflection on others’ practice)
- Describing own reflection, plan, or what they wanted to achieve
- Expressing personal worries, struggling, perspectives
- Exchanging opinions, suggesting other ideas, giving examples
- Prompting or leading others to talk about their practice explicitly
- Viewing a whole scene of the lesson
- Viewing a child objectively
- Understanding actual conditions of a child (e.g., current abilities, learning needs, achievements, feelings, thoughts and perspectives, preferences and interests, personalities and behaviours, peer relationships)
- Articulating ideal lessons
- Brainstorming how the children think, feel, see, and interpret their experiences in the situations through visualisation of the scenes
- Visualising the possible situations in the lesson (e.g., child’s responses, child’s thinking, teacher’s instruction or talk)
- Linking new ideas or theory to own practice

**Reduced codes**
- Reflecting on the scenes (i.e., bamen)
- Understanding children’s actual conditions
- Using holistic views to understand what happened in the lesson
- Articulating ideal lessons
- Visualising the situations in the lesson by brainstorming what would happen
- Obtaining new ideas
- Linking knowledge to practice

**Subthemes**
- Seeing a child and lesson as a whole
- Articulating ideal lessons

**Themes**
- Implementing ideal lesson into practice

**RQ**
- RQ2: Teacher groups

---

**Group lessons help children:**
- Being independent and showing initiative
- Being aware of peers and interacting with peers
- Working for peers and understanding others (i.e., empathy)
- Feeling self-satisfactions and confidence
- Sharing experiences
- Overcoming weakness

**Reduced codes**
- Complete tasks independently and with peers
- Sharing positive experiences with peers
- Developing empathy and confidence

**Subthemes**
- Having positive experiences
- Developing social and emotional competence

**Themes**
- Having positive experiences

**RQ**
- RQ2: Learning aim

---

**Teachers support children by:**
- Setting age/development-appropriate learning goals (e.g., participation, cooperation, contribution)
- Using supporting strategies (e.g., well-designed lesson, a logical flow of lesson, prompting, evaluation or reinforcement, peer encouragements and modelling, giving a role, environmental settings, learning tools and materials, visual cues, music prompts and background music, creating situations, giving an active role to a child)
- Responding to actual conditions of children
- Finding further possible improvements

**Reduced codes**
- Changing a lesson according to reflection
- Responding to actual conditions of children
- Designing social situations that children would interact with each other

**Subthemes**
- Creating learning situations
- Creating social situations

**Themes**
- Creating a lesson world

**RQ**
- RQ2: Strategies

---

---

See documents:
- TM1-step 2
- TM2-step 2
- TM3-step 2

---

---

See documents:
- TM1-step 2
- TM2-step 2
- TM3-step 2

---

---
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## Appendix K3. Manual Data Reduction: Interviews A, B, & C (Australia)

### Interview A (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of content</th>
<th>Reduced codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom activities (e.g., lessons, morning group time, school-lunch, break time, cleaning)—ATs</td>
<td>Day-to-day variations of activities, duties, and time spending</td>
<td>Variation of day-to-day activities, duties, time-spending, child’s behaviours, and classroom dynamics</td>
<td>Variation of day-to-day situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive activities between classes (e.g., music, art)—ATs</td>
<td>Every day is different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties (e.g., paperwork, meetings, bus duties)—ATs</td>
<td>Variation of group dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time variations (e.g., planning, preparation, paperwork)—ATs</td>
<td>Responding to behaviour throughout a day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact time—ATs</td>
<td>A lot of paperwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What they do “depends” on the day—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours interferes classroom learning—AT1 &amp; AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and preparation (e.g. individual adjustments)—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian versus American curriculum—AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (e.g., based on IEP goals, systematic data collection: GAS)—AT2 &amp; AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (e.g., Prep portfolio, ongoing snapshots)—AT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of children changing—AT1 &amp; AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills training—ATs</td>
<td>Accommodating individual needs</td>
<td>Accommodating individual needs</td>
<td>Responding to individual children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting (visual, verbal, eye contact)—ATs</td>
<td>Behaviour interventions to dealing with and prevent behaviours</td>
<td>Social skills training throughout a day to build skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mealtime support—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td>Consistence of instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for fine motor skills—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group participation—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being proactive—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with individual differences and behaviours (e.g., PBS)—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing behaviours—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD specific needs (e.g., anxiety, stress, health, behaviours)—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence—AT2 &amp; AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent instructions between ATs and teacher aides—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes based on assessment—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming versus special education environments —AT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-Home school diaries (during non-contact time)—ATs</td>
<td>Working with teacher aides</td>
<td>Working with teacher aides and other professionals</td>
<td>Communicating and working with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal meetings and informal communication with parents—ATs</td>
<td>Working with other professionals</td>
<td>Communicating with other teachers and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior meetings—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td>Communicating with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various paperwork—ATs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to other teachers before school about today’s schedule (ATs)</td>
<td>Working closely with teacher aides—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td>Communicating with other teachers and school administration staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing with other teachers after school—ATs</td>
<td>Working with therapists—AT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to other teachers during non-contact time—AT2 &amp; AT3</td>
<td>Working with guidance officers—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working closely with teacher aides—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td>Talking to school administration staff—AT1 &amp; AT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content

Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2

Step 3

Step 4

Step 5

Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3

Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories
### Interview B (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 and 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of content**

- Planning (paper and daily) — ATs
- State and school curriculum: Cooperating each learning elements into timetables — ATs
- Values of learning-related skills, appropriate behaviours, and group participation — ATs
- Values of confidence and independence — AT3
- Child’s learning levels (age-differences) and interests — ATs
- Group activities for learning about other people, being in a group, and building tolerance — ATs
- Focused classroom management at the end of year — ATs
- Documentation about the child’s histories — ATs

**Codes**

- Curriculum planning and delivery
- Individualised education goals
- Specific learning-related skills
- Understanding children before planning

**Reduced codes**

- Specific learning-related skills
- Curriculum development
- Curriculum as a vehicle

**Subthemes**

- Process of day-to-day adjustments (e.g., responding to the children’s mood and behaviours or to irregular events) — ATs
- Working in a team: Teacher aides may be main adults for the child — ATs
- Prompting (e.g., verbal, visual, physical) — ATs
- Dealing with the child’s anxiety — ATs
- Environmental settings — AT1 & AT2
- Skill-based and group-based activity (e.g., fine or gross motor skills, ICTs, cooking) — ATs
- Choice-making and rewarding and positive reinforcement system — ATs
- Structure of lessons (e.g., Introduction, Body, Closure)
- Every aspect is learning — ATs
- Not much changes in paper planning — ATs
- Systematic and ongoing assessment on children’s achievements — ATs
- Positive behaviour support — ATs
- Predicting the child’s progress and process of changes in planning — ATs
- Working in a team (i.e., teacher aides, therapists) — ATs
- Collaborative planning and delivery in mainstreaming and special education classrooms — AT3
- Confidence on own practice — AT1 & AT3
- Critical reflection on own practice — AT2
- Trial and errors — ATs
- Debriefing about today with other teachers — ATs
- Emotional support among teachers — AT1 & AT2
- Teacher-child relationship — ATs

**Themes**

- Supporting strategies
- Skill-based and group-based activities
- Skill-based learning
- Supporting strategies
- Skill-based and group-based activities
- Skill-based learning
- Monitoring of learning progress
- Debriefing with others
- Clear assessment

---

See documents:

- Interview 2-AT1 step 2
- Interview 2-AT2 step 2
- Interview 2-AT3 step 2
### Appendix K

#### Interview C (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 and 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using narrative note-taking techniques to summarise the content</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the summary of Step 1-2</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 3</td>
<td>Reflecting on the texts grouped in the codes of Step 4 and collapsing the codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of content</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Reduced codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See documents: Interview 3-AT1 step 2</td>
<td>“Best possible outcomes” – ATs</td>
<td>Best possible outcomes</td>
<td>Foundations for skill-building</td>
<td>Best possible outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3-AT2 step 2</td>
<td>“Life-long learning, social inclusion, happy life” – ATs</td>
<td>Foundation skills – ATs</td>
<td>Lesson content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3-AT3 step 2</td>
<td>“Behaviour outcomes – ATs”</td>
<td>Skill-building</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of clear achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Social skills and communication skills – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Group participation – AT2 &amp; AT3”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Engagement – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Independence and confidence – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Literacy and numeracy – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Behaviour and foundation skills first, then skill-building, and then academic learning – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Clear achievements in various learning areas – ATs”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Step 3

- Programming skills for assessing different learning goals – ATs
- Different approach and strategies from mainstreaming teaching but with same goals – AT3
- Balancing skills between individual and group learning – AT1
- Judging/proactive skills to respond to the behaviours and needs – ATs
- Specialist knowledge about ASD and effective practice – ATs
- Collaboration skills for working with different people (i.e., therapists, guidance officers, family service officers, school staff, other teachers, teacher aides) – ATs
- Skills for instructing teacher aides – AT1 & AT2
- Different perspectives from others to understand the child – AT2 & AT3
- Parent involvement – ATs
- Engagement in self-professional development – AT1

See documents: Interview 3-AT1 step 2

#### Step 4

- Specialist knowledge of ASD
- Specialist knowledge of effective strategies
- Skills for programming
- Skills for teaching a class
- Skills for judging and responding to needs
- Skills for working with others
- Ongoing engagement in self-professional development

See documents: Interview 3-AT1 step 2

#### Step 5

- Specialist knowledge and skills
- Implement of theory into practice

#### Step 6

- Stay on the same page – ATs
- Supportive school community and culture to maximise child’s outcomes – ATs
- Wider network – ATs
- School-wide PBS – AT1
- Implement of theory (i.e., evidence-based, curriculum) into classroom practice

See documents: Interview 3-AT1 step 2

- Implement of evidence-based practice – ATs
- Class room curriculum development aligned with state curriculum – ATs

See documents: Interview 3-AT2 step 2

- Stay on the same page
- School-wide PBS
- Implement of theory into practice

See documents: Interview 3-AT3 step 2

- Theory implementation
Appendix L.
NVivo Coding Protocol
## Appendix L1. Nvivo Coding Protocol for Text Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop folders in source and node to synthesise all information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Import all sources in NVivo (all data sets: video, audio, text, PDF, website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create an initial system of tree nodes (ecological categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Code semistructured transcriptions to the initial system of ecological categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Run &quot;Matrix Query&quot; to see any overlap among the categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop the second system of tree nodes using thematic categories identified through manual coding (see Table 3.17; Appendix K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Code all text data source (interviews, field notes, reflections) to the themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Refine the system of tree nodes to finalise themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Create an independent system of tree nodes for teacher role, code situational analysis interview texts to the nodes, refine the system with thematic categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample of tree node system for all texts (Japan, RQ2)

![Tree Node System](image-url)
Sample of tree node system for all texts (Australia, RQ2)
Appendix L2. NVivo Coding Protocol for Lesson Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Import lesson observation videos in NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create “classroom observation matrix” within NVivo (see Figure 3.7; Appendix K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Take notes while watching each video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Choose Key Moments and transcribe the vide-clips for data presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For the Japanese case, check the frequency of peer support by using “Filter Transcript Rows” on each child for ObWks 1, 5, &amp; 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code and definition of child engagement, child interaction, and peer support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Engagement</th>
<th>Child Interaction</th>
<th>Peer Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_Active Engagement</td>
<td>A_Active Interaction (talk each other, do thing together or copying movements with eye contacts, initiated interaction by the child)</td>
<td>F_The child gives peer instruction to the particular peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_Passive Engagement</td>
<td>B_Passive Interaction (being aware) from the child (watching peers, copying movements of other children without eye contacts)</td>
<td>FA_Peer instruction is given to the child, and the child responds appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Passive Nonengagement</td>
<td>C_Staying in the same space without active/passive interaction (watching teachers in the group, playing alone but in the group)</td>
<td>FB_Peer instruction is given to the child and the child only looks at the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_Active Nonengagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>FC_Peer instruction is given to the child and the child did not responds in any way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of behaviours for children were developed from Individual Child Engagement Record (ICER, Kishida & Kemp, 2006, 2009; Kishida et al., 2008). The ICER was initially designed to gather data on the engagement of individual young child with a range of disabilities including significant intellectual disabilities (ID) within natural environment and natural flow. Because a majority of children with ASD have ID in both sites, this instrument seems suitable for this inquiry. The table below indicates definitions of behaviours based on ICER literature with some modification for adapting for this inquiry as well as developers’ recommendations. The comments highlighted in yellow colour meant adjustments for this inquiry.

The educational foci of the Japanese practice appeared similar to those in the early childhood education literature. Therefore, ICER was used as a guide for this inquiry although primary school ages are targeted population in this inquiry. Second, some examples of behaviours were revised to match the study. For example, most of the activities in the ICER examples were for young children and often included mealtime or free play time, while the researchers will observe group-based practices not free time or mealtime in research sites. Third, the category of interaction was added to a core category as the developer suggested (Kishida et al., 2008). Fourth, the category of transition and physical prompt have been excluded from the category as the most recent literature concentrated on only three variables and reported its effectiveness of the instrument (Kishida & Kemp, 2009). The focused variables are, therefore, (a) engagement type, (b) occurrence of interaction, and (c) interaction partner in this instrument. Finally, the observer in this study will record engagement and interaction among a small group of children and a teacher, while ICER was designed only for recording single-subject.

As recommended by the developer of ICER, the instrument for Child Engagement and Interaction Checklist (SEIC) will include the separate column for qualitative information during observation as
well as rating scales for over all engagement and interaction. The anecdotal data during observation is regarded as valuable to record the contextual information. Rating scales were completed by the observer for ICER. However, in this study, the classroom teacher will be asked to record their overall feelings toward their practice addition to the observer’s completion. The observer will ask the teacher verbally about overall impression immediately after the direct classroom observation. The rating scales will be designed for rating level of engagement, level and quality of interaction, and frequency of repetitive behaviour as used in ICER (Kishida & Kemp, 2009). This idea helped the researcher develop Teacher Immediate Reflection Sheet (see below) and Classroom Lesson Observation Matrix (see Appendix L2).

Table of Definition of behaviours for the Individual Child Engagement and Interaction Record (Kishida & Kemp, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of behaviour</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Active engagement     | Ea   | A child actively participates in the activity by interacting with the learning environment appropriately by manipulating materials or vocalising. The child does not demonstrate repetitive and/or inappropriate behaviours. | (a) A child holds and moves the brush to paint with his/her eyes on the brush and paper during free play art lessons.  
(b) A child talks with friends and/or eats during mealtime when they are expected.  
(c) A child replies either orally or by gestures (e.g., pointing) to a teacher’s question during a one-to-one instruction activity when the teacher asks |
| Passive engagement    | Eb   | A child interacts with the environment without manipulation or vocalisation. | (a) A child looks at a teacher or book during story time or when teacher talks.  
(b) A child looks at a friend, who is eating his meal, during mealtime cooking activity during lessons. |
| Active non-engagement | Ec   | A child interacts with the environment in an inappropriate manner by manipulation/movement and/or vocalisation. | (a) A child wanders around or talks with a friend during story time teacher talks.  
(b) A child hits a friend during free play lessons. |
| Passive non-engagement| Ed   | A child does not interact with the environment and does not do what is expected of him/her during the activity or lesson. | (a) A child looks at a picture on a wall during story time lessons or when teacher talks.  
(b) A child sits in the sandpit during free play, but does not pick up any toys or sand in his/her chair during art lessons, but does not pick up any tools and does not interact other children. |
| Interaction           |      |                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Partner: Child/ren    | Is   | Child and another child/ren are close each other (within approximately 1 metre) and a gestural or verbal exchange occurs. | (a) A child is in a classroom and a friend sits next to the child. A child shows what he/she has to the friend and the friend responds to the child.  
(b) When asked to help by a friend during a lesson, a child points or responds orally. |
| Partner: Teacher/s    | It   | Child and a teacher are close to each other (within approximately 1 metre) and a gestural or verbal exchange between a child and a teacher occurs. | (a) A child is in a sand pit classroom and a teacher sits next to the child. A child shows a scoop his/her achievement to the teacher, and the teacher responds to the child.  
(b) When asked to choose food cooking tools by a teacher during mealtime cooking lessons, a child points or responds orally. |
### The definition of child engagement for free play (JT1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Japanese school (JT1)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Descriptor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>The targeted child actively participates in own or peer play (i.e., using equipment, having attentions to peers) and learning experiences appropriately by manipulating materials or vocalising. Or the child responds to teacher or peer instruction appropriately. The child does not demonstrate repetitive and/or inappropriate behaviours.</td>
<td>(a) The targeted child actively engages in what he/she needs to do at the time of group activity. (b) The targeted child actively plays with equipment during free play (both with/without peers). (c) The targeted child holds a cube block and tries to build a house/castle. (d) The targeted child talks with his/her peers during free play. (e) The targeted child replies either orally or by gestures (e.g., pointing, nodding) to a teacher’s question during a one-to-one or group instruction when the teacher asks. (f) The targeted child responds to teacher’s or his/her peer’s instruction by gestures/verbal responses. (g) The targeted child calls his/her peers to come to the group. (h) The targeted child sits in the box rider with active/passive interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>The targeted child does not participate in play but participates in the learning experience without manipulation or vocalisation during group activity. The child does not interact actively with the teacher or peers but observes the teacher or peers. The child does not demonstrate repetitive and/or inappropriate behaviours. In this category, “waiting” or “watching” is positive outcome valued by the teacher during free play.</td>
<td>(a) The targeted child looks at a teacher during instruction by or interaction with the teacher. (b) The targeted child looks at his/her peer, who is playing or doing group activity in the room during free play. (c) The targeted child stays in a group nicely as expected without active engagement (waiting for his/her peers to sit and join the class). (d) The targeted child looks at equipment or toys but not play with them. (e) The targeted child looks at his/her peer, who is engaging in individual or group play in the room—e.g., The targeted child stays in a room/group, does not engage in the activity, does not interact to peers, but looks at peers engaging plays or group activity during lesson. (f) The targeted child sits in the box rider without active engagement and any interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>The targeted child does not participate in play or the learning experience and does not do what is expected of him/her during the group activity. The child does not demonstrate repetitive and/or inappropriate behaviours.</td>
<td>(a) The targeted child looks at a picture on a wall during group activity, free play, or a teacher’s talk. (b) The targeted child puts his/her head down on the desk when teacher talks. (c) The targeted child stays in a group or close to peers without any playing behaviours and interactions during free play—e.g., The targeted child stays in a group, does not engage in the activity, does not interact to peers, and does not look at peers engaging the activity during lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>The targeted child does not participate in play or the learning experience in an appropriate manner. The child also demonstrates repetitive and/or inappropriate behaviours through manipulation/movement and/or vocalisation.</td>
<td>(a) The targeted child wanders around without any engagement or talks by him/herself during teacher talks or during free play. (b) The targeted child engages in behaviour (e.g., hitting own head, rolling on floor, sucking a finger) during free/group play. (c) The targeted child does not stay in a group and/or engages in behaviour during group activity. (d) The targeted child does not come to the group and plays by himself during instructed group activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L3. NVivo Coding Protocol for Japanese Teacher Meeting Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Import meeting observation videos in NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Divide the video with 1-minute intervals and transcribe the group conversations within NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Code the transcriptions to the system of tree nodes using the themes identified through manual coding (Figure 3.7; Appendix K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Refine the system of three nodes of meeting observations to finalise themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tree node system for teacher meeting observations
### Appendix L4. NVivo Coding Protocol for Cross-Case Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Read carefully each case study report and identify specific categories shared by the two cases for each ecological categories used for each research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create a system of tree nodes (ecological categories) for a cross-case analysis with these specific categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Code all text data source (interviews, field notes, reflections, video transcriptions of lessons and meetings, documents) to the system of tree nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Refine the system of tree nodes to finalise themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop tabular summaries of each research question for cross-case and case-specific findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop tabular summaries of strategies based on video examples of Key Moments highlighted in single case study analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

Tree node system for a cross-case analysis

Nodes
- Nodes
  - 1. Introduction nodes
  - 2. Literature review nodes
  - 3. Methodology nodes
  - 4. Japanese case study nodes
  - 5. Australian case study nodes
  - 6. Discussion nodes

Cross-cultural perspectives
- RQ1a TEACHER ROLE
  - School organisation
  - Social inclusion
  - Teacher skills
- RQ1b EVERYDAY STRUCTURE
  - Classroom staff
  - Collaboration
  - Daily duties
  - Variations of activities
- RQ1c EVERYDAY APPROACH
  - Key strategies across a day
- RQ2a PLAN
  - Learning and supporting materials
  - Lesson focus and meaning of a lesson
  - Lesson forms
- RQ2b IMPLEMENT
  - Child-centre philosophy
  - Lesson delivery
  - Lesson structure
  - Strategies
  - Task of extra adult
  - Task of teacher during a lesson
- RQ2c EVALUATE
  - Cycle of lesson development
  - Meaning of evaluation
  - Observation
- RQ3a Child with ASD
  - independence and self-determination
  - Learning engagement
  - Social and communication skills
  - Social inclusion
- RQ3b Teachers
  - Class plan
  - Evaluation
  - Individual support
  - Work with others
- RQ3c The school
  - Documentation
  - Learning community
  - Teacher support
Appendix M.
Leximancer Analysis
Appendix M1. Procedures and Settings for Leximancer analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delete all contextual information (e.g., JT1 laughs) from each semistructured interview transcription and save the transcription as a new document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organise folders of the transcriptions for each participant (e.g., JT2, AT3) and for each research topic (i.e., daily practice, group instruction, and valued outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Run Leximancer analysis for each interview topic for each case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Run Leximancer analysis for all interviews for each participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix M2. Examples of Leximancer Analysis Result (Only Extract)
A theme of “together” was a central of JT1’s talk. This was consistent with findings of thematic analysis revealing that the Japanese teachers concerned “doing things together.”

![Leximancer Analysis Diagram](image-url)
AT3 talked about outcomes from working with different people. This was consistent with thematic analysis revealing that AT3 valued that children with ASD work with other class children and teachers: confidence building for AA4 and understanding of school rules for AA3.

Three diagrams below suggest that the Australian teachers talked about specific children with ASD in their classrooms.

- All teachers talked about teacher aides who closely work with the children with ASD. This was consistent with manual analysis suggesting that these teachers emphasised the importance of communicating with teacher aides for consistent classroom instructions.
- AT1 and AT3 frequently talked about problem behaviours of AA1 or AA3 and AA4 because the degree and frequency of these behaviours directly affected their everyday teaching in the class. In contrast, AT2 did not talk much about behaviours, because her class did not have serious behaviours problems. This was consistent with manual analysis.
- AT2 frequently talked about “prompting” children throughout a day. This was consistent with manual coding that AT2 repeatedly mentioned that she needs a lot of prompting to facilitate the children to complete their daily routines and lesson activities.
- A manual analysis indicates that the teachers repeatedly said that their everyday practice “depends” on the day. However, Leximancer analysis did not extract the key concept. Instead, Leximancer analysis highlighted “different” “activities” and “needs”, which appeared to be reasons of why they said they everyday practice depends on the day.
### Appendix M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Concept: SPEAKER:att1</th>
<th>Selected Concept: SPEAKER:att2</th>
<th>Selected Concept: SPEAKER:att3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Name-Like</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related Word-Like</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Likelihood</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aides</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usually</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix N.
Methodological Challenges and Responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Research Process</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Researcher was asked to build a positive relationship with the children through interactions.</td>
<td>Cultural expectations. The school concerned that the negative interactive experiences impacted on the children’s heart and learning during observations.</td>
<td>Researcher stayed and played with the class for the entire day that she conducted any observations with them. She coded the observation time and neutral time with the business suit and sportswear to inform the children when they could interact with her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>The use of some terms created a conceptional disconnection between Researcher and JTs.</td>
<td>Linguistic boundaries. JTs had a different meaning of the word—“evaluation” (hyouka) as summative assessment.</td>
<td>A mirror process of developing interview questions was used (see Figure 3.2). The third semistructured interview questions (i.e., valued outcomes) were modified, after Researcher tested the questions with JTs during reflection interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Meeting observations were held randomly, and JTs had unpredicted discussions with senior teachers visiting from outside school.</td>
<td>Everyday variations. JTs were very busy and had LS related discussions whenever they had spare time or senior teachers visited them.</td>
<td>Researcher created a list of lesson study related discussions collaboratively with Head of the unit. The list was used for reflection interviews and the third semistructured interview questions (i.e., valued outcomes) to pinpoint the events during the interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>JTs showed struggles in talking about their practice in the previous study.</td>
<td>Cultural differences in the way of articulating their practices. JTs had difficulties in summarising what they were doing.</td>
<td>Researcher conducted pilot activities with JTs and asked them how they wanted to be asked and answer about what they were doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>JTs’ talks were very abstract when they were asked about their teaching approaches.</td>
<td>Cultural differences in the way of articulating their practices. JTs focused on the process of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Researcher applied video-clips to their reflection interviews and asked JTs about their approaches on the Key Moments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethical approval</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>The ethical procedures outlined by GUHREC were not culturally welcomed and were not practical in the cultural context.</td>
<td>Cultural boundaries. The school owned their protocols of conducting in-school research. They concerned that the use of different procedures would confuse parents and impact on the future research in the school.</td>
<td>Researcher negotiated the procedures with the participating school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Researcher spent a great amount of effort and time on finding the most suitable site.</td>
<td>System differences. SNEUs were no longer suitable for this study due to the advanced inclusive environment. (see more reasons in Appendix B)</td>
<td>Researcher reconfirmed the focus of this study as “teaching children with ASD in a small group”, and chose one special school matched to criteria (see Table 3.6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Researcher was requires to reschedule research activities every week.</td>
<td><em>Everyday variations</em>. Unpredicted events affected the schedules: Absence of many children and teachers due to flu and family issues. <em>System differences</em>. Irregular changes in staffing affected classroom schedules.</td>
<td>Researcher negotiated ATs with the alternative observation schedule, whenever irregular changes happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Researcher was not sure what lessons she should observe to make a bridge between two cases.</td>
<td><em>Lesson variations</em>. ATs had more variety of lessons.</td>
<td>Researcher reconfirmed the context of this study as “group instruction”, and chose lessons implemented in a group. Researcher observed one or more lessons weekly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>No teacher meetings focusing on developing lessons was held.</td>
<td><em>Different professional context</em>. ATs were independently engaged in lesson development.</td>
<td>No teacher meeting observation was held, but reflection interviews were used to confirm what they were actually engaged in together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Unwillingness to watch video-clips impacted ATs’ engagement in this study.</td>
<td><em>Different focus</em>. ATs reported that they felt uncomfortable with watching video-clips because they thought that these clips were focused on “problems” (i.e., child behaviours, teacher instructions).</td>
<td>The use of video-clips was withdrawn for ATs, and reflection interviews were scheduled soon after the lesson observations to help ATs reflect on fresh memory and identify Key Moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>The use of some terms made ATs confused.</td>
<td><em>Linguistic boundaries</em>. JTs and ATS had a different meaning of “collaboration” and “lesson”. <em>Different professional context</em>. ATs worked with various people with different professional backgrounds.</td>
<td>A mirror process of developing interview questions was used (see Table 3.2). The second semistructured interview questions were modified, after Researcher tested about asking collaborative activities. A probe was added to reflection interview sheet to define “lesson” as a broad meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Data Preparation</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Some words were not simply translatable into English.</td>
<td><em>Linguistic boundaries</em>. Japanese language has different grammars, structures, and linguistic nature.</td>
<td>A multilayered reflective process of transinterpretation was used for raw Japanese data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Researcher struggled with applying the observation matrix used for the Japanese case to the Australian case.</td>
<td><em>Different focuses</em>. Each group valued different learning outcomes for the child with ASD.</td>
<td>Researcher decided not to use the matrix to the Australian case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O.
Japanese Case Study Report
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Appendix O1. Special Events Recorded during the Japanese Fieldwork

During the period of the observation weeks, the lesson hour was reduced to 40 minutes every day in ObWk1 due to home visits after school hours, on the Friday in ObWk6 due to the need to prepare for the up-coming Lesson Study Conference the next day, and on the Thursday in ObWk7 due to Open Day for Parents.

Appendix O2. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Code</th>
<th>Ecological category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>JT1</th>
<th>JT2</th>
<th>JT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-A</td>
<td>Everyday structure</td>
<td>Every day is different</td>
<td>22.27%</td>
<td>13.39%</td>
<td>21.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-B</td>
<td>Everyday approach</td>
<td>Doing things together</td>
<td>31.13%</td>
<td>36.14%</td>
<td>33.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-C</td>
<td>Working with others</td>
<td>Communicating with others</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>15.94%</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key subthemes for “every day is different”
- Variations of duties and activities
- Preparation
- Being busy
- Struggling to talk

Key subthemes for “doing things together”
- Peer interaction
- Supervision
- Support-based learning
- Teacher activity participation

Key subthemes for “working with others”
- Parents
- Teacher colleagues
Appendix O3. Learning Content during Term 1

This bar chart shows the percentage of learning content that each Japanese teacher spent in Term 1 according to the data based on weekly schedule sheets with confirmed adjustments through teacher observations, reflection logs, and Interview A. It shows the coherent learning areas of the national curriculum for children with ID and addresses age-different time spending. Ms Ando (JT1) spent most time on instructing daily life skills (n = 45.8 %), while Mr Banba (JT2) and Ms Chiba (JT3) spent most time on implementing seitan life-skills lessons (n = 32.2 % or 34.6 %). Moreover, Ms Chiba spent much more time (n = 20.6 %) on academic learning (i.e., Numeracy and Literacy), comparing with other teachers (JT1: n = 9.6 %, JT2: n = 12.95 %). Here data collection considered only time officially allocated for lessons (45 mins x 5) and excluded time spent on other activities (e.g., lunch time, cleaning time, and break time) that may be considered as daily life skills. With the consideration, these findings were consistent with a 2004 national survey of time spent by special education classroom teachers (Ozawa, 2006).

Appendix O4. Group Activities during a Typical Day

Across a typical day, the teachers conducted relatively many group activities with the children, particularly in the morning. For example, Table 4.5 shows that, for a typical week, (a) three days of Morning Group Activity were scheduled for sport activity in which everyone in the school (i.e., children, teachers, and administration staff) played together in a huge playground; (b) one day was scheduled for Reading Time in which older RC children came to each SNEU class and interactively read the same book in pairs or to a whole SNEU class; and (c) one day was scheduled for Multiaged Groups Time in which children of the whole school were regrouped to do group activities together. The term that the school used for this activity was “Fuzokukko” means “the children of this school” and was created and used historically by the school to refer to all children together as a group.

In a similar spirit, three Lesson 2s per week were set as group lessons for all SNEU classes together—English on Monday, Music on Wednesday, Physical Exercise on Thursday—while the rest of the Lesson 2s was used for academic learning or other learning activities for each class independently. During these whole SNEU group lessons, a regular education teacher, specialised for three curriculum areas, gave instructions to the children, and the SNEU classroom teachers as well as the Head and support teacher attended as supporters.
Appendix O5. Class–Home Communication Book Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>願い</td>
<td>保護者から担任へのお願い、保護者が子どもに願うこと</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>相談</td>
<td>障害についての相談</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>学習</td>
<td>学習面についての相談</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>しつけ</td>
<td>しつけについての相談</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>その他</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>家での様子、活動</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>連絡事項</td>
<td>担任に連絡したいこと</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>その他</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Japanese teachers exchanges written conversations with parents through C–H Communication Books (daily). The topics from the teacher to parents were most about reporting how the children were during the school day. These included (a) today’s activities, (b) peer interaction and relationships, (c) child’s achievement. They also replied to parents’ inquiry about the child. These inquiries were about the child’s disability (JA1, JA2, and JA3) and about academic learning (JA5 and JA6).
Appendix O6. 3-Year Cycle of Schoolwide Lesson Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify a schoolwide research topic relevant to the most recent educational emphasis (National)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explore the topic and refine the direction of schoolwide lesson study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summarise the research outcome from the 3-year schoolwide lesson study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix O7. Individual Differences in How the Japanese Teachers Used Noncontact Hour during a School Day

Only Ms Ando used this time as a noncontact hour, while the other teachers stayed with the classes to support the children during the hour. The researcher noted in the reflection logs that she recorded after each teacher observation the reasons the teachers gave for using or not using the hour as noncontact. Ms Ando said she uses the time as a noncontact hour because “it refreshes her mind, and helps her to be calm when interacting with the children after the hour has finished” and that it “helps the children to become able to do things without relying on her.” Ms Chiba said that she wants to spend more time with the children to understand them and build a strong bond with them (JT3’s Reflection Interview in ObWk5). Mr Banba said that he stays with the class because he worries about the children in his class, especially Daichi.

Appendix O8. Examples of the site school using of han (i.e., small peer group) in the Japanese site school

For example, peer groups of upper grade regular education children came to SNEU1 to help the youngest children (Year1) complete their morning preparation (e.g., changing clothes and unpacking their bags). Moreover, all SNEU classes had pair groups from the regular education classrooms help with their daily chores (e.g., cleaning their own classrooms, morning activities such as whole-school playing activities, reading, singing and so forth). The researcher’s teacher observations identified that the supporting children from regular education classrooms were occasionally taught or advised how to interact with the SNEU children. Ms Ando taught these supporting children not to say “daijobu?” (“Are you ok?”) to Bunta, because the term triggered Bunta’s emotions and he then began to cry. In fact, when they said this term to Bunta, he became unsettled. During the group reflection time, Ms Chiba asked the supporting children who came to help with cleaning her classroom to name each child in SNEU3 when speaking with them, because these children need clear instructions to help them understand. Mr Banba suggested that one supporting child, who tried to help Daichi wipe desks, stay close to Daichi and verbally prompt him to move on to the next desk. These actions are consistent with the notion of peer monitoring in the English-language studies that typically developing peers are trained to help children with ASD in inclusive settings (e.g., Koegel, Vernon, Koegel, Koegel, & Paullin, 2012)
Appendix O9. Story Examples

These stories were extracted from the researcher’s reflection logs during the Japanese case study. They have been published in Working Together: Insights from a Special Education Unit in Japan (Kikkawa & Bryer, 2013).

**Story One. Duck Tale (ObWk1)**

A loud speaker announcement from school administration stopped all classes: “I understand that every class is doing your morning activity. However, I would like you to stop what you are doing now and to listen to me carefully.” When Ms Chiba heard the announcement, she stopped her lesson and prompted her class to focus on the announcement. The announcer continued to speak very slowly and gently to all children in the school. “This morning we have had such a sad story. I would like everyone to listen to me carefully, to think hard about what I tell you, and to solve the problem together.”

The school administration explained that one of regular education classes (i.e., Year 4C) had an issue. Their pet duck had a new born baby, and the class had asked everyone to place a suggestion for the baby’s name in the voting box located at the school entrance. In the morning, they found one paper saying something unpleasant. The administrator said that the children of Year 4C were very sad when they found it and that he was very worried about the “kokoro” (heart) of the “friends” in Year 4C and about that of the person who put the note in the voting box. The officer used the word “sad” to describe the note that said something unpleasant. He noted that administration would not find who did such a heartless thing, but that he would like the children to think how their Year4C friends felt and how they themselves could help these friends.

The Head of SNEU explained the purpose of the announcement to Ms Chiba who was a novice teacher in the school. That is, the children were being encouraged to think about how their friends felt and about what they would be able to do for their friends. The head also suggested that her class, as the oldest children, visit both of the other SNEU classes to discuss what they could do for their friends, and then visit the Year 4C classroom to cheer them up as representatives of SNEU. Ms Chiba talked to the children and asked them to think about how the Year 4C friends felt and what they should do as SNEU3. The two oldest children in SNEU3, both with ASD, left their classroom and talked to other SNEU children, with Ms Chiba’s verbal prompting. The other SNEU teachers also prompted their own classes. The solution adopted after this group discussion was “cheering up our Year 4C friends.” Then, these two children of SNEU3 went to Year 4C to comfort the friends by showing empathy from the SNEU children. Later on the same day, the Year 4C children used a school announcement to say thank you to all “friends” in the school for visiting and cheering them up after the morning school announcement.
Appendix O

*Story Two: One child’s behaviour as a group learning opportunity (ObWk2)*

At the end of the first playtime of the day, Ms Chiba came back to the classroom from the playground. She did not direct the children to come back to the classroom but waited for them to come back independently when the school bell rang. All children, except for Osamu, came back and prepared for a cooking activity for their *seitan* lesson. She said to the classmates, “Osamu has not come back here yet. I cannot stand what he is doing anymore. Do you mind if we start making cakes without Osamu?” She called each child’s name and confirmed each child’s response to her question. When Eji was asked if he did not mind if they started their activity without Osamu, Eji stood up and left the classroom. Ms Chiba followed the boy and witnessed the boy call Osamu’s name loudly and pull his hand to come to the classroom. Osamu responded to the boy’s prompt and came back to the classroom with him.

Ms Chiba scolded Osamu about his inappropriate behaviour and emphasised its negative impact on the class (i.e., that what he did interrupted what other children wanted to do). Osamu cried and said sorry to the class. Ms Chiba encouraged him to apologise to the class with a more specific sentence (i.e., that he was sorry because he did not come back to classroom and his behaviour caused other children to wait). Osamu prepared for the activity, and the other children watched as he finished his preparation. While waiting for him to get ready, Ms Chiba asked Eji why he went to call Osamu. He responded to her by reading the classroom goal: “Trying my best, for myself, for my friends.” Ms Chiba was surprised (touched and nearly cried) and confirmed that he did it for the class. Eji nodded, and Ms Chiba gave him a big praise in front of the class.

Appendix O10. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ2)

Result from a “Matrix Coding Query” in Interview B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JT1</th>
<th>JT2</th>
<th>JT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a lesson</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
<td>23.79%</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text = A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td>18.08%</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td>23.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating a lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text = B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the</td>
<td>57.09%</td>
<td>83.40%</td>
<td>71.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texts of “Evaluating”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlapping those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of “Planning” (= X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( X = \frac{B}{A} \)

Three themes emerged From Interview B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>JT1</th>
<th>JT2</th>
<th>JT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving practice tomorrow</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
<td>23.79%</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating social situations</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
<td>58.23%</td>
<td>65.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating learning</td>
<td>41.32%</td>
<td>38.41%</td>
<td>31.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix O11. Ms Ando’s Example of Her Lesson Development Across the Fieldwork

### Lesson Description | Changes from the last observed lesson/irregular events/conditions
--- | ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week1: Free play</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson flow:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) Group opening  
(b) Debriefing the last lessons (on own seat)  
(c) Moving to the playroom  
(d) Free play (e.g., sliders, making a house with jumbo soft blocks)  
(e) Packing up the room  
(f) Group reflection (sitting in a group) |
| Key Moments: |  
❖ JT1 “accidentally” broke the house down. The children complained to her and tried to fix the house together.  
❖ After the house was rebuilt, the class made two peer groups, and each group used a huge therapeutic ball to break the house down together.  
❖ JT1 led the class tell what they wanted to do next. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week2: Thematic play</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Flow:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) Group opening  
(b) Debriefing the last lessons (on own seat)  
(c) Moving to the playroom  
(d) Free play (e.g., ball pool, balloon play, jumbo thematic balls, blower)  
(e) Packing up the room  
(f) Group reflection (sitting in a group)  
(g) Group closure |
| Key Moments: |  
❖ JT1 waited for children to respond to environments (new toys and equipment).  
❖ The play of the class transferred from one to another when JT1 responded to JA2’s movement.  
❖ New toys and equipment motivate children to play and encourage them to interact with each other.  
❖ JT1 praised JC3 about calling JA2 when gathering in a group. Other children also started calling JA2.  
❖ New toys and equipment (e.g., ball pool, balloon play, jumbo thematic balls, and blower).  
❖ Naming the room as “Baikinman Land” |
### Lesson Description

**Week 3: Group activity of packing up balls**

**Lesson Flow:**

(a) Group opening  
(b) Explaining today’s lesson (on own seat)  
(c) Group activity of packing up the room (e.g., packing up balls, flattening therapeutic balls)  
(d) Group reflection (sitting in a group)  
(e) Group closure

**Key Moments:**

- JC3 told JA2 to pack up his book when having a group opening. JT1 praised how nicely he told his friend what to do. Soon after this, JA1 also told JA2 to do so.  
- JC3 asked peers to help him, and JT1 reinforced JC3’s prompt. JA1 copied what JC3. Other children started helping.  
- Some children spontaneously started flattening a huge therapeutic ball together. JT1 called every child to do it together.  
- JT1 tried to lead the children to tell their “stories” about the lesson.

**Changes from the last observed lesson/irregular events/conditions**

- Not free play.  
- With a part-time support teacher.

### Week 4: Individual task of craft and thematic play

**Lesson Flow:**

(a) Group opening (JA1’s leading)  
(b) Explaining today’s lesson (on own seat)  
(c) Individual task of making room decorations (on own seat)  
(d) Moving to the playroom  
(e) Free play (ball play, sliders, ball pool, box rider)  
(f) Packing up  
(g) Group reflection  
(h) Group closure

**Key Moments:**

- JT1 asked the class “who uses a red colour?” when giving colour-coded decorations to each child.  
- JT1 asked the children what to do with the decorations (creating a lesson together).  
- When moving to the playroom, the children’s desks and chairs were not neatly organised. JT1 stopped the class and said “How about your chair?” JC4 quickly tidied his chair up, and JT1 said...
Lesson Description

“Wow, someone has already tidied it up!” The rest of the class then tidied their chairs up. JT1 also praised JC4 about helping his friend (JA2) tide his chair in front of everyone.

- JT1 negotiated her character in role-play with children.
- JT1 tickled the children who used the slider, and the children were very engaged in the play and naturally took a turn. After a while, JT1 asked the children who to tickle her when she used the slide.
- JA2 observed the interactive play between JT1 and other children and came close to the group.
- JT1 asked how many children could be in the box rider (creating a rule together).
- JA1 gave a turn to JC4 after being asked.
- JT1 waited for the children to gather in a group without her prompts.

Key Moments:

- JT1 called the children as their character names in their role-play. The children called their friends also their character names.
- Soon after coming in, JA1 and JA2 noticed a new toy (i.e., jumbo puzzle). JT1 then shuffled the puzzle pieces.
- JA2 spontaneously started singing a theme song of the hero cartoon. JT1 followed him, and other children started singing the song.
- JA1 copied JC3’s play after JT1 praised it.
- JA2 observed the interactive play between JT1 and other children. JT1 asked him if he wanted to join, and immediately he joined.
- JT1 led a group discussion about what to do when Sandman visits them again (creating a lesson together).

Changes from the last observed lesson/irregular events/conditions

- No explanation at the beginning of the lesson because a sequence of lesson procedures has been set.
- Group exercise (SunSun Exercise)
- New tools (character wristbands, tea set).

- Adding new toys, equipment, and environment and naming them (Up-Down Slide, Baikinman Castle, Rainbow Tunnel, Two-Bridge, Rainbow Desert, Jumbo Puzzles, Rainbow Circle).
### Lesson Description

**Week 6: Thematic play**

#### Lesson Flow:

(a) Group opening story time (on own seat)  
(b) Moving to the playroom  
(c) Group activity of patrolling the room  
(d) Free play  
(e) Fighting to Sandman (cooperative activity)  
(f) Group discussion about what happened  
(g) Packing up + preparing for group reflection  
(h) Group reflection (sitting in a group)  
(i) Group closure

#### Key Moments:

- JC1 did not come to the group when starting patrolling. Everyone called him by using role-play character name (i.e., Currybreadman).
- The children found JA2’s wristband during their patrol. JA2 picked it up and passed it to him by calling him “Baikinman.”
- JT1 pushed the box rider for the children. JA1 and JA2 wanted to get in and waited for their

### Changes from the last observed lesson/irregular events/conditions

- Environments with more decorations: Play has been more organised with a lesson theme.
- An enemy, Sandman, visited the class first time.
- Individual duties contributing to the class.
- Have a toast with cups of tea.

- Reading a picture book of the hero cartoon about patrolling.
- New toys and equipment (Mogrin Rider, Raining Demon, Rainbow Curtain).
- Adding “patrol” as a group activity at the beginning of free play.
- Sandman visited while playing a trumpet.
- Adding a cooperative activity (pulling the rope together).
Lesson Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes from the last observed lesson/ irregular events/conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes from the last lesson/irregular events/conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Sandman fell asleep in “Rainbow Desert”, JT1 encouraged the class to come out from their hiding spots and to pull the rope of “Raining Demon” to defeat Sandman. She emphasised group effort when encouraging the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the group reflection, JT1 asked who they want to invite to their “Baikinman Land.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 6 (LS): Thematic play**

**Lesson Flow:**
(a) Group opening exercise (DVD)
(b) Moving to the playroom
(c) Group activity of patrolling the room
(d) Free play
(e) Sandman visiting
(f) Fighting to Sandman (cooperative activity)
(g) Packing up + preparing for group reflection
(h) Group reflection (sitting in a group)
(i) Group closure (JA2’s leading)

**Key Moments:**
- Sandman told that he just wanted to play with the children and appraised the class about being mean. JT1 asked each child if they can forgive him. Some of them said no, but then JC2 said “iiyo (it is ok).” JT1 picked the moment and praised JC2. Other children also agreed to forgive Sandman and become friends with him.
- Many visitors around them.
- Jumbo puzzle is added to the cooperative activity.
- Sandman did not run away after being defeated.

**Week 7: Individual task of origami craft**

**Lesson Flow:**
(a) Explanation of today’s lesson (on own seat)
(b) Individual task (origami craft with scissors) with JT1’s instructions
(c) Group reflection (on own seat)
(d) Group closure

**Key Moments:**
- Individual task in a group of children.
- While JT1 helped each child one by one, JA1 did not engage in the activity although holding her scissors, but she observed how friends were doing the task. JT1 skipped JA1 and helped the
### Lesson Description

- child next to her. JA1 tried to copy what JC4 was doing with JT1’s support.
- After making the first origami, JT1 asked the children to come to the front to put a string on the origami with a sticky tape. All children needed physical support to the task. While JT1 was busy in helping children one by one, JA2 and JC3, who were told to tie up their origami on the bamboo tree, went to the bamboo tree and struggled with tying up a string. Soon after JC1 joined these two children. They were looking at each other’s hands and trying to copy how to do it.

### Week 8: Group activity of cleaning the playroom

**Lesson Flow:**
- (a) Group opening
- (b) Moving to the play room
- (c) Group activity of packing up the room

**Key Moments:**
- When having a group opening, JA2 was still reading a book. After JT1 told him that it was the time for a lesson, other children encouraged him to replace his book.
- JT1 asked JA3 and JC5 to work with JA2.
- JA1 spent much time with JT2.

### Changes from the last observed lesson/ irregular events/conditions

- Group activity, not free play.
- SNEU2 helped SNEU1.
- No group reflection and closure.

### Week 9: Sport festival video review

**Lesson Flow:**
- (a) Group opening
- (b) Explanation of today’s lesson
- (c) Watching the video of sport festival held last year (JT1’s explanation)
- (d) Watching the video of ball dance that the children will do this year (JT1’s explanation)
- (e) Dance practice
- (f) Group closure

**Key Moments:**
- JA2 was wondering around during watching videos. JA1 and JC3 asked him to sit.

- Less activities and a lot of JT1’s direct instructions and explanations.
### Appendix O12. Sample of Video Examples Addressed in Chapter Four

**Video Sample 1. Mr Banba in ObWk5 (Mr Chef talks in the video letter are shown in square brackets)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All children are sitting in front of TV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr Banba: Are you ready?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Children: OK!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr Banba: I’ve got something for you. I got something in this (USB memory stick). It was delivered to me. Look!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr Banba inserts the memory stick into his video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The TV screen changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr Banba: This was delivered to me. Would you like to see this secret video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>All children nod and watch the TV screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The video starts with fun music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[“Chef” appears and teases the children.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>All children laugh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Luna: What is this!? It’s Mr Kato, isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr Banba: I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Luna: Is it Mr Banba?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr Banba: No, I am here, so the person in the TV is not me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[Chef: Everyone of SNEU2, good morning!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chiaki comes closer to the TV screen and shouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chiaki: GOOD MORNING!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>All children laugh and enjoy the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Daichi: Play with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>[Chef: Mm, I cannot hear everyone’s voice. Let’s say it one more time. Everyone of SNEU2, good morning!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chiaki &amp; Luna come very closer to the TV screen and shout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chiaki &amp; Luna: GOOD MORNING!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Daichi: Play with me!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>[Chef: I heard that you are making something yummy in your class. What are you making? Tell me, tell me! One, two, three!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[Chef leads the children to say it together]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chiaki: Pancake!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>[Chef: No, no. I cannot hear you. Say it louder please. One, two, three!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Chiaki &amp; Luna: PANCAKE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Daichi: It’s pancake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>[Chef: I see. You are making a pancake. I received this poster about how to make a pancake too.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chef reads the poster to tell them how to make a pancake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>[Chef: Chiaki, I count on you!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chiaki laughs loud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mr Banba pats Chiaki’s back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr Banba: He is counting on you! You need to work hard!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>[Chef: So, everyone! Work hard together to make a yummy pancake, please!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Chef shows the photos of the children of SNEU2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr Banba: Oh, there are photos of all of you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>[Chef: Everyone in these photos here is going to make a pancake together!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Children: Oh!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The children finish packing up jumbo cubic blocks at the end of lesson.
2. Ms Ando stops music and sits on the floor in front of the pile of blocks.
3. The children, except for Bunta and Ichi, happen to be there and sit with Ms Ando.
4. Ms Ando: Wow, Haru is the first.
5. While walking to the group, Ichi calls Bunta’s name.
6. Ichi: Bunta!
7. Bunta looks at Ichi but keeps running around the room.
8. Ichi sits and joins the group.
9. Aiko: We need Bunta [to be the SNEU1].
10. Ms Ando: That is right. We need Bunta [to be the SNEU1]. Did you hear what Ichi said to
11. Bunta?
12. Ms Ando looks around the children’s faces.
13. Ms Ando: Ichi was kind to call “Bunta” for his help, wasn’t he?
15. Haru: “[Bunta]!”
16. Ms Ando shows a gesture (i.e., with a hand close to mouth) to call Bunta.
17. JT1: Bunta!
18. The children copy Ms Ando and call Bunta’s name.
19. Aiko, Genki, Haru, & Jun: Bunta!
20. Ichi: Bunta, let’s get in a group!
21. Bunta slowly comes to the group and sits with peers.
22. Haru: [Bunta comes!]
23. Ms Ando: Bunta is now sitting very nicely, isn’t he? You know what I was pleased about
24. today? It’s that Ichi called Bunta’s name very nicely to help Bunta, who was not in
25. a group. When I said that, Haru, Jun, Aiko, and Genki also called Bunta’s name.
26. That pleased me so much.

Video Sample 3. Mr Banba (JT2.LO2.ObWk2.Interval:18-19)

1. Makoto does not want to wear his mask. Chiaki and Ken suggested to Makoto that he
2. wears his mask.
3. Chiaki: You cannot take off your mask!
4. Ken: Makoto, please put your mask on.
5. Chiaki: On no, Makoto is not wearing his mask.
6. Ken: Makoto, please put your mask on.
7. Makoto: No.
8. Mr Banba: Makoto, put your mask on please.
9. Makoto does not try to put his mask on.
10. Mr Banba comes close to Makoto to sit next to him and talk to him.
11. Mr Banba: When your friends ask you, “please put your mask on”, you need to do it. Your
12. friends, Ken or Chiaki, told you very nicely.
13. Mr Banba physically helps Makoto to put on his mask again.
Video Sample 4. Ms Ando in ObWk1 (JT1’s VC2)

Some children and Ms Ando are working together to build a house with jumbo cubic blocks during free play. When the house is nearly completed, Ms Ando enters the house. Ms Ando: I cannot see well. I am so scared!! Ms Ando stands up inside the house, and the house collapses. Ms Ando: Oh no! Ms Ando starts rebuilding the house. Ichi: Ah! You broke it! Jun: Ms Ando! No! Aiko: Ah, it is broken! Ms Ando: I am so sorry! Ms Ando gives one block to Bunta, and Bunta brings it to the house.

Video Sample 5. Ms Chiba in ObWk6 (JT3’s VC13).

Éji finishes his task and comes to help Osamu. Éji helps Osamu as he moves Osamu’s hand to measure the oil. Éji gives Osamu an egg and Osamu’s bowl. Éji: Crack it into this bowl. Osamu tries to crack the egg, but drops the egg on the floor. Éji: Oops. Oh no. Ms Chiba: When that happens, what do you need to do? Éji shows a table duster to Ms Chiba. Ms Chiba: Well, if you use that, it will make a mess. Ms Chiba grabs a tissue box. Éji goes to the fridge to get another egg for Osamu. Ms Chiba: Éji, before getting the egg, we need to do something else first. Other children observe Ms Chiba. Ms Chiba: Everyone! We’ve got some trouble! Help, help! Éji comes to grab tissue papers and clean the floor, while other children observe him. Ms Chiba: Wow, that is what the shop manager (i.e., Éji’s role) does! Great work! Is only the manager coming to help us? Naoki: I can do it too. Naoki grabs tissue papers from Ms Chiba and cleans the floor. Fuji is still doing his task, and Osamu observes outside the room. Ms Chiba: Osamu! Your friends are cleaning the floor for you. Osamu grabs tissue papers, and Fuji comes to grab tissue papers and join the group.

Video Sample 6. Ms Chiba in ObWk5 (JT3’s VC10)

Ms Chiba: Fuji, please get all of the bottles (ingredients) out from the fridge. Yes, all of them. Fuji takes out a basket of the bottles and brings it to the cooking table. Ms Chiba: Oh, we have one thing different from the last lesson. That is, we have only one set of bottles. Ms Chiba shows the basket to the children. Ms Chiba: Look. We have only one set of these. So how can you use them, because there is only one set?
All children and Ms Ando gather in a circle at the end of the lesson.
Ms Ando: What did you like most at Baikinman Land today?
Aiko: I...
Jun: I like that one!
Aiko also points at the box.
Ms Ando points at the box to confirm.
Ms Ando: Did you like riding on this box?
Aiko: Yeah.
Jun: But it turned over.
Ms Ando: What are we going to do with this box?
Jun: We’ll do it again!
Ms Ando: It may be interesting if we make the box a “Mogurin Rider”, which contains a lot of “Kabirunrun” (Little Mould Demons). If we put a lot of balls in the box, ride on it, and move it as a rider, this box is going to be “Mogurin Rider”! What do you think?
Jun: If we do that, [I want to have] the sliding entrance for the Mogurin Rider there.
Ms Ando: Sure.
Jun: That big one (Baikin-jyo) is [too hard for sliding the Mogurin Rider].
Aiko: Haru said that she wants to ride on it too.
Ms Ando: Yeah, I saw Haru riding on the box too. Before coming to this playroom, we made the colourful things like the Rainbow Fairies. Remember?
Aiko: Yeah.
Ms Ando: I’m thinking that we can display them on the ceiling. Can we?
Ms Ando points at the ceiling.
Aiko: Yeah.
Ms Ando looks at each child, and the children nod.
Ms Ando: OK, let’s display the Rainbow Fairies there. Ichi, would you like to display the fairy that you made too?
Ichi nods.
Ms Ando: Anything else? We can display our drawings on the walls too, if you like.
Aiko, Genki, Haru, and ichi look around the walls.
Ms Ando: Would you like a drawing of Anpanman’s bread factory or a rainbow around the wall? It would be better if we have background for Baikin-jyo too, wouldn’t it?
Aiko: Kabirunrun!
Ms Ando: You want Kabirunrun? How about Cheese (the name of a dog in the cartoon)?
Jun: I want Cheese!
Ms Ando: OK. Let’s colour pictures and display your drawing there!
Jun: I will colour Cheese!
Bunta looks up at the ceiling.
Ms Ando pats Bunta’s head to get his attention.
Aiko: I want to colour Anpanman!
Jun: I want Cheese!
Aiko: Me, Anpanman!
Jun: Me, Cheese!
Ms Ando: Sure. Let’s make the drawing together!
Appendix O13. Photographs from the Japanese Case Study

Examples of the equipment and tools used by Ms Ando

- Baikin-jyo (Baikin Castle)
- Mogurin Rider
- Rainbow Curtain
- Rainbow Tunnel
- Raining Demons
- Rainbow Circle
- Wrist-bands

Examples of cooking tools and environment designed by Mr Banba

- Classroom setting
- Colour-coded belongings
- Individualised bowl for Daichi
- For measuring instruments
- Place for mixing
- For making group mixture
- For cutting a group cake
- Eating with friends
Examples of cooking tools and environment designed by Ms Chiba.

Appendix O14. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ3)

Results from initial analysis of semistructured interview transcripts according to three ecological categories for the Japanese case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-structured interview</th>
<th>A child with ASD</th>
<th>The teachers</th>
<th>The school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>Mr Banba</td>
<td>Ms Chiba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from initial analysis of reflection interview transcripts according to three ecological categories for the Japanese case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection Interview</th>
<th>A child with ASD</th>
<th>The teachers</th>
<th>The school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Ando</td>
<td>Mr Banba</td>
<td>Ms Chiba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk1</td>
<td>50.79</td>
<td>34.95</td>
<td>65.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk2</td>
<td>37.18</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>20.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk3</td>
<td>55.18</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>36.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk4</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>42.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk5</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>66.39</td>
<td>51.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk6</td>
<td>55.62</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>76.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk7</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>58.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk8</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38.99</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>50.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O15. Individualised Learning Goals and Support

The information was extracted from the Japanese Lesson Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal sugata</th>
<th>Support during this lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>This lesson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aiko</strong></td>
<td>With teacher’s verbal prompts, Aiko can be aware of how friends are doing and can collaborate with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bunta</strong></td>
<td>Bunta tries to complete the jumbo puzzle collaboratively with friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiaki</strong></td>
<td>Chiaki takes initiatives to lead the class by saying “Every one, let’s go” or “one, two, three”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daichi</strong></td>
<td>Daichi is actively engaged in the activity with understanding of what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Éji</strong></td>
<td>Éji can communicate with friends throughout the lesson with his individual role of learning in class and appropriate environmental settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuji</strong></td>
<td>Fuji can engage in the activity with peer models or prompts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- bakes his cakes while being aware of the indicated orders;  
- leads the class verbally (e.g., “We have two more to finish”) to pack the cakes; and  
- uses verbal prompts indicating his awareness of friends or responding to the friends’ prompts.
Appendix P.
Australian Case Study Report
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Appendix P1. Australian Final Field Research Calendar

The activities that the researcher completed with the participants in the Australian case.

### Research Schedule in the Australia School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>First day of the week</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>AT1</th>
<th>AT2</th>
<th>AT3</th>
<th>Weekly update (10-15 mins)</th>
<th>AT1</th>
<th>AT2</th>
<th>AT3</th>
<th>One lesson observation (weekly) &amp; One whole-day teacher work observations</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2/May/11</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Wed (3 pm)</td>
<td>Wed (3 pm)</td>
<td>Wed (3 pm)</td>
<td>Preparation: Video testing, explanation, Interview 1</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- Unit plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Thu (8 am)</td>
<td>Mon (Fine: 9-10 am)</td>
<td>(Fine: 9-10 am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- Prep curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Thu (12 pm)</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- IEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Thu (8 am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- Other report recorded by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Mon (Fine: 11am-12pm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/May/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wed (3 pm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- School report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thu (3 pm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- Classroom report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16/May/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td>- Communication book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23/May/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30/May/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/Jun/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13/Jun/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/Jun/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra</td>
<td>7/Dec/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SOSE: 11am-12:30 pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Week reflection only
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Appendix P2. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ1)

Key themes (RQ1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Code</th>
<th>Ecological category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>AT1</th>
<th>AT2</th>
<th>AT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-A</td>
<td>Working through a day</td>
<td>Variation of day-to-day situations</td>
<td>66.81%</td>
<td>55.47%</td>
<td>58.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-B</td>
<td>Working with a child with ASD</td>
<td>Responding to individual children</td>
<td>27.72%</td>
<td>32.83%</td>
<td>38.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1-C</td>
<td>Working with others</td>
<td>Communicating/working with others</td>
<td>28.90%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subthemes

Working through a day – Variations of day-to-day situations
- Variations of duties and activities
- Unsettled environments

Working with a child with ASD – Responding to individual children
- Dealing with behaviours
- Supporting strategies
- Specified approach

Working with others – Communicating/working with others
- Other teachers
- Other school staff
- Teacher aides
- Other professionals
- Parents
Appendix P3. Sample of Individual Education Plans (Ben)

Extracts from Ben’s IEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Strategies [Gas -3 to +3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short term goals: When given a non-preferred task, or a new experience, with one verbal prompt, Ben uses 3 of the targeted coping strategies to continue with the activity.

Productive pedagogies: Planned experiences, routine changes.

Targeted coping strategies:
- Breaking down the task
- Deep breathing
- Negotiating rewards (“this first, then that”)
- Negotiating / taking breaks

Resources and constraints:
- Social stories, explicit teaching strategies, rewards charts, visual prompts, planned new experiences, planned routine changes
Anne presents with significant difficulty with functioning in the school environment. Her curriculum levels are well below her age peers and she requires a highly modified program. She requires structure and predictability and the use of current interests or preferred activity to calm day, expectations need to be adjusted accordingly and down times provided. Furthermore, her attention span is limited and she is reluctant to try new experiences and has a limited repertoire of play activities.

Anne requires:

- An alternative education program
- Curriculum: consultation & planning about adjustments to curriculum content, adjustments to teaching strategies, individual & small group instruction when necessary, breakdown tasks into smaller, achievable components, adjustments to assessment
- Therapy support
- Play and socialisation program
- Cognitive: alternative curriculum, alternative/modified materials, adjusted expectations/objectives, additional repetition or practice, alternative/modified directions, alternative/modified form of evaluation, multisensory approach, change in pace or sequence of activities, allowing for extended time to compensate for slower processing and response rates, peer involvement, visual support, focus attention and use simple concise instructions within context, explicit teaching of targeted skills in natural environments, use of facilitating and modelling
- Socialisation: social skills training involving modelling, social stories, scaffolded practice

Anne’s curriculum focuses on skills for everyday living. Her current program includes:

- Trying new experiences, increasing her repertoire of playing activities and lengthening her attention span
- Communicating her needs to an adult and extending her vocabulary – Picture Exchange Communication
- TO follow a one part, non-preferred routine direction

General Program

Self-care: toileting, eating, dressing

Physical capacity: programs to develop fine and gross motor, balance, strength and co-ordination

Communication: interacting with others, getting an adult’s attention, making a request, attending to communication, development of vocabulary

Social skills: Appropriate greeting, participation in a small group, supported/scaffolded play

Self-direction: following routines and simple directions, attending behaviours, developing alternate strategies to replace inappropriate behaviours
Appendix P5. Sample of Unit Plan (Ms Fleck)

Unit planner template

| School Name: XXXX School | Unit title: Africa | KLA(s): SOSE | Year level(s): Early/Middle Years | Duration of unit: |

### Identify curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of working</th>
<th>Knowledge and understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to:</td>
<td>Material and non-material elements influence personal identity and sense of belonging to groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pose questions for investigations</td>
<td>Maps have symbols to represent places and identify the relative position of features including landmarks and locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- plan simple investigations based on questions</td>
<td>Simple techniques and tools are used to manipulate and process resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identify and collect information and evidence from narratives and familiar sources</td>
<td>Languages and cultural practices have particular features, conventions, patterns and practices that may be similar to or different from one’s own language and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make judgments about the usefulness of the information</td>
<td>- Purposes for reading and viewing are identified and are supported by the selection of texts based on an overview that includes titles, visuals and headings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communicate social and environmental ideas, using texts and terminology to match audience and purpose</td>
<td>- Readers and viewers make connections between their prior knowledge and the subject matter of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- participate in group decision making to achieve goals</td>
<td>- Words, groups of words, visual resources and images elucidate ideas and information, and portray people, characters, places, events and things in different ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reflect on learning to identify new understandings to group plan and sequence main steps in production procedures</td>
<td>The purpose of speaking and listening involves exchanging information, sharing and exploring ideas, entertaining, supporting relationships, giving opinions and getting things done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make products by following production procedures to manipulate and process resources</td>
<td>- Spoken texts are different from written texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- follow guidelines to apply safe practices</td>
<td>- Statements, questions and commands contribute to making and clarifying meaning during discussions and conversations. Contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- evaluate products and processes by identifying what worked well, what did not and ways to improve</td>
<td>The purpose of speaking and listening involves informing, presenting simple arguments, negotiating relationships and transactions, and seeking opinions of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- notice and compare aspects of their own cultures and of the target cultures</td>
<td>- Spoken texts can adopt different roles, and make language choices appropriate to the level of formality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identify main ideas and the sequence of events, and make simple inferences</td>
<td>They manipulate and process resources and consider what has worked well and what could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognise and select vocabulary to describe subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- interpret how people, characters, places, events and things have been represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- construct simple literary and non-literary texts by planning and by using prior knowledge and experience to match an audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context for learning

Students use their fascination with people and places to make sense of their world. They investigate societies and environments and develop an understanding of their relationships with other people and places.

### Develop assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assessment</th>
<th>What will be assessed</th>
<th>When it will be assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Make judgments

| Purpose of assessment | Assessable elements |
# Sequence Learning

## Learning experiences and teaching strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show Africa in relation to the world. Colour in the three target countries on a map of Africa—MALI, SUDAN and SOUTH AFRICA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion on what the students want to learn about each country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion on making a power point of what we have learned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Body

### The area to explored and compared between the three African countries and Australia are:

- Animals
- Schools
- Food
- Houses
- Toys
- Music

Students will watch videos or virtual tours on the different topic area. Students will complete compare and contrast worksheets. Worksheets will allow students to write or draw their observations.

Students will decide the following weeks focus and discuss as group what that focus is like in Australia e.g. Houses what is their building made from, what types of rooms are in their house, what shape house do they have?

Student will use google image to find pictures they want to use to reflect their learning about each country. Students will save the chosen images to pictures in my documents.

The students with support will construct a power point; the power point will include images they have found and supporting text, it can also include sound and video bits. Students will choose after observing different techniques their preferred methods of transition.

## Adjustments for needs of learners

- Directions need to be given in short statements with extra time for processing and checking for clarification.
- Information sources need to be visually stimulating but not busy any voice overs need to use simple clear language.
- David and Catie need to be focused to the speaker before being asked a question.
- All students need simple questions were possible with visuals to support focus of question. E.g. what shape is your house? Draw different shapes on the whiteboard.
- During discussions and use of whiteboard all students will need support in turn taking and waiting. Reinforce Tash, Catie and Oliver when they will be their turn, reward good waiting with verbal praise and for high frequency reward. Encourage David to verbalise it his turn.
- Support Catie, Oliver and Noah in reading work sheets.
- Support: Catie and David in writing or drawing their responses. Oliver by writing his response on a piece of paper for him to copy. Noah by scribbling his response or writing it dot letters for him to trace.
- Use identical language for all students when giving verbal directions to the class on saving a google image to a folder.

## Resources

- Touch screen television
- Power point
- Internet
- Black line masters
- (site to get free sounds)
- Whiteboard
- Computer

---

## Use feedback

Ways to monitor learning and assessment
## Appendix P6. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ2)

### Key themes (RQ2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Code</th>
<th>Ecological category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>AT1</th>
<th>AT2</th>
<th>AT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ2-A</td>
<td>Plan a lesson</td>
<td>Curriculum as a vehicle</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2-B</td>
<td>Implement a lesson</td>
<td>Skill-based learning</td>
<td>52.19%</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
<td>85.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2-C</td>
<td>Evaluate a lesson</td>
<td>Clear assessment</td>
<td>19.65%</td>
<td>29.08%</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subthemes

- **Plan a lesson – Curriculum as a vehicle**
  - Individual arrangement in curriculum
  - Activities aligned with curriculum
  - IEPs/assessment informing curriculum
  - Planning with others
- **Implement a lesson – Skill-based learning**
  - Supporting strategies
  - Lesson delivery
- **Evaluate a lesson – Clear assessment**
  - Monitoring of learning progress
  - Debriefing with others
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Appendix P7. Video Examples Addressed in Chapter Five

Video Sample 1. Ms Fleck dealing with Cate’s out-of-seat behaviour in ObWk2 (AT3.ObWk2.Video2.Interval: 11-16)

1. The class is having SOSE lesson about Africa after watching an animal DVD.
2. Ms Fleck to the class: What do crocodile and hippopotamus eat?
3. Cate: What is that?
4. Ms Fleck to Cate: I think that you boys are sitting very nicely and staying in your seats. I [will give] you another lolly in [a few] minutes, because you are staying in your seats.
5. Cate comes back and sits in her chair.
6. Ms Fleck to Cate: When people are talking, getting up is rude.
7. Ms Fleck to the class: Oh, because you are sitting nicely, you can have another one, David. And you can have another one too.
8. Ms Fleck gives lollies to David and Oliver.
9. Ms Fleck to Adult5: Oh, Adult5, you are also staying in your seat beautifully. You can have one too.
10. Cate observes the interactions among others.
11. Adult5: Thank you.
12. Ms Fleck: OK.
13. Cate: I am going out.
14. Ms Fleck to the class: It’s OK.
15. Cate opens the door.
16. Ms Fleck: Oh, David. You are sitting so beautifully. So you can have another one.
17. Ms Fleck gives a lolly to David.
18. Cate did not go out and stands behind Adult5 to observe Ms Fleck.
19. Ms Fleck: So are you, and so is Adult5.
20. Ms Fleck gives lollies to Oliver and Adult5.
21. Cate comes back to her seat and sits in her chair.
22. Ms Fleck to Cate: Next round, if you are still sitting nicely, you can have one.


1. The class had free play time, and each child chose their individual activity.
2. Ms Deanne encouraged Anne to play with playdough on a table.
3. Ms Deanne: Would you like to pat, pat, pat?
4. Ms Deanne models how to play with playdough to Anne.
5. Anne refuses to touch playdough, walks away, and comes to Fran who is playing a computer.
6. Ms Deanne: Anne, I know you want your turn on a computer. It is gonna be your turn after Fran (Ms Deanne uses sign language).
7. Anne keeps her eyes on the computer.
8. Fran looks at Ms Deanne.
9. Ms Deanne: Anne, I know you want your turn on a computer. It is gonna be your turn after Fran (Ms Deanne uses sign language).
10. Anne will have a turn (Ms Deanne uses sign language).
11. Anne: Anne’s turn?
12. Ms Deanne: Lunch first, and then Anne’s turn.
13. Anne: Mm.
14. Ms Deanne: Let’s choose something different (Ms Deanne uses sign language).
15. Ms Deanne holds Anne’s hand and escorts her back to the table.
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1. The class has a group lesson about “tall and short” using a visual cue. There were three extra adults (Adult4, Adult6, and Adult8) to support the class of six children.
2. Ms Eden to the class: Who is last? Who has not had a turn yet? Who is this? Who is this?
3. Adult4, who sits with Ben and Matilda, points at the front to encourage Ben to respond to Ms Eden.
4. Ben: Yeah!
5. Ms Eden: It’s Ben. Ben, how tall are you? Are you taller or shorter? (Ms Eden used body language)
6. Ms Eden places a foot print on Ben’s body trace, and Adult8 helps her with blu-tack.
7. [...] Ms Eden: Today, we did a lot of counting. Let’s find out how tall Ben is.
8. The class: One, two, three, four, five, and six.
9. Ms Eden to the class: Ben has a six footprints tall too!
10. Ben: Yeah!!
11. Ms Eden colours the chart.
12. Ms Eden to Ben: So are you the same as Isabella? (Ms Eden uses sign language)
14. Ms Eden to Ben: OK, you are the same [as] Isabella. How about ... [others]? Are you [the] same [as] or different to Matilda? (Ms Eden uses sign language)
15. Ben: Different.
16. Ms Eden to Ben: You are different to Matilda.
17. Ms Eden to the class: Ben is taller, Matilda is shorter. (Ms Eden uses body language)
Video Sample 4. Ms Deanne’s a literacy lesson in ObWk6 (AT1.ObWk6.LO5.Interval:66-70)

Appendix P

Three children are having a literacy group with Adult1 and Adult2, while Anne is having her late lunch with Ms Deanne.

Ms Deanne: All finished. Now, it’s time for some game.

Anne: No!

Ms Deanne: Anne, it’s your chair.

Ms Deanne holds Anne’s chair.

Anne looks at her chair.

Ms Deanne holds Anne’s hand and escorts her to come to the group.

Ms Deanne; Good! Have a seat. Wait for your turn.

Ms Deanne walks away to get her own chair.

Adult1 gave Grace a toy.

Anne tried to take it off from Grace.

Ms Deanne: “Anne is waiting for her turn”.

Anne: Ahhh!!

Ms Deanne puts her chair behind Anne and sits with her.

Adult1 puts three cards of activities in front of Anne.

Adult1: Anne, look at these. We’ve got a guitar, a duck, or grow ball. What would you like?

Ms Deanne points at these cards, and Anne looks at the card.

She chooses a card of ball and places it on the sentence board.

Ms Deanne encourages Anne to give the card to Adult1.

Adult1 holds the card and waits for Anne to say a sentence.

Ms Deanne points at each word of the sentence board.

Anne: “I want ball”.

Adult1: Beautiful!

Adult1 gives Anne a grow ball.

Appendix P8. Typical Classroom Settings

AT1.ObWk1

AT2.ObWk2

AT3.ObWk2

Adult’s chair

Child’s chair

Child’s bean bag
Appendix P9. Sample of Ms Deanne's Class Curriculum

These photocopies from a PECS book were filled in Ms Deanne's class curriculum.
Appendix P

Appendix P10. Sample of Anne’s ELR

Active learning processes: Thinking
Children think and acquire by:
*generating and discussing ideas and plans and solving problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s name.</th>
<th>Planning and Making Choices</th>
<th>Becoming Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: May 3 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context: Focused learning & teaching
Investigating

Possible phase of learning:
Ex  MC  Ace

Communication/literacy skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Read/view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Write/shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fine motor sub skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Snip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R: refusal  F: full support / resistance  P: Partial support / awareness  I: approaching independence  E: exploring

Appendix P11. Sample of Ms Deanne’s Monitoring Matrix
Appendix P12. Sample of Data Collection (Ms Fleck) in ObWk2

Appendix P13. NVivo Analysis Result (RQ3)

Results from initial analysis of semistructured interview transcripts according to three ecological categories for the Australian case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-structured interview</th>
<th>A child with ASD</th>
<th>The teachers</th>
<th>The school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>44.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>47.79</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from initial analysis of reflection interview transcripts according to three ecological categories of valued outcomes for the Australian case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection Interview</th>
<th>A child with ASD</th>
<th>The teachers</th>
<th>The school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Deanne</td>
<td>Ms Eden</td>
<td>Ms Fleck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk1</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>59.77</td>
<td>33.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk2</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk3</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>54.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.23</td>
<td>40.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk5</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk6</td>
<td>55.41</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>48.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObWk7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>49.26</td>
<td>38.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Appendix P14. Sample of Field Notes Used for Interview A (Ms Fleck)
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