Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 2020; Vol 19 (Issue 3): pp. 4890-4899
http://ilkogretim-online.org
doi: 10.17051/ilkonline.2020.03.735642

Effectiveness Of Collaborative Learning Strategy On Sense Of Coherence Among Children With Disability In Inclusive And Special Schools Of Gurugram

Dr. Sonam Bansal Assistant Professor, Rao Lal Singh College Of Education, Sidhrawali, Gurugram (Haryana) India.

Abstract

The Collaborative Classroom is an intentionally designed environment in which academic learning is blended with cooperation and social development activities. Collaboration extends beyond traditional cooperation and compliance in Collaborative Classrooms, where students work together to solve problems. The purpose of this paper was to investigate the impact of collaborative learning on children with disabilities' sense of belonging in inclusive and special education settings. The research team used a control group design that included a pre-test and a post-test. The sample consisted of 120 children with disabilities ranging in age from 8 to 11 years' old who attended schools in Gurugram. The feeling of coherence assessment tool was employed in this study. The 2x2 ANOVA and the t-test were employed to analyse the data in this study. When it comes to enhancing children's sense of belonging, collaborative learning has proven to be more effective than other approaches. In inclusive schools, collaborative learning has proven to be more fruitful in terms of all of the dependent variables.

Keywords: Collaborative learning, Sense of Coherence, Children with Disability, Inclusion, Inclusive schools, Special schools

Introduction

Additionally, inclusive schools are the most effective means of combatting discrimination, fostering welcoming communities, and achieving universal education. Additionally, they provide effective education to the large majority of children and improve the overall efficiency and cost effectiveness of the educational system, as well as its effectiveness. This was stated at Salamanca in 1994 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Collaborative Learning

Teachers and students benefit psychologically from teamwork and collaboration in inclusive schools. It is beneficial for instructors to collaborate and seek advice from others. Teachers who work in inclusive schools have more possibilities to influence school policies and procedures. Meaningful inclusion necessitates teamwork. Collaboration is simply a process in which teachers who are involved build and share meaning and agendas before working together to put those agendas into action. Through constructive interactions, consultation, and communication, this can be attained Both indirect and direct collaboration are possible. Working with the instructor in an out-of-classroom setting to prepare for specific student needs is known as "indirect cooperation." Peer and teacher collaboration are examples of direct collaboration (Dash, 2006). When two or more individuals work together to learn something, it's called collaborative learning. Collaborative learning is different from solo learning in that it takes advantage of each other's resources and talents (e.g., asking each other for information, analysing each other's ideas, etc.). Collaborative learning involves students working together on the same task at the same time, collaborating on the challenges and complexities of the task at hand. Academic achievement, problem-solving abilities, and creativity all benefit from collaborative learning (Natasi and Clements, 1991), as evidenced by several studies. There are numerous benefits to using collaborative learning, such as the development of critical thinking and problem-solving abilities; the capacity to work in groups; the development of group process skills; and the ability to encourage and motivate one another in the classroom. A self-reflective view of the educational process. Smith & MacGregor (1992) defined collaborative learning by describing seven shifts that students must make in order for it to take place. The change in how authority and expertise are seen is one of the most telling differences between collaborative and cooperative learning. Classes become more collaborative as a result of students no longer seeing teachers and texts as the only sources of authority and knowledge, but rather seeing their peers and other people's ideas instead.

Sense of Coherence

Antonovsky, an American-Israeli medical sociologist, founded the SOC in the late 1970s (Antonovsky 1979, 1987). SOC is influenced by an individual's belief that the universe is predictable and consistent, as well as their ability to influence the outcomes of their own actions (Antonovky, 1979; Antonovsky & Sagy, 1986). Social cognition (SOC) is considered to influence how people respond to their surroundings' experiences (Antonovsky, 1990). One begins to regard the world as coherent and predictable when these experiences are consistent, participatory in moulding the outcome, and have an under-overload-overload balance of stimuli. But a measure of unpredictable events (unknown resources) is needed for forming a strong SOC (Antonovsky, 1979). Coherence and wellness are linked, and this will lead to a better sense of well-being in the long run (Strumpfer, 1995). People's desire for

order and understanding is fueled by their search for meaning (Korotkov, 1998). Gender, socioeconomic status, location, and culture are all considered to be part of the SOC. Instead of a stress buffer, SOC is more of a stress reducer, focusing on the general quality of an individual's conduct rather than on the individual's specific responses to specific behaviours. SOC (Flannery & Flannery, 1990). This means that the stability of one's disposition inclination toward coherence may be compromised by the stresses of learning and behavioural obstacles. To be global in outlook means to have a profound, enduring, but dynamic faith that the stimuli from one's internal and external environments are structured, predictable, and explicable in the course of living; the resources are available for one to meet the demands posed by these stimuli; and, according to Anatonovsky, these demands are challenges, valued investment and engagement (1987). Understanding, Manageability and Meaningfulness are three ways in which people make sense of the world. There are three intrinsic requirements of feeling of coherence that determine a person's ability to deal with life:

The ability to cope and feel a sense of purpose in life is attracted to those who have this profound emotional experience of life making meaning.

Understanding and obtaining the resources necessary to meet these demands is a key component of manageability.

Confidence that the world is organised and predictable rather than random and unpredictable.

"The Sense of Coherence" consists of Antonovsky's three ideas. For example, a person will see their surroundings as understandable and manageable if they see them as meaningful. Allows one to better handle stress and potentially turn it into a positive experience (Antonovsky, 1994). There may be problems or frustrations, but a person with good mental health is more certain that they will be handled with. Also, such a person has faith in their own abilities to deal with the difficulties of daily life. Even in the face of adversity, this idea urges a focus on the positive (Antonovsky, 1987). Coherence is linked to a person's emotional, social, and behavioural traits. Low sense of coherence was associated with a higher level of stress than high sense of coherence (Adams, Bezner, Drabbs, Zambarano & Steinhardt, 2000).

The Current Study

The educational programmes never met the needs of children with disabilities. In India, many people still believe that a deformed child is the result of God's wrath, or the ancestors' sins. In certain cases, disabled children's parents feel bad and even blame themselves. Unproductive and troublesome children are sometimes dismissed. Less fortunate are the

crippled girls. Most schools do not accept disabled students. Not all non-disabled parents embrace inclusion. Even still, some parents of non-impaired children oppose putting their kids to school with disabled kids. In special schools, children and parents feel safer with peers who are like them. As a result, individuals may not grasp the value of inclusion.

Disability or learning difficulties should not be used as an excuse to exclude or expel a kid from school, thereby devaluing or discriminating against them. To form relationships and prepare for mainstream life, all youngsters require schooling. In order to foster social acceptance and collaboration, education is currently required. Differentiation is accepted and respected in inclusive practises. In addition to their condition, children with disabilities must deal with all of their peers' physical, emotional, and social changes. Aside from the limitations imposed by disability on daily activities, they endure economic, educational, social, legal and health discrimination. Disabled people are alienated, isolated, and marginalised due to widespread disability myths. Despair and self-esteem are eroded in disabled children from an early age. The main issue is integrating disabled pupils with regular students. In order to reach the same requirements as other students, schools must accommodate kids with impairments. Educators will have to balance maintaining high standards for all children with meeting their individual learning needs. It is important to remember that these goals are not mutually exclusive. To overcome feelings of social isolation, peer rejection, and to strengthen interpersonal interactions and a sense of belonging in regular classes, students with disabilities must learn collaboratively. Children with impairments do better academically and socially in integrated environments, according to evidence from outside India. Cultural differences in social sensitivity Each value system's social response to a phenomenon is unique. The benefits of inclusive environments for disabled children have yet to be tested in India. Then disability will be as common as black hair or brown eyes, and true inclusion and empowerment will be possible. Inclusion is the new normal, and special education is a privilege no longer. According to Indian law, disabled children will eventually be in mainstream classrooms. It must succeed. Indian teachers teach huge classes. They are still ill-prepared to deal with disabled youngsters. A disabled child's classmates can considerably aid the teacher. Collaboration has a lot of potential in this light. For impaired children, inclusive schools can foster teamwork and dialogue. It also allows kids to participate in decision making and influencing their daily lives.

The current study examines whether collaborative learning builds coherence in children with exceptional difficulties. So, it can be predicted that:

- There is no significant effect of Treatment, Types of School and their interaction on Sense of coherence by considering pre- sense of coherence as covariate.

- There is no significant effect of Treatment, Types of School and their interaction on Sense of coherence by considering post- sense of coherence as covariate.

Method

Participants

The current investigation is experimental. The study used a pretest-posttest control group design. Two experimental and two control groups were created. The study included 245 students aged 8-11 with disabilities from both inclusive and special schools. Samples were gathered from Gurugram schools. Due to a lack of disabled children, two schools closed. Finally, the study sampled eight schools, four inclusive and four special. The study sample consisted of 245 individuals aged 8-11 years, chosen through a teacher referral form. Out of 245 kids, 52 had serious disabilities and were sent here. Raven's coloured progressive matrices were used to select 120 youngsters from 193. (CPM). The 73 children with I.Q. less than 65 were excluded. Thus, 120 people were identified. The subjects were then randomly separated into four groups: two experimental groups (EI and ES) and two control groups (CI and CS).

Instruments

- Teacher Referral Form: Using the teacher's response as a reference, the researcher was able to identify the individuals in this study Using the Teacher Referral Form, the investigator can learn more about the subject's disability and behaviour.
- Coloured Progressive Matrices (CPM**):** The investigator utilised this method to identify the final sample subjects. This tool (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1977) assessed children's IQ. A comparable technique was utilised in both inclusive and special schools.
- Sense of Coherence Scale: The scale created and standardised this scale. The scale has three components: comprehensibility, manageability, and meaningfulness. The scale had both positive and negative items. The positive items had a weight of 5 to 1 while the negative items had a weight of 1 to 5. The scale's test-retest reliability was 0.74 (n=100, p.01), and Cronbach's alpha was 0.81 (n=100, p.01). A higher score means higher coherence.

Procedure

With the use of teacher referral forms, we were able to learn about the children's difficulties. Loneliness, sense of coherence, and classroom behaviour scales were administered to all four groups: EI (in inclusive schools), ES (in special schools), and CI (in inclusive schools) (in special schools). The current study used collaborative learning as a remedial tool. Other

exercises included short stories, everyday routine chores, painting, environmental and hygiene issues. To develop rapport, researchers asked about their assignments, interests, sharing with friends, activities they play, and habitual learning practises. The researcher then implemented a collaborative learning technique on experimental groups. After two days of treatment, the individuals were given the dependent variable tool, sense of coherence. It was used to assess the experimental group's response to the intervention (collaborative learning). A three-month delay posttest was administered to all groups to assess the long-term effect of the intervention technique.

RESULTS

- **Effect of Collaborative learning on Sense of Coherence**

Table 2: Summary of 2X2 ANOVA of Sense of Coherence at Posttest stage

Source of variation	Df	SS	MSS	F
Treatment	1	177.63	177.63	8.43**
Types of School	1	320.13	320.13	15.19**
Treatment * Types of School	1	104.53	104.53	4.96**
Error	116	2443.66	21.06	

Table values of t at .05= 3.93; at .01=6.88; for df=116

From Table 2, A look at the F-value of treatment (F=8.43, df =1/116, p.01) shows that this is a very important number. It shows that treatment is the main factor that causes a lot of variation at this point. There was a big difference in how students felt about being together after treatment. There is a big difference in the sense of coherence of collaborative learning groups and traditional method groups. The collaborative learning group's mean sense of coherence score is 109.70, while the traditional method group's score is 107.26. So, it can be said that children with disabilities have a much lower sense of coherence when they use traditional methods than when they work together. It can also be seen that the F-value of different types of school is important (F=15.19, df =1/116, p.01). It shows that the type of school is the main factor that causes a lot of different things to happen. There was a big difference in how coherent students felt after they took the test. This was because of the type of school they went to. Also, the mean score of sense of coherence for students in inclusive schools is 110.11, which is a lot higher than the mean score of sense of coherence for students in special schools, which is 106.85. As a result of this, it can be said that at the posttest stage,

children with disabilities had a sense of coherence far more often than those without disabilities did. It is clear from Table 2 that the F value of the interaction between treatment and types of school (F=4.96, df =1/116, p>.05) is important. It shows that the interaction effect has a big effect on the sense of coherence of children with disabilities at the posttest stage. So, there was a big effect when treatment and type of school were combined to make kids with disabilities feel like they fit in at the end of the test, too.

It has been found that all the people in the experimental group (EGT) learned a lot from the pretest to the posttest. We found that this difference of 2.6% was very important (t= 7.18; p=0.01). There is no evidence that collaborative learning has an effect on sense of coherence in children with disabilities. This means that the null hypothesis 4 is wrong. This suggests that children with disabilities who learn together are more likely to have a sense of coherence. By using an intelligent collaborative learning system and group interactions, Mueller and Fleming (2001) and Soller (2001) found that children learned how to work together, reach a common goal, and improve their group learning process when they used these tools together.

There was a difference of 4.44 between the mean scores of those who participated in the trial at inclusive schools (EI) between the two assessments (t=9.82; p0.01). Discrepancies were determined to be critical. In inclusive schools, the null hypothesis states that collaborative learning will have no substantial impact on the sense of coherence. This finding demonstrates that collaborative learning has no effect. The mean difference between the pre-test and post-test levels in the group of special schools (ES) was 0.76. The difference (t=2.53; p0.05) was judged to be significant. This means that hypothesis 6 is invalid. It claims that special-needs children's sense of coherence will not be affected by collaborative learning in their classrooms.

Discussion

The current study demonstrated collaborative learning to be a useful intervention technique in which all children work together to solve problems, enhance living conditions, and improve classroom conduct.

Although significant changes in children's sense of coherence were discovered between pretest and posttest in both inclusive and special schools, the results for special schools are still ambiguous. In special schools, children with disabilities may have less opportunities than in inclusive schools. Stressful situations are less likely to be perceived negatively by children with high sense of coherence. The sheer number of students in inclusive schools exposes children with disabilities to a variety of stressors. Coherence is correlated with emotional, social, and behavioural characteristics. People with low sense of coherence were more anxious than people who had high sense of coherence (Langius et al. 1992), and sense

of coherence was positively associated with academic competence (Harri, 19). (Adams et al.,2000). Compared to special schools, the effect of collaborative learning was better in inclusive schools due to better environmental conditions.

Segregation inhibits teamwork and deprives pupils of opportunity to learn from and with one other. When beginning collaborative teaching, teachers typically marvel at the insights given by their allegedly lesser students. According to the current study, kids gained more from social learning than individualised learning. Collaborative learning involves groups of students working on the same task at the same time.

The current study supports a socio-constructivist perspective that emphasises relationships with others over actions. Individual training yields greater post-test performance than shared environment because shared environment offers a different perspective and concentrates on the social plane where emergent ideas are assessed as a group output. The results of this study support regular schools with inclusive orientation as the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society, and achieving education for all. Students with impairments learn isolated from their peers. The kid is the major focus of segregated education, and as a result, these pupils often receive an entirely different curriculum and assessment methodologies than their peers. This disconnect in school typically manifests in other areas of life. Thus, restricted social exposure limits resources, opportunities, and action. In this study, inclusive education in school improves social relationships through sharing information and is beneficial to all students (even disabled children) since it exposes them to the real world, resulting in greater social skills and interactions.

Collaboration-based learning strategies have seemed to increase children with disabilities in inclusive schools' feeling of coherence when compared to children in special schools. However, the study only included a small number of participants, and it is possible that a longer treatment would have been more effective in special schools.

CONCLUSIONS

Children's sense of coherence (SOC) was shown to be significantly different between the pre- and post-test mean SOC scores of all impaired children. Cooperative learning is an efficient method for building coherence among impaired children, although it works best in inclusive schools rather than special schools. When pupils are able to collaborate with others, they are better equipped to deal with difficult problems and come up with creative solutions. Disabled students, on the other hand, rarely interact with one another at special schools. As a result, efforts to help students in special schools have had less success.

References

Adams, T.B., Bezner, R.J., Drabbs, M.E., Zambarano, R.J., & Steinhardt, M. A. (2000). Conceptualization and measurement of the spiritual and psychological dimensions of wellness in a college population. Journal of American College Health, 48, 165-173.

Antonovsky, A. (1979). Health, stress and coping: New perspectives on mental and physical well-being. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Antonovsky, A. (1985). The life cycle, mental health and sense of coherence, Israel. Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences, 22(4), 273-280.

Antonovsky, A. (1987). Unravelling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Antonovsky, A. (1990). Health, stress and coping. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Antonovsky, A. (1993). The structure and properties of the sense of coherence scale. Social Science and Medicine, 36, 725–733.

Antonovsky, A. (1994). The sense of coherence: An historical and future perspective. In H. I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson & J. E. Fromer (Eds.), Sense of coherence and resiliency (pp.3-20). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved March 3, 2012, from http://www.sajip.co.za/index.php/sajip/article/viewFile/154/150.

Antonovsky, A. (1995). The life cycle, mental health and sense of coherence. In A.K. Hutchinson (2005), Meaning in life and sense of coherence as predictors of coping among young adults. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Johannesburg. Retrieved November 16, 2012, from

https://ujdigispace.uj.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10210/1540/Thesis.pdf.

Antonovsky, A., & Sagi, S. (1986). The development of a sense of coherence, Israeli. Journal of Psychiatry Relation Science, 22 (4), 273-280.

Antonovsky, A., & Sourani, T. (1988). Family sense of coherence and family adaptation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 79-92.

Anastasi. A., & Urbina, S. (2005). Psychological testing. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Limited.

Flannery, R. B., & Flannery, G. J. (1990). Sense of coherence, life stress and psychological distress: A prospective methodological inquiry. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 46(4), 415-420.

Harry, M. (1998). The sense of coherence among nurse educators in Finland. Nurse Education Today, 18, 202-212.

Korotkov, D. (1998). The sense of coherence. Making sense of chaos. In P. T. P Wong & P. S. Fry (Eds.), The human quest for meaning: A handbook of Psychological research and

clinical applications (pp.51-70). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved July 6, 2011, from http://etd.uovs.ac.za/ETD-db/theses/available/etd-10172011-110958/unrestricted/JacobsM.pdf.

Langius, A., Bjoervell, H., & Antonovsky, A. (1992). The sense of coherence concept and its relation to personality traits in Swedish samples. Scandinavian Journal of Caring sciences, 6, 165-171.

Loreman, T., & Deppeler, J. M. (2001). Working towards full inclusion in education in access. The National Issues Journal for People with a Disability, 3(6), 5-8.

Raven, J.C., Court, J.H., & Raven, J. (1977). Coloured Progressive Matrices. London: HK Lewisd Co.

Saint-Laurent, L., & Lessard, J. C. (1991). Comparison of three educational programs for students with moderate mental retardation integrated in regular schools. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 26(4), 370-380.

Smith, B.L., & MacGregor, J.T. (1992). What is collaborative learning? In A. Tri, M. Goodsell, Maher, & V. Tinto (Eds.), Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education (pp. 9-22). University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Soller, A. (2001). Supporting social interaction in an intelligent collaborative learning system. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 12. Retrieved January 4, 2014, from http://coitweb.uncc.edu/tbarnes2/ itsfall04/papers/soller-paper.pdf

Strümpfer, D. J. W. (1995). The origins of health and strength: From salutogenesis to Fortigenesis. South African Journal of Psychology, 25 (2), 81-89.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO.

Webber. (1977). Behaviour management, Retrieved May 1, 2013, from http://tccl.rit.albany.edu/knilt/index.php?title=What_is_Behavior_Management%3F&action=edit