

**INTERACTIONS BETWEEN TEACHER, SCHOOL SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL
AND STUDENT WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES: REFLECTIONS ON
PRACTICE**

***INTERAÇÕES ENTRE PROFESSOR, PROFISSIONAL DE APOIO ESCOLAR E
ALUNO COM DEFICIÊNCIA INTELLECTUAL: REFLEXÕES SOBRE A PRÁTICA***

***INTERACCIONES ENTRE DOCENTES, PROFESIONAL DE APOYO ESCOLAR Y
ESTUDIANTE CON DISCAPACIDAD INTELLECTUAL: REFLEXIONES SOBRE LA
PRÁCTICA***



Mônica Menin MARTINS¹
e-mail: mmmartins@uniara.edu.br



Maria Lúcia Oliveira Suzigan DRAGONE²
e-mail: mldragone@uniara.com.br

How to reference this article:

MARTINS, M. M.; DRAGONE, M. L. O. S. Interactions between teacher, school support professional and student with intellectual disabilities: Reflections on practice. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023120, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riace.v18i00.17714>



| **Submitted:** 10/02/2023
| **Revisions required:** 14/04/2023
| **Approved:** 19/05/2023
| **Published:** 07/12/2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹University of Araraquara (UNIARA), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Master's Degree in Teaching, Management and Innovation Processes.

²University of Araraquara (UNIARA), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Lecturer in the Postgraduate Program in Teaching, Management and Innovation Processes. PhD in School Education (UNESP/FCLAr).

ABSTRACT: This article originated from research characterized as a case study, located in a municipal school system in the interior of the state of São Paulo, developed at the Master's level in the area of Education. We sought to understand the interactions between the teacher regent and the student's school support professional with intellectual disabilities, aiming to identify how both professionals describe their roles and how they relate to consolidate the learning of this student. The research was developed between 2020 and 2021, with data collected through questionnaires answered remotely. The results were analyzed qualitatively, containing relevant information of the teacher about his teaching practice and the school support professional about his/her performance, indicating difficulties and factors that helped direct more specific training on a co-participation of professionals for the benefit of the educational needs of students with intellectual disabilities.

KEYWORDS: Teacher. School support professional. Intellectual disabilities. Interactions.

RESUMO: Este artigo originou-se de uma pesquisa caracterizada como estudo de caso, locada em uma rede municipal de ensino do interior do estado de São Paulo, desenvolvida em nível de Mestrado na área da Educação. Buscou-se compreender as interações entre professor regente e profissional de apoio escolar do aluno com deficiência intelectual, objetivando identificar como ambos os profissionais descrevem seus papéis e como se relacionam para consolidar o aprendizado do aluno. A pesquisa foi desenvolvida entre 2020 e 2021, com dados coletados através de questionários respondidos remotamente. Os resultados foram analisados de forma qualitativa, contendo relevantes informações do professor sobre sua prática docente e do profissional de apoio escolar sobre sua atuação, indicando dificuldades e fatores que auxiliaram no direcionamento de formações mais específicas sobre uma coparticipação dos profissionais em benefício das necessidades educacionais de alunos com deficiência intelectual.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Professor. Profissional de apoio escolar. Deficiência intelectual. Interações.

RESUMEN: Este artículo tiene su origen desde una investigación caracterizada como estudio de caso, ubicada en una red de educación municipal del interior del estado de São Paulo, desarrollada a nivel de Maestría en el área de Educación. Buscamos comprender las interacciones entre el profesor regente y el profesional de apoyo escolar para estudiante con discapacidad intelectual, con el objetivo de identificar cómo ambos profesionales describen sus papeles y cómo se relacionan para consolidar el aprendizaje de este estudiante. La encuesta se realizó entre 2020 y 2021, con datos recopilados a través de cuestionarios contestados de forma remota. Los resultados fueron analizados cualitativamente, que contiene relevantes informaciones del docente sobre su práctica docente y del profesional de apoyo escolar sobre su desempeño, señalando dificultades y factores que ayudaron a orientar una formación más específica en una coparticipación de profesionales en beneficio de las necesidades educativas de alumnos con discapacidad intelectual.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Docente. Profesional de apoyo escolar. Discapacidad intelectual. Interacciones.

Introduction

It is known that the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes in Brazilian schools was evident from the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, of December 20, 1996 (BRASIL, 1996), which ensures equal conditions for access and retention of these students, who are also offered specialized educational assistance in the after-school hours, provided by specialist teachers. Furthermore, the law directs that teachers receive initial training to meet this new demand, however, it was only in 2006 that the curriculum for teaching degree courses in Pedagogy was reformulated to train for inclusion. Sebastián-Heredero and Anache (2020) indicate that the inclusive process is not limited to including students with disabilities in the school space, but collective involvement is necessary, guaranteeing the quality and permanence of these students in the classroom.

The teacher needs new knowledge to act in this new educational scenario and know, among other things, that students with intellectual disabilities have difficulties in learning in general, which can generate problems with self-esteem and emotional instability, requiring repetition, routine, detailed explanations, special attention to their anxiety and insecurity behaviors (FIERRO, 2004).

Perrenoud (2000) points out that, according to Vygotsky, the teacher must start from the student's level of real development, in which the processes already completed are found, passing through the zone of proximal development, which is where the challenges of learning should be located, so that the level of potential development is reached. Therefore, the school must mobilize efforts so that the student is exposed to meaningful learning situations, which will keep them involved and interested, allowing them to apply what they already know or what they have learned to reach new levels of development. Among the factors that contribute to learning, Cole *et al.* (2007) highlight that Vygotsky included the interactions that must occur between the child and the adult and between the children themselves, which corroborates the assertiveness of school inclusion.

The teaching skills, applicable to different school situations, recommended by Perrenoud (2000), involve knowing how to observe the student, construct personalized teaching situations, having mastery over the affective and relational aspects of learning, knowing that students have different rhythms and cultures, know teaching and learning theories and encourage the development of a sense of responsibility, solidarity and justice in their class, allowing students with disabilities to feel welcomed and respected.

The teacher must also know his students deeply, establishing intense communication with them and constant observation, providing situations in which those who always see themselves as failures can have situations of academic success (BLANCO, 2004).

When the teacher knows the theory and has space to exchange experiences, he or she obtains support to develop and provide “[...] materials and procedures that allow students to advance at their own pace; additional time for students who need it; increasing students' responsibility for their own learning [...]” (MARCHESI, 2004, p. 36, our translation), awakening the interest in mutual cooperation in the classroom, favoring the achievement of learning objectives.

The Education Guidelines and Bases Law (BRASIL, 1996) and Law no. 13,146 (BRASIL, 2015) establish that all students with disabilities have the right to enroll in a regular classroom, to professional support and to specialized educational assistance. However, what was found at the time of the research, based on the state government's digital enrollment system to which the municipality is subject, differs from what would be ideal: of the 116 students with intellectual disabilities enrolled in regular education, only 44 received educational specialized assistance - AEE.

In this context, in the municipality in question, there is a difficulty in interaction between the AEE teacher and the regular classroom teacher, since the former serves students from different school units during school hours, that is, when the regular teacher is at school, the AEE teacher is not working and vice versa. Therefore, the meeting between these professionals can only occur during collective pedagogical moments, which take place once a week, in the evening. On these occasions, the AEE teacher goes to the school where the student attended studies to talk to the teacher and provide guidance, but does not guide the support professionals, as they do not work in these collective moments. As the AEE teacher serves, on average, 20 students, until he is able to guide 20 teachers, a long time passes between one meeting and another, accumulating doubts, misunderstandings, difficulties and anxieties.

Therefore, this article did not address all professionals involved in the school education of individuals with intellectual disabilities in the local municipality of the research. Having found this large gap in relation to specialized care, it was decided to for looking back at the regular teacher and support professional who are assisting the student on a daily basis.

Based on the researcher's professional experience as a teacher and school manager over more than two decades, it was possible to observe that some teachers in the initial grades of Elementary School obtained little productive results in the literacy of students with intellectual

disabilities, which was configured as a of the initial questions that drove this research developed at Master's level (MARTINS, 2022). The objectives of this study were: to identify how the teacher describes his role in the learning of his student with intellectual disabilities, to investigate how the teacher understands and how he uses the functions of the school support professional, to find out how the school support professional understands and how he fulfills his role in the classroom, verify what types of interactions are described by teachers and support professionals with students with intellectual disabilities and find out what suggestions for improvement are offered by the teacher and school support professionals to develop this student's learning process.

Location, participants and research instruments

This research was developed in a municipality in the interior of the state of São Paulo, involving teachers and support professionals from the municipal public education network who worked in the initial grades of Elementary School and had students with intellectual disabilities enrolled in their classes. The initial project of this study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee via Plataforma Brasil (CAAE 36718620.2.0000.5383), meeting all official recommendations of the National Teaching and Research Council – CONEP, in June 2020, and developed until April 2021. According to André (2013), this research can be characterized as a case study due to its analysis of a social unit, considering its multiple dimensions and natural dynamics.

The data collection phase took place during the pandemic caused by the covid-19 virus, making personal contact with participants unfeasible: therefore, it was carried out remotely, from the initial invitation, which was passed on to all teachers and support professionals by school management, up to data collection via *Google Forms*.

At the time, the municipality had 295 teachers working in the initial grades of Elementary School. Everyone was invited to participate in the research, as long as they had experience with the presence of students with intellectual disabilities in the classroom. Therefore, only 12 teachers expressed that they had already worked with students with intellectual disabilities in the classroom and were interested in participating in the research. Regarding school support professionals, out of a total of 60 who worked at the time, only eight expressed interest and met the criteria for participation. The names of the participants were kept ethically confidential and were designated as teachers P1 to P12. In the municipality where the

research was carried out, the school support professional is called “monitor of students with special educational needs”, therefore, the letter M was used to identify them in the answers, with M1 to M8.

The research instrument was composed of two questionnaires via *Google Forms*, made available in Martins' Master's dissertation (2022) – one specific for teachers (ANNEX A) and another for school support professionals (ANNEX B) – to seek data that would elucidate the difficulties encountered, expectations, suggestions and views about their role in these students' learning processes. The questionnaire for the teacher was composed of 15 multiple-choice questions and an essay question, which referred to training and professional experience, the teacher's role in the teaching processes of intellectually disabled students, communication between the teacher and the student in issue and the relationships between the teacher, the student and the school support professional. The questionnaire prepared for school support professionals consisted of nine multiple-choice questions, also referring to training and professional experience, the relationship between the school support professional and the teacher, and between the school support professional and the student, and how the professional perceived communication between teacher and student with intellectual disabilities.

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaires brought a specific, isolated, but significant photograph within the universe of the public network of the municipality where the research took place (MARTINS; DRAGONE, 2021).

It was possible to identify the training of the participating teachers, their references to how they proceeded to boost the learning process of students with intellectual disabilities and how they reported the communication processes between teacher - student with disabilities and support professionals. With the data obtained, it was found that, of the 12 teachers, only six were able to count on guidance from specialized educational service teachers.

Training and professional experience of teachers

Among the participants, ten teachers had a degree and two only had a teaching degree; five had or were studying Specialization in the area of Special Education, funded by their own resources, seeking to improve their skills in working with children with specific difficulties. All teachers already had more than seven years of experience in teaching, having worked with inclusion students in their classrooms more than once, however, two of them responded that they did not receive guidance for working with students, nor from education professionals, nor

in the health sector. These data confront the position of Blanco (2004), who highlights that collaborative work between the various professionals who work with students with disabilities is an important factor that contributes to inclusion.

Teachers' role in the learning process of students with intellectual disabilities

All teachers responded that they did not rely on evaluative activities to check the development of students with intellectual disabilities, even though they were in the literacy phase. They adapted for them the daily activities that they prepared for the rest of the class and observed them, perhaps to check what the child already knew to carry out the adaptation based on what they knew and so that there was progress in learning, as proposed by Vygotsky, cited by Cole *et al.* (2007). It is noteworthy that all teachers, regardless of their training, indicated that they acted in the same way, focusing on the student's development based on what they considered he would be capable of achieving.

It is necessary to recognize that the questionnaire used in the research left a gap to be addressed in the next version, as there was no question of what criteria the participants relied on when adapting the activities, how they recorded the student's progress and what theories or experiences they based on when planning your job.

Communication between teachers and students with intellectual disabilities

Communication between teacher and student is essential to favor the process of interaction in the classroom and again the responses showed significant data related to teacher training. A teacher who did not have specialization, but who had students with disabilities enrolled in her classes, responded that she was unable to deal well with students with disabilities in general. One with a Pedagogy and Specialization course in the area of Special Education and another with Teaching, Pedagogy and Literature courses reported having difficulty communicating with these students, as they became emotionally involved. The other teachers responded that they were able to communicate well with these students and related with affection, which favors social interaction, since the educator is the one who facilitates and mediates the relationship between students, according to Mattos (2008).

When pointing out what can prevent good communication with students with intellectual disabilities, they mentioned the lack of information about the specific disability, the lack of guidance on how to adapt the content, the numerous classes and the amount of

curriculum content that must be worked with other students. From these answers, it can be deduced that, whatever the teachers' training, even with Specialization is not a guarantee of work with positive results, as personal, emotional and environmental factors also need to be considered.

To obtain better results in communication, the teachers were able to choose several alternatives that they considered to be important support. Only one teacher indicated that the work of the school support professional within the classroom is sufficient. Family support in activities sent home and the need for a pedagogical professional in the classroom were alternatives highlighted by eight teachers. The support of the specialized educational service teacher was indicated nine times, and all teachers indicated the alternative support of health professionals who serve the student outside of school, corroborating the view of Sebastián-Heredero (2010) about the necessary partnerships so that the segregation of students targeted by Special Education is eliminated.

When asked to classify what they consider necessary to improve their training to work with students with disabilities, the majority indicated that guidance from specialized professionals who individually assist the student at school or outside is necessary. The least important item for most was taking postgraduate courses.

Relationships between teacher and student, and teacher and school support professional

The responses highlighted worrying data due to the reported difficulties. It was observed that eight teachers requested that support professionals perform pedagogical functions, such as explaining the activity to the student without having previously had contact with the activity, going beyond the functions stipulated in their hiring: monitoring the organization and handling of teaching materials and care with hygiene. Reinforcing the same misconception, all the teachers considered that, even if they explained the activity to the student with intellectual disabilities, it was the support professional who developed it, giving details or directing the student in carrying it out. Although they knew that the support professional did not have pedagogical training, all the teachers responded that they were satisfied with the work they carried out.

When responding about what the ideal relationship between teacher and student with intellectual disabilities would be like in the personal view of these teachers, some responses showed that they considered empathy, respect and affection to be important: “the teacher needs

to establish a relationship of affection and must stimulate and encourage students so that they have confidence and feel capable (P2)”, “break with prejudices (P3)”, “activities that the student can carry out, adapting them so that they are successful in carrying them out (P8)”, “necessary help to achieve this objective, which comes from the Department of Education, the management and teaching team, AEE and health professionals and the student's own family. (P10)”, “understand the rhythm of each student, with or without disabilities, to be able to involve them in the learning process; you need to make them feel capable and active in this process (P11)”, “have support to be able to sit with the student, interact with them, explain. There could be a Pedagogy intern or assistant teacher to help with others while the teacher dedicates time to the disabled student (P12)”.

In general, we see that there is an effort by some teachers to seek specialization in the area of Special Education and that they are all aware that it is necessary to prepare different activities for students with intellectual disabilities, even though they point out obstacles in the didactic and pedagogical scope and lack basis for a better understanding of the specific aspects of disability.

It can be seen, therefore, that, due to their teachers' lack of knowledge, students are not placed in challenging situations that allow them to advance in development based on their already completed processes (COLE *et al.* 2007). The need to serve all students, each in their own specificity, is defended by Sebastián- Heredero (2010) when he states that teachers must recognize that each student needs to have their individuality and learning pace respected, offering adequate opportunities for them to everyone can learn. The same aspect is defended by Tardif and Lessard (2014, p. 257), when they state that, despite teaching groups of students, “it is the individuals who learn and not the collective”.

It is clear that the role of support professionals in the classroom with students with intellectual disabilities is relevant and needs to be investigated, as was done in this research.

Characterization of the support professional

In this research, it was possible to count on the participation of eight school support professionals, known as monitors at the educational institution, one of whom had held the position for three years; six had been in office for periods ranging from four to six years, and one had been in office for more than 15 years. Four only had the required education (High School), two had already completed a degree in Pedagogy, one was about to complete a degree in Literature and one had completed Technical Education in Nursing. Five of them stated that they had received training from the municipality's Department of Education to carry out their duties, but three did not receive any training.

Just as the teachers pointed out, school support professionals indicated that they would like to receive guidance from specialized professionals who serve students outside of school, or training from the Department of Education, with only M5 considering that there should be moments of exchange between peers to share experiences. When they had doubts, seven mentioned turning to the classroom teacher, and one to the school director.

Relationship between the support professional, the teacher and the student

Although the role held by this professional when hired was to assist with hygiene, food and transportation tasks, only M7 indicated that he exclusively performed this. Seven school support professionals responded that they explained the activities to the student, two of whom believed that the teacher considered them as pedagogical support.

Regarding the relationship between the professional and the student with intellectual disabilities, one of the school support professionals (M5) responded that the student considered him as his teacher, obeying only him, not the teacher. M4 reported that the student did not follow his orders, needing to hear them from the teacher. Except for this one, the other school support professionals stated that they developed a relationship of affection and respect with the student who was under their care.

One of the school support professionals (M2) considered that the figure of the teacher is not essential for explaining the activities, as he can fulfill this role. M5 brought important information when he responded that the teacher left the student under his responsibility in all situations, without addressing him individually. The others considered that the role of the teacher and his communication with students with intellectual disabilities are important and should not take his place in explaining activities and content.

It is observed, therefore, that support professionals are involved in students' learning, even though they are aware of their support functions in daily life activities. Most manage to establish a good relationship with both the student and the class teacher, reinforcing the importance of collaborative work (SEBASTIÁN-HEREDERO, 2010), and partnerships between professionals (MARCHESI, 2004).

Final remarks

Although the inclusion of students with disabilities has been on the agenda in Brazil for at least two decades, it is clear that there is a growing movement for students to enter regular education. In the municipality where the research took place, it is noted that there are some training activity initiatives, however, they are not enough. Apparently, there is no concern on the part of the systems or managers to invest in the training of teachers and school support professionals so that there is permanence, equity and quality in the education offered. Furthermore, it appears that there is a problem in guaranteeing the rights of students with disabilities, given the number of students without access to specialized educational services.

The results obtained in this case study, focusing on the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities, indicate that some teachers sought additional training through individual initiatives, bearing the costs of specialization courses, while others expect this training to be offered by those responsible for the municipal network. It was highlighted that several teachers have difficulty communicating with intellectually disabled students, consider the help of the support professional to be positive and would like to have more specific guidance from professionals specializing in disabilities to improve their educational actions with these students.

As for school support professionals, whose role is confused with that of a pedagogical assistant, they demonstrate that they are interested in contributing even more to the development of student learning, going beyond their functions of helping with physiological needs; to do so, they need to be more prepared, expanding their theoretical and practical knowledge of special educational processes.

Therefore, these data reinforce that, in the current scenario of public schools, inclusion is a process that involves more and more individuals who are able to have their access rights guaranteed, and teachers need to meet the new demands, even if they are not always prepared. Therefore, it is necessary to provide moments of reflection for teachers about their practice, as

happened in this research, when they were exposed to the questions formulated, since the results indicate specific needs so that they can set goals for training actions that contribute to the development of students. teachers, offering subsidies that guarantee more satisfactory learning results in the context of school inclusion.

REFERENCES

- ANDRÉ, M. O que é um estudo de caso qualitativo em educação? **Revista da FAEBA – Educação e Contemporaneidade**, Salvador, v. 22, n. 40, p. 95-103, jul./dez. 2013. Available at: <https://www.revistas.uneb.br/index.php/faeaba/article/view/7441>. Access: 05 Oct. 2021.
- BLANCO, R. A atenção à diversidade na sala de aula e as adaptações do currículo. *In*: COLL, C.; MARCHESI, A.; PALACIOS, J. (org.). **Desenvolvimento psicológico e educação**. Tradução: Fátima Murad. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed, 2004.
- BRASIL. **Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm. Access: 10 Nov, 2020.
- BRASIL. **Lei n. 13146 de 6 de julho de 2015**. Institui a Lei brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2015. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/113146.htm. Access: 07 Aug. 2020.
- COLE, M. *et al.* **A Formação Social da Mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores** – L. S. Vigotski. Tradução: José Cipolla Neto, Luís Silveira Menna Barreto e Solange Castro Afeche. 7. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.
- FIERRO, A. Os alunos com deficiência intelectual. *In*: COLL, C.; MARCHESI, A.; PALACIOS, J. (org.). **Desenvolvimento psicológico e educação**. Tradução: Fátima Murad. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed, 2004.
- MARCHESI, A. A prática das escolas inclusivas. *In*: COLL, C.; MARCHESI, A.; PALACIOS, J. (org.). **Desenvolvimento psicológico e educação**. Tradução: Fátima Murad. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed, 2004.
- MARTINS, M. M. **Aluno com deficiência intelectual em sala de aula: interações e reflexões de professores e monitores**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Processos de Ensino, Gestão e Inovação) – Universidade de Araraquara, Araraquara, SP, 2022.
- MARTINS, M. M.; DRAGONE, M. L. O. S. Reflexões de professores sobre a inclusão de alunos com deficiência intelectual. *In*: SEBASTIÁN-HEREDERO, E.; ESQUIVEL, J. L. B.; SILVA, M. E. M. (coord.). **Actas del XV Encuentro Iberoamericano de Educación: Tejiendo redes**. México: EIDE, 2021. Available at: https://www.cetys.mx/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Actas-del-EIDE2021_v1.pdf. Access: 02 Jan. 2023.

MATTOS, S. M. N. A afetividade com fator de inclusão escolar. **Revista Teias**, Rio de Janeiro, ano 9, n. 18, p. 50-59, jul./dez. 2008. Available at: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/revistateias/article/view/24043>. Access: 04 Oct. 2021.

PERRENOUD, P. **Dez novas competências para ensinar**. Tradução: Patrícia Chittoni Ramos. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed, 2000.

SEBÁSTIAN-HEREDERO, E. A escola inclusiva e estratégias para fazer frente a elas: as adaptações curriculares. **Acta Scientiarum. Educacion**, v. 32, n. 2, p. 193-208, 2010. Available at: <https://periodicos.uem.br/ojs/index.php/ActaSciEduc/article/view/9772/9772>. Access: 15 Aug. 2021.

SEBASTIÁN-HEREDERO, E.; ANACHE, A. A. A percepção docente sobre conceitos, políticas e práticas inclusivas Estudo de caso no Brasil. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 1, p. 1018-1037, maio 2020. Available at: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/13514/9017>. Access: 09 Aug. 2021.

TARDIF, M.; LESSARD, C. **O trabalho docente: elementos para uma teoria da docência como profissão de interações humanas**. Tradução: João Batista Kreuch. 9. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2014.

CRedit Author Statement

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Financing: FUNADESP Support – National Foundation for the Development of Private Higher Education for Teachers Dr. Maria Lúcia Oliveira Suzigan Dragone.

Conflicts of interest: Not applicable.

Ethical approval: Research Project submitted to the Ethics Committee through Plataforma Brasil, approved on October 7, 2020. CAEE 36718620.2.0000.5383.

Availability of data and material: Access to complete research data: <https://www.uniara.com.br/arquivos/file/ppg/processos-ensino-gestao-inovacao/producao-intelectual/dissertacoes/2022/monica-menin -martins.pdf>.

Author contributions: Prof. Ma. Mônica Menin Martins – author of the research and dissertation to obtain the title of Master, author of the article now submitted.

Professor Dr. Maria Lúcia Oliveira Suzigan Dragone – research advisor and co-author of this article submitted.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.

Review, formatting, standardization, and translation.



ANNEX A

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR TEACHERS - Teacher, we ask that the answers to the questions be based on your experiences in the classroom in previous or current years, having enrolled <u>students with intellectual disabilities</u>, with other disabilities associated or not (Down Syndrome, Autism, cerebral palsy, degenerative disease , etc.).	
Question	Response type
1 – What is your background? () Teaching () Pedagogy () other: _____	1 alternative
2 – Do you have training in the area of Special Education? () Yes () no	1 alternative
2.1– If you answered “yes” to the previous question, answer below: a) What type of training (improvement, specialization, <i>lato sensu</i> , etc.) _____ b) Institution _____ c) Conclusion year _____	Open
3 – How long have you been an Elementary School teacher in the initial grades? () 1 to 3 years () 3 to 5 years () 5 to 10 years () 10 to 15 years () 15 to 20 years () more than 20 years	1 alternative
4- How many times have you had students with disabilities in your classrooms? () only 1 time. () few times. () practically every year.	1 alternative
5 - What type of guidance or training did you have the last time you worked with a student with a disability? Several alternatives can be highlighted. () guidance from the school’s psychopedagogue. () guidance from the AEE teacher () training with the AME team. () guidance from professionals who worked with the student. () did not have any specific guidance.	Multiple alternatives
6– How did you monitor the literacy development of your students with intellectual disabilities? () through activities carried out by the student. () through observation during specific assessment activities. () through observation of everyday activities.	1 alternative
7– When there was a report indicating intellectual disability, how did you consider the student's literacy? () adapted activities, but without the objective of teaching literacy. () worked the same activities as the others, because if you have a report, there is no way to become literate. () worked with activities adapted to teach literacy.	1 alternative
8– Do you consider your communication with students with intellectual disabilities: () easy, can communicate well and relate with affection. () difficult, as he cannot deal well with students with disabilities. () easy, as they seem to be more childish and affectionate. () difficult, as they are withdrawn students and do not like interventions. () difficult, as it gets emotionally involved. () difficult, as they require more attention time and you have other students to deal with.	1 alternative
9- In general, what do you consider can prevent your communication with students with disabilities from being better/even better? () information about the disability. () information on how to adapt content .	1 alternative

<p><input type="checkbox"/> psychological support for me. <input type="checkbox"/> very large classes, leaving no time or opportunity to interact with the student. <input type="checkbox"/> excess content in the curriculum, running out of class time, preventing the student from paying more attention. <input type="checkbox"/> none of the alternatives. <input type="checkbox"/> all alternatives.</p>	
<p>10- What type of extra support, inside or outside the classroom, do you think would be ideal for a student with an intellectual disability? Several alternatives can be highlighted. <input type="checkbox"/> if you can afford it, you don't need support. <input type="checkbox"/> just the monitor inside the room is enough. <input type="checkbox"/> family support in pedagogical activities designed by the teacher and carried out at home. <input type="checkbox"/> professional who provides pedagogical support within the classroom. <input type="checkbox"/> specialist teacher in the opposite period (AEE). <input type="checkbox"/> health professional (psychologist, speech therapist, neurologist).</p>	
<p>11- What do you consider would be important for the teacher who has a student with a disability in his class? Number them in order of importance, starting with 1 - the least important. If there is an item that you do not consider important at all, put 0 (zero) <input type="checkbox"/> take more postgraduate courses. <input type="checkbox"/> have more training offered by the Department of Education. <input type="checkbox"/> receive guidance from professionals who assist the student at school. <input type="checkbox"/> receive guidance from the health professionals who care for the student. <input type="checkbox"/> receive specific training for the student's disability in question that year. <input type="checkbox"/> have collective moments with other teachers to exchange experiences.</p>	<p>Classification of all alternatives</p>
<p>12- What type of support did you request from the monitor? Several alternatives can be highlighted. <input type="checkbox"/> take care of the child's hygiene. <input type="checkbox"/> assist her in handling and organizing school materials. <input type="checkbox"/> ensure that the child remains attentive. <input type="checkbox"/> ask them to explain the activities to the child. <input type="checkbox"/> never requested any support. <input type="checkbox"/> others (specify) _____</p>	<p>Multiple alternatives</p>
<p>13 - During classes, when there was a monitor: <input type="checkbox"/> you addressed the student individually, for explanations, but then let the monitor direct the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> you explained to the class in general and let the monitor explain it to the student. <input type="checkbox"/> you explained it individually to the student and monitored the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> you always prepared adapted activities for the monitor to carry out with the student while you taught the content to the rest of the class. <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes you explained it individually to the student, other times you explained it in general and the monitor explained it in detail, depending on the complexity of the activity.</p>	<p>1 alternative</p>
<p>14- During classes, when the monitor was present: <input type="checkbox"/> you followed the development of the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> you let only the monitor observe the development of the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> you did not follow the development, but made interference after it was finished. <input type="checkbox"/> you monitored the development, interfering during the activity.</p>	<p>1 alternative</p>
<p>15 - How do you evaluate the work done by the monitor in your last experience? <input type="checkbox"/> fully met expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> did not meet expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> met expectations after his intervention on the way he should work with the student.</p>	<p>1 alternative</p>
<p>16- Describe what you consider to be an ideal relationship between a teacher and a student with a disability.</p>	<p>Open</p>

ANNEX B

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR MONITORS - Monitor, we ask that the questions are based on your experiences from previous years. We ask that <u>students with intellectual disabilities</u> or other associated or unassociated disabilities (Down Syndrome, Autism, cerebral palsy, degenerative disease, etc.) be considered .	
Question	Response type
<p>1 – What is your background?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> High school</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teaching</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pedagogy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Technical course in _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Higher education in _____</p>	1 alternative
<p>2 – How many years have you been in this role?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 3 years</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 5 years</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 10 years</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 15 years</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 15 to 20 years</p>	1 alternative
<p>3- What type of training did you have to perform your duties?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> training offered by the Department of Education.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> improvement or specialization course paid for with own resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I had no training.</p>	1 alternative
<p>4- What type of training do you think you should have to perform your duties?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> training offered by the Department of Education.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> guidance from professionals who work with the student outside of school (psychologist, speech therapist, for example)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> collective moments where monitors can share experiences.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> does not consider that there should be training.</p>	1 alternative
<p>5- Who do you turn to when you have any doubts about your conduct with the student?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> student's father/mother.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> teacher.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> pedagogical coordinator.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> school director.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I don't turn to anyone, I hope the situation resolves itself.</p>	1 alternative
<p>6- In your last experience with a student with intellectual disabilities, did you:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> worked only in personal hygiene, transportation and eating activities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> helped the teacher, explaining the activities to the student.</p>	1 alternative
<p>7 – How did you see the teacher's communication with you, in your last experience?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the teacher considered me as pedagogical support, expecting me to explain and help the student to do the activity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the teacher considered me to support the student's personal activities, not asking for my help in pedagogical activities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the teacher did not maintain good communication with me, rarely speaking to me.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the teacher maintained good communication with me, explaining the class routine so that I could help the student.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the teacher left the student under my responsibility in all situations, without addressing him individually.</p>	1 alternative
<p>8 – How did you see the communication between you and the student? More than one answer may be marked.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student and I developed an affectionate and respectful relationship.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student and I developed a respectful relationship, with a certain distance.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student considered me his teacher.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student had difficulty following my orders, always needing to hear the teacher give the order before carrying it out.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student only obeyed my orders, not those of the teacher.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the student did not accept me and did not want me to help him with pedagogical and personal activities.</p>	Multiple alternatives

<p>9 – How do you consider communication between teacher and student with disabilities when explaining activities and content ?</p> <p>() I don't consider it essential, as I can transmit as well as the teacher.</p> <p>() I do not consider it important, as students with disabilities learn very little and the teacher has more students to worry about.</p> <p>() I consider it important and I don't think it's my role to explain in the teacher's place.</p>	<p>1 alternative</p>
---	--------------------------