



Previewing and Pre-Teaching Strategies in a Classroom of Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENS): Towards Strategies for Building Background Information

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21021563

Christine Joy O. De Los Santos

Western Colleges, Inc., Naic, Cavite

Dr. Arsenio T. Manalo

Western Colleges, Inc., Naic, Cavite

Abstract:

Effective instructional strategies in special education ensure that learners with special educational needs receive instruction designed to meet their learning needs. This study aimed to examine how teachers implement previewing and pre-teaching strategies in a classroom of learners with special educational needs (LSEN), to build their background information. The respondents were 30 teachers of Manggahan Elementary School. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was utilized. Statistical tools used included frequency, percentage, weighted mean, T-test and Pearson Correlation Coefficient. Based on the results of the study, the respondents are predominantly experienced, female, mid-career educators with graduate-level training. The findings revealed that the teachers consistently structure and scaffold content but underutilize reinforcement and interdisciplinary collaboration. Teacher demographics significantly influence how previewing strategies are implemented in LSEN classrooms. Furthermore, teachers rely on visual support and IEPs but need stronger emphasis on explicit communication and vocabulary reinforcement. Their demographics significantly shape pre-teaching practices in LSEN classrooms. The study indicated that teachers' use of previewing strategies does not predict their use of pre-teaching strategies; the two are implemented independently. The findings highlight the need to strengthen LSEN teaching practices.

Keywords: previewing, pre-teaching, strategies, Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN), building, background information

Introduction:

Inclusive education has become a fundamental principle in contemporary educational systems, emphasizing that every learner, regardless of disability or learning difficulty, has the right to equitable access to quality education. Learners with special educational needs (LSENs) require specialized instruction that responds to their unique learning characteristics, abilities, and challenges. Unlike typical learners, LSENs often encounter barriers that limit their participation and achievement in classroom instruction. Consequently, teachers are expected to implement evidence-based instructional practices that remove these barriers while providing appropriate academic and social support. Effective special education instruction therefore extends beyond curriculum modification and involves creating learning environments that promote engagement, confidence, and meaningful participation. According to Fikes (2023), effective teaching strategies for learners with special educational needs should focus on their unique needs, learning styles, and abilities while fostering positive relationships among teachers, students, and families.

One instructional approach that has gained increasing attention in special education is the use of previewing and pre-teaching strategies. These strategies are designed to prepare learners before formal instruction by activating prior knowledge, introducing essential vocabulary, presenting lesson expectations, and developing prerequisite skills. Previewing allows learners to become familiar with the content, structure, and purpose of upcoming lessons through the use of pictures, titles, graphic organizers, and other visual supports. Anggraini et al. (2022) describe previewing as an activity in which teachers provide clues about the lesson to encourage learners to make predictions



before engaging with the actual learning material. Similarly, Kashyap and Dyquisto (2020) define previewing as a strategy that enables learners to recall prior knowledge and establish a purpose for learning, thereby facilitating greater comprehension. Farkhadovna (2025) further emphasizes that previewing enhances reading comprehension by activating prior knowledge, establishing reading goals, and familiarizing learners with the organization of a text.

Complementary to previewing is pre-teaching, an instructional strategy that introduces critical concepts, vocabulary, and foundational skills before the main lesson begins. This proactive intervention enables learners with special educational needs to participate more effectively in classroom instruction by reducing cognitive overload and building confidence. Shrouder (2022) explains that pre-teaching differentiates instruction by providing learners with the necessary language and conceptual foundations before new lessons are presented. Likewise, Freir (2026) describes pre-teaching as a targeted instructional practice that equips learners with prerequisite knowledge, allowing them to engage more successfully in grade-level instruction. Rather than remediating learning difficulties after they occur, pre-teaching proactively addresses potential challenges, thereby promoting equitable participation in inclusive classrooms.

The effectiveness of previewing and pre-teaching strategies has been supported by numerous studies. Research has demonstrated that graphic organizers, visual supports, multisensory instruction, scaffolding techniques, assistive technology, differentiated instruction, and vocabulary pre-teaching significantly improve learners' comprehension, engagement, academic performance, communication skills, and motivation (Urton et al., 2024; Dzieciot-Pędich & Dudzik, 2024; Fujita, 2024; Manuel, 2025; Hidayati & Amalia, 2025; Mofield et al., 2023; Blanc et al., 2025). These instructional approaches are particularly beneficial for learners with disabilities because they strengthen background knowledge, facilitate meaningful connections between prior and new learning, and reduce anxiety associated with unfamiliar academic tasks. Moreover, studies indicate that well-designed previewing and pre-teaching interventions enhance learners' self-efficacy, independence, and active participation during classroom instruction (Blanc et al., 2025; Sharif et al., 2024).

Despite the growing body of international literature supporting previewing and pre-teaching strategies, there remains limited empirical evidence regarding how these instructional approaches are implemented by teachers of learners with special educational needs within local educational settings. Most existing studies have focused on the effectiveness of individual interventions rather than examining teachers' actual classroom practices and perceptions regarding these strategies. Furthermore, there is a need to investigate how previewing and pre-teaching contribute to building background knowledge among learners with special educational needs, which serves as a critical foundation for comprehension, participation, and long-term academic success.

Anchored on Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and the theory of instructional scaffolding, this study seeks to determine the previewing and pre-teaching strategies employed by teachers in classrooms of learners with special educational needs and examine how these strategies contribute to building learners' background knowledge. Specifically, the study aims to assess teachers' implementation of previewing and pre-teaching strategies, determine whether differences exist based on selected demographic variables, examine the relationship between these instructional strategies, and identify their contribution to developing the background knowledge necessary for meaningful learning among learners with special educational needs.

Review of Related Literature

Previewing and pre-teaching have emerged as two of the most effective instructional strategies for supporting learners with special educational needs (LESENs) in accessing grade-level instruction. These approaches are grounded in the principle that learners comprehend new information more effectively when they possess adequate background knowledge, prerequisite skills, and familiarity with lesson content before formal instruction begins. Rather than waiting for learners to struggle with new concepts, previewing and pre-teaching proactively prepare students for learning by reducing cognitive demands and increasing confidence. Numerous studies have



demonstrated that these strategies significantly improve learners' academic performance, engagement, motivation, and participation in inclusive and special education classrooms.

Previewing is widely recognized as an instructional strategy that activates learners' prior knowledge while preparing them for upcoming lessons. Anggraini et al. (2022) describe previewing as an activity in which teachers present clues, such as pictures, titles, or key ideas, before reading to encourage learners to predict lesson content and express their prior understanding. Similarly, Kashyap and Dyquisto (2020) explain that previewing enables learners to establish a purpose for reading while recalling relevant background knowledge. This process encourages students to examine text features before reading, thereby increasing comprehension and promoting active engagement with instructional materials.

Recent literature further highlights the cognitive benefits of previewing. Farkhadovna (2025) concluded that previewing is an effective strategy for improving reading comprehension because it activates learners' prior knowledge, establishes reading purposes, and familiarizes students with the structure and organization of a text. Likewise, Givens (2022) emphasized that previewing functions as a roadmap for learning by allowing students to evaluate the complexity of reading materials, assess their existing knowledge, and generate predictions before instruction begins. Such preparation enhances learners' readiness and reduces anxiety associated with unfamiliar content.

Providing preview materials before classroom instruction has likewise gained considerable attention among educators. Songrong (2014), Wang (2008), and Oi et al. (2015), as cited by Li (2021), reported that preview materials strengthen learners' retention of instructional content while stimulating interest and concentration during subsequent classroom discussions. Bailey (2015), as cited by Melani et al. (2024), similarly argued that previewing techniques, including the use of titles, pictures, diagrams, and visual representations, improve reading comprehension while expanding learners' vocabulary. These findings suggest that previewing serves not only as a preparation strategy but also as an effective means of increasing learners' motivation and cognitive engagement before formal instruction.

Visual supports represent one of the most widely researched forms of previewing for learners with disabilities. Urton et al. (2024), through a meta-analysis, found that graphic organizers significantly improve the academic performance of students with learning disabilities and other exceptionalities across multiple subject areas. Graphic organizers facilitate conceptual understanding by helping learners organize information and establish meaningful connections between new concepts and existing knowledge. Similarly, Qasserras (2024) reported that visual aids enhance student engagement, comprehension, and critical thinking while promoting more inclusive instructional practices. Tatel II (2025) further demonstrated that visual supports, including communication boards, schedules, and social stories, significantly improve communication, classroom participation, and behavioral regulation among learners with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

Research also supports the use of multisensory and differentiated previewing strategies for learners with special educational needs. Fujita (2024) concluded that multisensory instructional approaches substantially improve phonemic awareness, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension, particularly among learners with dyslexia.

Likewise, Hidayati and Amalia (2025) emphasized that differentiated previewing strategies accommodate diverse learner needs through multimodal instruction, thereby enhancing vocabulary development and language acquisition among children with disabilities. Melon-Galvez (2025) further argued that multimodal teaching allows learners to receive information through their strongest perceptual channels, increasing instructional effectiveness and promoting meaningful learning experiences.

Beyond previewing, pre-teaching has become an equally important strategy in special education because it equips learners with the prerequisite knowledge necessary for successful classroom participation. Shrouder (2022) defines pre-teaching as an instructional strategy that introduces concepts and skills before formal instruction to prepare



struggling learners for new learning experiences. Rather than functioning as remediation after instruction, pre-teaching proactively addresses potential learning barriers before they occur. Freir (2026) similarly described pre-teaching as an adaptive instructional approach that supports equitable learning by introducing foundational vocabulary, concepts, and prerequisite skills before the main lesson. The National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics (NCETM), as cited by Freir (2026), emphasized that pre-teaching should focus only on the prerequisite knowledge necessary for learners to access upcoming lessons rather than teaching the entire lesson in advance.

Several studies have documented the educational benefits of pre-teaching. Blanc et al. (2025) found that pre-teaching enhances self-regulated learning by strengthening learners' cognitive preparation and motivational readiness before classroom instruction. Their findings indicate that students who participate in pre-teaching sessions demonstrate higher engagement, stronger self-efficacy, greater independence, and improved academic achievement. Likewise, the Specially Designed Instruction Guide (2026) identified pre-teaching as one of the most effective instructional supports for students with disabilities because it builds background knowledge, activates prior learning, develops prerequisite skills, and increases learner confidence. Recommended strategies include introducing key vocabulary, simplifying complex concepts, providing opportunities for guided practice, and using graphic organizers to establish lesson structure.

Vocabulary instruction constitutes another important component of pre-teaching. Mutaliani et al. (2023) found that vocabulary pre-teaching is more effective than brainstorming in improving reading comprehension among learners. However, Bruzzan (2020) cautioned that while vocabulary pre-teaching consistently benefits reading comprehension, evidence regarding its effectiveness in listening comprehension remains mixed. Despite these differences, vocabulary instruction remains a critical strategy because unfamiliar terminology often serves as a major barrier to comprehension among learners with special educational needs.

Scaffolding strategies closely complement previewing and pre-teaching by providing temporary instructional support that gradually decreases as learners develop independence. Manuel (2025) identified guided practice, questioning strategies, visual aids, prompting, and cueing as the most commonly used scaffolding techniques for improving the academic performance of learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Similarly, Sharif et al. (2024) explained that scaffolding allows teachers to provide individualized support within learners' Zone of Proximal Development, enabling students to accomplish increasingly complex learning tasks while gradually developing independent problem-solving skills. These findings strongly support the use of previewing and pre-teaching as forms of instructional scaffolding that prepare learners for meaningful classroom participation.

Advances in educational technology have also strengthened previewing and pre-teaching practices. Mofield et al. (2023) concluded that assistive technologies, including text-to-speech software, adaptive learning applications, and augmentative and alternative communication devices, significantly improve learning experiences and academic outcomes among children with disabilities. These technologies provide learners with multiple opportunities to preview content independently while addressing diverse communication and learning needs. Furthermore, individualized education plans (IEPs) remain essential in ensuring that previewing and pre-teaching strategies are tailored to each learner's strengths, challenges, and educational goals.

The reviewed literature consistently demonstrates that previewing and pre-teaching are evidence-based instructional practices that enhance learners' background knowledge, comprehension, motivation, and academic achievement. These strategies reduce learning barriers by activating prior knowledge, introducing prerequisite concepts, employing visual and multisensory supports, strengthening vocabulary, and providing scaffolded instruction before formal learning occurs.

Although numerous international studies have established the effectiveness of these instructional approaches, relatively few investigations have examined how teachers of learners with special educational needs implement previewing and pre-teaching strategies in actual classroom settings. This gap in the literature highlights the need for



further research examining teachers' practices and perceptions regarding these instructional strategies and their contribution to building background knowledge among learners with special educational needs.

Methodology:

The researcher used correlational-descriptive research design. Descriptive design is suitable wherever the subjects vary among themselves and one is interested to know the extent to which different conditions and situations are obtained among these subjects. The word survey signifies the gathering of data regarding the present conditions. A survey is useful in: (1) providing the value of facts; and (2) focusing attention on the most important things to be reported.

Specifically, first, it utilized descriptive-correlational design because of its appropriateness to the study. It was used to determine whether a degree of relationship exists between two or more variables. In descriptive design, study focused on the present condition. On the other hand, descriptive-correlation is designed to determine the relationship between two variables, whether the relationship is perfect, very high, high, marked or moderate, slight or negligible (Calmorin & Calmorin, 2013). It is descriptive because it described the profile of the teacher-respondents and their assessment on previewing and pre-teaching strategies in a classroom of learners with special educational needs (LSEN). In this study, it was utilized to determine any significant relationship between/among previewing and pre-teaching strategies of LSENs teachers in a classroom of learners with special educational needs (LSENs).

Then next is descriptive, which may help determine how much variation is caused by one variable in relation with the variation caused by another variable.

Descriptive status is a problem solving which seeks to answer questions to real facts relating to existing conditions. This is a technique of quantitative description which determines the prevailing conditions in a group of cases chosen for the study. In this study, it was utilized to determine any significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on previewing and pre-teaching strategies in a classroom of learners with special educational needs (LSEN), when grouped accordingly.

The method of gathering data is a survey questionnaire which is a product of a thorough reading of related literature and studies. After the construction, the questionnaire was validated by the experts and she asked the help of her former professors in the graduate school in the revision of the survey. Moreover, the last step in the validation was proposal defense where the comments and suggestions of the panel were included in the revision.

The respondents of the study were teachers of Manggahan Elementary School. The locale was chosen because the researcher observed the need to improve the strategy to build background knowledge of learners with special educational needs.

The instrument is developed using a 4-point scale (Salkind, 2012). The gathered data were subjected to statistical treatment which as follows: Frequency Count – This was used by the researcher in the analysis of the data profile of the respondents from the subject foreign school; Weighted Mean – This was used by the researcher in determining the degree of the responses of the respondents from the subject foreign school; and T-test – This tool was used by the researcher to explore the significant differences of the different survey questions and each of the questions related to variables. Lastly, Pearson Correlation Coefficient, for a test of significant relationship.

Results and discussion:

The discussion is organized according to the sequence of research questions, covering the profile of respondents, level of implementation of instructional strategies, differences when grouped according to demographic variables, and the relationship between the two strategies.



1 Profile of the Teacher-Respondents

Table 1. Profile of LSEN Teacher-Respondents

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	35–39	11	37%
	40–44	19	63%
Sex	Male	10	33%
	Female	20	67%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s Degree	12	40%
	With MA/MS/MST Units	18	60%
Length of Service	10–14 years	16	53%
	15–19 years	14	47%

The results indicate that the LSEN teacher-respondents are predominantly mid-career professionals with substantial teaching experience. All respondents fall within the 35–44 age bracket, suggesting a mature workforce with no novice teachers included in the sample.

In terms of sex distribution, the majority are female (67%), which is consistent with global and national trends showing that teaching, particularly in special education, remains a female-dominated profession.

Regarding educational attainment, 60% of respondents have pursued graduate-level units, reflecting a strong culture of continuous professional development. This may be attributed to promotion requirements and the increasing demand for specialized competencies in inclusive education.

Finally, all respondents have at least 10 years of teaching experience, with nearly half reaching up to 19 years of service. This indicates that LSEN instruction is handled by highly experienced educators with deep exposure to inclusive classroom challenges.

Hence, the profile suggests a stable and experienced teaching workforce, which is critical in managing the complexity of LSEN classrooms. However, the absence of younger teachers may indicate potential sustainability and succession concerns in the field of special education.

Level of Implementation of Previewing Strategies

The level of implementation of previewing strategies in classrooms handling Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) is notably high, as reflected in the composite mean of 3.53, which is qualitatively interpreted as “Highly Previewed,” with a relatively low standard deviation of 0.48. This result indicates that the respondents demonstrate a generally consistent and strong application of previewing strategies across different classroom contexts. The closeness of the responses suggests that there is minimal variation among teachers in terms of how they integrate previewing practices into their instructional routines, pointing to a shared pedagogical understanding of its importance in LSEN instruction. Previewing strategies, as reflected in the data, are widely recognized as essential preparatory mechanisms that enable learners with diverse cognitive and developmental needs to access upcoming lessons with greater clarity and reduced cognitive load.

A closer examination of the data reveals that the most frequently employed strategies are those that emphasize structure, clarity, and cognitive accessibility. Teachers reported the highest mean score for providing clear lesson outlines with headings and subheadings, which obtained a mean of 3.80. This suggests that teachers place strong emphasis on organizing instructional content in a way that allows learners to anticipate the flow of lessons and better understand the progression of ideas. Closely following this is the practice of relating new concepts to prior knowledge, which obtained a mean of 3.77.



This indicates that teachers consistently attempt to anchor new learning experiences to familiar cognitive frameworks, thereby enhancing comprehension and retention among LSEN learners. Similarly, the pre-teaching of vocabulary, also with a mean of 3.77, reflects the teachers' awareness of the importance of linguistic preparedness in facilitating understanding, especially for learners who may struggle with abstract or unfamiliar terminology. The use of simplified and clear language, with a mean of 3.73, further reinforces this trend toward accessibility, as teachers consciously adjust their communication style to match the cognitive and linguistic capacities of their learners. Additionally, the use of visual schedules and timelines, which obtained a mean of 3.67, highlights the importance placed on visual structuring as a tool for promoting predictability, reducing anxiety, and supporting executive functioning among LSEN students.

Collectively, these highly rated strategies demonstrate a strong orientation toward structured instruction and cognitive scaffolding. They reflect an instructional approach grounded in Universal Design for Learning principles, where multiple representations of information are used to ensure that learners with varying abilities can access content meaningfully. The emphasis on clarity, repetition, and visual organization suggests that teachers are highly responsive to the learning needs of LSEN students, particularly in terms of reducing complexity and enhancing predictability in the learning environment. These practices also indicate that teachers are actively engaged in creating instructional environments that minimize confusion and maximize comprehension through careful lesson planning and anticipatory guidance.

However, despite the strong implementation of these core previewing strategies, the data also reveal that certain practices are comparatively less emphasized. Collaboration with support staff, which obtained a mean of 3.30, appears to be less frequently practiced, suggesting that interdisciplinary cooperation is not as deeply embedded in daily instructional routines as individual classroom strategies. Similarly, consulting Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), with a mean of 3.37, indicates moderate but not fully consistent integration of individualized planning documents into lesson preparation. While IEPs are critical in tailoring instruction to specific learner needs, the data suggest that their use may not be fully maximized during the previewing stage of instruction. The provision of varied response formats, also with a mean of 3.37, reflects a moderate level of differentiation in how students are allowed to demonstrate understanding, but it is not among the most dominant practices. Additionally, celebrating small successes, which obtained a mean of 3.30, appears to be relatively less emphasized, even though such reinforcement strategies are known to play an important role in motivation and positive behavioral reinforcement among LSEN learners.

The interpretation of these findings suggests that while teachers are highly competent in implementing cognitive and visual scaffolding strategies, their practices are less consistent when it comes to collaborative, individualized, and affective dimensions of previewing instruction. This implies that previewing strategies in LSEN classrooms are largely teacher-centered and instructional in nature, focusing primarily on how content is structured and delivered within the classroom setting.

The emphasis is placed on clarity of instruction and accessibility of materials rather than on the broader system of support involving collaboration with specialists or the intensive use of individualized education frameworks. As a result, previewing practices tend to function more as isolated classroom-based strategies rather than as part of a fully integrated, multidisciplinary approach to inclusive education.

In synthesis, the findings clearly demonstrate that previewing strategies are strongly and effectively implemented in LSEN classrooms, particularly in terms of instructional structuring, cognitive preparation, and visual scaffolding. Teachers show a high level of competence in organizing lessons in a way that supports comprehension and engagement among learners with diverse needs. However, these strengths are accompanied by noticeable limitations in the areas of collaboration, individualized planning, and affective reinforcement.

The implementation of previewing strategies, while highly developed at the instructional level, remains partially constrained by limited integration with broader support systems and individualized instructional planning tools. This



indicates that while teachers are effective in preparing learners cognitively for upcoming lessons, there is still room for improvement in strengthening the collaborative and individualized dimensions of previewing practices to achieve a more holistic and fully inclusive instructional approach.

Relationship Between Previewing and Pre-Teaching Strategies

The relationship between previewing and pre-teaching strategies among teachers handling Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) was examined using Pearson correlation analysis, with the results presented in Table 6. The computed correlation coefficient ($r = 0.040$) indicates an extremely weak and almost negligible positive relationship between the two instructional variables.

This value is very close to zero, suggesting that there is virtually no linear association between teachers' use of previewing strategies and their use of pre-teaching strategies. Furthermore, the associated p-value of 0.2733 is significantly higher than the standard level of significance set at 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted, confirming that there is no statistically significant relationship between previewing and pre-teaching strategies among the LSEN teacher-respondents. This statistical outcome provides important insight into how these two pedagogical approaches are implemented in actual classroom practice, particularly within inclusive education settings where instructional scaffolding is expected to be highly coordinated.

The findings suggest that the extent to which teachers apply previewing strategies does not predict or influence their use of pre-teaching strategies, and vice versa. In other words, a teacher who demonstrates strong implementation of previewing techniques—such as the use of visual aids, structured outlines, and schema activation—does not necessarily exhibit an equally strong application of pre-teaching strategies, such as vocabulary introduction, behavioral preparation, and explicit instructional rehearsal. Although both strategies are conceptually designed to support learners with diverse needs by preparing them for upcoming lessons, the results indicate that they are not operationally linked in the actual teaching practices of LSEN educators. Instead, they appear to be treated as separate and independent instructional tools that are applied selectively depending on the situation, lesson content, or immediate classroom demands.

This lack of significant relationship may be understood in the context of how these two strategies function differently within the teaching-learning process. Previewing strategies are primarily concerned with cognitive organization and structural clarity. They are typically used to help learners anticipate the flow of instruction, understand the structure of content, and activate prior knowledge that will facilitate comprehension. These strategies often involve visual scaffolds, such as charts, diagrams, lesson outlines, and timelines, which are designed to reduce cognitive overload and support information processing.

On the other hand, pre-teaching strategies are more focused on content readiness and behavioral preparation. They involve introducing key vocabulary, explaining difficult concepts in advance, establishing routines, and preparing learners emotionally and behaviorally for upcoming tasks. While previewing operates at a structural and cognitive level, pre-teaching functions more at a linguistic, conceptual, and behavioral level. Because these domains address different dimensions of learning readiness, teachers may naturally implement them separately rather than in an integrated manner.

The separation observed in the findings suggests that teachers may be applying instructional strategies based on immediate classroom needs rather than following a unified or systematically integrated framework for lesson preparation. For instance, in lessons where cognitive overload is anticipated, teachers may prioritize previewing strategies such as visual aids and structured outlines. Conversely, in situations where students struggle with vocabulary or behavioral transitions, teachers may focus more on pre-teaching strategies. This situational application leads to the independent use of each strategy rather than their simultaneous or coordinated implementation. As a result, even though both strategies serve the overarching goal of supporting LSEN learners, they are not consistently used as interconnected components of a single instructional system.



From an interpretative standpoint, the absence of a significant relationship highlights a potential gap in instructional integration within LSEN classrooms. It suggests that while teachers are familiar with both previewing and pre-teaching strategies, these are not necessarily conceptualized as complementary or mutually reinforcing approaches. Instead, they may exist as separate sets of practices within the teacher's instructional repertoire. This fragmentation may be influenced by several factors, including limited professional development that emphasizes isolated rather than integrated strategy use, heavy teaching workloads that restrict comprehensive lesson planning, and the absence of structured frameworks that explicitly guide teachers in combining multiple scaffolding techniques in a cohesive manner.

In addition, the findings may also reflect the practical realities of inclusive classrooms, where teachers often need to make rapid instructional decisions based on time constraints, learner behavior, and available resources. Under such conditions, it may be more feasible for teachers to implement either previewing or pre-teaching strategies independently rather than deliberately integrating both within a single lesson sequence. This pragmatic approach, while effective in addressing immediate classroom needs, may inadvertently contribute to the observed lack of statistical relationship between the two strategies.

Thus, the results clearly indicate that previewing and pre-teaching strategies function as independent instructional approaches rather than interconnected pedagogical systems among LSEN teachers. The absence of a significant relationship suggests instructional fragmentation, where each strategy is utilized on its own rather than as part of a holistic framework for lesson preparation and learner support. While both strategies are valuable and widely recognized as essential components of inclusive education, their independent use highlights the need for more structured training and professional development programs that emphasize the integration of multiple scaffolding techniques. Strengthening the conceptual and practical linkage between previewing and pre-teaching strategies may enhance instructional coherence and ultimately improve learning outcomes for learners with special educational needs.

Conclusions:

- A. The LSEN teacher pool is predominantly experienced, female, mid-career educators with graduate-level training.
- B. Teachers consistently structure and scaffold content but underutilize reinforcement and interdisciplinary collaboration.
- C. Teacher demographics significantly influence how previewing strategies are implemented in LSEN classrooms.
- D. Teachers rely on visual support and IEPs but need stronger emphasis on explicit communication and vocabulary reinforcement.
- E. Teacher demographics significantly shape pre-teaching practices in LSEN classrooms.
- F. Teachers' use of previewing strategies does not predict their use of pre-teaching strategies; the two are implemented independently.

References:

- Anggraini, W. P., Usman, S., & Arid, M. (2022). A study of previewing and predicting strategy in teaching reading comprehension at SMP Negeri 14 Sigi. *E-Journal of ELTS (English Language Teaching Society)*, 10(1), 66–75.
- Blanc, B., Aydan, S., & Mamas, C. (2025). Pre-teaching to enhance inclusive learning: Connecting cognition, motivation, volition, and emotion. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1636343. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1636343>
- Dzięcioł-Pędich, A., & Dudzik, A. (2024). Developing reading skills for learners with special educational needs. In *36th Annual APPI Conference: The Book of Proceedings*.



Farkhadovna, A. (2025). Unlocking comprehension: Previewing strategy for effective reading. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*.

Fikes, M. (2023). Teaching strategies for special education. <https://blog.ecapteach.com/teaching-strategies-for-special-education>

Freir, L. (2026). Using pre-teaching to improve accessibility for all learners. *England Curriculum*.

Fujita, R. (2024). The effectiveness of multisensory approaches in teaching reading to children with dyslexia. *International Journal of Literacy and Education*, 4(2), 22–25.

Givens, S. (2022). Why preview? Kirkwood Community Knowledge. <https://kirkwood.pressbooks.pub/readingskills/chapter/previewing/>

Hidayati, D. A., & Amalia, T. Z. (2025). Enhancing English vocabulary learning for children with special needs using a differentiated method. *Mitra Ash-Shibyan: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 8(01), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.46963/mash.v8i01.2495>

Manuel, M. (2025). Utilization of scaffolding strategies in enhancing academic success for students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(6). <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000113>

Melani, N., et al. (2024). Previewing predicting strategy and reading motivation. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*, 3(1), 188–194.

Melon-Galvez, S. (2025). Multimodal learning preference in inclusive instruction. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 13(1), 63–71.

Mofield, T. A., Prasetyo, R. A., & Tsujimoto, S. B. (2023). Assistive technology in inclusive education. *Journal of Education*, 6(4), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5252>

Mutaliani, S. M., Omulando, C., & Barasa, P. L. (2023). Effect of pre-reading activities on comprehension. *Journal of Advanced Education and Philosophy*, 7(10), 412–421.

Qasserras, L. (2024). The role of visual learning aids in inclusive education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*.

Sharif, F., Johari Fard, R., & Bornha, M. R. (2024). Scaffolding and learning disabilities. *Cognition, Behavior, Learning*, 1(2), 182–191.

Shrouder, O. (2022). What is pre-teaching. *Bedrock Learning*.

Tatel II, H. (2025). Visual supports in autism education. *Psychological Education*, 46(8), 1057–1083. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.460806>

Urton, K., et al. (2024). Effects of graphic organizers on students with disabilities. *University of Münster, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences*.