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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the efficiency of the teachers in Special Education Integrated Programs (SEIP) for students with learning disabilities in management and teaching special classes and identify factors associated with the level of teacher competency in SEIP. It use the Skill Acquisition Model that focuses on the five competence levels are novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient and expert. The study was done using an interaction survey methodology based on the survey, observation, documentation and interview (SODI). The Cranach Alpha value for all standardized instruments of overall observed items is 0.9455. A total of 85 teachers from special schools chosen randomly. In terms of management, 61% of teachers in SEIP are at efficient level. However, in terms of teaching about 65.4% of teachers SEIP efficient level. Overall, there is no teacher who is at the novice level and only 1.2% of teachers who are at the level of experts in management and teaching. Teacher background component consists of 10 predictor variables of gender, marital status, teaching experience, task specialization, level, number of years teaching, academic qualifications, the teachers, and school location. Teaching experience (β=0.220) and teaching hours (β=0.220) to contribute directly and significantly to the level of teacher competency in teaching SEIP. Meanwhile, the task of coordinator (β=0.1700 0 and school locations (β=−0.304) contributed directly and significantly to the level of efficiency in the management of SEIP teacher. There are two variables that are not significant but meaningful and contribute directly to the level of competency of teachers in the teaching SEIP (pedagogical content knowledge) β=0.2021 and personality (teacher expectations β=0.123). This has direct positive implications on the level of teaching competency SEIP. The findings shows that the factors such as experience, location of school, teachers professional and pedagogical knowledge and environmental factors for students to contribute the largest test in directly on the level of management efficiency and teaching in SEIP. Specific strategy have to be considered in order to increase the level of teachers competency as strategic planning and action research, teacher workload, physical and location of the school.
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INTRODUCTION

Special Education Programs in Malaysia is intended to make a child with special needs as talent, ability, faith, self-reliant, able to manage life and realize their potential as individuals and community members of a balanced and productive. To achieve its goals, especially the goal of special education are some basic things that should be prioritized as very important class appropriate physical, educational equipment and special education teachers trained enough with the student. Apart from possessing noble qualities such as sympathy, empathy and dedication, special education teachers also need creative and critical ideas to teach special students to achieve the vision and mission of Special Education. To become qualified teachers, teachers should endeavor has special criteria; teachers have to face many problems and become more mature and able to deal with various problems in the future (Mohammed Sani ET al.2006). Special education teachers should also provide opportunities for individuals with special needs interact and develop positive attitudes in the community and to ensure that they receive job opportunities and quality of life assurance (Norani et al., 2001).

Thus, strategic planning could help speed up and improve the effectiveness of special education achievement embodied in the vision of education. Planning, involvement and commitment of all members in the design, planning and implementation of the program of the school or educational institution is very important. Thus, as in the SWOT analysis or strength elements should be viewed in detail as strength elements describe the ability to achieve its goals. As described above, based on the SWOT analysis, teachers are elements that can be seen in the form of strength or otherwise. Thus, the strength of the teacher should be seen in terms of efficiency and management of their teaching in the classroom. To see more clearly and accurately on the efficiency of teachers of Special Education Programs Integration Problems (SEIP), then the efficiency of the teacher in teaching and management should be evaluated according to specific levels. Development of teachers is as a process towards the formation of teachers to achieve the level of expertise and excellence. The development stages are novice level, began to edge, efficient, proficient and expert (Berliner .1995).

BACKGROUND OF RELATED WORK-
OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To reviewing the efficiency SEIP teachers in classroom management and teaching.

2. To clarify whether background factors SEIP teachers as gender, marital status, teaching experience in learning difficulties class, function, specialty, teaching hours per week, highest academic qualification, the number of teachers and school locations that influence the efficiency of teachers in the management and teaching SEIP classes.
3. To clarify whether domain factors such as the role of teacher professional knowledge (Pedagogical content knowledge), competencies (management style) and personality (Teacher expectations) affect the level of teacher’s efficiency in management and teaching SEIP.

4. To clarify whether environmental factors such as background, the needs of students, Classroom climate, school goals and affect test efficiency of teachers in classroom Management and teaching SEIP.

5. To determine the amount of variables such as teachers background factors, domain of Professional roles of teachers and environmental factors contribute directly or indirectly to the level of efficiency in the management of teachers and teaching SEIP class.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Stems from a number of problems that arise in connection with the rationale, importance and purpose of the study, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What percentage of teachers in SEIP achieve novice level, was developed, competent, Proficient and expert in management and teaching in class SEIP?

2. What extent SEIP teachers background factors such as gender, marital status, teaching Experience in SEIP class, function, specialty, teaching hours per week, highest Academic qualification, the number of teachers and school location affects the efficiency SEIP teachers in classroom management and teaching?

3. What extent the variable domain of the professional role of teachers as pedagogical content knowledge, skilled in management style and attitude in teachers' expectations influence the level of efficiency teachers in classroom management and teaching SEIP?

4. What extent do environmental factors such as background, the needs of students, classroom climate, school goals and affect the efficiency of teachers in classroom management and teaching SEIP?

5. Does variable background of teachers, professional role domain and environmental Factors contribute directly or indirectly to the level of efficiency in the management of Teachers and teaching in SEIP classes?
SCOPE OF RESEARCH-CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK STUDY

Conceptual framework built specifically for this study was to describe the role of teacher background factors, factors in teachers' professional and organizational factors in students environment with to the level of efficiency and management of teachers of special education integrated Program (SEIP). Conceptual framework describes the influence of the level of efficiency of the planning and management of effective teaching of teachers in SEIP. Research framework in Figure 1 is the result of a combination of three sources, namely Model of Professional Teachers Role by Mohammed Sani (2001), Model of Skills Acquisition by Kraut (1994) and Model of Teachers Dynamic in Career Cycle by Fessier and Christensen (1992). All three models have been merged to become the conceptual framework of a special nature and can enhance the relationship between these factors directly involved in influencing the efficiency and management of relationships with teachers in SEIP and planning effective teaching for producing quality teaching and learning outcome among SEIP teachers.

Figure 1: Conceptual Frame Work of Management and Teaching Competency Level of Teachers in Special Education Integrated Program (SEIP)

Source: Fessier & Christensen (1992), Eraunt (1994) and Mohammed Sani(2001)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine the management and teaching competence level in SEIP for students with Learning Disabilities. Skill Acquisition Model focuses on the five competence levels which novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient and expert. This study used an interaction, survey based on the survey, observation, document and interview (SODI) model. The instrument used were made up of two parts: the first part included the teacher’s background, role of professional teacher and the environment factors, while the second part include evaluation instrument used to gauge the SEIP teacher’s management and teaching competency. The Cronbach Alpha value for all standardized instrument of overall observed items is 0.9455. A total of 85 SEIP teachers were selected at random. All data obtained were processed using the SPSS PC 11.0 for Windows.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND RESULTS

In general, 61% of the SEIP teachers were at the competence level in the management aspect; while 65.4% were at the competence level in the teaching aspect. No teachers were at the novice level and only 1.2% were at expert level in both teaching and management aspect. No teacher was at the novice level and only 1.2% was at expert level in both teaching and management aspects. The teacher’s background component consisted of 10 predictable variables i.e gender, marital status, teaching experience, duties, specialization, level, teaching hours, academic qualification, number of teachers and location of school. Teaching experience (β=0.220) and teaching hours (β =0.222) contributed directly and significantly to the SEIP teacher’s teaching competency level. Coordinating duties (β =0.1700) and location of school (β = -0.304) contributed directly and significantly to SEIP teacher’s management and competency level. Two variables were not significant but meaningful and contributed directly to the SEIP teacher’s teaching competency level, i.e knowledge (pedagogical content knowledge - β=0.2021) and personality (teacher’s expectations β=0.123). This had direct positive effect on the teacher’s teaching competence. The findings of this study shows that factors of teachers’ background such experience, total teaching period in a week, location of school, pedagogical knowledge and expectation as well as the environment factors like students’ needs and assessment need directly contributed to the competency level of management and teaching SEIP teacher was still at the average level and to get to the expert level take along time. In order enhance teacher’s competence, serious attention must be given to the factors such as strategic planning and action research, teacher’s work load, physical setup and location of school.

Table 1
Highest Percentage of Respondents Competency Level in management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>Provide strategic planning SEIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Moving</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>Lists of teaching materials by topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>Daily lesson plans written properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillful</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>The absence of noise and interference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Class condition neat and clean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Highest Percentage of Respondents Competency Level in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Asking question such as recalling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Moving</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>Actively engages with external parties to facilitate the teaching and learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>Adapt teaching strategies according to the needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillful</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>Taking little time top the lesson today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>Ensure that every student in the class to follow the rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Overall Percentage SEIP Teacher Competency in Management and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY COMPONENT</th>
<th>NOVIS (0-1.49)</th>
<th>START MOVING (1.5-2.59)</th>
<th>EFFICIENT (2.6-3.59)</th>
<th>SKILLFUL (3.6-4.59)</th>
<th>EXPERT (4.6-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background of Teachers

Teacher’s background component consists of ten predictor variables of gender, marital status, teaching experience, task specialization, level, time teaching, academic qualifications, and school location. Teaching experience ($\beta = 0.220$) and the teach ($\beta = -0.022$) to contribute directly and significantly to the level of teacher competence in teaching SEIP. However, four significant predictor not yet meaningful and direct positive impact on the level of teaching competence SEIP such as gender, job, specialization and location of school.

Obviously teaching experience factors significantly influence towards SEIP teachers competence in teaching experience in special education increased teaching efficiency. The findings of this study support the findings Yoder and Mc Duffie (2006) which states beginning teachers with teaching experience is certainly not because they are new entrants to the teaching environment and affect the efficiency of teaching. Number of teaching hours also have a significant impact on the teaching time of teachers is decreasing and increasing efficiency special education teachers in teaching SEIP. These findings also support the results Veenman (1984) and Suhaida Abdul Kadir et al (2007) state novice teachers face many problems, including problems in the teaching workload with a compact schedule and also faced with the problem of planning and preparation to teach.
While the task of coordinator ($\beta = 0.1700$ and school ($\beta = -0304$) to contribute directly and significantly to the level of efficiency in the management of SEIP teacher. Duties as coordinator of an impact or a meaningful contribution to the efficiency of the management of teachers. While getting close to city school affects and contributes to the efficiency of teachers.

**The Domain for Professional Teachers Role**

These three variables do not contribute directly and significantly to the efficiency of knowledge management of teachers (pedagogical content knowledge) ($\beta = 0.008$), competencies (management style) ($\beta = 0085$) and personality (teacher expectations) ($\beta = 0061$). However, there are two variables that are not significant but meaningful and contribute directly to the level of competence of teachers in the teaching of science for student with learning difficulties (pedagogical content knowledge) ($\beta = 0202$) and personality (teacher expectations) ($\beta = -0132$). This gives a direct positive effect on the level of teaching competence in the SEIP.

**Environmental Factors**

There are five variables in this block that predicts the level of teaching competency of student background, student needs, classroom climate, school goals and testing. A variable that contributed directly and significantly to the level of efficiency in the management of teacher of SEIP test ($\beta = 0205$). There is a variable that is not significant but meaningful and directly contributes to the level of efficiency in the management of teacher SEIP school goals ($\beta = -0129$).

Yet there is one variable that contributes directly although not significant, but means the level of teacher competence in teaching SEIP the needs of students ($\beta = 0176$). The results showed that the teacher’s background component consists of ten predictor variables of gender, marital status, teaching experience, task specialization, level, time teaching, academic qualifications, the teachers, and school location. Greatest impact on teacher background contributed by the experience. The findings show that the more experience special education teacher, the higher the level of teaching competence. This is followed by a time of teaching. Thus the variable effects of teaching period showed that the level of efficiency in teaching also increased when the minute teaching period decreases. However, four significant predictors not meaningful and direct positive impact on the level of teaching competence in SEIP such as gender, job, specialization and year of teaching experiences.

In this study a number of variables such as the number of teaching eksogenus and location of the school were found to be significant and meaningful contribution to the level of efficiency in the management of teachers and teaching special classes. On the other hand there are also a number of variables that are not significant eksogenus but meaningful to teacher efficiency. The findings of this study have shown that the level of teacher competence is related to teacher’s background variables and the environment. The findings of this study are also similar to those described by cognitive theory Yoder and Symons (2010) and also support the findings by Hapidah (2001) that the background variables and the environment relate to the teaching component.
This study shows that there are three variables that do not have a direct impact on the level of management efficiency SEIP teacher. This means that the domain variable sets the professional role of teachers do not give any meaning to the level of management efficiency in SEIP. However, this study shows that there are two predictors are not significant, but means of knowledge (pedagogical content knowledge) and personality (teacher expectations) This gives a direct positive effect on the level of teaching competence in SEIP. The findings of this study support the theoretical explanation expectations raised by Lunenberg & Orstein (1996), cognitive theory by Lefton (1997).

The results showed a significant predictor variables of the test has had the greatest impact on the level of perceived competence. Thus, the need for teachers to provide School Based Tests of high value to the level of teaching competence. This gives a direct positive effect on the level of management efficiency in SEIP teachers needsThese findings thus support the view Brophy and Good (1986), Bernard, Myers & Myers (1995) the goal of factors have contributed to the efficiency of school management and teaching.

CONCLUSION

This study has produced a Competency Model Management and Teaching for teachers in SEIP such as background factors of teachers, professional teachers role domain and environment shows the contribution of these factors directly and indirectly related to the level of competence of teachers and management in SEIP teaching. The focus of discussion in this section is to be applied to the efficient management and teaching SEIP and causality and correlate with the challenges of the current special education and efforts to improve the teaching profession, especially in special education and in particular in SEIP.

Based on this awareness so as to relate the findings discussion with teachers helping SEIP to achieve efficiency starting from the novice to the expert level in the short term. Results from the analysis showed that the efficiency of the management of teacher in SEIP the highest percentage is at a level that is 63.2% efficient, skilled level of 14.4%, 0% at the level of experts and the remaining percentage in the novice and beginning to prosper. Similarly, the level of teacher competence in teaching SEIP, analysis shows that the highest percentage is in the efficient (70%), was developed (16.8%), skilled (13.2%) and novice (0%).

Although SEIP teacher who had taught in class SEIP more than five years were 27.1% and between three to five years is 22.4%, but the efficiency of their management and teaching is focused on the efficient and a little at the skilled and not directly at the level of experts. This finding is supported by Berliner Development Model (1995) that stated the advanced or beginner most teachers who had taught for two or three years at this stage. Based on the percentage SEIP teachers took more than five years to achieve the proficient level and to achieve excellent expert or guru SEIP have to take almost ten years or more.

Results show that the greatest impact on teacher background contributed by the experience. The
findings show that more and more experience SEIP teacher, the higher the level of teaching competence. This finding supports the study Foorman and Moats (2004) found that teacher's experience in special class affect the efficiency of teaching and teacher management. This study also supports the findings which concluded that experienced teachers have a more sophisticated scheme to teach in the classroom as well as interpreting the classroom situation.

This is followed by a time of teaching. Thus the variable effects of teaching period showed that the level of efficiency in teaching also increased when the hours of teaching period decreases. This means SEIP teachers need time to make preparations before teaching. Compact schedule, causing teachers to teach in a hurry and lack of commitment to effective teaching. If teachers in SEIP have adequate and appropriate time, of course, Individual Educational Plans (IEP) can be implemented successfully. The findings of this study support the findings Cook (2004) the main problem is that novice teachers are faced with students who are different, low achievement, taught class capabilities vary, lack of time or crowded schedule.

Four predictors are not significant, but significant and direct positive impact on the level of teaching competence SEIP these blocks are gender, job specialization. However, a significant predictor of management efficiency and SEIP teaching is the school location. Schools near the town have affected the efficiency of the teachers. Urban school is close to a resource center, library, and stationery shops, close to the Teachers' Centre, District Education Office and close to other amenities that support teachers to teach comfort. Ease of getting the resources or references to assist teaching, being close to home and work teacher, it is very ease and stimulating teaching.

The results showed the efficiency of teaching background, student needs, classroom climate, school goals and testing. A significant predictor variable of the test has had the greatest impact on the level of perceived competence. These findings indicate the need to test teachers give high value to the level of teaching competence. Teachers do not need summer if test or tests coordinated by the Ministry of Education, the State Education Department or the District Education Office for SEIP students of various categories of course have various levels of learning. It is not fair if we evaluate SEIP lesson pupils learned about what does or does not assess what has been learned. Then teachers SEIP choose testing or evaluation of Students Based Assessment (SBA). They are easy to formulate the questions that correspond with what has been taught to students SEIP. By providing question bank and questions workshops will facilitate the management of SEIP teachers in providing tests for students in SEIP.

There is not a significant predictor, but means that the school's aims. This gives a direct positive effect on the level of management efficiency SEIP teacher needs to the school's aims and values connected to the level of management efficiency of SEIP teachers. Indeed, the school has its own goals and objectives. SEIP program also has goals and objectives that are in line with the aims of the school. The school is also proud of SEIP student achievement in the curriculum, co curricular and outdoor activities that involve the community.

According to the analysis of the study found that levels were very weak and the problems in the management and teachers teaching SEIP. Among these problems is that the aspects of management, teachers SEIP no strategic plan, no annual action plan which does not include teaching materials according to the lesson plan and not provided the learning modules according
to groups of students. Strategic planning is important in the management of the special education class. Process to improve the quality of special education in schools is fair and equitable for students with special needs. Special education students also have the same rights as ordinary students to achieve a goal or objective in the period they are in school (Gross & White 2003). It is the responsibility of the Special Education teacher diagnostic test, analyze and target achievement of students during the past three or four years or the time that students should learn in school.

The findings based on path analysis model shows that there are three variables that predict the level of teaching competence. No significant predictors. However there are two significant predictor not yet mean that knowledge (pedagogical content knowledge) ($\beta = 0.0202$) and personality (teacher expectations) ($\beta = 0.132$). This gives a direct positive effect on the level of teaching competence SEIP. This study support by Hapidah (2001) that the domain of thought refers to the mental operations that involve the five components of the philosophical thought of teaching, pedagogical content knowledge, management style, teacher’s expectation and teaching goals is to contribute significantly and directly to teaching performance in SEIP. This study also supports research Foorman and Moat (2004) found a significant relationship between teacher competence in SEIP pedagogical knowledge and experience of a teacher.

The results also indicate the need for teachers on student’s background factors in special class, coping skills diverse needs of students, classroom climate that is conducive and test requirements for special needs students is affecting the level of management skills and teaching SEIP. Rokiah Roohana (1999) found that teachers who were directly involved with the students in SEIP should have extensive knowledge about the background of the students. According to Lipsey and Wilson (2001), children in SEIP required follow up instruction, writing and drawing a bright and clear from teachers and multi-sensory approach for learning. To face the challenges in teaching and learning, teachers' knowledge is important to help students in SEILP through exercises and tests provided (Ott, P. 1997).

**Implications for Teaching**

Teacher background component consists of ten predictor variables of gender, marital status, teaching experience, task specialization, level, time teaching, academic qualifications, the teachers, and location of school. Greatest impact on teacher background contributed by teaching experience ($\beta = 0.0220$). The finding shows that the more teachers in SEIP experience, the higher the level of teaching competence. Thus the variable effects of teaching period shows that the level of efficiency in teaching also increased when the minute teaching period decreases.

Therefore, efforts to improve teacher’s performance in SEIP teaching should pay attention to the teaching experience in special education and teaching schedule. To enhance the experience and knowledge, teachers in SEIP must make some changes in teaching based on student achievement and the effectiveness of teaching strategies, use of teaching aids and curriculum adaptation. Therefore, educators should be wise in choosing the various methods, approaches, strategies and activities in accordance with the diversity of educational technology ability of the students to the

When teachers plan and implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) to the setting of targets and the achievement of students (Ahmad F. Ramj hun. 2002), strategic planning, action research and evaluation, will provide experience that is useful for teachers in SEIP and thereby to improve the quality management and teaching from time to time. Teachers focus on a very needed lesson in class because the students in SEIP only focus or learn lessons that interest them alone. Therefore, the arrangement timetable SEIP teacher is vital that teachers have some space to rest while making thorough preparation.

Three variable domain of the professional role of teachers skills, knowledge (pedagogical content knowledge) and personality (teacher expectations) that predicts the level of teaching competence. Results from the analysis of two studies found no significant predictor but means of knowledge (pedagogical content knowledge) ($\beta = 0.020$) and personality (teacher expectations) ($\beta = -0.132$). This gives a direct positive effect on the level of teaching competence in SEIP. Pedagogical knowledge is important for all teachers, especially teachers who teach pupils SEIP. Similarly character (teacher expectations) special education teachers is an important domain of influence SEIP teaching efficiency. Teachers' expectations of high value to the school community. Bernard (1995) has highlighted a number of findings that have demonstrated the value of high expectations at school. Among them is a study by Brook et al. (1989), Edmonds (1986), Howard (1990), Levin (1988), Rutter et al. (1979) and Slavin (1990) who found that school that emphasizes high expectations for all students and provide the necessary support to achieve the expectations of the outstanding academic achievements.

However, there is a significant predictor not yet mean that the needs of students ($\beta = 0.176$). This gives a direct positive effect on the level of efficiency of teaching SEIP more skill mastered by teachers according to the needs of the growing student teaching efficiency. Coincide with the findings by Hapidah (2001) that environmental factors that coping skills are predictors of students' needs and contribute significantly to the teacher directly.

The findings in this study also shows that job as a teacher coordinator in SEIP give a high value on teaching efficiency. As a teacher coordinator who was entrusted by the Special Education Unit, State Education Department to operate and manage special classes certainly has a lot to offer in terms of experience planning and implementing instruction, programs and activities involving students learning in SEIP.

This was followed by school ($\beta = -0.304$). Thus the effect of school location variables indicate that the level of efficiency in teaching also increased when the location of the school was located in urban areas compared to rural and suburban areas. There are several advantages of location in urban schools than in rural or suburban areas. Among its advantages is that schools in urban areas are close to the offices of education, it was easy to visit or supervised by any party as the Inspectorate, District Education Officer or the State Education Officer. Therefore, the effect of periodic supervision or visits is good inputs can then be produced in the teaching and learning SEIP class. In addition, teachers deal special classes easier to get materials and information or
teaching equipment such as computers or telecommunications equipment due to its proximity to the city. As the findings in this study that the level of good management will generate the good teaching.

**Implications for Management of Teachers**

There are three significant predictors and impact directly on the level of efficiency of management school ($\beta = -0.304$), test ($\beta = -0.205$) and the teacher ($\beta = -0.170$). Next block indicates that the variable location of the school, and the teachers' test impose direct and significant impact on the level of management efficiency in SEIP teacher. This means an increase in one unit of management efficiency SEIP teacher assisted by an increase of 0.304 units were negative for the location of the school, 0.205 units were negative for all tests and 0.170 for the teacher.

School location close to the city in close proximity to the District Education Office, State Education Department, State Education Resource Center, government offices and private companies, business centers and enterprises is the maximum impact on the efficiency of management and teaching. Besides facilitating teachers to obtain materials or teaching resources sold or provided at the State Resource Centre or at the offices of education, teachers are also easy to interact and deal with any government officials and non-governmental organizations in the interest of students with learning disabilities. Education officers or the Inspectorate also easily make a trip or supervision because to get to the school concerned will take a short time compared to the rural schools. Easy and a lot of opportunities as well as cost-effective option is a direct impact on the level of management efficiency SEIP teacher in class room.

Next variables of the teacher as a teacher or teacher of SEIP coordinator is directly impacting on the level of management efficiency of SEIP teacher. Special education integrated program teachers are appointed as coordinator by the school or the Special Education Unit, the State Education Department is composed of experienced teachers who are trained in the field of special education. They were given a course for managing and SEIP in schools is appropriate. They were also given the opportunity to participate in workshops or courses related to the management SEIP organized by State or District Education Department with that objective knowledge and experience coordinating teachers can be adapted to the management and teaching in the classroom as well as hope SEIP knowledge and experience will be served or shared with teachers. The problem here is that the skills acquired by teachers and coordinator SEIP should balance. Teachers of SEIP not always have the opportunity to raise the level of efficiency, especially in management, whereas SEIP teachers who still do not get the novice level of knowledge sharing is as it should be.
Implications of Management and Leadership Education for Professional Development

School principals and teachers play an important role in improving the teacher's responsibility for the curriculum and pedagogy. The results show some significant variables that influence the level of management and teaching SEIP. As pedagogical leaders, principals and teachers have a responsibility to enhance the professionalism of teachers helping teacher’s development process to achieve the level of expertise and excellence (Lilia and Abdullah. 1998).

In this study, personality (teacher expectations) and knowledge (pedagogical knowledge) directly contribute to the efficiency and management of teaching SEIP. Environmental factors that can be manipulated by teachers and principals to improve efficiency as the needs of students and classroom climate. The implication of this statement is clear that principals and teachers should act as a determinant of educational climate of the school. Factors teachers’ task is to coordinate and schedule factors should also be considered because it is significantly and directly contributes to the efficiency and management of teaching SEIP. Teacher in SEIP be selected from experienced teachers in special education. Experienced teachers in other areas, or troubled refugee teachers from other areas, should not be appointed as a teacher or coordinator of SEIP because it will cause problems to implement program that has many benefits. One of its attractions is the Special Education has special provisions for repair or upgrade special classes and provide the appropriate equipment and furniture for pupils with special needs.

The leadership charismatic in special education is in a situation not much difference in the organization of education. To realize quality education system is the responsibility of a leader or administrator knowing perspective of SEIP teachers especially. Leaders or administrators need to understand the principles and system management of SEIP first class before allowing special education program implemented. Special education teachers should be given the chance and given full responsibility to manage and implement the SEIP calmly and according to the principles and rules of proper implementation of the program without threatened by other tasks not related to special education. In this case the order of planning, program implementation and monitoring process from the point of view of management efficiency and teaching special class note about the strengths obtained in the background of the teachers, the teachers' professional factors and environmental factors. These strengths should be blended in synergy to enable all teachers in SEIP achieve high levels of efficiency either in management or in teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Some general and critical suggestions in particular for the development of teaching and management efficiency and professionalism of teachers in special classes. Recommendations are as follows:

a) Program and the monitoring process has certainly been made by the Inspectorate of Special Education Department, Special Education Unit in State, and District for teachers and school administrators. It is better if the monitoring or supervision undertaken more frequently, always to maintain and increase the quality, skills and expertise in SEIP.
b) To ensure the management and teaching in SEIP to a higher level of competence, teachers should be given chances for such service training course planning and management, action research and effective teaching.

c) To ensure that SEIP classes are more conducive and has equipment adequate teaching and learning needs of students, the administration should make the supervision and monitoring of teachers and coordinators who manage government spending.

d) The school administrators who receive placement of special education teachers in SEIP should talk to them about the duties and responsibilities that need to be implemented and ensure tasks and enable them to improve thinking skills and expertise in special education.

e) The Department of Special Education at the Ministry of Education, State Education Department and Office of Education plan programs to enhance the professionalism of teachers in SEIP like program on teacher expectations, develop strategic planning, action research, workshop building modules of teaching and learning, course management program, teaching methods, management and implementation of courses and workshops to build the module IEP for vocational transition.
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