

A Schizoanalysis Toward Interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts Courses for Special Education Students.

**By Anthony David Vernon - Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Miami-Dade College
Department of Arts & Philosophy, Kendall, Florida & St. Thomas University Biscayne
College, Miami Gardens, Florida**

Keywords:

Interdisciplinary education, Special education, Social science and language arts integration,
Schizoanalysis.

Abstract:

This paper explores the potential benefits and challenges of implementing interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students. Challenges such as curriculum design, teacher training, and the need for evidence-based practices are also discussed. The paper provides practical recommendations for coursework, including collaborative writing, interactive read-alouds, and multimodal tools, while emphasizing the necessity of further research to validate and refine interdisciplinary models for special education settings. Ultimately, then, the research is limited by the sample of papers used to conduct a set of document content analyses via schizoanalysis. That being stated, research demonstrates that interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses targeted for special education improve upon various comprehension skills for the special education students who are taught under said courses. This paper demonstrates that the implementation of interdisciplinary courses for special education students globally is not idealistic, yet is instead a practical, materialistic matter. The purpose of this paper is to help with the allowance of special education students to create new territories for themselves and not be consumed by the forces of production into labor machines.

Introduction and Limitations

There is little research on interdisciplinary social studies and language arts courses for special education students. As a result, a ‘proper’ meta-analysis cannot be conducted on interdisciplinary social studies and language arts courses for special education students. So a meta-analysis, as schizoanalysis, will be conducted, an analysis that “Conceives of desire as a productive force that constitutes subjects from multiplicity...a dissolution of the isolated individual subjectivity produced within disciplinary societies” (Sellar) and systems. The works analyzed here largely do not specifically study interdisciplinary education that joins the subjects of social science and language arts, let alone how courses of this sort could be implemented for special education students.

Instead, this analysis acts as a guiding star toward future research, laying the groundwork for how an interdisciplinary social science and language arts course for special education students could be the basis of a call to positively deterritorialize and positively reterritorialize the classroom. “When deterritorialization occurs, all of those structures spontaneously disappear... structures across lines of deterritorialization are made more and more invisible to the observer - they are integrated heavily into other parts of the apparatus” (Punished Felix). In all of this, there is a need to be careful when adjusting the territories of special education classrooms and knowing the structure of territory adjustment as: “Controlling reterritorializations are added to the processes of deterritorialization” (Deleuze and Guattari). The very process of territorializing in any direction can be quite confusing, as “It may be all but impossible to distinguish deterritorialization from reterritorialization, since they are mutually enmeshed, or like opposite faces of one and the same process” (Deleuze and Guattari).

This paper does not tell one how to go about the implementation of interdisciplinary items or how to go about the deterritorialization and then reterritorialization of social science and language arts for the benefit of special education students. But this paper does point to what

teaching forms benefit students in social science and language arts.

No specific demographic details outside special education placement are being considered, so the analysis is general because it cannot be objectively demarcated who falls into special education categories, and further alienation of people labelled along with placed into special education settings only hampers students' solidarity so thus their progress. This is not to universalize special education populations nor implement universal systems, but for the allowance of special education to exist beyond arbitrary demographics and exist as self-collectivising individuals. This work is limited by educational frames of subjectivity, but subjectivity can be pushed beyond itself as: "Subjectivity becomes a field of struggle for rights and visibility" (de Maman). Here we can think of education as a system that, for special education students, should help out with so-called 'noncognitive skills': "Noncognitive skills refer to personality characteristics or subjective dispositions that are not measured by cognitive tests," (Sellar), ideally those away from measures of academic success and especially economic success.

This analysis will present the challenges and possible benefits of building an interdisciplinary social science and language arts course for special education students. This schizoanalysis also does not favor recent data but favors data on interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses, which could be seen as a limitation.

The schizoanalysis here is not only speaking to schizophrenic individuals; we are all filtered into authoritarian educational regimes. Instead, by destroying the borders between educational territories, we see the arbitrary bounds between the social sciences alongside language arts. A schizoanalysis allows us to lay the groundwork for a potentially beneficial reterritorialization post-deterritorialization, the interdisciplinary social science and language arts course.

Methodology & Why Measure Reading

This piece is a literature review of interdisciplinary methods that work in settings where social science and language arts classes are conjoined. This paper does not, by and large, recommend how instructors are to implement methods. Instead, this paper is a matter of qualitative research, a schizoanalysis using continental methods in an anti-structuralist sense. The schizoanalysis does not prioritize recent literature but instead references relevant literature, those pieces of literature that speak to interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses, which rarely exist. In some sense, this meta-analysis, as schizoanalysis points to a timeless historiography, an evidence-based narrativization meant to be emphasized. In some sense, every meta-analysis is a schizoanalysis or, at least in its most ideal form, a schizoanalysis. "According to this method of analysis, it is possible to tell and retell about the lived process from the perspective of the reconstructive under multiple faces" (de Maman).

In terms of data analysis, researchers referenced go about using various metrics to measure student success in interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses. To handle this diversity of measurements, I sought to compile the data, focusing on reading improvements. This is because reading improvement is a more measurable datum than critical thinking, for example. Yet multiple measures of reading literacy are examined via data analysis of compiled

data. The data drawn from is previously analyzed and collected under various methodologies, but the elements of the data are drawn to focus on that continentalized narrativization of the interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses.

However, reading was also selected as the mark to be measured, as reading demonstrates new possibilities beyond the demands of Oedipal teachers. If one can read for themselves, then one's learning and growth are not inherently bound to the lesson taught in the classroom. The classroom is a force that, in part, is meant to turn special education students into productive laborers. However, reading can show students manners of existence beyond desiring-production: "Desiring-production is a primary process of producing associations, connections, and links between thoughts, feelings, and ideas, but the processes only become visible in and through the machines they form" (Pedersen). A shift from pigeon-holing special education into labor and instead helping students to become interpersonal positive desiring machines: "Desiring-machines have an ability to make endless connections in all directions" (Pedersen).

This is not to say that reading outside of the classroom is not tinged with propaganda that teaches one to desire their productive abilities and almost nothing more. Reading is a path to potential, and all potentialities are actualities. All too often, decisions are made for special education students; instead, we should be focusing on the systems that go beyond Oedipal education and allow special education students to make choices for themselves to embrace their interpersonal possibilities.

Why Interdisciplinary Courses for Special Education Students?

"Interdisciplinary instruction has many characteristics attractive to special education instruction. It focuses on meaningful learning and skills that occur across content/curriculum and should assist students in forming the associations needed for lifelong learning" (Gardner et al.). For interdisciplinary instructors, meaningful learning is learning to make associations; interdisciplinary instruction at least 'promises' to improve students' ability to make connections. "Interdisciplinary learning is highly associated with the constructivist philosophy...Students can reconstruct knowledge by reproducing knowledge from foreign disciplines, deconstruct existing knowledge by identifying the limitations of disciplines, and construct knowledge by innovatively integrating ideas across disciplines" (Braßler). However, the actuality of presenting connections between subjects does not promise that students will make connections between subjects. "Students make connections between the content and their own experiences but rarely see how subject areas intertwine with one another" (Becker). Yet, no educator should be guiding students toward particular connections; what is important here is the creation of connections at all. Students should be allowed to make connections that flourish in rhizomatic and non-rhizomatic matters. An educator's job is to force connections but to assist students in the process of desiring connections.

Another potentiality of interdisciplinary studies is that students may be more prepared for the world outside of school, as the world is interdisciplinary. "With an abundance of connection[s] and cross-content relations, students are more likely to experience learning environments that resemble the real world. Students may also be more engaged and interactive with the material as it builds off both prior knowledge and previously learned content. With an

increase in engaging content and connected curriculum, students will be more likely to enjoy learning and will be better equipped for life after school” (Becker). Yet, if students are not assuredly making connections in the classroom through interdisciplinary education, then we cannot be sure if interdisciplinary education is assisting students with making associations outside of the classroom, as “Individual persons are social persons first of all...Private persons are therefore images of the second order, images of images—that is, simulacra that are thus endowed with an aptitude for representing the first-order images of social persons” (Deleuze and Guattari).

Interdisciplinary education also offers more flexibility as multiple subjects are being covered at once. “Interdisciplinary instruction also allows teachers and students to multitask in different subject areas...Interdisciplinary units allow students to collaborate with teachers and peers to determine the material that they will learn. With interdisciplinary units, students can have a choice of activities. Because lessons are directed toward different learning styles, students with learning disabilities in understanding and assimilating new information can benefit” (Jenkins).

Interdisciplinary courses for special education could improve students’ associative abilities, improve real-life skills, and offer more flexible coursework. Yet, these results do not always emerge; this may be because “Research suggests that although many elementary teachers integrate social studies with the language arts, this instruction tends to be poorly designed with little emphasis on social studies learning” (Strachan). This partial integration also seems to occur outside of the elementary special education space. But the data on any of these points is sparse, yet partial objects can be moved great distances.

The potential here is enough to attempt interdisciplinary courses. Any practice that could improve particular outcomes for special education students is worth putting through experimentation. It is often assumed that because an object is partial is of no use. However, through experimentation with the partial objects we hold, data could be built up to more surely understand if interdisciplinary courses help special education students, make associations, improve their real-life skills, offer more flexible coursework, and improve on other unmentioned measures, along with acquiring unmeasurable skills such as a student’s ability to interconnect beyond Oedipal expectations: “The Schizoanalysis approach, making visible the importance of collective and collaborative practices to build knowledge in a democratic and participatory way. Schizoanalysis proposes the creation of new realities and the transformation of the instituted, showing in teaching that new forms of teaching and learning need to break with traditional paradigms and open the way for a more inclusive, dynamic, and relevant education” (de Maman).

Why Interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts Courses For Special Education Students?

The main pragmatic goal of forming interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students is to improve comprehension outcomes so they can comprehend territories of their creation. These comprehension outcome improvement goals include improving reading comprehension and oral comprehension, but truly all comprehension

in general. Especially in the face of all too common cutbacks, “Cutbacks in public education are common, and learning supports for students with mild learning disabilities may be referred to as a luxury in schools that have minimal budgets” (Antifave).

With cutbacks, fewer and fewer special education courses will be made available to special education students. There is an unfortunate need for efficiency under limited funds. However, two birds may be killed with one stone: courses can be made interdisciplinary to adjust for budgetary cuts, and these interdisciplinary courses could be built in such a way that comprehension outcomes are improved. While it is preferred, obviously, that funds are not cut at all, one must be prepared to have their territories invaded.

In addition, social science can increase interest in language arts. Vice versa, language arts styling can be used to increase interest in social science. Social science offers myriad stories that can be offered in and placed in a language arts context. Thus, competencies within these fields themselves could be improved. “Interdisciplinary competence refers to the understanding of different disciplinary knowledge, methods, expectations, and boundaries. Further, it refers to the ability to think about different disciplinary perspectives, to use different disciplinary perspectives in solving interdisciplinary problems by making connections, to synthesize and integrate knowledge across academic fields, and to recognize the need to reconsider the direction of one’s thinking and problem-solving approaches” (Braßler). Due to aiming for competencies, a course should not cover too many subjects at once, as special education students may begin to struggle with comprehension of subject matter and materials.

Practically, if interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students are to aim for one main measurable goal, it should be reading comprehension. This is because reading helps with all other competency areas, so without reading, there is “Greater difficulty meeting the demands of content area courses” (Solis & Vaughn et al.). Students already lack areas where they can focus solely on reading, and this is problematic as “Reading comprehension is a complex process requiring the integration of many processes, including background knowledge, vocabulary, attention, memory, and word reading, and missing any of these contributes to a lack of understanding” (Solis & Vaughn et al.). With special education, social sciences, and language arts courses on potential chopping blocks, a space for special education reading must be conserved.

The world is filled with written literacies, and students need to be taught these skills to be able to succeed outside the classroom to the highest degree. “Social studies instruction draws content and ideas from disciplines that vary in their substance, goals, and methods of inquiry. As a consequence, social studies offers a rich arena in which students can do more than learn facts—they can learn and apply problem-solving skills, examine issues and events from multiple perspectives, engage in authentic literacy activities, and be apprenticed into different means of inquiry and habits of mind” (Scruggs et al.).

In addition, reading comprehension is easier to test for than other comprehension. If reading comprehension can be boosted, then it is practically and pragmatically easier to advocate for funding. Outside of this cynicism, interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts courses for special education students may be best suited to raise reading scores. Interdisciplinary courses, in so far in that they can bring in topics of potential interest, could help spark reading engagements in special education students. Achieving improved reading outcomes with a smaller

budget will take more than optimism, but it must come with careful planning. Nonetheless, these are the main potential positives of interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts courses for special education students and why a study of the possibility of such courses is beyond worthwhile.

Initial Challenges

Interdisciplinary courses face the initial challenge of altering the established nature of subjects. School systems are used to a standard set of subjects, and introducing interdisciplinary courses is akin to introducing a new subject. When bringing a new quote on a quote subject, it must be understood that “An interdisciplinary [lens] should help evaluate how to bring together these many [chosen] disciplinary insights and practices into an integrated set of student supports” (Antifave).

Interdisciplinary courses being added to a student’s schedule also alter a student’s overall educational goals. “Introducing interdisciplinarity into special education would include refashioning a student’s individual education program (IEP) in interdisciplinary ways and integrating a student’s program and regular classroom education” (Antifave). Students will likely not initially understand how to integrate multiple topics together, such as social studies and language arts.

Teachers also face myriad challenges in teaching interdisciplinary courses. “Understanding interdisciplinarity calls for an understanding of several disciplines that address learning disabilities. Educators may not have the training in each [select] discipline or may find the task of understanding several disciplines daunting” (Antifave). To solve this issue, “Educators could function as mediators across disciplines or implement tutors that are able to model interdisciplinary integration and facilitate interdisciplinary student collaboration” (Braßler), but this assumes a school has the resources to provide proper education. In this, “Only desiring-machines produce connections according to which they function, and function by improvising and forming the connections” (Deleuze and Guattari).

Ultimately, to solve the initial challenges, time, familiarity, and foremost, skilled, evidence-based design are needed. Along with the systemic challenges, to move schools away from “Supposed personal interests in self-investment through education and social interests in education as a driver of economic productivity and a means to reduce social welfare costs to the State. These interests are invoked by the neoliberal ‘politics of aspiration’, in which ‘[t]he aspiration to ‘better oneself’ in material and commodified terms” (Sellar).

Design

Universal design principles are always necessary when making courses for special education students. This is in part because “Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework for lowering barriers in the interactions that learners have with content, each other, instructors, support staff, and their communities... best practice is to simplify this to “plus one” thinking: if there is one way for learners to interact now, create one more.” (Tobin). Special education classes need to be accessible to as many students as possible with all possible needs, and ideally accessible to every possible student. UDL focuses on provisions for creating more entry points

for students to be able to comprehend any given material.

In this pursuit of UDL, interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts courses for special education students need to adopt multimodality. Multimodality for special education is about “Making sure teaching tools, materials, and practices are accessible to students with disabilities and therefore more usable for everyone” (Dunn). By definition, multimodality is when a learning item is presented in multiple modes, such as video plus audio or text plus audio, as examples. Multimodal tools such as accessible PDFs, Alt Text, closed captions, and verbal transcription would allow a greater portion of students to engage with social science language arts materials presented. “Literacy software programs offer supported access to text through technology tools that provide procedural support for comprehension. These programs typically include text-to-speech (TTS) options, in which text can be ‘read’ to students in a variety of voices. Students often can choose the voice of the ‘reader’ and adjust features such as speed, volume, and pitch” (Scruggs et al.). Examples of these literacy software programs are ever-evolving, and preferred tools should be regularly sought.

In pursuit of engagement and improvement of comprehension, including reading comprehension, “all materials should be accessible from day one” (Dunn). When designing a course for special education students, the course should not be retrofitted, as “Retrofits in education may mean that the disabled student is still at a disadvantage, despite the attempted remedy” (Cecil-Lemkin), and so, “Classes must be made accessible not through accommodation but through initial design” (Birdwell & Bayley).

Still, it must be maintained that all designs undertaken are a matter of social production and: “Social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions” (Deleuze and Guattari). Meaning, there can be no truly universal design, and as design is bound to local territories. Design is also geared to draw out production, while a design under a schizoanalytic framework seeks to create truly universal designs that do not force productivity.

General Coursework Options & Recommendations

“Careful attention to disability—particularly an understanding of intersectional disabled identities and how issues of access and disability can inform our pedagogical and programmatic choices” (Hubrig). This is only emphasized by the fact that “Some students may know they are disabled and have the proper documentation, but have learned to keep silent about it, choosing not to disclose their disability, for various reasons...Even for those students who *do* have a documented diagnosis and choose to disclose their disability, the inequalities disabled students face—and especially multiply marginalized students face—are stark” (Hubrig). All of this must be in mind when selecting coursework, alongside selecting coursework that has succeeded under evidence-based practices.

On this basis, there are strong reasons to go about collaborative writing assignments: “Researchers have found that collaborative writing can improve writing and nurture positive attitudes toward writing” (Cecil-Lemkin). For example, “In a cluster randomized trial, middle and high school science, and social studies teachers were trained to implement CSR [Collaborative Strategic Reading], and students who used CSR in these content area classes at

least once a week had significantly higher reading comprehension outcomes than students who did not receive the CSR instruction” (Vaughn et al.). A collaborative writing style lets students with special education needs know they are not alone in their struggles. “This type of assignment can create strong communities amongst peers...leading to increased comprehension through dialogue with peers” (Cecil-Lemkin). That being stated, collaborative options are not perfect as they are not “Always an accessible option for them [special education students] because of the interpersonal requirement,” so “While the majority of mentally disabled participants do enjoy working in a team, it’s still valuable to offer an accommodation to allow students to work on the project independently” (Cecil-Lemkin) and still “Teachers should never assume that students can access ADA accommodations” (Birdwell & Bayley).

In collaborative assignments, it must be accounted that “Humanity relies on [the] cooperative division of labor for success” (Birdwell & Bayley), figuring out the fair and or proper division of labor is class context-dependent, which may include no labor at all and a calling of labor into question. “The subject is formed and transformed through social practices and discourses” (de Maman). It may be easy to consider social performance as a part of group work, and while sociability is inherently a part of group work, ultimately, “Students shouldn’t fail based on their level of ability to act neurotypically, no more than 10 percent of the final grade can equitably be devoted to behavior and auto-fail conditions should be eschewed. That way, a student who would otherwise pass based on writing, reading, and analysis skills still has the chance to do so...emphasis on demonstration of learning outcomes, not social performance, should be reassuring” (Birdwell & Bayley).

Participation assignments lean the heaviest into social performance, and this can be problematic in special education settings. Having participation assignments offers difficulties in the special education setting. “If you do grade for participation, we would recommend that you base the grade on something concrete, and not just whether someone “‘appears ready for class’ or how many times they interject into a conversation” (Birdwell & Bayley). Students who appear distracted may be going about techniques that help them focus, such as fidgeting “If the instructor grades on whether the student *appears* to be attentive and active in class, neurodivergent students may pay attention but still fail, as the behavior they use to concentrate may look like idleness or distractibility” (Birdwell & Bayley).

Further regarding sociality, teachers of interdisciplinary Social Science and Language Arts courses for special education students should avoid potentially invasive assignments, which include personal assignments such as personal essays: “Personal narrative assignments can become invasive or feel almost coercive in the ways that they solicit disclosure of neurodivergence or other differences” (Birdwell & Bayley). Invasive assignments could also include assignments where a student must speak, as this “Can prove onerous for neurodivergent students” (Birdwell & Bayley). In making coursework for special education students, the most “Important role of special education teachers is working with students as individuals,” (Wasburn-Moses). This last point may seem to go against UDL, but “we should always keep the largest possible audience in mind as we make design decisions, ensuring that our final product serves the needs of those with disabilities as well as those without...universal design is efficient” (Williams) keeping the largest possible audience in mind, including individual flexibility. This can be accomplished efficiently, as being and having ready-made materials is always more

efficient than scrambling together a retrofit.

Individual flexibility could naturally speak to personalization, and the desire to personalize topics, classwork, and assignments. So, it must be fully noted, “Personalization may be particularly advantageous for students with disabilities, who may have more limited experience with or understanding of key social studies concepts...However, personalization may also limit understanding, particularly in history classes. Students' everyday lives and experiences are vastly different from most of the historical events and characters they study...Interpreting history through the lens of our own experience leads to the bias of presentism, thus limiting our ability to understand people and events in the context of the times and situations in which they occurred. Hence, teachers need to both draw students into social studies [by] making history more personal and then help them stand back and examine the differences between then and now” (Scruggs et al.). Of course, it is seemingly obvious that “Students expressed greater interest in those topics that were relevant to their personal interests and chronological ages,” yet there is a fine balance that must be handled between personal interest and needed topics. Still, personal and individual must always account for given disabilities and all students must be given a personal and individual entry point to an assignment “The incorporation of all senses including movement, touch, sight, and hearing, making it highly effective because a child with reading difficulties is able to see, sound, write and this has been proven to promote great mastery of literacy skills” (Oluoch-Suleh & Ombara).

Coursework must be pretested with a class before being implemented for a grade. Teachers must determine if interdisciplinary coursework meets desired goals for special education, including improving reading comprehension and a great understanding of subject topics. So, “by working to meet the needs of disabled people—and by working with disabled people through usability testing” (Williams), as technology needs to be tested, so does coursework, and having a testing period will allow students to feel unencumbered while working through subject topics. Testing allows for teachers to work with student needs both en masse and as individuals. No coursework is going to be perfectly befitting, but via testing, teachers can make adjustments for particular classes. Still, “A curriculum that is broad and opens opportunities for individualized learning needs and opportunities is the best suited for students with specific education needs, such as children with dyslexia” (Oluoch-Suleh & Ombara).

Some Classwork/Assignment Options

Interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students should not be lectured based, “Not surprisingly, research has shown that students with reading and language disabilities learn less from lectures, as measured by comprehension of content, than do their peers...instructional practices that improve the amount of information students learn and retain from lectures include review of prior information, guided notetaking, lecture outlines, and frequent pauses to ask questions and summarize information...Study guides, which make explicit the information that students are expected to learn for tests or other evaluation activities, also effectively improve the performance of students with disabilities in social studies classes” (Scruggs et al.).

The most obvious sort of classwork that benefits both social science and language arts

studies are read-alouds. These read-alouds cannot be isolated but must be interactive and collaborative to best build a joint understanding of materials for the totality of students within a given classroom. Interactive collaborative read-alouds allow for the teacher or teachers, plus students, to become a resource for all students to understand any given materials. These interactive read-alouds cannot just be presented without thoughtful planning, or students may deeply misunderstand a set of given materials, “During interactive read-alouds, teachers scaffold children’s sense-making and support their learning of new concepts through direct instruction; asking questions before, during, and after reading; helping children make connections between the book and their own lives or world; and extending children’s responses. Concepts collaboratively discussed over time through multiple read-alouds become internalized for children as they make the knowledge their own and integrate it within their existing framework. In the field of literacy, research demonstrates clear benefits of interactions during read-alouds between students and the teacher on young children’s content vocabulary” (Strachan).

Vocabulary-based classwork and assignments are also live options. Both social science and language arts vocabulary can be interlaced into classwork and or assignments. Vocabulary-based work would enhance special education students’ factual learning. “At the most basic level, social studies entails factual learning, or the development of declarative knowledge about specialized vocabulary” (Scruggs et al.), where specialized vocabulary could become everyday vocabulary. In this sense, a teacher must be highly selective of which vocabulary they teach upon ensuring the vocabulary indeed has everyday or near everyday utility, “Teaching words in context and demonstrating and discussing different situations in which they occur, including those outside of the social studies, extends students’ understanding of the nuances of word meaning and helps them generalize their vocabulary understanding to novel material” (Scruggs et al.). General vocabulary work can include, but also does not need to be limited to, “[The creation of] study aids such as notecards. [Linking] new vocabulary to familiar ideas and experiences.[Practicing] to-be-learned words in small sets of 3-5 until mastery. [Using] short practice sessions, spread over time, rather than lengthier, “cram” study sessions...[Providing] frequent and systematic review, interspersed with practice on new words” (Scruggs et al.). Yet, the teaching of vocabulary does not have to be limited to the factual level; conceptual learning, procedural learning, and investigative learning, among other learnings, are desirable.

Graphic organizers are also helpful for special education students and give students an interactive means to understand the given materials. This is due to their clear visual presentation of notions: “Graphic organizers help students develop their understanding of the relationship among ideas through comparison and cause-effect routines” (Scruggs et al.). Graphic organizers do not have to be an isolated assignment but can be interlaced with other classwork or assignments: “Before discussion and reading, graphic organizers can help teachers assess students’ prior knowledge, introduce a topic, activate students’ prior knowledge, provide a reason or rationale for the topic, facilitate brainstorming, and pique students’ interest. During discussion [if used] and reading, graphic organizers can support notetaking, provide a memory aid, extend learning, highlight main ideas, and offer the teacher means to assess students’ understanding and misconceptions. After reading and discussion [if used], graphic organizers can also assess learning, reinforce or review content, provide a summary of what has been learned, and set the stage for future instruction” (Scruggs et al.).

Group projects are a positive outlet for students in special education environments: “Students’ attitudes toward social studies are more positive in project-based learning conditions” (Scruggs et al.). Of course, the nature of projects can vary, but they should be flexible and allow students to draw from their particular skill sets. Any restrictive group projects could easily isolate students from the work at hand and from their peers. It must also be noted that “Interdisciplinary student teamwork should be guided by defining roles and tasks separate from discipline-based stereotypes” (Braßler), meaning students need to be shown how to act within multiple disciplines at once. Examples of group work include partner and choral reading: “Students [could] alternate between partner reading and choral reading. At appropriate stopping points...ask students to summarize or list key ideas from the text...pull sentences out of the text and change a few words, and ask students whether the sentence still [makes] sense with the new words. These strategies were designed to facilitate the necessary skills to ultimately integrate idea units from text to support deeper meaning” (Solis & Vaughn et al.).

As is obvious, classwork and assignments should not be static. “Adjust readability levels of text based on the individual needs of students. The multicomponent intervention consisted of the following instructional components: (a) vocabulary instruction, (b) fluency with text, and (c) reading comprehension. These components were scaffolded with a buildup of difficulty level by first focusing on word-level understanding, then sentence-level comprehension, and finally multi-paragraph passage reading” (Solis & Reutebuch et al.). In addition, all the evidence-based work options have not been exhausted here, yet all point to some general useful notions: mainly implicitly, that assignments should assist in the process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. “Deterritorialisation means that previous territories are swallowed up and emptied out of their particularities” (Cole & Gannon), that students should have the space to interact and interact in myriad terms.

While work comes with the territory of education, desiring-production should not be forced as: “Desiring-production is personalized, or rather personologized, imaginized, structuralized” (Deleuze and Guattari). If a student desires production, such desires and productivity tendencies ought to be encouraged, but if a student does not desire normative standards of productivity, then we must educate toward that student’s flourishing. In a world without resource limits, it would be ideal for every student to have an IEP. Yet, we must make use of the truly available resources lest we find ourselves in a state where: “Production is reduced to mere fantasy production, production of expression” (Deleuze and Guattari).

Teacher Resources

The nature of available useful resources is always changing. Ideally, teachers should do their best to keep updated with the resources made available to them, along with seeking resources that can benefit students. However, we are not in an ideal world; teachers face myriad stressors and institutional setbacks that disallow them from providing ideal resources to special education students.

While the resource landscape is always changing, some tools remain steadfast and should remain highly useful for quite some time. For example, “Just about every major historical museum, national park, and large university offers websites that contain rich primary and

secondary source documents about social studies topics and events” (Scruggs et al.).

Teachers ultimately must be creative with the resources they are given and find. In addition, teachers simply cannot use resources willy-nilly, as, for example, “Even visual media, such as pictures and movies, which we tend to accept as more accessible than print, may not be immediately useful to students without instruction and guidance” (Scruggs et al.). But what is before the educator, no matter what it may be, could be put to use if utilized creatively: “Everything divides, but into itself. Even the distances are positive, at the same time as the included disjunctions” (Deleuze and Guattari).

Outcomes

Some potential outcomes of interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students cannot be objectively tested, such as “Social studies instruction has a publicly recognized social goal to prepare students for participation in the decisions and actions that can improve the society in which they live...the relevance of many social studies topics to everyday life is perhaps more direct than is the case in other subjects, facilitating the potential application and generalization of social studies learning” (Scruggs et al.). How could one objectively test whether socialization has improved or if social sciences assist students in comprehending everyday life? As if there is one way to comprehend everyday life:

“Schizoanalysis approaches beings (i.e., consumers, parents, teacher education candidates, beginning teachers) as points of subjectification that form and reform within collective practice” (Cole & Gannon). Interdisciplinary education under schizoanalysis reveals that life for the student exists not as an individual practice, but as a rhizomatic web. Ultimately, what comprises improved socialization and matters of everyday life are highly, if not totally, subjective. What instead should be aimed for is an even more subjective matter that “Life can be analyzed and expanded from new perspectives” (de Maman).

As a secondary accomplishment, students in interdisciplinary courses improved at using varied technologies: “All students became more proficient in using Web-based search engines to collect data” (Jenkins). Especially since technologies can open up new territories for students: “Deteritorialisation and reterritorialisation ‘operate on physical bodies and involve material investments or energy’” (Sellar), along with the living-machines and non-living-machines.

That being stated, in terms of accomplishing contextual goals, there is evidence that students are more than capable of connecting social science and language arts: “Data directed towards students’ awareness of connections between the disciplines showed students consistently seeing connections between language arts and science, and connections between language arts and social studies” (Akins & Akerson). Yet, improvements have been made not just in terms of connecting subjects but also “The content of social studies provides engaging and compelling ideas and issues that are ideal for knowledge acquisition and for improving reading comprehension” (Vaughn et al.).

But it must be noted that every educational outcome is a partial outcome and therefore a partial object. And so any outcome displayed only reflects the partial reality of any given student: “Partial objects are subjected to the notorious law of totality-unity acting as ‘lacking’” (Deleuze and Guattari).

Data Analysis & Oedipal Reproduction

Data Compilation Table

Measure	Design	N (number of participants)	Intervention Focus	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Effect Size/ Improvement	Key Findings
Social Studies & Content Literacy	Pre-post	39	Social studies + literacy integration	SS: 28.26 (5.22)	SS: 38.72 (7.03)	$P < 0.001$	Significant gains in social studies knowledge and content literacy.
Vocabulary Interventions	SCD (single case)	2-4	Vocabulary instruction	Varies by study	Varies by study	23.6% - 47.5% improvement	1:1 tutoring (researcher/peer) showed consistent vocabulary gains.
Reading Comprehension	SCD/pre-post	3-31	Comprehension strategies	Varies by study	Varies by study	14 % - 96% improvement; ES = 0.32 - 1.57	Peer tutoring and small-group interventions are effective.
Woodcock-Johnson Passage Comprehension	Mixed-effects model	261 (Treatment)	Multi-component	Baseline: 83.10	Post: 80.41 (11.11)	$G = 0.45$	Moderate effect size; GARS severity levels influenced outcomes.
Test of Sentence Reading Efficiency	Mixed-effects model	261 (Treatment)	Reading fluency/ comprehension	Baseline: 9.13	Post: 85.18 (10.81)	$G = 0.45$	Significant improvement in silent reading efficiency.

Measure	Design	N (number of participants)	Intervention Focus	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Effect Size/ Improvement	Key Findings
Strategy Use Measure (SUM)	Mixed-effects model	261 (Treatment)	Metacognitive strategies	Baseline: 8.48		P < 0.001 (time effect)	Strategy use improved, especially with verbal ability support.
Interdisciplinary Outcomes	Pre-post		Social studies + language arts integration	Pre: 4% (SS), 8% (LA)	Post: 54% (SS), 70% (LA)		Interdisciplinary methods doubled proficiency in social studies and language arts.

*Note: Data compiled from tables by (Akins & Akerson), (Strachan), (Solis & Reutebuch et al.), (Solis & Vaughn et al.), (Vaughn et al.)

*Note 2: SS = Social studies content knowledge summed score.

*Note 3: LA = Language Arts content knowledge summed score

*Note 4: GARS = Gilliam Autism Rating Scale

*Note 5: SCD = single case design

* Note 6: ES = effect size

In the simplest terms, in the majority of cases, interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses improve various reading literacies for students. The data shows that teachers and staff should figure out how to implement interdisciplinary social science and language arts coursework or courses. While implementation is the most difficult process, there is philosophical soundness alongside evidence to point to the desirable implementation of interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses. In this, “Literacy skills are key in determining performance in other subjects taught in the school curriculum” (Oluoch-Suleh & Ombara).

This set of data points to the need to go about “Pedagogical practices that challenge the traditional curriculum and incorporate more experimental and inclusive methods, allowing for greater freedom of thought and action” (de Maman). But as it currently stands, education reinforces false normative frames and regularly reproduces these frames: “This shifts the victimizing position of education from an involuntary target of, and respondent to crisis, to a driving anthropo-reproductive force in escalating it” (Pedersen). Education reproduces particular

images of what it means to be human while displacing others, “Lack is arranged in the most scientific of ways” (Deleuze and Guattari). Interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses offer the possibility of showcasing more images of humanity both in the classroom and while more importantly, helping to grant students the confidence to assert their images of the world.

Conclusion & The Need for Further Specified Research

Simply put, “The role of interdisciplinarity and integration of special education and regular classrooms is also not well examined” (Antifave), nor are any other aspects of special education and interdisciplinary work. Further research on interdisciplinary courses for special education students, including interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students, needs “New, streamlined models of secondary programming that are based on only a few explicit goals need to be developed and field-tested with students to determine their effects on achievement and outcomes” (Wasburn-Moses).

All in all, the hope and need for research into interdisciplinary social science and language arts courses for special education students should be done because an “enhanced understanding of human society and the physical universe can be expected to improve the quality of the lives of students with disabilities” (Scruggs et al.), which can lead to an improvement of all comprehensions in general. So in summation, “educators need access to more specialized, evidence-based instruction as part of their specialized instructional supports required to improve academic outcomes” (Solis & Reutebuch et al.).

The evidence and philosophical strength of the interdisciplinary social science and language arts course are present. “The encounter between teaching and schizoanalysis is fertile ground for the creation of innovative and transformative pedagogical practices...schizoanalysis contributes to emphasizing the importance of singularization processes, where each subject is seen as unique and in constant transformation” (de Maman). Now what must be done is a matter of political philosophy, a need to understand and wield power to have a beneficial course implemented in educational settings. Teachers must be granted the freedom to experiment with interdisciplinary approaches by Oedipal administrators or override Oedipal administrative desires to teach in ways that follow evidence-based practices. “Systems change over time. Instead of evolving linearly and predictably, they spread out and make their systems more dispersed and difficult to isolate and trace” (Punished Felix). Teachers must learn to be deterritorializers and reterritorializers, no datum or recommendation will teach that. “One can never go far enough in the direction of deterritorialization: you haven’t seen anything yet—an irreversible process” (Deleuze and Guattari). Reading improvements, myriad forms of learning, and interdisciplinary classes are but first steps toward reorienting new possibilities of special education for the benefit of special education students.

References:

Akins, A., & Akerson, V. L., "Connecting science, social studies, and language arts: An interdisciplinary approach," *Educational Action Research*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 479–498, 2002. DOI: [10.1080/09650790200200196](https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790200200196)

Antifave, L., "Interdisciplinary special education teachers: Individual education plans (IEPs) for students with learning disabilities," Master's final project essay, Athabasca University, 2013.

Becker, K., "Effects of interdisciplinary instruction on students' connection of knowledge across learning domains," *Honors Projects*, Bowling Green State University, Paper 695, 2022. Available: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/honorsprojects/695/>

Birdwell, M. L. N., & Bayley, K., "When the syllabus is ableist: Understanding how class policies fail disabled students," *Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC)*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 220–237, 2022.

Braßler, M., "Interdisciplinary teaching and learning – Theory, empirical results, and practical implications," *ICERI Proceedings*, 2020. DOI: [10.21125/iceri.2020.2072](https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2020.2072)

Cecil-Lemkin, E., "Expanding access in collaborative writing pedagogy," *Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC)*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 203–219, 2022.

Cole, David R., and Susanne Gannon. *Teacher-Education-Desiring-Machines*. Issues in Teacher Education, season-03 2017, files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1157177.pdf.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. 1972. Translated by Robert Hurley et al., Penguin Books, 2009.

De Maman, Daniela. "The Encounter Between Teaching and Schizoanalysis: Desiring Investments by Female Teachers." *Revista Aracê*, vol. 7, no. 3, Mar. 2025, pp. 10209–25. doi.org/10.56238/arev7n3-005.

Dunn, Patricia Ann. *Learning Re-Abled: The Learning Disability Controversy and Composition Studies*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1995.

Gardner, J. E., Wissick, C. A., Schweder, W., & Smith Canter, L. (2003). Enhancing interdisciplinary instruction in general and special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(3), 161–172. doi:10.1177/07419325030240030501

Hubrig, A., "Emphasizing access in open-access education: One disabled person's plea to two-year college English teacher-scholar-activists," *Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC)*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 193–202, 2022.

Jenkins, R. A., "Interdisciplinary instruction in the inclusion classroom," *Teaching Exceptional Children*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 42–48, 2005.

Oluoch-Suleh, E., & Ombara, J., "Application and relevance of the Orton Gillingham Structured Literacy Teaching Approach to pupils with specific learning disabilities in Kenyan public primary schools," *Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, vol. 6, no. 8, pp. 343–350, 2023. DOI: [10.36348/sijll.2023.v06i08.001](https://doi.org/10.36348/sijll.2023.v06i08.001)

Pedersen, H. (2022). Anatomies of desire: Education and human exceptionalism after *Anti-Oedipus*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 56(3), 252–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2022.2130043>

Punished Felix. *What Is Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization?* 8 Jan. 2022, punishedfelix.com/notes/01-08-2022.html.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & Marshak, L., "Science and social studies for students with disabilities," *Focus on Exceptional Children*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 1–21, 2008.

Sellar, S. (2015). A Strange Craving to be Motivated: Schizoanalysis, Human Capital and Education. *Deleuze Studies*, 9(3), 424–436. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45331824>

Solis, M., Reutebuch, C., Vaughn, S., & Jimenez, Z. (2022). Reading enhancements for students with autism spectrum disorder: A matched Randomized Pilot Experimental Study. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 93, 101937. doi:10.1016/j.rasd.2022.101937

Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Stillman-Spisak, S. J., & Cho, E. (2018a). Effects of reading comprehension and vocabulary intervention on comprehension-related outcomes for ninth graders with low reading comprehension. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 34(6), 537–553. doi:10.1080/10573569.2018.1499059

Strachan, S. L., "Kindergarten students' social studies and content literacy learning from interactive read-alouds," *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, vol. 39, pp. 207–223, 2015. DOI: [10.1016/j.jssr.2015.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2015.08.003) SAGE Journals

Tobin, T. (2022). Overwhelmed? Are You Guarding the Wrong Tower? *Thriving in Academe*, 402(2).

Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Williams, K. J., Miciak, J., Fall, A.-M., & Roberts, G., "Efficacy of a high school extensive reading intervention for English learners with reading difficulties," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 373–386, 2019. DOI: [10.1037/edu0000289](https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000289)

Wasburn-Moses, L., "Roles and responsibilities of secondary special education teachers in an age of reform," *Remedial and Special Education*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 151–158, 2005.

Williams, G. H., "Disability, universal design, and the digital humanities," in *Part III*, pp. 202–212, 2023.