# КОРЕКЦІЙНА ПЕДАГОГІКА

## LITERATURE AND LIFE: USING IMPLICIT THEORY OF PERSONALITY AND PSYCHO-SEMANTIC PRINCIPLES FOR PEER-TUTOR MODELING IN SPECIAL NEEDS LANGUAGE AND WRITER-RESPONSE

**Dr. Thomas Eaton**

*У багатьох програмах із підвищення грамотності невірним є припущення про те, що можливо винайти програму із навчання читання та письма, що буде підходити великій кількості учнів із особливими потребами. Дане дослідження стверджує, що «програма» фіксованого навчального плану, яка спрямована на задоволення даних потреб, виявиться невдалою, адже навчальний план не здатен врахувати інтерактивного характеру особистості учня та адаптуватися до міри його значущості у навчальному процесі. Ця стаття використовує дослідження у сферах мотивації, інтерпретацій мислення, орієнтирів розвитку при оволодінні мовою, а також базується на первинних літературних розвідках узагальнюючого навчання та доступності книг, та визначає засоби виявлення літературних припущень і роль літератури у навчанні звичайних учнів та учнів із особливими потребами. Також у дослідженні надається огляд двох психологічних підходів, потрібних для успішної інтеграції інклюзивного навчання та демонструється важливість залучення особистісних та семантичних цінностей учня з особливими потребами при вивченні літератури, на відміну від інших дисциплін, що можуть викладатися в утилітарному форматі в межах інклюзивної освіти. Останнє твердження чітко прослідковується через призму досліджень Людмили Шевченко-Савчинської та Костянтина Балашова (2015 р.), які залучають літературу древнього світу як таку, що включає ці важливі психологічні елементи у процес інтеграції грамотності в сферу особливих потреб.*

*Ключові слова: особливі потреби, навчальна інтеграція, залучення літератури, семантичні цінності, інтеграція грамотності.*

*Во многих программах по повышению грамотности неверным является предположение о том, что возможно создание программы по обучению чтению и письму, которая будет подходить большому количеству учеников с особыми потребностями. Данное исследование утверждает, что «программа» фиксированного учебного плана, которая направлена на удовлетворение данных потребностей, окажется неудачной, ведь учебный план не способен учесть интерактивного характера личности ученика и адаптироваться к степени его значимости в учебном процессе. Эта статья использует исследования в сферах мотивации, интерпретаций мышления, ориентиров развития при овладении языком, а также базируется на первичных исследованиях литературы обобщающего обучения и доступности книг, и определяет средства обнаружения литературных предположений и роль литературы в обучении обычных учеников и учеников с особыми потребностями. Также в исследовании предоставляется обзор двух психологических подходов, необходимых для успешной интеграции инклюзивного обучения и демонстрируется важность привлечения личностных и семантических ценностей ученика с особыми потребностями при изучении литературы, в отличие от других дисциплин, которые могут выкладываться в утилитарном формате в пределах инклюзивного образования. Последнее утверждение четко прослеживается через призму исследований Людмилы Шевченко-Савчинской и Константина Балашова (2015), которые привлекают литературу древнего мира как такую, которая включает эти важные психологические элементы, в процесс интеграции грамотности в сферу особых потребностей.*

*Ключевые слова: особые потребности, учебная интеграция, вовлечение литературы, семантические ценности, интеграция грамотности.*

*In many literacy programs, the assumption that a program can be invented that will fit with a multitude of special-needs learners in reading and writing proves untrue. This research argues that a set curriculum «program» to address these needs will result in failure because a programmatic curriculum fails to take into consideration both the interactive nature of the personality of the student being addressed, as well as not being able to adapt to the learner's measure of meaning.Incorporating studies in motivation, developmental benchmarks in language acquisition, interpretations of intellect, and building on primary literary research regarding stereotyping learning and literary access, it indicates a means of identifying literary assumptions and the role of literature to both mainstream and special-needs learners. This research also provides an overview of two psychological approaches necessaryfor successful special-needs learning integration and demonstrates that while other disciplines can be treated in a utilitarian format within special-needs training areas, literature must engage personality and semantic valuesof the special-needs learner as is clearly indicated through the research lens of LyudmylaShevchenko-Savchynska&Kostyantyn Balashov, (2015) in their engagement of ancient literature as meeting these psychological elements crucial to special-needs literacy integration.*

*Key words: special-needs learners, theory of personality, interactive nature of personality, motivation, semantic values.*

## Definitions

Programmatic (Core) Curriculum – A learning curriculum that a school, state, or country apply to serve all students on core subjects (language, mathematics, science, and history) as a means of meeting the core-learning needs of the widest range of students regardless of implicit personality identifications or special-needs indicators. Referred to in this work as utilitarianism.

Peer-Tutor Modeling (Curriculum) – A technique whereby the teacher tailors learning, working directly with individual special-needs learners' physical, psychological, and semantic boundaries on a one-to-one basis, connecting to (programmatic Core) curriculum but not making the mainstream curriculum the teacher-learner priority. Referred to in this work as humanistic.

Identifiers/Markers – Established conditions of special-needs learners that fall within the field of special-needs study, used to help define and identify the special-need that is not, or cannot be addressed through programmatic core curriculum. The identifier/marker serves as a baseline for special-needs categorization as the first step in identifying a special-needs approach to learning core objectives and addresses these areas:

- Physical(sensory; sight, audio or coordination/mobility)
- Mental (trauma/brain development, chemical imbalances, (ADHD or Depression)
- Emotional (anxiety, abuse)
- Social (economic/racial/ gender identification)
- Advanced (Gifted and Talented, Savant)
- Linguistic (ESL, TESOL, dominant and secondary language)

Implicit Theory of Personality – A psychological application that attempts to identify human motivation factors by finding the link or connection between individual personality traits and their connection to a larger, social world. ITP most often employs how the special-needs learner identifies himself or herself and what elements promote motivation to learn, as well as those which impede learning.

Psycho-Semantics – Psycho-semantics studies the origin, structure and function of the individual systems of meaning that influences thought, memory, and decision-making skills. It also includes language acquisition development levels at various ages and connects to meaning in the individual mind. This area may include results from Implicit Theory of Personality indicators.

Multilingualism – A condition whereby literature serves to provide an understanding of other cultures through translated works, allowing a special-needs learner to engage in global literature, even though he or she may not speak the language. Multilingualism is connected closely to bilingual study, which is the basis of being able to speak two languages with an understanding of their syntactic meaning. The level of multilingualism, including both bilingualism and interpretive multilingualism can serve to increase psycho-semantic meaning and alter current representations of the special-needs learners' personality and motivation in a positive way.

## Introduction

The issue of how to address special-needs learners in classrooms worldwide is becoming a greater issue for teachers as more students are identified as special-needs. The debate, as it were, is how can we best serve them and provide them with the best education that meets with their abilities within the closest margin of our mainstream population not identified as special-needs. The utilitarian concept of education addresses one side of the debate through providing a «one size fits all» style, which may have its advantages but still, many are going to fall through if we follow the Utilitarian ideal. This ideal states that».

«All moral and political decisions are justified by their utility, that is, by their conduciveness to the «greatest good of the greatest number» (Beck, p.177).

While Utilitarianism marks what we know as textbook-driven schools with textbooks set for certain ages and set formulas for all students in that age group that are not special-needs learners, education recognizes to some extent the idea of utilitarianism, especially in language and literature as not the answer for education in schools worldwide, such as we see in Franco's I' statement that:

«We do so not because of greedy national ambitions, that here we have an old and rich literature, but simply because we see the history of literature as the image of intellectual development of the nation, that has never and will not be the subject to any one formula» (Franco, I, in L. Shevchenko-Savchynska, and K. Balashov, 2015.) (italics-mine).

This position is also argued in other cultures, including and led by German humanist philosophies that reject utilitarianism, especially in art and creating, as we see demonstrated by Hugo Von Hofmannsthal (1894) whereby:

«… The Task is to call forth from the lost fragment, through a great exertion of the imagination, a momentary vision of that strange world. Whoever can accomplish this and is capable of such an exertion and concentration of the reproductive imagination will be a great critic. He will also be very just and very conciliatory because he will measure every work of art by an ideal but a subjective ideal gained from the artist's personality…» (Hofmannsthal, H., «Walter Pater» (1894).

Given these choices then; that all things relating to society, education being one of them, teachers have to make a decision to follow a utilitarian route mandated by the state or their school district, or teachers have to be willing to allow learners to experiment with forms of learning and study that do not subscribe to a utilitarian idea. In many cases, the utilitarian method is most often employed; rigid course constructs that all students follow to their graduation and fully representative of the utilitarian concept of educating as many learners as possible in the shortest amount of time, at the least expense, and to the same level to be operative in their respective societies. The utilitarianism approach places student personality, intellect, and their associations to the world as secondary to the program core objectives, meaning that the learners are there not to necessarily engage the learning but simply to learn the objectives put forth in the core subjects.

## History

For the most part, this method works. However, in U.S. schools, the late 1960's and 1970's brought outcry from parents with special-needs children who were attending public schools only to be either ignored in the classroom, or isolated in special classrooms. The utilitarian plan was not addressing special-needs learners in either an intellectual or social capacity. Laws were enacted that made schools responsible for providing special-needs training and insisted that special needs learners be mainstreamed – that is to participate with peers for a part of the day, rather than being isolated to special education classrooms with limited interaction outside of that room.

This movement led towards massive educational and psychological research in identifying special-needs learners and building support curricula that would help them learn «around» their specific special-need, leading to our application of the IEP (Individualized Education Plan) for assisting special-needs learners' intellectual processes while still supporting their mainstreamed social participation. Note too, the word «individualized» indicating that utilitarian plan would not work with special-needs learners and serving as evidence that a more humanist and peer-tutor approach would be necessary.

Even now, almost 50 years later in the U.S., the conflict still stands. Many states adopted what is termed «Common Core» as an attempt to socially equalizeeducation for everyone while providing the same curriculums across states. To say that the program has failed would be judgmental; however, many U.S. states have refused to engage the Common Core process, recognizing that it does not allow for student engagement and critical thinking, nor does it address special-needs learners in the classroom or focus on teacher quality (Eaton, 2015). As educational research has built a stronger foundation since its early years, especially in the area of special-needs learners, more are identified and given IEP support, indicating that a more humanist approach to education, rather than a utilitarian blanket-approach may be emerging in education.

Therefore, as we address the literature within the limitations of this introductory research we find that many countries are facing the same dilemma although at different periods in their history: How do we maintain a utilitarian educational system that serves the widest body of learners while still serving special-needs students in a participatory and positive learning experience?

One answer lies in balancing the utilitarian approach with the humanist approach through applying Implicit Theory of Personality, coupling it with Psycho-Semantics, and building curriculum that is not textbook-driven but one that is teacher-driven through listening, learning, and adapting multilingual literature to fit the personalities, learning levels, and meaning-accessibility of all of our learners. Such will be the focus of our review of literature that focuses upon this psycho-educational, humanist approach within a utilitarian framework.

## Review of the Literature

This research, serving only as a brief introduction to the issue of how best to engage the special-needs learner, first addressed whether the utilitarianism approach of programmatic core textbooks will better serve the special-needs learner, or if the humanist approach with individualized peer-tutor learning and engagement perspectives will better serve. This research argues that the only the peer-tutor approach will work because of the various categories of special needs. This research forms the argument, through the lenses of both Implicit Theory of Personality, and psycho-semantic interaction, that the humanist, personalized approach will yield higher results in assisting special-needs learners to incorporate more gradually into the mainstream utilitarian educational system globally inherent in most worldwide educational centers. The crux to this research then comes down to one salient point–teachers at all levels must engage their special-needs learners in conversation and expression before attempting any form of «teaching» – meaning that teachers must have a sense of each special-needs learner's implicit personality as well as his or her psycho-semantic successes and limitations. This can only be done through one-on-one discussion and conversation with the special-needs learner.

Addressing special-needs learners through Implicit Theory of Personality.

In its abbreviated form, Implicit Theory of Personality (Petrovsky A.V &Yaroshevski,M.G 1987) simply suggests that all of us connect to the world in a way that forms much of our personality. Whether that connection becomes fixed, or is fluid, is still a topic within psychology not yet resolved. For teachers engaging in literature teaching, understanding the special-needs learner's personality, at least to a moderate point, is necessary to

generate literature choices that will resonate with the special-needs learner, rather than literature that is simply canon-based and taught because it is famous. The result that we are looking for in understanding our special-needs learners and their personality approaches is so that we may pinpoint their motivation factors.

Motivation (Dweck& London, 2004) is the key to success in any endeavor and motivation or «mental representation» is generated when the teacher brings in literature that is relevant to the special-needs learner, especially as whichever special-needs category that needs to be addressed will play a major role in the implicit personality paradigm of the special-needs learner. For example, a special-need learner who is blind is going to have a different perception (Implicit Personality element) of the world than a special-needs learner who may have suffered early head trauma or is dealing with serious emotional issues at home. The teacher must be able to adapt literature to fit those individual personality constructs. How then, may a teacher with limited time in teaching special-needs learners, gain insight into the various personalities in his or her classroom?

Due to the complexity of personality study it would be impossible to know every element of every student. However, teachers can gain insight and generate motivation to literature by connecting literary studies to three standard areas of implicit personality theory – areas shared by all learners at all levels. These elements include self-esteem, intelligence measures, and metaphor use in student response.

Self-esteem (Erdle, Gosling, and Potter, 2009) is a keyfunction of Implicit Theory of Personality because there is strong support that a higher level of self-esteem connects to problem-solving skills. In the field of literature, these two concepts are paramount as learners connect to literature both at a level of a positive or troubled self-esteem implicit (implied) connection. For special-needs learners, the sense of self-esteem, in terms of how well the special-needs learner has learned to cope with his or her need, is of direct importance. Therefore, a teacher who can recognize the level of self-esteem within his or her special-needs learners can adapt literature to strengthen the learner's self-perception, or to demonstrate how, as readers and writers, special-needs learners participate in literature as a means of establishing their place and value in the world; what L. Shevchenko-Savchynska& K. Balashov, 2015) within their studies of the role of Latin literary influences on Ukrainian literature show through early Latin and Ukrainian literary art as «…ful filled with humanistic ideas, full of delight by man as God's creation…The mind, however, can easily understand it.»(Drohobych's (1988) in Shevchenko-Savchynska&Balashov, 2015).

While Shevchenko-Savchynska&Balashov's work in Ukrainian literature was not directed to any discussion of special-needs learners and may seem disconnected in this subject, a close review of the literature surrounding their research represents the idea of literature as a connection between a teacher and learners, in developing both personal and national self-esteem. Therefore, their inclusion in this research is in demonstrating both the connective idea of literature to all, regardless of special-needs, and their concept of historical literature speaking to both the individual and a nation in terms of breaking down stereotypes – a key objective, this 'breaking down' – that we are trying to achieve in how we both teach and interact with special-needs learners. Their research gives indicators in terms of how we perceive literature. These perceptions can provide indicators in terms of whether teachers are prohibiting or encouraging special-needs learners to engage in literature and connect to the larger world of implicit personality and related history, and expanding their personal psycho-semantic range of meaning through reading, exploration, sampling, and a positive return to earlier languages.

The second level within Implicit Personality Theory is that of teacher's perception regarding intelligence. While a quality teacher attempts to eliminate these perceptions as biased, intellectual perception plays a large role (Oakes J., Wells, A., Jones M., &Datnow, A., 1997) in the interpretation of what a special-needs learner can or cannot do within literature. Therefore, there is a tendency to move away from literature that can profess nationalism and self-esteem for something «easier». This misconception sets a dangerous schema for teachers serving special-needs children because if a teacher assumes that an intellectual level is set – that is, fixed, then the answer is to make the literature easier, rather than harder, which undermines self-esteem that needs to take on challenges to prove itself active. Literature study affected by teacher bias then, cancels out one attribute (self-esteem) to address another goal (a reading level where the special-needs learner can perform at what the teacher presumes to be the appropriate reading level.) Such evidence lies in the following perspective:

«Implicit theories of intelligence are especially important in educational settings because students who view intelligence as something that can be changed tend to be more academically-motivated and perform at higher academic levels than students who view intelligence as a fixed, unchangeable trait (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, &Dweck, 2007).

Intelligence-factoring by teachers becomes an area of caution if assumptions are made in regard to the special-needs learner's intellectual capacity. Therefore, teachers dealing with special-needs learners have to control their own assumptions and assume that intellect is fluid. This is a key problem with utilitarian textbook training, whereby all students are categorized by their age and grade, rather than their intellectual ability of being either above or below that age/class threshold.

The third level of Implicit Theory of Personality in which teachers can engage, especially in literature, as issues of self-esteem and intellect are considered, is the condition of 'self-reporting.'

One of the beauties of humanistic, tailored peer-tutor literature training in a special-needs classroom is the opportunity for the special-needs learner to 'teach the teacher.' Self-reporting means that the learner engages in his or her own learning and 'reports' to you, the teacher, on his or her perception of the learning that is going on. This is an element missing in utilitarian education where the teacher asks the question and a random student responds, whereas the 'self-report' is directed specifically at the special-needs student who is made to take ownership of his or her learning by participating within it(Banerjee &Yuill, 1999). This area of 'self-reporting' bridges the chasm between Implicit Theory of Personality and its companion, psycho-semantics. This occurs because the special-needs learner uses metaphor to describe his or her progress. Metaphor is an element of semantic grouping and is natural in self-reporting and can tell the teacher a lot about what the learner is thinking. This self-reporting, with psycho-semantic meanings, can tell a qualified teacher a lot about what type of literature will be best to help assist the learner.

«I feel like I'm dying; like the rose in winter…»(dramatic-- but intuitive)

«I think that I'm dumb, like a rock.»(negative self-esteem)

«When I read, I do nothing. I'm just standing like a post.»(Post-analysis, Implicit truth)

Engaging both metaphors and similes, self-reporting allows the learner to tell what he or she doesn't like; how the learner is connecting to the world now (Implicit Theory of Personality) and also demonstrates a level of sophistication in psycho-semantics(Petrovsky A, &Yaroshevsky, M., 1987). A special-needs learner that can provide unique metaphors and similes in self-reporting is actually demonstrating both a more clear comprehension of his or her awareness within his or her own level of Implicit Theory of Personality, and in his or her psycho-semantic levels in sharing with the teacher. In the examples above, the first simile suggests sadness, the second, self-esteem, and the third, inaction. With these 'self-reports', a teacher can find literature that will respond positively to each condition, and he or she does so by listening to the special-needs student on a humanistic level. The example can work in reverse but tells the teacher the same thing:

«Reading is stupid and it makes me sad.»

«I'm too dumb to read a book.»

«I can be doing something else with my time than reading.»

In these examples, the learners are **not** using metaphor or simile. This does not reflect on their intellect but it does demonstrate that, in terms of implicit Theory of Personality that they have 'fixed' upon the idea that reading literature is a waste of time, and that the absence of simile or metaphor may indicate a lower psycho-semantic level of meaning which tells the teacher that a different literary work may be in order for those students; something which involves them.

Understanding the role of metaphor and description in 'self-reporting' within the learning processes of special-needs learners and their teachers can assist new teachers in choosing literature that will best affect a change in their learners and best compliment the special-needs category in which the special-needs learner IEP places that learner. This desired outcome leads back to (Oreyzlick, Olsson, Nabuco, & Cruz (2003) in Jones etal., 2012) conclusive statement that:

«…Other teachers have reported that teacher's judgments of their student's intelligence can impact their students' view of intelligence».

This means that encouraging special needs learners to 'declare' or self-report their learning can assist teachers in asserting more positive and accurate intelligence summaries. These more accurate views then will likely lead to more productive IEP schedules.

In summary then, from an implicit theory of personality perspective, with metaphor bridging the gap between personality and language -- what Noam Chomsky (2005) refers to as I-intellect, and leading into the second phase of psycho-semantic definition --special-needs learners need to have the experience of literature that bolsters self-esteem, that does not place their intellectual ability on par with the special-needs issue that needs addressed, (he or she had a head trauma, so obviously, cannot learn as much…) and to be given the opportunity to 'self-report' their learning as an opportunity to both participate in their growth as a learner and to verbally share their psycho-semantic level through applying meaning to their learning and the effects of literature upon them.

Psycho-Semantics:

This research, thus far, has promoted a humanistic peer-tutor condition in working with special-needs learners, and suggested that effective special-needs learning will only occur through a shared dialogue of implicit personality connectivity and psycho-semantic referencing in order to choose the best forms of literature for special-needs learners.

It has also offered that the use of metaphor used in spoken and written self-reporting within implicit personality theory, bridges the gap to psycho-semantics; the metaphorical and descriptive syntax providing the

best indicator of a special-needs learner to receive world literature as a further expression of the student himself or herself. From this metaphor juncture, the area of psycho-semantics may now be employed.

Alfred Tarski (1962), in his contribution to the discussion of the relationship between language and truth, defines perhaps the most accessible definition of semantics.

«Semantics is a discipline which, speaking loosely, deals with certain relations between expressions of a language and the objects or (state of affairs) referred to by those expressions… We may mention designation, satisfaction, and definition …(italics – mine) [as] the simplest and most natural way of obtaining an exact definition of truth is one which involves the use of other semantic notions… related to the more general problem of setting up the foundations of theoretical semantics.»

Psycho-semantics, then, works with the idea of some truth in how special-needs learners form perceptions of what is true and what is not. According to Tarski, that perception will be specifically influenced by 'satisfaction' – a key emotive judgment here that has an even greater influence on how a learner responds. If the learner views truth toward literature that «literature is boring,» or «literature has no relation to me,» then the confirmed truth in that learner's psycho-semantic vocabulary remains (boring… no relation = truth) until changed, becoming part of the learner's implicit personality.

Understanding even a little of the psycho-semantic operations of special-needs learners, along with any implicit theory of personality revelations that one may learn while teaching can strengthen the teacher-learner bond. The teacher, through these three areas, can discover what literature the learner values, be that historical, social, non-fiction, fantasy or any other genres. Evidence that the learner can supply through self-reporting, in terms the success or failure of the literary response, falls under generative meaning, problem solving, and dialogue problem-solving.

Generative meaning(A. Loretto& J. Chisholm, 2012) is a concept whereby special-needs and mainstream learners can provide written, visual (drawing) or imitated (audio) form of appropriate response that indicates their understanding of acertain literary work. As research in this and other research indicates, the closer the assigned literature choice is to the reader in terms of implied theory of personality, and the higher the operating level of psycho-semantic interpretation, the more advanced the response is likely to be. Generative means, then, to regenerate or 'grow again' – that the special-needs learner develops some sort of a response to the influence that a particular piece of literature brought forth. The expression is less relevant; be that a drawing, a writing assignment, an acted-out skit or play, an interpretation, conversion to a poem, or any other form that demonstrates acquired personality and a relationship to the work in the special-needs classroom, than the evidence that a connection was made to the literature.

The second key approach to resolving issues of truth and perception within individual psycho-semantic and implicit personalities in the classroom is that of problem-solving; that with Andrew Armitage (2013) terms as dialogue and collaborative problem-based learning or conscientization– the act of solving problems through bringing the problem to the front of the mind and then discussing it. Armitage' key contribution is showing how standard PBL (problem-Based Learning) components can be modified in the hands of a good teacher by generating what (Steier, 1995) tells us is an approach that allows for a condition whereby:

«We contextually recognize the various mutual relationships in which our knowing activities are embedded. (Steier, 1995) and, «[Participants in learning] are able to focus of analysis [to be] able to value alternative perspectives of the world, and dialogue is considered to be central to the process of deconstruction and reconstruction of theirs and others' lives in order to make sense of roles and relationships.»(Savin-Baden & Major, 2004 in Armitage, 2013).

In summary, what is being offered here is that special-needs learners, possessed of a set or temporarily-established psycho semantic meanings about what the world means, and the truth contained within it, can engage in a dialogue-based, problem-solving motif, mediated by a teacher who can both manage the discussion and analyze both metaphorical usage emerging from each learner's participation in solving the problem, and gaining an indication then of implicit personality elements of his or her learners, as well as gain insight into positive and negative approaches to problem solving that indicate a psycho-semantic level of comprehension of the issue being discussed. In short, the teacher can learn much about his or her special-needs learners' implicit personality constructs and psycho-semantic levels and judgments of truth, simply by listening to the possible answers at the root of a problem-solving issue. Problem-solving does much to promote psycho-semantics because it forces the participants to think of problems in new ways, verbalize those thoughts, and challenge their own concept of the world based upon their individual implicit personality condition and psycho-semantics meaning-formulations. In essence, «unlearning» a certain psycho-semantic meaning can be as valuable as learning a new one» (Eaton, 2008).

The third component that gives an indication of psycho-semantic meaning levels is that of a close evaluation of foreign language or ESL training. Learning a new language is considered, for all people, a form of special-needs education because it confers different meanings and approaches to all other academic areas. As

Shevchenko-Savchynska&Balashov (2015) reference several times throughout their work, and with strong evidence globally in terms of understanding linguistic transfer, Ukrainian, in this case, does not transfer easily to other languages in terms of full psycho-semantic interpretation but rather; is built upon predicating influences of Greek and Latin and a multilingual national history as a language unto itself.

Few would argue that most languages do not transfer intact in terms of meaning. As one learns a new language, the meanings, intonations, tone, and approach may mesh with that speaker's native language, but is more likely to mean something a bit different from one tongue to another. Therefore, foreign language courses may not be dealing with a specific special-need in terms of trauma, or emotion, or physicality, or the other special needs categories because in ones' own language, her or she may be highly-proficient in utilitarian learning classrooms -- but it certainly demonstrates that the technique of the humanistic peer-tutoring model; one that engages the implicit personality and psycho-semantic levels of the new language learner, will lead to a stronger psycho-semantic understanding of the new language within that special-needs address, and will facilitate basic syntactical growth and the ability to at least speak the language at a basic level, even if not fully understanding all of the intrinsic meanings behind the language.

Yang Gao, (2013) takes his research on foreign language learning into a utilitarian classroom room for philosophical discussion. However, this research too corroborates the idea of a peer-tutor model approach to special-needs learning – of which new language learners immersed in the culture they are attempting to learn to qualify as «special-needs» – through revisiting traditional educational scaffold philosophies. Most notably, the use of L.S. Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural and bio-cultural research whereby Vygotsky perceived learning as being embedded with social events, as occurring as a child interacts with people, objects, and events in the environment… emphasizing both process and outcome of communication rather than only the outcome (Vygotsky in Gao, 2013).

Vygotsky's latter observation, that of both process and outcome being considered instead of only outcome, sets the demarcation for utilitarian mainstream education against a humanistic implicit-personality and psycho-semantic peer-tutor model being put forth in this research as the best for any category of special-needs learner in terms of how teachers may best help the special-needs learner to operate both as an individual with the highest intellect, and within the more utilitarian mainstream of engagement. Vygotsky's point of 'process and outcome' is highly relevant because utilitarian mainstream education only addresses outcome, whereas the peer-tutor approach, directed through perceptions-understanding in implicit personality registers and psycho-semantic meaning levels measurements, address both the process of learning and the outcome of learning. This research maintains that special-needs teaching without a process element will continue to fail as its lack is even questionable in the mainstream utilitarian classroom where the teachers speak and the students listen with no awareness of the interaction between the teacher and the students in terms of each implicit personality register and psycho-semantic meaning level that populate that classroom.

## Methods – Implications for Further Research

This research, which serves as only an overview of difficulties arising in textbook-driven utilitarian literature and composition core curricula within the realm of how best to serve special-needs learners, possesses no quantitative or qualitative research methods aside from data research and offers no primary method for results. However, should the approach toward peer-tutor humanistic management under discovery of both the implied personality register and the psycho-semantic meaning level of special-needs learners prove valuable as an alternative to traditional utilitarian textbook integration methods, the following suggestions do offer opportunities for further qualitative and quantitative research.

• A qualitative study making use of a sample set of IEP (Individual Educational Plans) whereby personal information is deleted for privacy but the researcher can analyze special-needs categories and plan approaches for indicators of the special-needs category being addressed, implicit personality constructs being introduced in first interviews, and psycho-semantic definitions evident within associated portfolio notations regarding the progress of the student. Serving as historical artifacts (learners' portfolios) this sample of privacy-secured IEP's may give many indications of special-needs teachers and special-needs students' interaction. Much like an ethnographic or case study, the notes provided by the teacher on the student's progress may serve to show frequency of occurrences within the series of IEP processes being researched, as well as yield patterns of dominance in various special-needs designations, leading to further research.

• A quantitative study of families and students in the mainstream utilitarian training, through a sound survey instrument with statistical response-analysis, which indicates responses to questions regarding the categories of traditional special-needs. In many countries, political alignment has a strong connection to identifying special-needs including issues such as gender identification, mental illness (not originating from head trauma) or instances of regional or national violence (post-war stress). This study, within the parameters of the implicit personality and psycho-semantic humanist peer-tutor method offered in this research, could serve to help identify or disqualify

categories in special-needs attention as they change within political regimes by defining characteristics that the public qualify as «special-needs» within their children.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

This research was designed to provide an overview of the issue facing public education not just in the U.S. but globally in terms of how we identify and teach special-needs learners. Due to the sheer number of students attending our schools, the peer-tutor model or humanist approach is more desirable but impractical. Mainstream education with those students facing challenges but not facing any specific need must be brought through to their ability most often through a utilitarian policy; the largest number of students served to the best advantage that teachers and textbooks can provide with the intent of entering post-secondary learning or the workforce and contributing to the greater good of the society.

Historically, special-needs learners have been expected to adapt to the utilitarian method and many, worldwide, have done so. However, it has often been done through either segregating special-needs learners into separate classrooms, or through attempting to use the same utilitarian methods used in the mainstream classroom to help them «catch up.»

This research argues that this latter method cannot work, specifying its rationale as too many special-needs learners being stigmatized into negative needs while not recognizing that both gifted & talented students and foreign students learning a new language are also special-needs. The idea then, that utilitarian programmatic core programs, like our own Common Core in the U.S., can address our special-needs students in any real capacity, is respectfully -- but pointedly -- being challenged in this research.

This research moves to the idea that the peer-tutor model, often referred to in this work as the humanistic approach, will bring more deliberate and meaningful results to special-needs learning than any utilitarian program can ever hope to master.

The means by which this approach will work is focused through two primary psychological theories; that of understanding our special-needs learner's implicit personality, and gaining insight into their acceptance or rejection of literature, specifically in this research, through keen listening as they self-report, to their psycho-semantic references, which tell teachers how well a learner connects to a body of work. Where utilitarian structures generally define what learners will read, the humanistic approach demands, respectfully, that the teacher listen to his or her special-needs learners and then uses his or her expertise in the field of literature to locate excerpts and readings that will both relevant to the special-needs learner's implicit personality register, as well as his or her psycho-semantic ability to read, process, and find solidarity within literature. This solidarity will, in turn, modify the special-needs learner's implicit personality register and expand his or her psycho-semantic level -- the primary purpose of education in any discipline -- to connect more with the world and its understandings, and to be able to process, evaluate, deconstruct, and problem-solve through applying an advanced psycho-semantic reference of linguistic meaning.

Implicit Theory of Personality applications in this research took the form of using literature to address the three categories of self-esteem, intellectual perceptions and motivational theory, and the use of metaphor, either spoken or written, as a bridge between implicit personality and psycho-semantic meaning indicators within special-needs learners.

Psycho-semantic applications in this research focused upon generative meaning, dialogue problem-solving, and ESL/TESOL language translation as means of improving and gaining insight into psycho-semantic levels of special-needs learners and then using literature to enhance multilingual understanding of meanings across language.

No quantitative or qualitative methods were applied in this overview but recommendations for future investigations were offered via qualitative investigations into secured IEP's as historical documents for special-needs patterns and teacher-insights, or a quantitative survey study measuring public (parent and student) responses to what defines special-needs as a means of expanding our perceptual understanding of special needs with in a larger, cultural world.

This research concludes, as its overall argument, that an attempt to use a forced textbook full of what may be Canon literature for that country in a special-needs classroom, insisting that all learners read the text, will result in failure because literature itself does not teach literacy or improved meaning skills. This research respectfully insists that literature be specifically crafted to meet both the implicit personality and the psycho-semantic level of the special-needs learner. While some other academic areas, such as mathematics or introductory science, may be able to apply the textbook method in a special-needs classroom, literature – and associated literacy skills – do not lend themselves to blanket treatment within a special-needs classroom and can even be argued as to their value in a utilitarian mainstream classroom. Teachers of literature must be able to access a wide range of literary styles and purposes, connect to his or her special-needs learners on an individual basis through listening to the signals they will issue regarding their implicit personality beliefs and psycho-semantic levels of meaning and perception, and then provide a relationship to the literary choice for study, meeting the learner's needs through what (Shevchenko-

Savchynska&Balashov, 2015) term in their work definitions of Art whereby: «Artistic – refers to the perception of phenomena of art or its creation, implementation, and transmission…the creative reflection of reality in artistic images and the creative artistic performance...» and later, «sphere of mastery» (Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, 1973).

Whether we argue that education is an art or a science, or some of both, we cannot argue that literature and learning thrive by creation, implementation, and transmission with an end hope of mastery for all learners, and it is the teacher that must be both the scientist and the artist in whichever classroom he or she creates within, be that utilitarian or the peer-tutor model.

## References

1. Armitage, A. (2013). Conscientization, dialogue, and collaborative problem-based learning.

2. Journal of Problem-Based Learning in Higher Education, 1(1), 1-18.

3. Bannerjee, R. &Yuill, N. (1999). Children's explanations for self-presentational behavior.

4. European Journal of Social Psychology, 29, 105-111.

5. Beck, R. (1967). Perspectives in social philosophy: Readings in philosophic sources of social thought. New York: Holt, Rinehart &Winston, Publ., 178.

6. Blackwell, L., Trezesniewski, K., &Dweck, C. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention, Child Development, 78(1) 246-263.

7. Chomsky, N. (2005). Three factors in language design. Journal of Linguistic Inquiry. [Retrieved,2016] http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/linguistic_inquiry/v036/36.1chomsky.pdf

8. Dictionary of the Ukrainian language, 1973, V4,11, NaykovaDumka Publ., Kyev: Ukraine, p. 719.

9. Drohobych, Y (1988). The prognostic assessment of year 1483 – Ukrainian literature of XIV-XVI centuries in Shevchenko-Savchynska&Balashov's, (2015) Ancient literature breaking down stereotypes. Медієвіст Publ. [Reprint, Amazon ™ Digital, LLC].

10. Dweck C. & London. B. (2004). Mental representation in social development. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 50.4, 428-444.

11. Eaton, T.M., (2015). Common core standards analysis: A four-point position model. [Report by request], office of the Lt. Governor, State of Arkansas, Governor's Council on Common Core Review, Arkansas: Little Rock. June 3, 1-10.

12. Eaton, T.M., (2008). [Keynote Address]. Trails, Trials, and Technology: Education Present and Future. Front Range Community College Honors Consortium, CO: Fort Collins.

13. Erdle, S., Gosling, S.D., and Potter, 2009. Does self-esteem account for the higher order of the big five? Journal of Research in Personality, 43, 921-22.

14. Franco I. Social &political views of M. Drahomanov, V.45, in Shevchenko-Savchynska L., &Balashov, K.,(2015). Ancient literature breaking down stereotypes. Медієвіст. Publ. [Reprint, Amazon ™ Digital, LLC]. 431.

15. Gao, Yang. (2013). Investigating foreign language education through the lenses of great minds. English Language Teaching, 6(3). Canada: Canadian Center of Science & Education, Publ. 104-107.

16. Jones, B., Bryant, L., Snyder, J.D., & Malone, D. (2012.) Preservice and Inservice teachers' implicit theories of intelligence. Teacher Education Quarterly, spring.

17. Loretto, A., & Chisholm, J. (2012). Learning to teach generative meaning-making through multimodal inquiry. English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11(1), 136-149.

18. Oakes, J., Wells, A., Jones M., &Datnow, A. (1997). Detracking: the social construction ofability, cultural politics, and resistance to reform. Teachers College Record, 98(3), 482-510.

19. Petrovsky A.V &Yaroshevski, M.G., (1987). A concise psychological dictionary [translatedfrom Russian, Skikirev, P. (Ed)]. New York: International Publishers, P. 138-39 and 254.

20. Saven-Baden & Major, C.H. (2004). Foundations of Problem-Based Learning. Milton-Keynes: Open University.

21. Schwarz, E. (1970).Hugo Von Hoffmannstahl as a critic. In Arthur Evans Jr. (Ed.) On FourModern Humanists: Hoffmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, &Kantorowicz, New Jersey:PrincetonUniversity Press. 3.

22. Shevchenko-Savchynska L., &Balashov, K., (2015). Ancient literature breaking down stereotypes. Медієвіст Publ. [Reprint, Amazon ™ Digital, LLC].

23. Steier, F. (Ed) (1995) as cited in Armitage (2013), Research & Reflexivity, London: Sage Publ.

24. Tarksi, A. (1969). The semantic conception of truth. In Thomas M. Olshewsky's (Ed.)Problemsin the Philosophy of Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Publ. 578-610.

25. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978).The development of higher psychological processes. MA: Cambridge,Harvard University Press.