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Abstract
The purpose of this action research study was to determine if individualized instruction in the special education classroom positively correlates with vocabulary acquisition. This study focused exclusively on a middle school special education student diagnosed with autism and ADHD. The researcher utilized a pre-test to begin data collection prior to starting the unit. A post-test was given at the end of the unit to determine vocabulary acquisition. Data analysis revealed the student increased vocabulary over the course of the unit. The research findings suggest individualized education teams should consider the special education classroom when determining the least restrictive environment. The outcome contradicts current research supporting inclusion into the general education classroom. The conclusion provides evidence for individualized instruction in the special education classroom.
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Individualized Instruction in the Special Education Classroom

Students with disabilities all across the United States depend on supports provided by special education services. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2023), between 2021-22, 7.3 million students ages 3–21 received special education and/or related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This is the equivalent of 15 percent of all public-school students. IDEA, first enacted in 1975, requires school districts to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all students and, in addition, ensures students with disabilities receive special education and related services (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). FAPE is provided through the use of Individualized Education Plans (IEP) for students with disabilities.

IEPs are a legal written document that is developed, reviewed, and revised, in a meeting where special education services and related supports are considered (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). IEPs indicate the least restrictive environment (LRE), or where students will receive their services. There are numerous research articles supporting the idea of inclusion within general education classrooms. Researchers Cole et al. (2021), Cosier et al. (2013), and Alnahdi et al. (2021) demonstrate positive attributes with inclusive classrooms. However, little research has been completed regarding student progress when the LRE is the special education classroom. A major problem IEP teams face is to establish the most appropriate LRE for each student and if the student is showing growth in that educational setting.

The purpose of this action research study was to determine if individualized instruction in the special education classroom positively correlates with vocabulary acquisition for a special education student. One seventh-grade student was included in this study. Previously, this student received core instruction in the general education setting. However, she struggled to maintain
vocabulary words from day to day. Therefore, in December of 2023, her IEP team convened and amended her IEP to reflect core instruction in the special education classroom. This means the student’s LRE changed from the general education classroom to the special education classroom.

This change allows for the *TCI Social Studies Alive* curriculum to be used at the kindergarten level. This action research presented an opportunity to determine if the student showed growth with social studies vocabulary presented in a different LRE. This research project fills the void left by others as it examines vocabulary acquisition when instruction occurs in an individualized setting.

IEP teams use quantitative data to determine the LRE for each special education student. The student in this study previously received instruction in the social studies general education classroom. After reviewing her data, the IEP team concluded the student was not making progress. This study utilized pre-test and post-test scores to determine vocabulary acquisition when the student received individualized instruction in the special education classroom.

Resources for this action research study were compiled from the DeWitt Library at Northwestern College and through Google Scholar. All studies have been published in a peer-reviewed journal with the majority of articles published in the past 10 years. Articles were excluded if they were greater than fifteen years old. The researcher of this study focused on finding articles related to students with disabilities, inclusion, and the least restrictive environment.

The literature review begins by defining inclusion and characteristics of inclusive schools. Next, the literature review defines LRE and explains attributes related to the LRE decision making process. Finally, the literature review addresses both peer and teacher beliefs regarding students with disabilities.
Review of the Literature

Inclusion/Inclusive Schools

Due to FAPE requirements, it is necessary for every student to have access to the general education curriculum, regardless of individual skill level. Inclusive classrooms are one method schools use to enhance opportunities. Shogren et al. (2015) sought to understand how students with and without disabilities defined inclusion. Their research included 11 focus groups made up of students, teachers, and principals. The researchers found there were diverse interpretations of inclusion and what it means to be an inclusion school across participants. Some example definitions of inclusion are: “educating everyone together,” “everyone being included,” and the “way classroom activities are structured and organized to include (or not include) students with disabilities” (Shogren et al., 2015).

Communication is one variable considered when determining inclusive placements for students with disabilities. Chen (2017) surveyed 74 students, their parents, and 12 teachers regarding variables related to inclusion such as peer interaction, teacher interaction, activity participation, and academic performance. Chen found early intervention in language development improved the inclusive classroom experiences for students with disabilities. This indicates students will have a more positive experience being included in the general education classroom when students have the proper skills to communicate with their teachers and peers.

One trend multiple researchers observed is the rise of inclusion rates in general education settings. Ebenbeck et al. determined the inclusion rate in Bavaria, Germany, increased from 28% to 33.3% from 2010 to 2020 (2022). While this statistic is low, their study still supports the increase of inclusive classrooms. In the study by Gomez et al. (2021), the researchers questioned educational placements of students with autism and intellectual disabilities over a five-year period. They analyzed data from the California Department of Education to determine placement
trends. The researchers determined more students with disabilities are spending 40-79% of their school day in the general education classrooms. In turn, there was a decline in students spending less than 40% of their school day in the general education classroom. When considering results from Ebenbeck et al. (2022) and Gomez et al. (2021), there is a trend of students with disabilities spending more time within inclusive classrooms.

**Least Restrictive Environment**

One of the requirements of an IEP is defining the least restrictive environment applicable to the individual student. U.S. Department of Education, as cited in Kleinhert et al. (2015), has a least restrictive environment mandate. IDEA specifically states that students are to be removed from general education classroom settings only when the severity of their disability is such that even with modifications, their needs cannot be met in a regular class (Kleinhert et al., 2015). However, there are no specific criteria, checklists, or guidelines for schools to follow when determining the LRE for students.

IEP teams must discuss LRE options available to the student and decide where the student will demonstrate the most academic growth. Within the school setting, this may be the general education classroom, the general education classroom with accommodations, or the special education classroom. Additional options include separate schools or home settings. Kleinhert et al. (2015) researched where students with the most significant disabilities are taught. The researchers examined survey responses regarding 39,833 students who participate in alternate statewide assessment. Kleinhert et al. (2015) determined students who participate in alternate assessments were placed in self-contained classrooms, separate schools, or home, hospital, residential settings 93% of the time. Additionally, the researchers evaluated factors that led to placement decisions. The researchers determined students with low communicative
competence who may utilize an augmentative or alternative communication system, and students multiple grade levels behind their peers in reading and math were more likely to be served in settings excluding the general education classroom (Kleinhert et al., 2015). This study concludes students who take alternate statewide assessments are more likely to be placed in the special education setting. This study also noted that communication is a factor when determining placement; consistent with the findings of Chen (2017).

There are further factors suggesting a student will have an alternative placement to the general education classroom. Banerjee et al. (2017) interviewed and surveyed parents of 415 students. The students were between the ages of 6-13 and all had multiple disabilities. The researchers explored different variables used when determining educational placement decisions. The questions within the interview and survey were related to placement options, support options, and time spent in different classrooms. Their research determined parental involvement, parental expectation, social disadvantages, receipt of early special education services, and age of the child explain the varying amounts of time a student with multiple disabilities spends in the general education classroom. While IEP teams may not explicitly discuss such variables, the research concludes the student’s background plays the most significant role when determining the LRE.

IEP teams explore numerous variables when determining the LRE. The potential academic growth for the student is a primary factor. Multiple research studies support educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom. A study by Cole et al. (2021) examined ELA standardized state assessment scores of 1,619 students in grades fourth through eighth along with math standardized state assessment scores of 1,669 students. The data analysis revealed students who spent more than 80% of their school day in the general education
classroom showed more growth on both the ELA and math standardized state assessments. Cosier et al. (2013) completed a similar study examining Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Academic Achievement scores of 3,100 elementary children labeled with disabilities. These scores concluded that for each hour spent in general education, students scored 0.5 points higher on the reading assessment and 0.37 points higher in the area of math. Both of these research studies support student growth in the general education classroom.

As noted previously, the student’s age and current grade level are considered variables when discussing the LRE. Kurth & Mastergeorge (2010) reviewed IEP records for 15 students with autism. They analyzed the amount and type of goals, curricular standards, adaptations and services, and educational setting. The IEP analysis revealed students placed within inclusion classrooms had more adaptations present in their IEPs than students who were not included (2010). The researchers also found shifts in IEPs from elementary school, to junior high, to high school. The researchers stated, “IEP teams have lesser expectations of student ability to participate in the core general education curriculum over time” (Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2010, p. 155). Their data analysis revealed middle school students with disabilities were being instructed utilizing elementary level standards. This concludes that students with IEPs perform lower academically compared to their peers. Additionally, this shows being placed within inclusive classrooms may require accommodations. Therefore, IEP teams must consider academic levels and accommodations when determining the LRE.

**Students with Disabilities and Peer Beliefs**

Peer interactions of students with and without disabilities vary greatly. Some students have positive beliefs towards their peers with disabilities. Research has shown students with more experiences alongside peers with disabilities creates a positive belief. Alnahdi et al. (2021)
analyzed survey results from 652 elementary students from both inclusive and regular classrooms. Overall, the results concluded students had a rather positive attitude toward peers with disabilities since the percentage of students with a negative perception was quite low (Alnahdi et al., 2021). Researchers found that students educated within an inclusive classroom had more positive attitudes when compared to the regular classroom (Alnahdi et al., 2021).

Schwab (2017) experienced similar results. Schwab (2017) surveyed 436 eighth-grade students from both inclusive and regular classrooms. After analyzing survey results, Schwab (2017) concluded students who had direct contact also had a more positive attitude towards students with disabilities. Schwab (2017) states, “it is not contact in and of itself that is important, but rather the nature of the contact between the students (p. 164).” When considering peer beliefs regarding students with disabilities, students that had a more positive experience will have more positive beliefs. However, students who had a more negative experience will have more negative beliefs.

Peer beliefs and academic performance of all learners are potential concerns when determining the LRE for a student with a disability. Wuthrich et al. (2023) explored if peer beliefs could change after receiving an intervention regarding student diversity. Researchers utilized two test groups. One group of students received the diversity intervention while the second group of students did not. Students were in grades third through sixth. They completed a questionnaire at the beginning of the study and again eight weeks later. The researchers determined students who received the intervention improved in explicit attitudes toward peers with disabilities but experienced no change in implicit attitudes (Wuthrich et al. 2023). In conclusion, when students are given intervention related to diversity, they are more likely to have positive explicit attitudes towards their peers with disabilities.
Academic achievement for all students must be considered when implementing inclusive classrooms. Dessemontet & Bless (2013) completed a quasi-experimental study in order to investigate academic progress of all students within an inclusive classroom. Researchers gave 404 students between the ages of seven and nine the Swiss Academic Achievement Test measuring literacy and mathematics. Students completed this test at the beginning of the school year (September) and again at the end of the school year (May). From the pre-test and post-test, they concluded there was no statistically significant difference between the progress of low-, average-, and high-achieving pupils in classrooms with or without inclusion (Dessemontet & Bless, 2013). Therefore, academic achievement for nondisabled students is not influenced by inclusivity status.

Researchers also questioned how inclusive classrooms can alter peer beliefs over time. Thomas & Rose (2020) provided a questionnaire to 247 undergraduate students measuring their beliefs toward peers with intellectual disabilities (ID), their contact with peers whom have an ID, and their demographic information. After analyzing the questionnaires, the researchers determined that the relationship between contact at school and attitudes toward people with IDs is significant (Thomas & Rose, 2020). In other words, students who experienced an inclusive classroom have a higher likelihood to maintain a positive attitude into adulthood.

Despite this evidence, not all students with disabilities have positive peer relationships. Bullying continues to be of concern for all students. Multiple studies demonstrate bullying towards students with disabilities. Rose et al. (2016) examined survey results from 1,183 students with disabilities. The researchers concluded bullying occurs for students with disabilities. Their research revealed students with disabilities were more likely to represent bully-victim, and increased victimization predicts increased bully perpetration and fighting.
Additionally, Hartzell et al. (2020) collected data using surveys, observations, student interviews, and teacher interviews to investigate social skills and social skills interventions of students with disabilities. The researchers observed elementary students ignore their peers with emotional and behavioral disorders during unstructured social times such as lunch and recess (Hartzell et al., 2020). Therefore, students with disabilities are bullied in a variety of ways.

However, there has been research contradicting an increase in bullying for students with disabilities. Rose et al. (2015) had middle school students complete four different scale surveys from the University of Illinois. Researchers grouped survey results into two categories: students without disabilities and students with specific learning disabilities (SLD). When comparing the two groups of students, researchers determined students with SLD did not report higher or lower levels of bullying, victimization, fighting, anger, belonging, or social support (Rose et al., 2015). Therefore, research cannot conclude the rate at which bullying occurs within inclusive classrooms. Nonetheless, teachers must be mindful of bullying, especially of students with disabilities.

**Students with Disabilities and Teacher Beliefs**

Teachers have a wide variety of beliefs regarding students with a disability. Teachers often question the academic potential of students with disabilities within the inclusive classroom. Mason (2023) examined teacher beliefs regarding math potential of students with disabilities. Mason (2023) interviewed and surveyed 20 general education mathematics teachers about the potential growth of their 407 students (121 with disabilities). After analyzing survey and interview responses, the researcher concluded teachers did not view students with disabilities as mathematically capable as their peers (Mason, 2023). According to this evidence, students’ growth potential is categorized based on their characteristics prior to math teachers’ instruction.
Teacher candidates in college receive little instruction regarding students with disabilities. Therefore, teachers’ confidence levels vary when instructing an inclusive classroom. Able et al. (2015) completed focus groups with 34 teachers to determine teachers’ beliefs about educating students with disabilities. The study concluded general education teachers who have students with disabilities (specifically autism spectrum disorder) feel unprepared to support these students in their classroom. The focus groups also demonstrated the teachers were unaware of how to place students with autism in cooperative learning groups. These factors hinder teachers’ abilities to advocate for these students.

In another study, Herzig Johnson (2023) confirms that teachers feel unprepared to educate students with disabilities. The researchers completed a qualitative case study involving a team of special education and general education teachers. Both groups implemented inclusive practices in their school. Herzig Johnson (2023) concluded three themes amongst teachers that ultimately impact teachers’ levels of self-efficacy, and their willingness and ability to implement inclusion. The themes are (a) experience (including personal mastery experiences and vicarious experiences); (b) support; and (c) levels of stress (Herzig Johnson, 2023). Based on the evidence presented, if teachers are supported in the area of inclusion, then there is a higher likelihood of self-efficacy.

In addition to teachers, administrators have wavering beliefs regarding inclusion. DeMatthews et al. (2021) completed interviews, observations, and surveys of six principals throughout an entire school year. Their goal was to determine principals’ perceptions of inclusion and students with disabilities. The results from this study were similar to Herzig Johnson in those principals also felt unprepared to support students with disabilities. Additionally, principals felt as though their teachers did not have the necessary training for
inclusive classrooms. Principals believed further training on educating students with disabilities for their staff would be beneficial. Furthermore, a need for resources to support general education teachers and additional special education teachers on staff was expressed. In conclusion, both teachers and principals feel there is a need for further training to support students with disabilities within an inclusive classroom.
Methods

Participants

The following research question was addressed through the action research plan:

Question 1:

Will individualized instruction in the special education classroom increase social studies vocabulary acquisition?

This action research study took place in a middle school special education classroom with one seventh grade student. The school used in this study has about 700 students from three different rural communities in the Midwest. This student is a 13-year-old female previously diagnosed with autism and ADHD. In December of 2023, her IEP team amended her services to include individualized instruction in the special education classroom for science, social studies, reading, math, and writing due to lack of academic growth. Therefore, this changed the student’s LRE from the general education setting to the special education setting. This allows for instruction to occur at her current academic level (kindergarten).

The focus of this action research project was social studies vocabulary acquisition. Included in this study were two variables. The individualized instruction in the special education classroom was the independent variable, while the student’s social studies vocabulary pre-test to post-test data was the dependent variable. The student completed a pre-test of social studies vocabulary prior to starting the unit. After receiving direct instruction and completing the unit, the student completed a post-test consisting of the same questions.
The curriculum chosen to be utilized is the kindergarten level *Social Studies Alive* textbook with supplemental activity slideshow. This curriculum includes 27 vocabulary words in total. The student’s pre-test was given at the beginning of the unit. A vocabulary word was voiced to the student, in which the student responded with the definition. The student’s responses were recorded, and this process was completed again at the end of the unit. All data collection occurred and was stored in the special education classroom from February 2024 through May 2024. The researcher examined the rate of growth by comparing the pre to post-test scores. The anticipated statistical analysis by the researcher was an increase in words known and a decrease in words unknown.

Prior to beginning this study, the researcher received an institution review board (IRB) exemption. This study met all exemption requirements such as involving normal educational practices, being unlikely to adversely impact student learning, and being unlikely to adversely impact teacher assessment.

**Data Collection**

The following research question guided the choices for data collection:

**Question 1:**

Will individualized instruction in the special education classroom increase social studies vocabulary acquisition?

Quantitative data was included in this action research study. This study used a pre to post-test design to measure student growth. The student was given a pre-test of social studies vocabulary words included in the *Social Studies Alive* textbook. The researcher verbally stated the vocabulary word. In turn, the student responded verbally with the definition while the researcher scribed the student’s answer.
The scoring system provided the student 1 point for a correct definition, 0.5 point for a partial definition, and 0 points for an incorrect definition. For example, one of the vocabulary words was “special.” The definition included in the textbook was “different in your own way, unique.” On the post-test, the student responded with “unique, kind.” The student received 0.5 points because she stated “unique” but substituted the word “kind” instead of “different in your own way.”
Findings

Data Analysis

Data collection began in February 2024 when the pre-test was performed. The post-test was administered in April 2024 to conclude data collection. 27 vocabulary words were included in this study. The researcher provided a table including every vocabulary word with the point value received for both the pre-test and post-test score (see Appendix A). This information was then utilized to calculate the percentage of words known, words partially known, and words unknown. The results are available in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words Known</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words Partially Known</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words Unknown</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-test results concluded the student fully knew the definition for eight out of the 27 words, or 29.63%. In addition, the student partially knew the definition of four words, or 14.81%. She was unfamiliar with 15 words, or 55.56%. The post-test analysis revealed the student successfully knew the definition of 17 words, or 62.96% and partially knew 25.93% of the words. When comparing the words she knew in the pre-test to her scores on the post-test, the student was able to fully acquire 11 new vocabulary words, along with a partial understanding of five words she did not know prior. However, on the post-test, the student partially missed two definitions she got correct on the pre-test. From the pre-test to post-test results, the student was unable to learn 3 of the vocabulary words, or 11.11% of the list.
Furthermore, the post-test analysis revealed a trend between words that were presented early in the lesson and words the student received one point for on the post-test. The student scored 1 point for the words she knew the longest. She scored more zeros and half-points for words introduced later in the unit. Each day the student reviewed the previously introduced vocabulary. Therefore, the student had more practice with words included in the first half of the textbook as compared to the second half of the textbook resulting in more accurate answers. These findings align with observations made in the classroom by the researcher.
Discussion

Summary of Major Findings

This action research study utilized social studies vocabulary acquisition as the primary focal point when implementing individualized instruction in the special education classroom. The participant of this study was a 13-year-old female attending a rural school in the Midwest whose LRE was the special education classroom. A pre-test was administered prior to any instruction. After completion of the unit, the post-test was given. The pre-test to post-test scores present a 33.33% increase in vocabulary words known.

Past research supports the findings of this action research study. For instance, Kurth & Mastergeorge (2010) concluded middle school students with disabilities often utilize instruction with elementary level standards. Additionally, Kleinhert et al. (2015) concluded students who are academically behind grade-like peers were more likely to receive instruction in a small group or individualized setting. Therefore, the student in this study demonstrated the importance of utilizing the most appropriate LRE to implement individualized instruction at the student’s academic level.

Contradicting research exists regarding student growth in different LREs. Cole et al. (2021) and Cosier et al. (2013) found test scores increase when students are included in the general education classroom. In their studies, the general education classroom was the LRE. However, in this study, the special education classroom was the LRE. This study found an increase in post-test scores. Due to these conflicting conclusions, all options must be considered when IEP teams determine the LRE for a student.
Limitations of the Study

This study focused exclusively on one student who received individualized instruction in the special education classroom as determined by the student’s IEP. Data produced by this study was limited to that of one student with ADHD and autism. Therefore, the results may vary for students in alternate grade levels as well as different disability categories. Additionally, this study did not include vocabulary acquisition data obtained in a different LRE such as the general education classroom. As a result, comparative data was a limitation of this study.

Further Study

Due to limitations in this study, future research should be considered. IDEA officially includes 13 disability categories. This study represented two categories, autism and other health impairments (ADHD). Future research should consist of categories not represented in previous studies. Furthermore, additional participants should be incorporated into future studies. Data from multiple students would provide the opportunity to compare student academic growth in a specified LRE. In addition, this study focused primarily on a middle school student. Different ages such as elementary students and high school students should be considered in future research. Not only should other disability categories and multiple students be further researched, but also other subject areas should be investigated. Because this study prioritized social studies vocabulary acquisition, a gap was left for future research in other subject areas. In conclusion, future research should include different IDEA categories, increase the number of participants, and explore a variety of subject areas.
Conclusion

The purpose of this action research study was to determine if individualized instruction in the special education classroom would improve vocabulary acquisition for a special education student. Most commonly, the LRE for students with disabilities is the general education classroom. However, some students may not demonstrate growth in this LRE. Because of this, alternative placement options must be considered by IEP teams. Evidence from this study indicates there is potential for academic growth when a student receives instruction in the special education classroom. The data analysis revealed the student increased vocabulary words known by 33.33%. This contradicts current research published by Cole et al., 2021 and Cosier et al., 2013, concluding students with disabilities were more successful when instructed in the general education classroom. This action research study provided evidence supporting student growth after receiving individualized instruction in the special education classroom. Therefore, when IEP teams are determining the LRE for a student with a disability, the special education classroom should be considered a suitable LRE.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocab Word</th>
<th>Pre-Test Score</th>
<th>Post-Test Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Along</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total          | 10             | 20.5            |