Inclusion: The Varying Perspectives of Elementary, Middle, and High School Teachers in Low Resource Schools

A Master's Research Paper Presented to

The Faculty of the College of Education

Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Education

By:

Laurie Verba, M.Ed.

July 2010

This Master's Research Project has been approved by the Department of Teacher Education

Dianne M. Gut, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Special Education

John E. Henning, Ph.D., Professor and Chair of the Department of Teacher Education

Inclusion is currently one of the most debated and controversial topics involving current education practices. Success with inclusion of students with disabilities often depends on the perspectives of the teachers implementing inclusion. The process of inclusion can easily fail if the necessary supports and teacher commitment are not present. The following research surveyed practicing educators from two school districts, at each level of education (elementary, middle, and high school) regarding their perspectives, feelings, and beliefs regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities. All teachers were surveyed using an adapted version of the Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale. All teachers rated each criterion on a scale from one to five (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree). The survey included items related to: success with inclusion in the classroom, helpfulness of in class resources (aides), appropriate accommodations and modifications, effect on students with disabilities and general education students, and professional development opportunities related to inclusion. Teachers also answered ten short answer questions related to demographic information as well as the items above. The data revealed that the majority of all teachers, elementary, middle, and high school, welcome students with disabilities into their classroom. The majority indicated they feel more professional development and training is needed in order to successfully implement inclusion. The teachers expressed concern for the lack of support and available resources in order to support students with special needs in the general education classroom. The majority of teachers felt that inclusion will supports students academically and socially; however, did not feel that students progress any faster academically in the general education classroom compared to a pullout resource room.

Table of Contents

Title Page1
Signatures
Abstract3
Review of Literature
Introduction to Inclusion Terminology
History of Inclusion
Traditional Education Approach vs. Inclusive Education
Elementary and Secondary Program Evaluation
Teacher Training
Methodology
Research Question
Setting and Participants
Instrument
Procedures
Data Analysis
Results21
Demographic Data
Forced-Choice Items
Teacher's Perceptions of Inclusion
Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion
Middle School Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion
High School Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion

Recently, there has been a push for educating students with disabilities within the general education classroom in schools across the United States. Teachers with a positive attitude

relating to inclusion often take the time to adapt the curriculum and environment to meet the needs of these students (Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008). Many researchers have concluded that successful inclusion depends on the goodwill and/or positive attitudes of practicing educators (Sharma, Forlin & Loreman).

A great deal of research has assessed the attitudes and perspectives of pre-service teachers, current educators, administrative professionals, and special service providers regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities. Many professionals are in support of the inclusion philosophy when it is implemented in a collaborative and supportive way (Idol, 2006). Research has also indicated that previous exposure to special education concepts and or students with special needs contributes to a more positive attitude towards inclusion (Praisner, 2003).

The purpose of this qualitative and quantitative research was to determine the varying perspectives and attitudes of current elementary, middle, and high school educators, regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities by assessing their overall perspectives and experiences with inclusion. The researcher believes that successful inclusion can be implemented if support services and collaboration among professionals are included in the planning and implementation process. Teachers must also hold a positive attitude in order to successfully include a student with disabilities in the classroom, for if the proper accommodations and modifications are not provided, the student will not have the opportunity to succeed. These supports are often hard to provide if the teacher is unsure of how to include the student and/or holds a negative attitude towards including the student in his/her classroom.

Review of Literature

Introduction to Inclusion Terminology

Terminology within the field of special education is continuously changing in order to make the vocabulary more socially appropriate and politically correct. This trend of changing vocabulary is no different for the practice of inclusion--the integration of students with disabilities into the general education classroom. Although there has been a recent push for schools to educate students with disabilities in the general education classroom, inclusion has always been around; however, in past years, the integration of students with disabilities with their typically developing peers was known as mainstreaming which is different from inclusion in several ways. Other terminology related to inclusion includes terms such as the Regular Education Initiative, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and descriptors of inclusion such as full inclusion, and partial inclusion.

Regular Education Initiative. Regular Education Initiative (REI) was an advocacy effort that took place in the late 1980's (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). This advocacy movement pushed for more collaboration among special and general educators and advocated for educators to make a commitment to serve all students with both learning problems and identified disabilities (Lewis & Doorlag).

Mainstreaming. Inclusion is a concept that essentially grew out of mainstreaming and shares many of the same goals (Salend, 2001); however, the two practices are very different. Many individuals use the words interchangeably today, when they should be seen as different concepts (Salend). Mainstreaming refers to the inclusion of students with special needs in the general education classroom. A student is considered mainstreamed if they have spent any amount of time with general education peers (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). With mainstreaming, students were served in the special education classroom and visited the general education

classroom for mainly non-academic courses (e.g., art, music, physical education), as well as lunch and recess.

Least Restrictive Environment. When determining the environment where a student with special needs receives his/her education, a legal mandate entitled the Least Restrictive Environment, or LRE, should be followed (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). The Least Restrictive Environment is the environment closest to the general education classroom that meets the students' needs (Lewis & Doorlag). The Least Restrictive Environment, a legal mandate, requires schools to educate students with disabilities with their peers without disabilities and should be determined based on the student's individual educational needs (Salend, 2001). The Least Restrictive Environment mandate supports the placement of students in the general education classroom and supports alternative placements such as special classrooms or schools only when academic performance deems outside supports necessary (Salend).

Full Inclusion. Full inclusion is a recent movement attempting to reform the segregation of students with disabilities in the school setting (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). Full inclusion is the practice of educating students with disabilities, mild to severe, for the entire day within the general education classroom (Lewis & Doorlag). Ideally, when practicing full inclusion, students never leave the general education classroom, even to receive special services, and instead receive the services within the general education setting (Lewis & Doorlag).

Partial Inclusion. The time a student spends in the general education classroom may vary according to the student's grade level and individual student' needs (Choate, 2000). Partial inclusion is similar to mainstreaming and may occur during specific subjects or for specific times during the school day (Choate). Partial inclusion allows students with disabilities to be educated within the general education setting but allows them to be pulled out for instruction to meet their

individual needs (Choate). Partial inclusion is most closely aligned with the mandate for Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Inclusion takes into consideration the individual needs of the students before placing them in the general education classroom. Mainstreaming may have meant the same thing as inclusion to many educators, professionals, and the public; however, it sent a message that the primary focus of mainstreaming was the physical presence of a child with disabilities in a regular classroom (Smith, 1998). Instead of making the experience meaningful for the student, in this form, mainstreaming could only be seen as the appearance of integration (Smith, 1998). Since mainstreaming and inclusion have been used interchangeably, it is important to clarify with professionals what they mean by the vocabulary they are using; one must determine if they are including students to the maximum extent appropriate or just for short visits with peers (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006).

History of Inclusion

Before the government took a stand and created legislation to support the education of students with disabilities, students with disabilities were mostly educated in segregated classrooms. This practice of rarely, if ever, educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom changed when Congress enacted Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Crossley, 1994). This law required students be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) and established procedures for educating individuals with disabilities in the general education classroom, including providing aids and supports to assist with their education success (Crossley). PL 94-142 not only required students with disabilities to be educated in the least restrictive environment, but also provided federal funding to support the goal of including students with disabilities to the maximum extent possible (Crossley).

PL 94-142 was the first legislation that mandated students with disabilities be educated in their home school (the school they would go to if they were typically developing), which by some was interpreted as the practice known as mainstreaming. This law guaranteed that all individuals, no matter their disability, received an education (Henley, 1992). Unlike inclusion, mainstreaming was a practice where students visited general education classrooms in order to be integrated with peers without disabilities. The term mainstreaming was phased out and replaced by inclusion during the 1990's (Lewis & Doorlag, 2003).

The Education of All Handicapped Act, P. L. 94-142 was followed by P. L. 98-199, Amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act in 1983 that mandated states to collect data on students with disabilities leaving the school system and to consider and plan for transitions of secondary students (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2004). It also provided incentives for states that created programs for preschoolers with disabilities (Mastropieri & Scruggs).

In 1986, P. L. 99-457, Education for All Handicapped Children Act Amendments were passed (Mastropieri & Scruggs). This law encouraged states to not only provide services for preschoolers with disabilities but allowed states to develop services for infants and toddlers with disabilities (Mastropieri & Scruggs).

Over the years, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act has been amended several times and in 1990 was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). The Education for All Handicapped Education Act of 1975 mandated that schools serve children with disabilities; while IDEA mandated specific requirements and guidelines regarding the education, remediation, and assessments students are entitled to (Lewis & Doorlag, 2003). In 1997, IDEA was amended again, P. L. 105-17, allowing states to serve children under the age of three experiencing delays without identification, required students with

disabilities to take state assessments, expanded Individualized Education Plan (IEP) teams to include multiple professionals, reviewed IEP requirements to maximize efforts to include students in the general education classroom, and added discipline provisions for students with disabilities (Lewis & Doorlag).

IDEA was revised again in 2004, P. L. 108-446, and created requirements for special educators to be highly qualified, again required students with disabilities to take state assessments, changed the criteria to be considered a student with a learning disability, required IEP's to include research-based interventions, and allowed parents and school professionals to determine if reevaluation was necessary (Lewis & Doorlag).

Traditional Education Approach vs. Inclusive Education

Modern traditional education practices respect the fact that individual students all come to school with different abilities and backgrounds (Burrello, Lashley, & Van Dyke, 1996). If a student starts to fail in school, it is the school's responsibility to provide interventions and remediation to assist the student. These intervention services often referred to as special education, often take place in resource rooms outside of the general education classroom (Burrello, Lashley, & Van Dyke). Students then are able to return to the general education classroom once they have caught up and can perform to the level of the students in the general education classroom. Many teachers who learned and have taught using traditional approaches assume that all students learn in the same way, at the same time, and the same content with no modifications or adaptations; to these teachers this is considered the "fair" way to practice education, teaching all students in the same way (McLeskey & Waldron, 2000).

Inclusive practices allow all students to attend the school they would attend if they did not have a disability, and no student can be denied placement because of a disability unless they

are a danger to themselves or other students (Burrello, Lashley, & Van Dyke, 1996). Students with disabilities are included in the school population and served in the general education classes alongside students without disabilities (Burrello, Lashley, & Van Dyke). Unlike traditional education practices, inclusive education strives to provide intervention, remediation, and supports within the general education classroom. Inclusive education is based on the principle that education should be delivered using multiple methods and at different levels to meet the needs of all students.

Elementary and Secondary Program Evaluation

One recent study relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities completed a program evaluation of eight different schools (four elementary and four secondary). The purpose of the study was to assess how each school provided support and educational services for students with disabilities, how much inclusion was actually taking place and the effect of inclusion on the faculty within the schools (Idol, 2006). The study aimed to describe what happens in schools where inclusion is practiced (Idol).

Idol's study (2006) focused on the following aspects of inclusion:

- the types of disabilities of the students in special education attending the school;
- the amount of time students in special education actually spent learning in the general education program;
- the number and types of support personnel available and how they were used;
- the number and types of referral for special education testing;
- the attitudes of all staff toward one another, toward collaboration, toward students with special education needs, and toward inclusion;

- staff perceptions of their skills in making instructional and curricular
 modifications, as well as their skills in discipline and classroom management; and
- staff perceptions of the impact of inclusion on other students. (p. 79)

The study analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data obtained through personal interviews with the majority of educators from each school; however, no random sampling was utilized in the research (Idol, 2006). Each interview was completed utilizing predetermined questions related to the position of the individual being interviewed. During each interview, the interviewee and interviewer both held a copy of the interview questions. Answers were read aloud and scribed for all education professionals being interviewed (Idol).

In the elementary schools, a total of one hundred and twenty-five interviews were completed including five administrators, four instructional assistants, seventy-five classroom teachers, twenty-four special educators, and thirteen support aides. The study focused on several aspects including school district policies, inclusion, modifications, special education teachers, instructional assistants, student's behaviors, and statewide test scores; however, for the purpose of this research only the results relating to inclusion are being reviewed.

According to Idol (2006), only one of the four elementary schools included students with disabilities 100% of the time. Each of the elementary school administrators interviewed indicated that they fully supported the practice of inclusion within their school and felt they could be a good collaborator with their teaching staff. None of the principals felt that inclusion could be successful without additional supports including aides in the classroom (Idol).

During the study, teachers were asked to evaluate their attitudes regarding the education of students with disabilities. Results of the study indicated that all of the elementary teachers held attitudes toward inclusion ranging from willing to accept and try inclusion, to being in favor

of the practice of inclusion (Idol, 2006). The data also indicated that only two of all education professionals interviewed felt that students with disabilities should be taught in a self-contained classroom (Idol). Across all the elementary schools participating in the study, 68% of the teachers felt that other students' performance with the presence of students with disabilities in the classroom was unaffected and/or improved. Only 6% of the elementary professionals felt that other students were negatively affected when students with disabilities were educated in the general education classroom. Elementary professionals also reported that students' attitudes toward their peers with disabilities improved or made the same progress when inclusion was practiced (Idol).

Lastly, Idol's (2006) study found the following from the qualitative data analysis:

Several educators indicated that they liked having instructional assistants; valued the special education teachers and speech pathologists; were proud of their programs; felt that the statewide test scores of general education students were not affected; did not like pullout programs; and did like inclusion. Several teachers also recommended that certain practices and policies be implemented, such as offering more professional development on inclusion; offering opportunities to visit schools that were further along with inclusion; respecting the special challenges presented to the classroom teacher and providing support; making the special education assessment process more relative to classroom applications; providing better training for instructional assistants; catching reading problems earlier; and using mainstreaming rather than inclusion with students with more serious emotional problems. (p. 85)

With regard to the secondary schools, two principals, two interim principals, two assistant principals, one hundred and six general education teachers, fifty-three special education

teachers, and seven instructional assistants were interviewed (Idol, 2006). All secondary administrative professionals indicated they were in favor of the practice of inclusion; however, one principal added a comment to her rating indicating that it is not always appropriate; however, all teachers should strive to include all students. No secondary administrators were in favor of the practice if supports are not available. When rating their personal attitudes and beliefs for where students with special needs are best educated, one professional felt they were best educated in the general education classroom, two felt that special educators or aides should attend grade level classes with the students, and one principal chose to mainstream students with disabilities.

The majority of secondary educators favored educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom with a special educator or aide present (Idol, 2006). Similar to the elementary attitudes towards how to best educate students with special needs, 77% of the secondary teachers felt students should attend the general education classroom and aides or special educators should provide assistance during the class period.

When secondary educators were asked to evaluate the impact of including a student with special needs on other students in the general education environment, over half of the professionals felt that the other students remained unaffected and another quarter of the teachers felt that other students' progress increased. As for qualitative responses from secondary educators, most felt that more support staff was needed to fully implement inclusion and additional training or professional development was needed to support teachers (Idol, 2006).

Teacher Training

According to Sharma, Forlin, and Loreman (2008), "Those educators who have received some disability education are more likely to have positive attitudes to inclusion. In this regard,

research tends to suggest that there is a positive correlation between the amount of disability education and educators' positive attitudes" (p. 774). In response, the authors assessed the impact of training teachers regarding the education of students with disabilities and the affect of that training on their attitudes and concerns.

Their study included six-hundred and three participants from Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Students at the various universities were issued a combination of surveys at the beginning and end of a course covering various issues regarding the education of students with disabilities. The surveys focused on demographic information, attitudes toward inclusion, personal attitudes regarding interactions with people with disabilities, and concerns about inclusion. Courses at the various institutions varied in content and changes in attitudes could not solely be attributed to the course content because the students were also participating in lab placements. Each of the programs' main foci included appropriate terminology, information specific to disabilities, instructional strategies, rationale for inclusion, and behavior management strategies, although each course was ran differently (Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008).

According to Sharma, Forlin, and Loreman (2008), the results indicate that a significant change took place in all participants' attitudes regarding inclusion, except for the participants from Singapore. The study concluded that programs that emphasize the nature and needs of students with disabilities prepare teachers to handle students with multiple conditions. Results also indicated the teachers felt inadequately prepared to actually implement inclusion, despite their support for the practice. Lastly, the study indicated that a significant change was not present in their personal attitudes towards people with disabilities in general (Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman).

Another study examined the current attitudes of high school teachers towards inclusion. The authors surveyed 125 high school teachers from San Antonio, Texas using an Inclusion Survey and asked teachers to rate each item using a four-point rating scale (Van Reusen, Shoho, & Barker, 2000). The survey focused on teacher training, academic climate, academic content/teacher effectiveness, and social adjustment of students. The analysis indicated a correlation between the years of experience or training, and positive or negative feelings regarding inclusion. Findings also indicated that teachers with previous experience or training relating to students with disabilities held more positive attitudes. Overall, the results indicate that the amount of training in special education content and direct experiences is related to the teachers' positive or negative attitudes toward inclusion (Van Reusen, Shoho, & Barker).

Methodology

The following section includes a description of the research procedures, the setting and participants, and a description of the instrument used to collect data. The overall results along with an analysis of the data are discussed in subsequent sections.

Research Question

The purpose of this study was to determine the current perspectives of teachers at each grade level (elementary, middle, and high) regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities using survey methodology.

Setting and Participants

Participants in this study were currently practicing elementary, middle, and high school educators from two different school districts within the Southeastern region of Ohio. Upon obtaining permission from Ohio University's Institutional Review Board and the local school districts (i.e., building principals), teachers were invited to participate by distributing the surveys

to their individual mailboxes. Surveys were distributed to each teacher in each school building and data was collected from any teacher who voluntarily completed the survey. A total of two-hundred and seventy-five surveys were distributed among six different schools. Twenty-two surveys were returned for a response rate of 8%.

Instrument

The instrument used to collect data for this study included six demographic questions, ten open-ended, short answer questions, and twenty-eight forced-choice rated items. The survey was adapted from the Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995) and was designed to evaluate current educators' perspectives relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.

The open-ended questions addressed the following topics and factual information regarding the teacher's current beliefs and experiences with inclusion: resources available within the classroom to support students with disabilities, aides currently assisting in the classroom, ratio of students with disabilities to students without, accommodations utilized within the classroom, feelings relating to students with disabilities benefiting from inclusion in the general education classroom, biggest challenges with students with disabilities, co-teaching arrangements, and overall feelings regarding inclusion.

The itemized forced-choice questions focused on specific student characteristics, acceptance and success of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, effect on classroom procedures and lesson implementation, support to implement inclusion, and effect of inclusion on both students with and students without disabilities. Each item was rated on a scale from one to five, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The following are examples of the rating response questions.

- "Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments."
- "Increased freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities."
- "The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities."
- "The students with a disability will not be socially isolated in the regular classroom."

 The revised survey including forced-choice questions, open-ended questions, and demographic questions can be found in Appendix A.

Procedures

Two months before conducting the research, a survey was selected to utilize for the research and was adapted to meet the research needs of this study. The original survey focused on students with learning disabilities being educated in the general education classroom. This research project focused on the inclusion of all students with disabilities both physical and intellectual, mild to severe. Therefore, the forced-choice questions were revised to refer to all students with disabilities. The demographic information and ten open-ended response questions were also added.

Following official approval from Ohio University's Office of Research Compliance and approval from two local school districts in the Southeastern Ohio area, the surveys were photocopied and delivered to six different schools (two elementary, two middle, and two high schools). Each teacher within each school building received a copy of the survey with instructions for completion and a consent form in his/her mailbox. Teachers were given the first two weeks of April 2010 to respond to the survey and were asked to place the completed survey

and consent from in the envelopes provided, seal the envelopes, and return them to their school office by April 14th, 2010. There was no obligation to participate in the survey and all information was collected anonymously.

Data Analysis

To analyze the results for the forced-choice items, the researcher calculated means, mode, and standard deviation for each item and compiled the results into one table. Descriptive statistics were also used for the demographic data to help describe the respondents and their backgrounds. The researcher compiled all of the answers for the short answer questions and using qualitative analysis techniques, analyzed the responses for central themes.

Results

The purpose of this research was to determine current teaching professionals' attitudes towards inclusive education. The results of the survey and short answer response questions are reported in the following sections.

Demographic Data

A total of twenty-two teachers responded to the survey: seven elementary teachers, eight middle school teachers, and seven high school teachers.

Elementary school teachers. The elementary teachers taught grades first through fifth. A total of two first grade teachers, two second grade teachers, and one third, fourth, and fifth grade teacher responded to the survey. Of those who responded, four indicated that they practice partial inclusion at their school while the other three indicated that the type of inclusion depends on the individual student. Of the seven elementary teachers who responded, five had some type of formal training in special education while two had not received any formal instruction relating to special education.

Middle school teachers. The middle school teacher participants taught grades sixth through eighth. A total of one sixth grade teacher, three seventh grade teachers, and three combined grade level teachers responded to the survey. Of those who responded, four indicated that partial inclusion was practiced in their school and four indicated that full inclusion was practiced.

High school teachers. The high school teacher participants taught grades nine through twelve. All the teachers indicated they taught multiple grade levels. Of those who responded to the survey, three indicated that partial inclusion was practiced; three more indicated that full inclusion was practiced, and one respondent was unsure. Of the seven respondents, four had received no training in special education while three had.

Forced-Choice Items

The survey consisted of twenty-eight statements the teachers responded to using the following scale: 1 - I disagree pretty much, 2 - I disagree a little, 3 - I agree a little, 4 - I agree pretty much, 5 - I agree very much. Results of all teachers' attitudes towards inclusion are reported first. The results are divided into three categories by level: elementary school teachers, middle school teachers, and high school teachers and are reported in the following sections.

Teachers' perceptions of inclusion. As a whole, current educators are neutral in their beliefs of whether a student with disabilities can best be served in the general education classroom. Practicing general education teachers indicate they feel inadequately trained to educate students with disabilities in their classrooms; however, they do not feel they need any extensive retraining to educate students with disabilities. General educators do not feel that students with disabilities demonstrate more behavior problems in the regular education classroom and do not see their behaviors as setting a bad example for their peers.

In general, teachers feel that students with disabilities do not progress any faster in the general education environment; however, they feel students' social and emotional skills benefit from inclusion. Educators do not feel that students with disabilities are isolated in the general education classroom and feel that their presence can be beneficial to other students.

The educators in this study hold a positive attitude towards the inclusion of students with disabilities and welcome them into their classrooms. Although they are willing to include students with disabilities in their classrooms, they indicate that the process of inclusion requires more patience in their teaching and an adjustment of the curriculum and the classroom schedule. They also feel the extra needs of students with disabilities could be detrimental to the other students. Despite some negative perceptions of inclusion, the teachers indicate that inclusion can promote acceptance of students with disabilities and can be beneficial for all students. See Table 1 for the survey results for all educators combined.

Table 1

All Teachers' Perspectives of Inclusion

Statement #	Statement	Mean	Mode	SD
1	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	3.4	3	.94
2	Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.	3.3	3	1.3
3	Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.	3.7	4	1.2
4	It is likely that students with disabilities will exhibit behavior problems in regular classrooms.	2.1	2	.81
5	Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.	2.9	3	.99
6	The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.	2.8	3	.99

7	The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of students with disabilities.	3.2	3	.94
8	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant change in regular classroom procedures.	1.1	3	1.0
9	Increase freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities.	2.3	2	.69
10	Regular classroom teachers have the abilities necessary to work with students with disabilities.	2.7	2	1.4
11	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.	2	2	.98
12	The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.	1.8	1, 2	.73
13	The students with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in special classrooms.	2.5	2	.78
14	Integration of students with disabilities will not promote his or her social independence.	1.8	2	.78
15	It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains students with a disability than in one that does not contain students with disabilities	2.7	3	1.1
16	Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher's time.	2.4	2	.94
17	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.	3.7	4	1.0
18	Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in a regular classroom.	2.2	2	.57
19	Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.	2	2	.85
20	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the students with disabilities.	2	2	.82
21	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in regular classrooms when possible.	4	5	.93
22	The classroom behavior of students with disabilities generally does not require more patience from the teachers.	2.1	2	.76
23	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special education teachers than by regular classroom teachers.	3	3	1.0
24	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the students with a disability.	1.9	2	.79
25	The students with a disability will not be socially isolate in the regular classroom.	3	3	.95
26	Assignments should not be modified for students with disabilities.	1.5	1	.72
27	Modification of coursework for students with disabilities would be difficult to justify to other students.	2	2	1.1
28	I would welcome students with disabilities in my class and enjoy working with	4	5	.90

them.		

Note.

Total number of teachers responding to the survey (n = 22)

Elementary teachers' perceptions of inclusion. The results indicate that overall, elementary teachers agree that students with special needs should be educated in the general education classroom. Elementary teachers feel that general education teachers have the ability to work with students with special needs; however, they may need some additional training. The elementary teachers do not feel that students with disabilities display any more behavior problems than other students within the general education classroom and do not feel that their presence has a negative effect on the other students. Although the teachers indicate that they do not feel their students with disabilities develop academic skills faster in the general education classroom, they do feel they benefit socially and emotionally from inclusion.

Overall, the elementary teachers welcome students with disabilities into their classroom but indicate their presence requires a higher level of patience on their part but does not require many changes in the daily schedule. See Table 2 for the compiled survey results for elementary teachers.

Table 2

Elementary Teachers' Perspectives of Inclusion

Statement #	Statement	Mean	Mode	SD
1	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	3.15	4	.83
2	Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.	2.86	3	1.1
3	Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.	4	5	1.1
4	It is likely that students with disabilities will exhibit behavior problems in regular	2.29	2	.88

	classrooms.			
5	Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.	3.29	3	.45
6	The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.	2.71	3	.88
7	The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of students with disabilities.	3	3	.76
8	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant change in regular classroom procedures.	2.43	3	.73
9	Increase freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities.	2	2	.53
10	Regular classroom teachers have the abilities necessary to work with students with disabilities.	3	1, 5	1.6
11	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.	1.7	1	.88
12	The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.	1.6	2	.49
13	The students with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in special classrooms.	2.4	2	.49
14	Integration of students with disabilities will not promote his or her social independence.	1.7	2	.45
15	It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains students with a disability than in one that does not contain students with disabilities	2	1	1.1
16	Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher's time.	2.6	2	1.0
17	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.	4	3,5	.93
18	Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in a regular classroom.	2.1	2	.64
19	Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.	2.1	3	.83
20	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the students with disabilities.	1.6	1	.73
21	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in regular classrooms when possible.	4.3	4, 5	.70
22	The classroom behavior of students with disabilities generally does not require more patience from the teachers.	2	2	.53
23	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special education teachers than by regular classroom teachers.	3	3	.53
24	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the students with a disability.	1.9	1	.83
25	The students with a disability will not be socially isolate in the regular classroom.	3.3	3,4	.70

26	Assignments should not be modified for students with disabilities.	1.1	1	.35
27	Modification of coursework for students with disabilities would be difficult to justify to other students.	1.7	1, 2	.70
28	I would welcome students with disabilities in my class and enjoy working with them.	4.6	5	.50

Note Number of elementary teachers responding to the survey (n = 7)

Middle school teachers' perceptions of inclusion. The results indicate that middle school teachers, unlike their elementary colleagues, disagree that students with disabilities can best be served in the general education classroom. They feel that general education teachers lack the ability to provide the necessary modifications to educate students with special needs in the general education classroom and also feel that general education teachers need more training and support for educating students with special needs.

Similar to the elementary teachers, middle school teachers do not feel that students with special needs display more behavior problems in the general education classroom. The middle school teachers also indicate they do not feel students with special needs make progress with academics any faster in the general education classroom; however, they indicate their presence promotes more acceptance of their disability and improves their social and emotional development. Overall, middle school educators welcome students with disabilities into their classroom, but indicate their presence requires more patience on their part and an adapted schedule. See Table 3 for the survey results for middle school teachers.

Table 3

Middle School Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion

Statement #	Statement	Mean	Mode	SD
1	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	3.1	3, 5	.78
2	Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of	4	4	1.2

	regular-classroom teachers.			
3	Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.	3.6	4	1.2
4	It is likely that students with disabilities will exhibit behavior problems in regular classrooms.	2.1	2	.93
5	Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.	2.5	2	1.3
6	The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.	3	4	1.1
7	The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of students with disabilities.	3.1	3	1.1
8	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant change in regular classroom procedures.	3.8	3, 5	1.1
9	Increase freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities.	2.6	2	.70
10	Regular classroom teachers have the abilities necessary to work with students with disabilities.	2.6	2	1.2
11	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.	2.1	2	1.2
12	The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.	1.9	1, 2	.78
13	The students with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in special classrooms.	2.4	3	.99
14	Integration of students with disabilities will not promote his or her social independence.	1.9	1	1.1
15	It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains students with a disability than in one that does not contain students with disabilities	2.9	4	1.1
16	Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher's time.	2	2	.70
17	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.	3.4	4	1.2
18	Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in a regular classroom.	2.3	2	.43
19	Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.	1.8	2	.66
20	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the students with disabilities.	2.3	2	.83
21	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in regular classrooms when possible.	3.8	4	.97
22	The classroom behavior of students with disabilities generally does not require more patience from the teachers.	2	2	.71
23	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special education teachers than by regular classroom teachers.	3.1	4	1.3

24	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the students with a disability.	1.9	2	.93
25	The students with a disability will not be socially isolate in the regular classroom.	2.5	2, 3	.87
26	Assignments should not be modified for students with disabilities.	1.5	1, 2	.5
27	Modification of coursework for students with disabilities would be difficult to justify to other students.	2.5	2	1.3
28	I would welcome students with disabilities in my class and enjoy working with them.	3.75	4	.97

Note. Number of middle school teachers responding to the survey (n = 8)

High school teachers' perspectives of inclusion. The results indicate that high school teachers agree that students with disabilities can best be served in the general education classroom. However, they indicate feelings of neither being able, nor adequately trained to serve students with special needs in the general education classroom. High school educators disagree that students with special needs display negative behaviors in the regular classroom and do not feel their behaviors negatively affect the other students.

The high school teachers, like their elementary and middle school counterparts, also indicate they do not feel students with special needs progress any faster with academics in the general education classroom; however they do feel their presence in the general education classroom is beneficial for their social development. They also report they do not feel students with disabilities feel isolated in the general education classroom and that their presence can be beneficial for students without disabilities. Overall, high school teachers welcome students with disabilities into their classrooms, but realize that this integration requires more patience and an adapted schedule. See Table 4 for the survey results for high school educators.

Table 4

High School Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusion

Statement #	Statement	Mean	Mode	SD
				İ

1	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	4	3, 5	.93
2	Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.	3	3	1.2
3	Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.	3.6	4	1.2
4	It is likely that students with disabilities will exhibit behavior problems in regular classrooms.	2	2	.53
5	Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.	3	3	.76
6	The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.	2.6	3	.90
7	The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of students with disabilities.	3.4	3	.90
8	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant change in regular classroom procedures.	2.7	2, 3	.70
9	Increase freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities.	2.1	2	.64
10	Regular classroom teachers have the abilities necessary to work with students with disabilities.	2.6	4	1.3
11	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.	2	2	.76
12	The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.	1.9	1	.83
13	The students with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in special classrooms.	2.6	2	.73
14	Integration of students with disabilities will not promote his or her social independence.	1.9	2	.64
15	It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains students with a disability than in one that does not contain students with disabilities	3.1	3	.64
16	Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher's time.	2.6	3	.90
17	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.	3.9	4	.64
18	Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in a regular classroom.	2.1	1	.64
19	Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.	2.1	2	.99
20	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the students with disabilities.	2	2	.76
21	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in regular	4.1	5	.99

	classrooms when possible.			
22	The classroom behavior of students with disabilities generally does not require more patience from the teachers.	2.4	2	.90
23	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special education teachers than by regular classroom teachers.	2.7	2, 3, 4	1.0
24	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the students with a disability.	2	2	.53
25	The students with a disability will not be socially isolate in the regular classroom.	3.3	2, 3, 4	1.0
26	Assignments should not be modified for students with disabilities.	2	2	.93
27	Modification of coursework for students with disabilities would be difficult to justify to other students.	1.9	1, 2	.99
28	I would welcome students with disabilities in my class and enjoy working with them.	3.7	3	.88

Note.

Number of high school teachers responding to the survey (n = 7)

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

The survey included a total of ten short answer questions which included the following:

- What resources do you have available to you in your classroom to support the inclusion of students with disabilities?
- How many aides, if any do you have assisting in your classroom on a regular basis?
- How many students with disabilities are currently in your class? How many students without disabilities are currently in your class?
- What accommodations do you utilize in your classroom to support the inclusion of students with disabilities?
- Do you feel that the education of students with disabilities in the general education is a benefit for the student with disabilities? For all students in the classroom? Please explain.
- Do you think the money and available resources (including aides) you currently have provided by the school are enough to effectively carry out inclusion in your classroom?
 Please explain.

- What is your biggest challenge with the inclusion of students with disabilities in your classroom?
- What does inclusion look like in your classroom?
- Do you feel that co-teaching is an effective way to practice inclusion? What do you foresee as the benefits/drawbacks of co-teaching and inclusion?
- What are your overall feelings or concerns regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in your classroom?

Results of all teachers' attitudes towards inclusion are reported first. Then, the results are divided into three categories by level: elementary, middle, and high school teachers and are reported in the following sections.

Teachers perceptions of inclusion. Overall, all the teachers who completed the survey indicated support for the practice of inclusion in general; however, they feel there is a lack of resources and support in their classrooms. Many of the teachers indicated that more training and/or support in planning accommodations to meet the needs of students with special needs would be beneficial for those students in the general education classroom. Aides within the classroom are currently more commonly seen in elementary classrooms compared to middle and high school classrooms.

Common accommodations currently being used by educators include: graphic organizers, extra time on tests, scribes for written assignments, shortened assignments, group work, and technological devices. Elementary and middle school teachers feel that co-teaching is an effective practice for differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners, while many high school teachers were unfamiliar with the specifics of the teaching method.

Elementary teachers' perspectives of inclusion. Elementary teachers indicated that resources within the classroom mainly consist of the resources provided by the text book and specific reading intervention program companies. Several teachers indicated that they have the availability of an aide for short periods of time throughout the day, as well as access to computer and internet resources for additional assistance to create accommodations. Of the seven elementary teachers who completed the survey, five have assistance from an aide for varying amounts of time throughout the day.

Accommodations for students with disabilities provided by elementary educators include: use of manipulatives, tests read aloud, scribes for written assignments, fewer requirements, group work, posted schedules, and special seating arrangements.

The elementary teachers expressed strong beliefs in the practice of inclusion benefiting all students. The teachers indicated that both students with and without disabilities benefit academically and socially; however, more progress could be made with the presence of a full-time aide in the classroom. All of the teachers indicated there is a lack of money and resources in their schools and that more aides and additional resources would be beneficial, but are not financially feasible.

Elementary educators' main frustrations with inclusion derive from a lack of help and time available to provide the necessary support and assistance to students with disabilities.

Several elementary teachers felt that co-teaching is an excellent resource and method to implement inclusion but felt that co-teaching in often not implemented correctly and that one teacher ends up being in charge of the classroom and the other teacher essentially becomes an aide. In order to implement co-teaching, the teachers felt that the planning and instruction should be done together. Overall, the middle school teachers felt that inclusion could be beneficial for

all students if the appropriate supports and planning are done to meet the needs of the students with disabilities.

Middle school teachers' perspectives of inclusion. The middle school teachers indicated that resources within the classroom are limited for assisting students with special needs. The teachers indicated that the resources available are often hard to align with standards. Some resources used to modify the curriculum include simplified reading strategies and word walls. Other accommodations include: extra time on tests, tests being read aloud, reading partners, group work, and graphic organizers. Of the eight teachers surveyed, only two have assistance from a classroom aide. The middle school teachers felt that inclusion of students with disabilities can be a benefit students; however, it depends on the particular student. The teachers indicated that the inclusion of the student with disabilities can help with social skills although it can also cause the student to become frustrated academically, if the appropriate supports are not provided.

All the teachers indicated there is a lack of money and resources available to support inclusion. Several teachers indicated that assistance from an aide to implement inclusion would be very beneficial. The teachers indicated frustrations with their students with special needs segregating themselves in the classroom. Several teachers also expressed frustrations in their ability to modify the curriculum to allow students with special needs to feel successful while still allowing the typically developing students to make progress in the curriculum.

The middle school educators expressed high levels of support for co-teaching; however, indicated that it must be done in an effective manner, meaning that both teachers should be included in the lesson planning and delivery of instruction. Overall, middle school teachers

supported the practice of inclusion but felt that more resources including formal instruction for general educators should be provided in order to effectively implement inclusion.

High school teachers' perspectives of inclusion. The high school teachers indicated that access to technology provided the biggest resource for meeting the needs of students with disabilities. Accommodations are provided through resources such as computers, headsets, and calculators. Other common accommodations include private spaces to work, reading assistance, extended time on tests, scribes for testing, assignments read aloud, tests retakes, and study guides. High school educators felt that inclusion can be beneficial for all students and that it is especially beneficial for the student with disabilities because they need to learn how to interact in an appropriate manner in society. Likewise, students without disabilities need to develop acceptance for all people.

The high school teachers felt there is a lack of money available to provide resources, including aides, which creates a barrier for effectively implementing inclusion; however, the teachers strive to do the best they can. Several of the high school teachers were unfamiliar with the co-teaching method of inclusive instruction; however, indicated that any extra support in the classroom would be beneficial for all students. Overall, most high school educators support the inclusion practice but felt that more support and resources are needed in order to meet the needs of all students.

Discussion

In general, the results of the study support the practice of including students with special needs in the general education classroom. The majority of the teachers who responded to the study welcome students with disabilities into their classroom; however, also indicated many of the same concerns relating to inclusion. The results suggested that many teachers feel they are

unaware of the strategies and modifications needed to support students with special needs in their classroom and therefore are in need of additional training or support from trained staff in order to successfully implement inclusion.

Regarding the advantages of inclusion, the majority of the teachers who responded to the survey felt that inclusion can be a benefit for both students with and without disabilities. This benefit is mainly seen in the social context in which students with disabilities can learn how to interact within society and students without disabilities can learn how to accept people of different abilities. Inclusion can also be a benefit academically when teachers arrange peer buddy systems in which higher level students can teach or re-teach content to lower level learners. This practice can benefit both students by providing time to practice and reinforce the material.

In general, inclusion can provide benefits both academically and socially; however, it depends on how the practice is implemented. The results revealed that many teachers find the practice of inclusion to be rewarding, but time consuming to implement. When students with disabilities are integrated into the general education classroom, more individual attention is required for the student as well as time for the teacher to modify classroom assignments. With available supports and background knowledge relating to special education practices inclusion can be implemented in more successful ways; however, the lack of money becomes an issue for many schools, which in turn, causes a lack of support for inclusive education in school systems.

Overall, there were no major differences in perspectives of teachers at the varying grade levels who participated in this research. All teachers at each grade level were accepting of students with disabilities into their classroom. The elementary teachers who completed the survey had more access to aides and support staff, compared to the middle school and high school; however, all teachers expressed concern for the lack of resources available to students

with special needs in the general education classroom. Similar accommodations for students with disabilities are used across the grade levels including extra time on tests, scribes, graphic organizers, tests read aloud, and reduced requirements. Overall, the results indicated that inclusion is implemented and is similarly viewed the majority of classroom teachers, however, it is their perception that limited resources impacts their ability to provide appropriate services for students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Limitations

As with most research projects, some limitations are involved. Limitations for this project included difficult obtaining information and or lack of participation and completion of the surveys. This can be avoided in future studies by providing an incentive. Additionally, the number of participants was 22 out of 275, which as too small of a population to provide results that are representative of an entire population and therefore limited in their generalization.

Conclusion

Inclusive education can be beneficial for both students with and without disabilities. The researcher strongly believes that inclusion is more successful when resources, including trained support staff, are available within the building. Secondly, the results support the belief that students with disabilities can progress significantly both academically and socially when the student feels welcome and appreciated in the classroom. The results indicated that the majority of teachers do not foresee students with disabilities causing problems within the classroom and therefore should be welcomed into the classroom, the same as a student without disabilities. Overall, the success of inclusion depends on the individual student, general education teachers' attitudes, and supports the school is able to provide.

References

- Antonak, R., & Larrivee, B. (1995). Psychometric analysis and revision of the Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale. *Exceptional Children*, *62*(2), 139–142.
- Burrello, L., Lashley, C., & Van Dyke, R. (1996). Aligning job accountability standards in a unified system of education. *The Special Education Leadership Review*, *3*(1), 29-41.
- Choate, J. S. (2000). Successful inclusive teaching: Proven ways to detect and correct special needs. Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Education Company.
- Crossley, K. E. (1994). Inclusion: A new addition to remedy a history of inadequate conditions and terms. Journal of Law & Policy, *4*, 239-259.
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial & Special Education*, 27(2), 77-94.
- Lewis, R. B., & Doorlag, H. D. (2003). *Teaching Special Students in general education classrooms* (6th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Lewis, R. B., & Doorlag, D. H. (2006). *Teaching special students in general education classrooms* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2000). *Inclusive schools in action: Making differences ordinary*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mastropieri, M., & Scruggs, T. (2004). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Praisner, C. L. (2003). Attitudes of elementary school principals toward the inclusion of students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 69(2), 135-145.
- Salend, S. J. (2001). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices* (4th ed.).

 Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Sharma, U., Forlin, C. & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. *Disability*, *23*(7), 773-785.
- Smith, D. J. (1998). *Inclusion: Schools for all students*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Van-Reusen, A. K., Shoho, A. R., & Barker, K. S. (2000). High school teacher attitudes toward inclusion. *High School Journal*, 84(2), 7-20.

Appendix A

Section I: Background	<u>Information</u>	
Grade Level Taught: _		Circle One: General Educator or Special Educator
What level of inclusio	n is practiced in your cla	assroom – Circle one:
Full Inclusion	% of Time Included	Partial
Please explain how yo	our school defines the le	evel of inclusion identified above:
	level of inclusion is practiced in your classroom — Circle one: clusion % of Time Included Partial e explain how your school defines the level of inclusion identified above: is your area of teaching? (Art, English, Math, etc.) u have any training in Special Education? Yes or No (Circle One) Please Explain: you or do you currently have a student with a disability in your classroom? Yes or No(Circle One)	
What is your area of t	eaching? (Art, English, I	Math, etc.)
Do you have any train	ing in Special Education	n? Yes or No (Circle One) Please Explain:
Have you or do you cu Please Explain:	urrently have a student	with a disability in your classroom? Yes or No(Circle One
ricuse Explain.		
Section II: Open Ende	d Questions: Please ans	wer the following based on your beliefs of inclusive
education and/or curr	ent practice in your clas	sroom/school:
1. What resources do	you have available to yo	ou in your classroom to support the inclusion of students

with disabilities?

2. How many aides, if any do you have assisting in your classroom on a regular basis?
3. Number of students with disabilities currently in your class
Number of students without disabilities currently in your class
4. What accommodations do you utilize in your classroom to support the inclusion of students with disabilities?
5. Do you feel that the education of students with disabilities in the general education is a benefit for the student with disabilities? For all students in the classroom? Please explain:
6. Do you think the money and available resources (including aides) you currently have provided by the school is enough to effectively carry out inclusion in your classroom? Please explain:
7. What is your biggest challenge with the inclusion of students with disabilities in your classroom?

8. What does inclusion look like in your classroom?
9. Do you feel that co-teaching is an effective way to practice inclusion? What do you foresee as the benefits/drawbacks of co-teaching and inclusion?
10. What are your overall feelings or concerns regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in your classroom?
Additional Comments:

Section III: Attitudes Scale:

Directions: Please place a check mark in the square that best describe your agreement or disagreement with the statement. There are no correct answers: the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings. There is no time limit, but you should work as quickly as you can.

Scale taken from: (The rating key has been adapted)

Antonak, R., & Larrivee, B. (1995). Psychometric analysis and revision of the Opinions

Relative to Mainstreaming Scale. Exceptional Children, 62(2), 139–142.

Please respond to every statement

KEY

1: I disagree pretty much

2: I disagree a little

3: I agree a little

4: I agree pretty much

5: I agree very much

Example:

#	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
X	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.				X	
#	Statement	1	2	3	4	5

	<u></u>			ı	1	1
#	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.					
2	Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.					
3	Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.					
4	It is likely that students with disabilities will exhibit behavior problems in regular classrooms.					
5	Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.					
6	The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.					

7	The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of students with disabilities.			
8	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant change in regular classroom procedures.			
9	Increased freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for students with disabilities.			
10	Regular classroom teachers have the abilities necessary to work with students with disabilities.			
11	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.			
12	The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.			
13	The students with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in special classrooms.			
14	Integration of students with disabilities will not promote his or her social independence.			
15	It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains students with a disability			

	than in one that does not contain students with disabilities.			
16	Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher's time.			
17	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.			
18	Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in regular classroom.			
19	Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.			
20	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the students with disabilities.			
21	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in regular classrooms when possible.			
22	The classroom behavior of students with disabilities generally does not require more patience from the teachers.			
23	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special education teachers than by regular classroom teachers.			

24	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the students with a disability.			
25	The students with a disability will not be socially isolated in the regular classroom.			
26	Assignments should not be modified for students with disabilities.			
27	Modification of coursework for students with disabilities would be difficult to justify to other students.			
28	I would welcome students with disabilities in my class and enjoy working with them.			