


5-1-1995

Regular Education Teacher's Perceptions of Inclusion in Virginia

Karen F. Schroeder
Longwood University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schroeder, Karen F., "Regular Education Teacher's Perceptions of Inclusion in Virginia" (1995). *Theses, Dissertations & Honors Papers*. Paper 280.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Longwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations & Honors Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Longwood University. For more information, please contact hinestm@longwood.edu.

LC
4032
. V8
S37
1995

Regular Education Teacher's Perceptions of Inclusion in Virginia

Karen F. Schroeder

Longwood College

This thesis was approved by:

Dr. Ruth Meese (chair): Ruthlyn Meese

Dr. Terry Overton: Terry Overton

Dr. Stephen Keith: Stephen C. Keith

Date of approval: May 1, 1995

Running head: INCLUSION

FARRVILLE, VIRGINIA 22031
LONGWOOD COLLEGE LIBRARY

Abstract

Forty regular education teachers responded to a questionnaire concerning regular education teachers' beliefs and perceptions about the benefits, attitudes, and effectiveness of inclusion. The results were analyzed by calculating percentages and means for each item of the questionnaire and by calculating mean scores for each respondent's questionnaire to examine positive or negative reactions to inclusion. In addition, a t-test was computed. The results indicated that regular education teachers who responded were not strongly positive towards the inclusion of students with disabilities into regular education classrooms. The t-test showed no significant difference between regular education teachers who have students with disabilities included in their classrooms and those teachers who do not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms 60% or more of the day.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my committee. Thank you very much, Ruth Meese (chair), Stephen Keith, and Terry Overton for your professionalism and dedication to my work and all of the graduate students.

I want to thank my family for their continued love and support during this project. Thank you Mom, Jim and Will for listening and providing encouragement.

Finally, thank you to my roommate Tracy and all of my fellow graduate students for listening to my "thesis" complaints and stories.

Table of Contents

List of Appendices by Titles.....5

List of Tables by Titles.....6

Text of Thesis

 Literature Review.....7

 Inclusion.....14

 Advantages and Disadvantages of Inclusion.....23

 School Personnel's Attitudes Towards Inclusion.....27

 Statement of Purpose.....29

 Methods.....31

 Subjects.....31

 Instruments/Materials.....31

 Procedure.....32

 Results.....34

 Demographic Data.....34

 Likert Scale.....36

 Discussion.....39

References.....43

Appendices.....51

Tables.....60



List of Appendices by Titles

Appendix A: Letter to the Superintendent.....	52
Appendix B: Letter to the Principal.....	54
Cover Letter.....	55
Questionnaire.....	56

List of Tables by Titles

Table 1:	Mean Scores for Individual Items.....	61
Table 2:	Total Teacher Responses to Likert Scale.....	63
Table 3:	Responses by Teachers Who Have Students With Disabilities Included in Their Class.....	65
Table 4:	Responses by Teachers Who Do Not Have Students with Disabilities Included in Their Class.....	67

Regular Education Teacher's Perceptions of Inclusion in Virginia

A major challenge facing regular and special educators today is the inclusion of children with disabilities into regular education classrooms. PL 94-142, which is the Education for All Handicapped Children Act now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, set the stage for students with disabilities to be placed in the least restrictive educational environment. In the late 1980's, a new proposal was made by educational professionals known as the Regular Education Initiative (REI). Through this initiative there were many arguments made concerning the "inclusive education model." This model suggested that children with disabilities should be placed in regular education classrooms to become the responsibility of the classroom teacher. The regular educator, in return, was to be supported by special education teachers and specialists in that classroom (Alper & Ryndak, 1992; Friend & Cook, 1993; Haas, 1993; Hardie, 1993; Wilczenski, 1992; Wisniewski & Alper, 1994).

The idea for the REI was set in a 1985 conference, when Madeline C. Will stated that the "so called 'pull out' approach to the educational difficulties of students with learning problems has failed in many instances to meet the educational needs of these students and has created, however unwittingly, barriers to their successful education" (Will, 1986, p.412). Will (1986) at that time called for a partnership between regular and special education. In addition, Stainback and Stainback (1984) called for the merger of special and regular education. They felt it was possible to meet the needs of all

students within one system of education. This system would not deny differences, but instead would recognize and accommodate for these differences (Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

In 1988, the REI was established. Advocates proposed that all students with mild to moderate disabilities, as well as students with other special needs, be educated in regular classrooms (Davis, 1989; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Keogh, 1988; Lerner, 1987). Advocates stated that the REI was not aimed at ending special education services (Wang & Walberg, 1988). Instead, special education teachers were to work as co-teachers with regular education staff, where both would share in the instruction of students (Jenkin & Pious, 1991). According to Keogh (1988), the REI rests on the assumption that the regular education system is capable of serving all students. Lieberman (1990) believed that the REI was really a special education initiative for regular educators.

Students classified as having a learning disability or having mild to moderate mental retardation would receive all instructional services in the regular classroom under the REI (Jenkins, Pious & Jewell, 1990). However, if the child's individualized education program (IEP) called for additional instruction beyond that provided to regular education students (e.g. instruction at a different pace or instruction using different materials from the other students in the class), additional resources would be sought (Jenkins et al., 1990). The regular education teacher would still maintain control and the responsibility for overseeing student achievement of the goals set in

the child's IEP. The extra instruction needed in one certain area by some students might entail the child being placed in a separate program taught by a special education teacher. The special education teacher would then assume primary responsibility for the student's education in that area, while the regular educator would assume responsibility for all other instruction (Jenkins et al., 1990).

To some educators, learning disabilities are viewed as a mild or moderate handicapping condition (Keogh, 1988). These teachers believe full integration of these students into a regular education classroom is an obvious possibility. Unfortunately some learning disabilities can be severe and occur throughout life (Lieberman, 1990). Often children with severe learning disabilities do not have the capabilities to cope with the many problems in the regular classroom (Lerner, 1987). These students should not be overlooked for special services before being fully integrated (Lieberman, 1990). Lieberman (1990) believes that each decision should be made on an individual basis.

The REI states that children labeled mildly disabled are to be included in general education classes. The term mildly handicapped usually includes those classified as behaviorally disordered (Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, 1989). These students are often rated by teachers as the most difficult to teach, and they are considered to exhibit the least acceptable behavior and to cause the most problems in maintaining an effective learning environment for all students (Council for Children With Behavioral Disorders, 1989). Under the REI, the regular education teachers would need to seek advice on how

to overcome a student's conduct problem (Jenkins et al., 1990). The Virginia Council for Children with Behavior Disorders (VCCBD) (1994) stated that schools may be successful in including students with physical and learning disabilities. Yet, children with emotional disabilities may not be successfully integrated. In addition, the VCCBD (1994) noted that some students with emotional disabilities do not belong in regular classrooms because teachers do not have the appropriate resources or assistance and because these students cause problems for the nondisabled students. The Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD) (1989) pointed out that years ago children with behavioral disorders were in regular classrooms, and in this system these students either dropped out, were encouraged to drop out, or were excluded from school. The CCBD (1989) felt that it is not realistic to believe that regular educators will be able to develop or should have to develop the ability to manage the problems created by behaviorally disordered students. Therefore, they maintain there is a need for pull-out programs (i.e., self contained classes and resource rooms) to be continued.

Some advocates of the REI, however, believe that all children should be fully integrated into regular classrooms despite their condition, disability, or need. For example, the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH) seized control of the reform movement (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994) stating that having a separate education for students with disabilities just because these students have different ability or achievement levels is neither fair nor equal (Jenkins &

Pious, 1991). They believed that it is possible to deliver an appropriate instructional program in the regular classroom to children with severe disabilities, with the possible exception of students who are given to extreme violence and aggression (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Jenkins et al., 1990; Sailor, 1991). Yet, TASH felt that it would not be fair to the general education teachers to hold them responsible for teaching all possible skills, such as functional living skills. The students, therefore, would still have some program time in special classes (Jenkins et al., 1990; Sailor, 1991). Jenkins et al. (1990) felt this was extremely important not only for the special needs students, but also because regular education teachers need to be protected from unrealistic expectations and parents of normally achieving students can be assured that their children will also succeed.

The REI calls for a partnership between regular and special education (Jenkins & Pious, 1991; Jenkins et al., 1990; Reynolds, 1989). Jenkins et al. (1990) found this assumption of the REI not well defined. Their interpretation of the REI was that the regular educator and special educator become partners in classroom instruction, but the classroom teacher has primary control. Reynolds (1989) felt that special education teachers needed to be moved into regular classrooms as co-teachers in the instruction. The special education teachers would work on "such matters as child study, working with parents, and offering intensive instruction to students who have not been progressing well in school learning" (p. 10). Two models of partnership between special and regular education teachers are consultation models and direct teaching

models (Coates, 1989; Jenkins et al., 1990). The use of the consultation models, which are based on shared responsibility between classroom teachers and special education staff in assisting students with disabilities, is believed to help teachers learn to deal with diversity in the classroom (Jenkins et al., 1990). In the direct service model the regular education teacher is supported by special education staff in instructional activities, but the classroom teacher maintains primary responsibility for all students in his or her class (Coates, 1989; Jenkins et al., 1990). The main difference between those two models is the amount of responsibility assumed by the classroom teacher.

Lloyd, Crowley, Kohler, and Strain (1988) provided a review of literature on cooperative learning, prereferral teams, consulting teachers and peer tutoring, four approaches for implementing the direct service delivery model. They found that the available evidence on the usefulness of these methods was not conclusive, and the many unanswered questions would indicate that it was too early to rally for widespread use of these methods over current special education services. Heufner (1988) felt that the consultation method holds a lot of promise but warns that early implementation could produce a number of problems that could hurt its potential.

An assumption of the REI is that once regular classroom teachers learn how to use instructional skills for students with disabilities, they will be more willing to accept these students into their classrooms (Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988). However, Coates (1989) used a

questionnaire designed to measure 94 teachers' agreement/disagreement with certain underlying assumptions of REI proponents. They found that regular education teachers believe resource rooms are effective; however, they are also skeptical of the idea that children with disabilities can learn entirely in a regular class, even with additional consultant assistance. They believed pull out programs should be expanded to serve additional students and that the process of referral, testing, and placement needed to be faster.

Similarly, Semmel, Abernathy, Butera and Lesar (1991) examined special and regular educator's perceptions and opinions of the REI and pull out programs. They found respondents preferred the pull out program over the consultant model. The teachers viewed themselves in a single educational system, which required regular and special educators cooperating together. In addition, a high percentage of respondents felt that placement of a child with disabilities into the regular classroom would effect instructional classroom time, and teachers felt that full time placement would not help benefit the social relationships of students with disabilities. The results of these two studies suggest that there is resistance from regular educators concerning the REI. Placing students with disabilities in a regular classroom on a full-time basis will not benefit a child if the teacher's beliefs and expectations are negative (Semmel et al., 1991).

Advocates of the REI proposed the movement to place students with mild and moderate disabilities into regular education classrooms as an alternative to pull out programs. The focus then shifted not only to

the students with mild to moderate disabilities, but also to those classified with severe disabilities. Presently a growing number of schools and districts across the United States are moving in the direction of welcoming all children, regardless of their learning, physical, or emotional characteristics, as full members of their school communities (Davern & Schnorr, 1991). This move towards integrating students with disabilities into regular education is called inclusion.

Inclusion

Inclusion is described as the placement of children with disabilities into a regular education classroom with children who do not have disabilities (Friend & Cook, 1993; Haas, 1993; Hardie, 1993; Schattman & Benay, 1992). In an inclusive classroom the arrangement between the teacher and the specialist (e.g., often a special education teacher, a speech/language pathologist, school psychologist, audiologist, and other support specialists) varies depending on the student's needs (Friend & Cook, 1993).

Friend and Cook (1993) stated that a common misconception of inclusion is that students with disabilities never leave the classroom for special help. But, some students need special treatments, such as physical therapy, which is better handled outside the classroom. In addition, if a student's needs can not be met in a regular education classroom, he or she may be moved to a special education setting. However, students do not leave a regular education setting just because they are learning at a different rate or using different materials than the other students.

Classroom teachers who have a student with disabilities integrated into the regular education classroom need to be supported (Haas, 1993). In an inclusive environment the special education teacher is brought into the classroom as a resource or teammate to help not only with the child with disabilities, but also to help with the rest of the class (Alper & Ryndak, 1992; Haas, 1993; Schattman & Benay, 1992). This teaching approach can occur in the classroom in many ways: (1) planning, implementing, and assessing instruction together, (2) one teacher teaching a large group, while the other is circulating around the room, or (3) each teacher teaching two small groups the same information (Haas, 1993). In addition, the special education teacher may need to create alternative materials for the student to eliminate possible difficulties in the regular education setting (Friend & Cook, 1993). Schattman and Benay (1992) stated that through a multidisciplinary approach, teachers, parents, administrators and related service providers recognize the difficulty of the task to organize personnel and resources in a manner that allows for success. Finally, it is important for the classroom teacher to model an attitude of acceptance. As Hardie (1993) explained the teacher influences the child's acceptance into the class. If the teacher focuses on the student's strengths and abilities, he/she will help build a positive self esteem in that child. In addition, if the teacher models acceptance, the nondisabled students will learn to include students with differences into their lives.

Inclusion was first suggested for those students with learning disabilities. McIntosh, Vaughn, Schumm, Haager and Lee (1994) conducted a study to look at the degree to which regular classroom teachers made accommodations and adaptations for students with learning disabilities. They found that students with learning disabilities were treated the same as other students. Yet, a troubling part of this study was that the regular educators did not differ in the way they attempted to meet the needs of students with disabilities and nondisabled students. In addition, few adaptations were made; students with disabilities participated very little in class activities. These students infrequently asked the teacher for help, they did not volunteer answers, and their interaction with the teacher and peers was at a lower rate than for nondisabled students.

While some researchers are more cautious regarding the inclusion of students with severe and multiple disabilities into regular education programs (Jenkins et al., 1990), others insist on the inclusion of all students with disabilities (Friend & Cook, 1993; Haas, 1993; Hardie, 1993; Schattman & Benay, 1992; Thousand & Villa, 1990). Results from several studies indicate that students with severe disabilities can be provided with an effective education in a regular education setting with support services (Alper & Ryndak, 1992; Giangreco & Putnam, 1990; Kozleski & Jackson, 1993; McDonnell, 1987; York & Vandercook, 1991). These studies have shown that inclusion benefits students with severe disabilities by providing increased opportunities for communication and social interactions, as well as by providing models of age appropriate

social behavior. York and Vandercook (1991) believed full inclusion provides students with severe disabilities an opportunity to learn social behaviors in the context of regular classes, extra curricular activities, and other age appropriate environments.

In a study conducted by Giangreco, Dennis, Cloninger, Edelman and Schattman (1993), students with severe disabilities were assigned to regular education classrooms. Nineteen teachers participated with a great deal of reluctance. The teachers agreed to take these students contingent upon receiving support from specialists. The teachers reported that the students experienced improvement in awareness and responsiveness to teachers, peers and support staff. In addition, the students learned a variety of communication, social, motor, academic, and other skills that helped in their participation in home, school, and community activities.

Kozleski and Jackson (1993) explored the results of full inclusion for a student with severe disabilities. When the study started, the child was eight years old, severely mentally retarded, and had unintelligible speech. The emphasis was placed on learning functional skills (e.g. interacting with peers), though she was expected to participate in all instructional activities to the best of her abilities. After inclusion, the student interacted with peers through the use of verbal language, learned to identify the written names of her classmates, and asked her peers to read signs, notes and books to her.

Simpson and Sasso (1992) examined the severe disability classified as autism. They felt that full inclusion is only beneficial to students

with autism when it benefits the child himself/herself as well as nondisabled peers. They felt that children with autism must be integrated into a regular classroom on a case by case basis. This type of setting must be deemed to provide the most benefits to a person with autism.

These criteria for persons with autism could also hold true for all students with disabilities. Each student must be assessed individually. Before the student is fully integrated into a regular education classroom, the setting must be determined to be the most beneficial for the student and his or her peers. Decisions should not be based on trends or on what appears to be a suitable alternative (Alper & Ryndak, 1992; Reganick, 1993; Schattman & Benay, 1992; Simpson & Sasso, 1992).

In addition to the benefits that have been cited for students with disabilities, there have also been benefits cited for nondisabled students. Through daily exposure to students with disabilities, nondisabled students can learn new skills, values, and attitudes that can prepare them for life after school (Alper & Ryndak, 1992). Research indicates that full inclusion has positively influenced the attitudes of nondisabled students about their disabled peers in addition to helping their relationships with those students (Alper & Ryndak, 1992; Giangreco et al., 1993; York & Vandercook, 1991).

Some researchers, however, believe that the regular education classroom is an inappropriate setting for students with severe disabilities. For example, Jenkins et al. (1990) believe that students

with severe disabilities should be excluded from the full inclusion model because their needs go beyond the realm of the regular education teacher's instructional responsibilities. Jenkins and Pious (1991) expressed concern for the teachers with full inclusion classrooms, saying that many are neither able nor willing to accept the responsibility of children with special needs, claiming that regular education classes pose challenges that are too difficult for children with disabilities. In addition, Diamond (1993) believed children with disabilities will withdraw into themselves and become completely isolated if placed in a regular education classroom. Each student is different, and these differences need to be taken into consideration when selecting a placement for each student (Reganick, 1993).

Salisbury, Palombaro and Hollowood (1993) investigated several characteristics and changes within an inclusive elementary school. The movement for change was a shared commitment as the staff worked with the administration to work towards full inclusion. The staff found they needed to adapt curriculum and use collaborative problem solving (i.e., the whole class working together to solve problems) in the inclusion of students with severe disabilities. Teachers found shared planning and co-teaching to work well. In addition, the teachers moved away from paper-pencil activities and moved toward more activity-based instruction which makes it easier to include everyone. The changes in this school were slow, but in the end the school developed an inclusive model that faculty believed was beneficial to all students.

When trying to decide whether to include a child with disabilities into a regular education class, the willingness and ability of the regular classroom teachers to assume primary responsibility for the academic and social education of all students needs to be examined. Some teachers are concerned that additional instructional time will be needed to teach children with disabilities, which will in turn hamper the total quality of learning in the classroom (Wisniewski & Alper, 1994). Thousand, Nevin-Parta, and Fox (1987) described an Inservice Model that was implemented in five school districts in Vermont which was rated highly by regular and special education teachers, parents, and school administrators. The model provided regular educators with consultative services, collaborative efforts with special education staff, and teaching tools that were developed by special educators which were successful aides in having children with severe disabilities in the classroom.

Lyon (1988) discussed the successful development of effective inservice programs for teachers geared towards collaborative teams, providing models of instruction and developing a "common language" (p. 74) between regular and special educators (Thousand, 1988). Lyon felt that to achieve success in inservice programs these models for instruction needed to be demonstrated and then used in the classroom through guided practice (Thousand, 1988).

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) chose to require regular class teachers to complete special education coursework (Hoover, 1986). Hoover (1986) found that these

classes emphasized the development of attitudes and knowledge of disabling conditions, rather than how to teach these students or how to use behavior management techniques. Reiff, Evans and Cass (1991) found that for regular elementary education certification 14 states had no requirement for special education training, 31 had a special education introductory course requirement, and 6 mentioned a special education competency requirement but did not require specific course work. As found in Hoover's (1986) study, these classes were generally not method courses. This generates a problem, in that these courses provide an understanding of children with disabilities, but do not explain issues such as assessment, intervention, or behavior management (Reiff, Evans, & Cass, 1991).

The information concerning the types of resources available for regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms is scarce. Miller (1990) believed that resources and materials for teachers need to be provided, along with an attitude for change, before change is possible. Pearman, Barnhart, Huang and Mellblom (1992) reported that 91% of school personnel surveyed felt that regular and special education staff were not provided with the time to work together in planning instruction. Miller (1990) stated that classroom teachers need to use special educators as resources, to develop plans for action in teaching students with disabilities. Kozleski and Jackson (1993) found teachers were given support and opportunities to attend and visit similar programs to prepare them for

inclusion, if they first agreed to accept a student with disabilities into their classrooms.

The American Federation of Teachers surveyed 400 teachers on inclusion (Virginia Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, 1994). They found that 77% of the teachers surveyed opposed inclusion. Seventy percent indicated a lack of teacher training and discipline problems with included students. In addition, 62% of regular classroom teachers said that they were unable to give enough time to the students with disabilities. Forty-seven percent said that they did not have enough time for non-disabled students. Twenty-two percent reported receiving training and only half of those reported the training as "good"; 76% of teachers with included students reported not having aides in their classrooms; and 46% of teachers reported that maintaining discipline in the classroom is more difficult as a result of inclusion.

The willingness of teachers to accept students with disabilities into a regular education classroom could affect the instructional needs of the child. Teachers who do not successfully work with students who do not conform to their rules and teaching styles will probably not be very willing to accept students with disabilities into their classrooms (Kauffman et al., 1989). Kauffman et al. (1988) found that teachers who expected student conformity expressed less willingness to accept the placement of students with disabilities into their classrooms. The teachers who take responsibility for their students' behavior, believe they can change it and have high expectancies for each student are the

most willing and best persons to work with students with behavior disabilities (Kauffman et al., 1989).

In Landrum and Kauffman's (1992) study of elementary teachers, the authors found that a teacher's sense of efficacy (i.e., which is the amount of time and effort a person will give when confronting obstacles) is important in teacher's perceptions of who they believe they would be effective in teaching. Though it was not shown whether these teachers do indeed work better with students with disabilities, it does determine what types of teachers may be more effective in working with these students.

Teacher willingness, resources, and inservice and preservice activities are all matters to take into consideration when placing a child with disabilities into a regular education class. In addition, the attitude of the school's administrative staff towards integrating students with disabilities is important. Pearman, Barnhart, Huang, and Mellblom (1992) found that 77% of school personnel indicated that inclusion had created tension within the school community, while 95% of the principals reported that there was tension in their buildings as a result of inclusion. The authors indicated that the district offices were supportive, yet only 68% of those surveyed said that the principals in their schools provided the support needed in the inclusion of special education students.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Inclusion

Although regular educators may be unwilling to teach some students with disabilities, no one would disagree that special educators are

advocates for children with disabilities or that they want to implement programs which are in the best interest of each student. Nevertheless, special educators have been debating among themselves whether or not inclusion is the best environment for all students with disabilities.

Snell (1991) felt that "the three most important and reciprocal benefits from integration...are (a) the development of social skills...across all age groups, (b) the improvements in the attitudes that nondisabled peers have for their peers with disabilities, and (c) the development of positive relationships and friendships between peers as a result of integration" (pp.137-138). The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH) believes that a separate education system is unequal, and that the educational system cannot put up barriers between the disabled and nondisabled just because they have differences in ability or achievement (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Jenkins & Pious, 1991). Some full inclusionists feel that special education in itself, is responsible for general education's failure to handle students with special needs because it gives general education a way to get rid of its difficult to teach or trouble makers (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). So in return, they feel inclusion will force regular educators to deal with all children and eventually change into a better system for all (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

York, Vandercook, MacDonald, Heise-Neff, and Caughey (1992) examined students with severe disabilities who were included in regular education classes. They found that the two main reasons that special educators integrated their students were because they felt interaction

with nondisabled peers would be beneficial or the students with disabilities could learn from these peers. The most difficult aspect of inclusion was the development of strategies to use in the regular classroom or the scheduling and time for regular and special education activities. Teachers also reported that the benefits of inclusion were nondisabled peer acceptance and/or skill acquisition. The integration of the students with severe disabilities was perceived as positive and they recommended further integration for students with disabilities.

In addition to some special educators who have pushed for full inclusion, there are also those who believe that full-time regular education placement is not appropriate for all students (Jenkins & Pious, 1991; Simpson & Sasso, 1992). Full inclusion into a regular education program may be found appropriate for one student, but not for another (Jenkins & Pious, 1991; Simpson & Sasso, 1992). No one method of placement is best for every student (Simpson & Sasso, 1992).

Semmel, Abernathy, Butera and Lesar (1991) found a preference among teachers for pull-out special education services rather than for the consultative model. Teachers felt that inclusion of students with mild disabilities into regular education classrooms would not have positive social benefits for these students (Diamond, 1993; Semmel et al., 1991)

Brown, Long, Udvari-Solner, Schwarz, VanDeventer, Ahlgren, Johnson, Gruenewald and Jorgensen (1989) believed that some special education teachers want their own classroom and the personal freedom

that comes with being the head teacher in a classroom. They believed that if special education teachers are pushed into teaching in a regular classroom that they will be ineffective and unhappy. In contrast, Jenkins, Pious, and Jewell (1990) felt that regular educators are not responsible for teaching students with disabilities because their needs go beyond their circle of responsibilities.

Lieberman (1992) stated that no matter what professionals do, there are going to be students who are going to need special education services outside of the regular education classroom. Some students are going to need specialized services and the increased potential to succeed in a small classroom setting such as special education.

Similar to Lieberman (1992), Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove and Nelson (1988) argued that some students need special education. In addition, special education teachers require different skills than regular educators. Creating partnerships between regular educators and special educators could jeopardize the services that are presently available and cause many of the services to be eliminated from the education system.

In addition, the curricular focus between regular and special education is different in the classroom (Lieberman, 1992). Regular educators are given a classroom curriculum agenda before seeing any students. In contrast, in special education each child is approached individually, and their education plan is based on their individual capabilities (Lieberman, 1992).

Lieberman (1992) found similarities between full inclusion and the deinstitutionalization of persons with mental illness. Deinstitutionalization caused more than 250,000 people with schizophrenia or manic depressive illness to live in shelters, on the streets, or in jails. The failure of deinstitutionalization leads to the following question: How can the mainstream of education improve so dramatically as to incorporate an increase in diversity when it has such obvious difficulty accommodating the student diversity it already has (McIntosh, Vaughn, Schumm, Haager & Lee, 1994)?

School Personnel's Attitudes Towards Inclusion

The attitudes of superintendents would definitely be an influential aspect of inclusion. Stainback, Stainback and Stainback (1988) surveyed superintendents in Virginia as to their attitudes toward the integration of students labeled severely and profoundly disabled into regular education classrooms. They found that 50.5% held positive attitudes toward integration, 15.5% held negative attitudes, and 34% were uncertain. In addition, those superintendents who held positive attitudes also perceived community support for integration, whereas, those who had negative attitudes perceived lack of community support for integration.

The attitudes of regular education teachers towards inclusion also differ across situations. Negative attitudes have been noted to be a result of the lack of "preservice training, resources made available to teachers, knowledge of best practices, and personal experiences with students with disabilities" (Wisniewski & Alper, 1994, p. 6).

Wisniewski and Alper (1994) believed that the more severe the disability, the greater the negative perceptions of regular educators.

In a study conducted to measure regular class teachers and undergraduate elementary education major's attitudes toward integration, Wilczenski (1992) found that both groups were willing to teach students whose disabilities did not effect their learning or anyone else's learning in the class. In addition, both groups favored making physical accommodations, rather than academic and behavioral accommodations.

The resistance to having children with disabilities in regular classrooms sometimes changes into cooperation and complete support for the students with disabilities and the inclusion process (Giangreco, Dennis, Cloninger, Edelman & Schattman, 1993; Salisbury et al., 1993; York, MacDonald, Heise-Neff & Caughey, 1992). On the other hand, Friend and Cook (1993) asked regular education teachers to speak out about inclusion. Teachers reported not having necessary help to handle children with emotional disabilities who were hurting other classmates. They did not possess materials and resources to work with students with disabilities, and they reported feeling as if they were "traffic cops" because of the number of specialists who came into the classroom throughout the day.

Not knowing what to expect by having a student with disabilities in a regular education classroom can initially cause many negative reactions. Yet, Giangreco, Dennis, Cloninger, Edelman and Schattman (1993) found that the negative attitudes of seventeen out of nineteen teachers towards inclusion changed to positive ones over time. The two

who reported that their attitudes stayed constant throughout the study noted feelings that the disabled student was not really their responsibility. These teachers, at times, forgot the student was even in their class. On the other hand, seventeen teachers reported that they developed a willingness to work with the student and to learn new skills to teach that student, and that their perceptions of children with disabilities changed to having an open mind and heart.

In the Pearman, Barnhart, Huang and Mellblom (1992) study, all personnel in a Colorado school district were surveyed as to their attitudes and beliefs about inclusion. Forty-nine percent of the respondents disagreed that inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of all students. Forty-one percent disagreed that special education teachers want their students to be fully included in a regular education classroom, while sixty percent disagreed that regular educators want disabled students in their class full time. Twenty-eight percent felt that the inclusion of students with disabilities would hurt the education of nondisabled peers. In addition, fifty-three percent of those surveyed thought that the inclusion of students with disabilities into regular education classrooms would be too much extra work for the school staff.

Statement of Purpose

The literature has shown that much debate exists as to whether the REI and inclusion are feasible. In addition, professionals debate whether or not the REI and inclusion are in the best interest of all children or represent reasonable expectations for regular education

teachers. When considering inclusion, a teacher's pre-service and inservice training, available resources, and willingness to accept students with disabilities need to be taken into account. In addition, special educator's opinions as to whether inclusion is the best option for all students with disabilities is a heated controversy. Yet, few studies have focused on regular educator's views towards inclusion. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate regular elementary education teacher's perceptions of inclusion in their classrooms.

Method

Subjects

The sample for this study consisted of teachers in five elementary schools selected from two school divisions in Virginia (i.e., two schools in one division and three schools in another division). The subjects were regular elementary school teachers in pre-kindergarten through grade five who do and do not have children with disabilities included in their classrooms.

Instruments/Materials

A letter was sent to each school division superintendent explaining the study, assuring confidentiality, and asking for permission to conduct the study in that school division (Appendix A). Once permission was obtained from the superintendent, a phone call was made to the principals in each school requesting permission to conduct the study. Once permission was obtained from each principal, questionnaires were mailed to each school's principal, who was requested to distribute the questionnaires to the subjects (Appendix B). The teachers returned the questionnaires to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that was provided. The questionnaire was field tested for clarity on several elementary school teachers not participating in this study

prior to being given to the subjects. Items were modified according to feedback received before the survey was mailed.

The questionnaire had three components. The first component was demographic data. The demographic data included questions about gender, teaching experience, certification, age, and special education experience. The questions in the second section addressed the nature of children with disabilities in a teacher's classroom. This section included a definition of inclusion and asked questions such as: number of special needs students in the classroom, how long the child is included in the classroom per week, what types of disabilities the children possess, and how many years a child with disabilities has been included in that teacher's classroom. Using a Likert scale, the third section contained questions assessing the teacher's beliefs and perceptions about the benefits, attitudes, and effectiveness of inclusion. On the Likert scale, a 5 represented a strong positive perception and a 1 represented a strong negative perception.

Procedure

Permission was obtained from the two school division superintendents through a letter (Appendix A) that ensured confidentiality and anonymity for the school division and all participants. Once permission was received, a phone call was made to each school's principal requesting

permission and assuring confidentiality. The questionnaires were sent in the Winter of 1995 to each principal along with a request that he or she distribute them to each subject. Each teacher then mailed the questionnaire directly back to the researcher in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. A summary of the results was sent to each superintendent and principal following data analysis.

Results

Seventy surveys were distributed to regular education teachers in five schools from two school divisions in Virginia. Fifty-seven percent (N=40) of the teachers responded to the survey. Thirty-seven of those forty questionnaires were used in the study, while three were discarded due to missing information. Sixty-eight percent (n=25) of the respondents had students with disabilities included in their classrooms. Thirty-two percent (n=12) of the respondents did not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms.

Demographic Data

The first section of the questionnaire dealt with demographic data. In the category of gender, 100% (N=37) of the respondents were female. The mean age for respondents was thirty-eight, with a range in age of 22-64 years. The teachers were asked how many years they had been in the teaching profession. The mean length of time was thirteen years, with a range from six months to thirty years. In addition, the teachers were asked in what grade level each taught. Three percent (n=1) taught pre-kindergarten, 19% (n=7) taught kindergarten, 19% (n=7) taught first grade, 16% (n=6) taught second grade, 19% (n=7) taught third grade, 11% (n=4) taught fourth grade, and 13% (n=5) taught fifth grade. The mean number of years of teaching mainstreamed students

was eight years, with a range of 0-25 years. Teachers were asked if they had taken any special education courses. The mean number of classes taken by respondents was one, with a range of 0-5 classes. The same held true for special education workshops taken by the regular education teachers. The mean number of workshops completed by respondents was one, with a range of 0-5.

The second section of the survey dealt with the nature of children with disabilities in a teacher's classroom. The first question asked how many children with disabilities were included in each teacher's classroom. For those teachers who had students with disabilities included in their classrooms, the mean number of students was two, with a range of 1-6 students. The mean number of hours these students spent in the regular education classroom was 25.92 hours per week, with a range of 18-30 hours per week.

Teachers were then asked to list what types of disabilities were included in their classrooms. Ninety-six percent (n=24) responded they had a student with a learning disability in their classroom, 28% (n=7) had a student with a behavior disorder in their class, 28% (n=7) had a student who was developmentally delayed in their class, 8% (n=2) had a student with mental retardation in their class, 20% (n=5) had a student with a physical disability in their class, and 12% (n=3) responded to the "other" category. These three

teachers reported that they had an autistic child and/or children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in their classrooms. The final question in section two asked the teachers to indicate how many years they have had students with disabilities included in their classroom. The mean number of years was 10.4, with a range of 0-25 years.

Likert Scale

The final section of the questionnaire was a Likert scale, assessing the teacher's beliefs and perceptions about the benefits, attitudes and effectiveness of inclusion. The mean score for each item was computed for the whole sample, for teachers who have students with disabilities in their classrooms, and for teachers who do not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms (Table 1).

Percentages were calculated for each question (Tables 2-4). Sixty-seven percent (n=8) of the teachers who did not have students with disabilities included in their class disagreed that inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities. However, only 32% (n=8) of the teachers who do have students with disabilities included in their classroom disagreed, while 36% (n=9) did not know, and 8% (n=2) agreed that inclusion was the best way to meet the needs of these students. Sixty-four percent (n=16) of the teachers who have students included in their class agreed that children with disabilities who are included in a

regular education classroom are socially accepted by their nondisabled peers. Only 25% (n=3) of the respondents who did not have students with disabilities included in their classroom agreed to this statement. Forty-eight percent (n=12) of teachers who did have students included and 50% (n=6) of teachers who did not have students included disagreed that regular education teachers are willing to have children with mental retardation included in their class. Similarly, forty-eight percent (n=12) of teachers who had students with disabilities in their classrooms and 58.3% (n=7) of teachers who do not have students included disagreed that regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavior disorders in their classrooms.

Interestingly, eighty-nine percent (n=33) of all teachers strongly agreed that each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom. In addition, 86% (n=32) of all teachers strongly agreed that if students with disabilities are included in a regular education classroom, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the student's learning needs. Fifty-six percent (n=14) of teachers who have students with disabilities included in their classrooms and 67% (n=8) of teachers who do not have such students included in their classrooms strongly disagreed that their teacher training at

the undergraduate level prepared them to teach children with disabilities effectively. Finally, of all the teachers surveyed, 49% (n=18) strongly disagreed that regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities, while 27% (n=10) disagreed, 16% (n=6) did not know, and 8% (n=3) agreed with this statement.

Mean scores were computed for each survey, with 95 as the highest possible score and 19 as the lowest possible score. A score of 95 represents a strong positive reaction to inclusion. The closer the score is to 19, the more negative the teacher's reaction is to inclusion. The mean score for all teachers was 52.24. The mean score for teachers who had students with disabilities included in their classroom was 51.64, with a standard deviation of 9.768. The mean score for teachers who did not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms was 53.5, with a standard deviation of 6.776.

A t-test was computed to see if there were any significant differences between the two groups. The results showed that $t = -.672804$ at the $p < .05$. Confidence interval levels were -7.2796 to 3.5596 . The critical value was $t = +1.96039$ or -1.96039 . The P-value was $.50107$. There was no significant difference between the two groups.

Discussion

The regular education teachers who responded were not strongly positive towards the inclusion of students with disabilities into regular education classrooms. In addition, the teachers were more agreeable to having in their classes students with learning disabilities and physical disabilities rather than those students who have mental retardation, behavioral disorders, autism and/or multiple handicaps. This was found to be consistent with previous research. Inclusion was not seen as the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities. There seemed to be no differences between those teachers who had students with disabilities included in their classrooms and those teachers who did not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms.

Teachers did believe, however, that each child should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom. In addition many teachers felt that it was "okay" if students with disabilities were placed in a regular education classroom. The teachers surveyed did feel there was a need for more pre-service and inservice training in how to work with children with disabilities. This may show that attitudes towards inclusion are slowly changing from the negative to the positive.

A limitation of this study was the small sample size. The results of this study are only useful for the two school divisions surveyed and can not be generalized beyond this sample. Another problem was the unequal group sizes. It seems that this study interested those teachers who did have students with disabilities included in their classrooms more so than teachers who did not. It is hard to tell if the result of no difference between group perceptions is true or just due to the unequal group size. In addition, there might have been bias in who returned the survey. The teachers who returned the surveys might be more accepting of inclusion or more negative towards inclusion than those teachers who did not respond. Finally, gender representation may have been a limitation. All respondents were women and men may have different perceptions towards inclusion. It is, however, difficult to get male responses in elementary school's, so in the future researchers might compare elementary school teacher's perceptions with secondary school teacher's perceptions towards inclusion.

In addition, the questionnaire had limitations. For example, the experimenter had to assume that all the respondents answered the questions honestly. Also, two teachers stated in the survey margins that one of the questions from the Likert scale was a "loaded" question. As a result they responded "I don't know."

Reseachers have many options for future studies in the area of inclusion. First, fully examining the perceptions and attitudes of teachers towards inclusion would require an extended period of time. Future research regarding regular education teacher's perceptions should involve a more in depth study conducted over a longer time span. In addition, a researcher might choose to survey all school divisions in the state as well as those in other states. Another suggestion would be to select only one group to examine, either those teachers who do have students with disabilities included in their classrooms or those teachers who do not have students with disabilities included in their classrooms and validate these teacher's responses through actual classroom observations.

Second, interviewing a randomly selected group of regular education teachers, in addition to surveying teacher's perceptions, might produce more valid results. Personal interviews might also provide more in-depth information.

Third, special education teacher's perceptions of inclusion could be studied. The special education teacher's perceptions could be compared to regular education teacher's perceptions towards inclusion to examine differences. Finally, an in-depth, long term study could be conducted comparing regular education teachers', special education

teachers', administrators', and parents' perceptions and attitudes toward inclusion.

In evaluating the results of this study, regular education teachers do not hold strongly positive perceptions of inclusion. Because there is an increasing trend towards placing students with disabilities into regular education classrooms, regular education teachers' beliefs and attitudes are going to have a large impact on those students with disabilities who are placed in their classrooms. The regular education teachers surveyed do not feel they have had the training at the undergraduate level nor inservice/workshop training to teach children with disabilities effectively. This lack of pre-service and inservice teacher preparation is a growing issue that needs to be addressed.

References

- Alper S. & Ryndak, D. L. (1992). Educating students with severe handicaps in regular classes. The Elementary School Journal, 92(3), 373-385.
- Braaten, S., Kauffman, J.M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C.M. (1988). The regular education initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. Exceptional Children, 55, 21-28.
- Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Schwarz, P., VanDeventer, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F., Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1989). Should students with severe intellectual disabilities be based in regular or in special education classrooms in home schools? Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 8-12.
- Coates, R.D. (1989). The regular education initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22(9), 532-536.
- Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (1989). Position paper on the regular education initiative. Behavioral Disorders, 14(3), 201-207.
- Davern, L. & Schnorr, R. (1991). Public schools welcome students with disabilities as full members. Children Today, 20, 21-25.

- Davis, W.E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55(5), 440-446.
- Diamond, S.C. (1993). Special education and the great god, inclusion. Beyond Behavior, 3-6.
- Friend, M. & Cook, L. (1993). Sion. Instructor, 103(4), 53-56.
- Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L.S. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Exceptional Children, 60(4), 294-309.
- Giangreco, M.F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jon": Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 59(4), 359-372.
- Giangreco, M.F. & Putnam, J. (1990). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in general education environments. In L.H. Meyer, C. Pech, and L. Brown (Eds.), Critical issues in the lives of persons with severe disabilities (pp. 245-270). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Haas, D. (1993). Inclusion is happening in the classroom. Children Today, 22(3), 34-35.
- Hardie, A. (1993). Inclusion: Accepting children with disabilities. Texas Child Care, 17(2), 2-8.

- Heufner, D. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54, 403-414.
- Hoover, J.J. (1986). The preparation of regular class elementary teachers for education of exceptional children: An emphasis upon knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Educational Research Quarterly, 10(3), 2-7.
- Jenkins, J.R. & Pious C.G. (1991). Full inclusion and the REI: A reply to Thousand and Villa. Exceptional Children, 57, 562-564.
- Jenkins, J.R., Pious, C.G. & Jewell, M. (1990). Special education and the regular education initiative: Basic assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56(6), 479-491.
- Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 6-11.
- Kauffman, J.M., Lloyd, J.W., & McGee, K.A. (1989). Adaptive and maladaptive behavior: Teacher's attitudes and their technical assistance needs. The Journal of Special Education, 23(2), 185-200.
- Keogh, B.K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 19-22.

- Kozleski, E.B. & Jackson, L. (1993). Taylor's story: Full inclusion in her neighborhood elementary school. Exceptionality, 4(3), 153-175.
- Landrum, T.J. & Kauffman, J.M. (1992). Characteristics of general education teachers perceived as effective by their peers: Implications for inclusion of children with learning and behavioral disorders. Exceptionality, 3, 147-163.
- Lerner, J.W. (1987). The regular education initiative: Some unanswered questions. Learning Disabilities Focus, 3(1), 3-7.
- Lieberman, L. (1990). REI: Revisited...again. Exceptional Children, 56(6), 561-562.
- Lieberman, L.M. (1992). Preserving special education...for those who need it. In W. Stainback and S. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial issues confronting special education (pp.13-25). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lloyd, J.W., Crowley, E.P., Kohler, F.W., & Strain, P.S. (1988). Redefining the applied research agenda: Cooperative learning, prerefferal, teacher consultation, and peer-mediated interventions. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 43-52.

- McIntosh, R., Vaughn, S., Schumm, J.S., Haager, D., & Lee, O. (1994). Observations of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms. Exceptional Children, 60, 249-261.
- Miller, L. (1990). The regular education initiative and school reform: Lessons from the mainstream. Remedial and Special Education, 11(3), 17-28.
- Pearman, E.L., Barnhart, M.W., Huang, A.m., & Mellblom, C. (1992). Educating all students in school: Attitudes and beliefs about inclusion. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 27, 176-182.
- Reganick, K.A. (1993). Full inclusion: Analysis of a controversial issue. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366145).
- Reiff, H.B., Evans, E.D., & Cass, M. (1991). Special education requirements for general education certification: A national survey of current practices. Remedial and Special Education, 12(5), 56-60.
- Reynolds, M.C. (1989). An historical perspective: The delivery of special education to mildly disabled and at-risk students. Remedial and Special Education, 10(6), 7-11.

- Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. Remedial and Special Education, 12(6), 8-22.
- Salisbury, C.L., Palombaro, M.M., & Hollowood, T.M. (1993). On the nature and change of an inclusive elementary school. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 18(2), 75-84.
- Schattman, R. & Benay, J. (1992). Inclusive practices transform. The School Administrator, 49(2), 8-12.
- Semmel, M.I., Abernathy, T.V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58(1), 9-23.
- Simpson, R.L. & Sasso, G.M. (1992). Full inclusion of students with autism in general education settings: Values versus science. Focus on Autistic Behavior, 7(3), 1-13.
- Snell, M.E. (1991). Schools are for all kids: The importance of integration for students with severe disabilities and their peers. In J.W. Lloyd, A.C. Repp and N.N. Singh (Eds.), The Regular Education Initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models (pp.133-148). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

- Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51(2), 102-111.
- Stainback, G.H., Stainback, W.C., & Stainback, S.B. (1988). Superintendents' attitudes toward integration. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23, 92-96.
- Thousand, J.S. (1988). Addressing individual differences in the classroom: Are we up to the job? Teacher Education and Special Education, 11(2), 72-75.
- Thousand, J., Nevin-Parta, A., & Fox, W.L. (1987). Inservice training to support the education of learners with severe handicaps in their local public schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 10(1), 4-13.
- Virginia Council for Children With Behavior Disorders (1994). Inclusion, 1(1).
- Wang, M.C. & Walberg, H.J. (1988). Four fallacies of segregationism. Exceptional Children, 55, 128-137.
- Wilczenski, F.L. (1992). Measuring attitudes toward inclusive education. Psychology in the Schools, 29, 306-312.

- Will, M.C. (1986) Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-415.
- Wisniewski, L. & Alper, S. (1994). Including students with severe disabilities in general education settings. Remedial and Special Education, 15(1), 4-13.
- York, J. & Vandercook, T. (1991). Designing an integrated program for learners with severe disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, 23, 22-28.
- York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1992). Feedback about integrating middle-school students with severe disabilities in general education classes. Exceptional Children, 58(3), 244-258.

Inclusion

51

Appendix A

Dear

I am a graduate student currently working on a master's thesis in special education at Longwood College in Farmville, Virginia. The purpose of my research is to examine regular elementary education teachers perceptions of inclusion. Inclusion occurs when children with disabilities are placed in a regular education class for 60% or more of the school day. The survey will examine regular education teachers who do and do not have students with disabilities in their classrooms. The results of this study will give insight into regular education teachers perceived success or perceived problems with inclusion.

I will appreciate your school district's cooperation in this study. At no time would you, any schools, school staff, or your school district be identified in any published reports. Upon permission to use your school district in my study, would you please enclose a letter of consent, and return it to me within ten days, in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. This letter will then be sent to the principals of the selected elementary schools in your school district to request their permission. Upon permission from the school district and principals of the selected schools, survey's will be sent to regular education teachers. Completing the survey is voluntary and confidential. The results of this study will be sent to you following the completion of the thesis. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Schroeder

Inclusion

53

Appendix B

Dear Principal:

I am a graduate student currently working on a masters thesis in special education at Longwood College in Farmville, Virginia. The purpose of my research is to examine regular elementary education teachers' perceptions of inclusion. Inclusion occurs when children with disabilities are placed in a regular education class for 60% or more of the day. The survey will examine regular education teachers who do and do not have students with disabilities in their classrooms. The results of this study will give insight into regular education teachers' perceived success or perceived problems with inclusion.

As explained over the phone, at no time will you, the teachers, or your school be identified in any published reports. The results of this study will be sent to you following the completion of the thesis. I appreciate your support and cooperation in distributing the surveys to the teachers as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Schroeder

Dear Teacher,

I am a graduate student currently working on a masters thesis in special education at Longwood College in Farmville, Virginia. The purpose of my research is to investigate regular elementary education teachers perceptions of inclusion. Inclusion occurs when children with disabilities are placed in a regular education class for 60% or more of the day. The survey will examine regular education teachers who do and do not have students with disabilities in their classrooms. The results of this study will give insight into regular education teachers perceived success or perceived problems with inclusion.

Your cooperation is requested in completing the survey. Your responses will be treated in strict professional confidence and will be used only in combination with others responses. At no time will you or your school be identified in any published reports.

I will appreciate your completing the attached survey and returning it to me within ten days, in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Schroeder

Part I. Please answer the following questions in the spaces provided.

1. Male _____ Female _____
2. Age _____
3. Number of years in the teaching profession _____
4. Grade level presently teaching _____
5. Number of years teaching special education students who have been mainstreamed _____
6. How many special education courses have you taken? _____
7. How many special education workshops have you attended? _____

Part II.

Inclusion is when a child with disabilities (i.e. learning disability, mental retardation, behavioral disorder, and/or physical disability) is placed in a regular education class for 80% or more of the school day.

Referring to the definition of inclusion given above, please answer the following questions in the spaces provided.

8. How many children with disabilities are included in your classroom? _____
9. On average, how long is each individual child included into your classroom per week? _____
10. What specific disabilities are included in your class? Check all that apply.

Learning disability _____	Mental retardation _____
Behavioral disordered _____	Physical disability _____
Developmentally Delayed _____	Other (Please specify) _____

11. For how many years have you had children with disabilities included in your classroom 60% or more of the day? _____

Part III. Please respond to each statement by answering:

- 5-Strongly Agree
 4-Agree
 3-I don't know
 2-Disagree
 1-Strongly Disagree

12. Regular education teachers are given in-service training before having a child with disabilities included into their classroom. SA DK SD
 5 4 3 2 1
13. Regular education teachers are supported by special education teachers when teaching a child with disabilities in the regular education classroom. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Regular education teachers are given materials and resources to appropriately work with students with disabilities. 5 4 3 2 1
15. School administrators provide support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms. 5 4 3 2 1
16. Inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Regular education teachers want students with disabilities in their classrooms. 5 4 3 2 1
18. The inclusion of students with disabilities will benefit the education of non-disabled students. 5 4 3 2 1

5-Strongly Agree
 4-Agree
 3-I don't know
 2-Disagree
 1-Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|---|---|
| 19. | Children with disabilities who are included in a regular education class are socially accepted by their non-disabled peers. | SA | DK | SD | | |
| | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. | Regular education teachers are willing to have children with learning disabilities included in their classroom. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 21. | Regular education teachers are willing to have mentally retarded children included in their classrooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 22. | Regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavioral disorders included in their classrooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 23. | Regular education teachers are willing to have children with physical disabilities included in their classrooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 24. | Regular education teachers are willing to have children with autism included in their classrooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25. | Regular education teachers are willing to have children with multiple disabilities included in their classrooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 26. | Each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 27. | If students with disabilities are included in a regular education class, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the students' learning needs. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

- 5-Strongly Agree
- 4-Agree
- 3-I don't know
- 2-Disagree
- 1-Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|-------|
| 28. | My teacher training at the undergraduate level prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities. | SA | DK | SD |
| | | 5 | 4 | 3 2 1 |
| 29. | My teacher workshops/in-service training prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities. | 5 | 4 | 3 2 1 |
| 30. | Regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities. | 5 | 4 | 3 2 1 |

THANK YOU!

Inclusion

60

Tables 1-4

Inclusion

61

Table 1
Mean Scores for Individual Items

<i>Likert Scale Questions</i>	<i>Total Teacher Population</i>	<i>Teacher's with Included Students</i>	<i>Teacher's without Included Students</i>
12. <i>Regular education teachers are given in-service training before having a child with disabilities included in their classroom.</i>	2.08	1.88	2.5
13. <i>Regular education teachers are supported by special education teachers when teaching a child with disabilities in the regular education classroom.</i>	3.14	2.76	3.92
14. <i>Regular education teachers are given materials and resources to appropriately work with students with disabilities.</i>	2.43	2.24	2.83
15. <i>School administrators provide support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms.</i>	2.73	2.48	3.25
16. <i>Inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities.</i>	2.24	2.28	2.17
17. <i>Regular education teachers want students with disabilities in their classrooms.</i>	2.11	2.08	2.17
18. <i>The inclusion of students with disabilities will benefit the education of non-disabled students.</i>	2.73	2.68	2.83
19. <i>Children with disabilities who are included in a regular education class are socially accepted by their non-disabled peers.</i>	3.43	3.48	3.33
20. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have children with learning disabilities included in their classroom.</i>	3.46	3.52	3.33
21. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have mentally retarded children included in their classrooms.</i>	2.19	2.28	2
22. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavioral disorders included in their classrooms.</i>	2.11	2	2.33
23. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have children with physical disabilities included in their classrooms.</i>	3.51	3.44	3.67
24. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have children with autism included in their classrooms.</i>	2.11	2.16	2
25. <i>Regular education teachers are willing to have children with multiple disabilities included in their classrooms.</i>	2.19	2.2	2.17
26. <i>Each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom.</i>	4.89	4.84	5

Inclusion

27. <i>If students with disabilities are included in a regular education class, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the student's learning needs.</i>	4.86	4.84	4.92
28. <i>My teacher training at the undergraduate level prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.</i>	1.7	1.76	1.58
29. <i>My teacher workshops/in-service training prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.</i>	1.95	2	1.83
30. <i>Regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities.</i>	1.84	1.84	1.83

5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-I don't know 2-Disagree 1-Strongly Disagree

Table 2
Total Teacher Responses to Likert Scale

Likert Scale Questions	3A	A	DK	D	SD
12. Regular education teachers are given in-service training before having a child with disabilities included in their classroom.	3% n=1	10% n=4	16% n=6	32% n=12	37% n=14
13. Regular education teachers are supported by special education teachers when teaching a child with disabilities in the regular education classroom.	13% n=5	39% n=14	13% n=5	19% n=7	16% n=6
14. Regular education teachers are given materials and resources to appropriately work with students with disabilities.	8% n=3	11% n=4	19% n=7	41% n=15	21% n=8
15. School administrators provide support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms.	11% n=4	22% n=8	13% n=5	38% n=14	16% n=6
16. Inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities.	0% n=0	8% n=3	30% n=11	43% n=16	19% n=7
17. Regular education teachers want students with disabilities in their classrooms.	0% n=0	11% n=4	11% n=4	57% n=21	21% n=8
18. The inclusion of students with disabilities will benefit the education of non-disabled students.	5% n=2	27% n=10	19% n=7	33% n=12	16% n=6
19. Children with disabilities who are included in a regular education class are socially accepted by their non-disabled peers.	8% n=3	51% n=19	22% n=8	14% n=5	5% n=2
20. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with learning disabilities included in their classroom.	8% n=3	54% n=20	16% n=6	19% n=7	3% n=1
21. Regular education teachers are willing to have mentally retarded children included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	11% n=4	19% n=7	49% n=18	22% n=8
22. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavioral disorders included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	8% n=3	14% n=5	48% n=18	30% n=11
23. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with physical disabilities included in their classrooms.	14% n=5	48% n=18	16% n=6	19% n=7	3% n=1
24. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with autism included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	6% n=2	24% n=9	43% n=16	27% n=10

Inclusion

25. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with multiple disabilities included in their classrooms.	3% n=1	3% n=1	36% n=13	29% n=11	29% n=11
26. Each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom.	89% n=33	11% n=4	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
27. If students with disabilities are included in a regular education class, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the student's learning needs.	86% n=32	14% n=5	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
28. My teacher training at the undergraduate level prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	14% n=5	3% n=1	24% n=9	59% n=22
29. My teacher workshops/in-service training prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	16% n=6	0% n=0	41% n=15	43% n=16
30. Regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities.	0% n=0	8% n=3	16% n=6	27% n=10	49% n=18

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree DK-I don't know D-Disagree SD -Strongly Disagree

Table 3
Responses by Teacher's Who Have Students with Disabilities Included in Their Class

Likert Scale Questions	SA	A	DK	D	SD
12. Regular education teachers are given in-service training before having a child with disabilities included in their classroom.	0% n=0	12% n=3	8% n=2	36% n=9	44% n=11
13. Regular education teachers are supported by special education teachers when teaching a child with disabilities in the regular education classroom.	8% n=2	32% n=8	12% n=3	24% n=6	24% n=6
14. Regular education teachers are given materials and resources to appropriately work with students with disabilities.	8% n=2	12% n=3	4% n=1	48% n=12	28% n=7
15. School administrators provide support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms.	8% n=2	20% n=5	8% n=2	40% n=10	24% n=6
16. Inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities.	0% n=0	8% n=2	36% n=9	32% n=8	24% n=6
17. Regular education teachers want students with disabilities in their classrooms.	0% n=0	12% n=3	8% n=2	56% n=14	24% n=6
18. The inclusion of students with disabilities will benefit the education of non-disabled students.	0% n=0	36% n=9	12% n=3	36% n=9	16% n=4
19. Children with disabilities who are included in a regular education class are socially accepted by their non-disabled peers.	8% n=2	64% n=16	4% n=1	16% n=4	8% n=2
20. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with learning disabilities included in their classroom.	8% n=2	60% n=15	8% n=2	24% n=6	0% n=0
21. Regular education teachers are willing to have mentally retarded children included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	16% n=4	16% n=4	48% n=12	20% n=5
22. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavioral disorders included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	8% n=2	12% n=3	48% n=12	36% n=9
23. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with physical disabilities included in their classrooms.	8% n=2	52% n=13	20% n=5	16% n=4	4% n=1
24. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with autism included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	8% n=2	24% n=6	40% n=10	28% n=7

25. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with multiple disabilities included in their classrooms.	4% n=1	4% n=1	32% n=8	28% n=7	32% n=8
26. Each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom.	84% n=21	16% n=4	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
27. If students with disabilities are included in a regular education class, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the student's learning needs.	84% n=21	16% n=4	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
28. My teacher training at the undergraduate level prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	16% n=4	0% n=0	28% n=7	56% n=14
29. My teacher workshops/in-service training prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	20% n=5	0% n=0	40% n=10	40% n=10
30. Regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities.	0% n=0	12% n=3	8% n=2	32% n=8	48% n=12

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree DK-I don't know D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

Table 4
Responses by Teacher's Who Do Not Have Students with Disabilities Included in Their Class

Likert Scale Questions	SA	A	DK	D	SD
12. Regular education teachers are given in-service training before having a child with disabilities included in their classroom.	8.3% n=1	8.3% n=1	33.3% n=4	25% n=3	25% n=3
13. Regular education teachers are supported by special education teachers when teaching a child with disabilities in the regular education classroom.	25% n=3	50% n=6	17% n=2	8% n=1	0% n=0
14. Regular education teachers are given materials and resources to appropriately work with students with disabilities.	8.3% n=1	8.3% n=1	50% n=6	25% n=3	8.3% n=1
15. School administrators provide support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms.	17% n=2	25% n=3	25% n=3	33% n=4	0% n=0
16. Inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of children with disabilities.	0% n=0	8% n=1	17% n=2	67% n=8	8% n=1
17. Regular education teachers want students with disabilities in their classrooms.	0% n=0	8% n=1	17% n=2	58% n=7	17% n=2
18. The inclusion of students with disabilities will benefit the education of non-disabled students.	16.7% n=2	8.3% n=1	33.3% n=4	25% n=3	16.7% n=2
19. Children with disabilities who are included in a regular education class are socially accepted by their non-disabled peers.	8.3% n=1	25% n=3	58.3% n=7	8.3% n=1	0% n=0
20. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with learning disabilities included in their classroom.	8.3% n=1	42% n=5	33% n=4	8.3% n=1	8.3% n=1
21. Regular education teachers are willing to have mentally retarded children included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	0% n=0	25% n=3	50% n=6	25% n=3
22. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with behavioral disorders included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	8.3% n=1	16.6% n=2	58.3% n=7	16.6% n=2
23. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with physical disabilities included in their classrooms.	25% n=3	42% n=5	8% n=1	25% n=3	0% n=0
24. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with autism included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	0% n=0	25% n=3	50% n=6	25% n=3

Inclusion

68

25. Regular education teachers are willing to have children with multiple disabilities included in their classrooms.	0% n=0	0% n=0	42% n=5	33% n=4	25% n=3
26. Each child with disabilities should be considered individually before being placed in a regular education classroom.	100% n=12	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
27. If students with disabilities are included in a regular education class, special education personnel and classroom teachers should collaborate on the student's learning needs.	92% n=11	8% n=1	0% n=0	0% n=0	0% n=0
28. My teacher training at the undergraduate level prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	8% n=1	8% n=1	17% n=2	67% n=8
29. My teacher workshops/in-service training prepared me to effectively teach children with disabilities.	0% n=0	8.3% n=1	0% n=0	41.6% n=5	50% n=6
30. Regular education teachers should be responsible for the education of both children with and without disabilities.	0% n=0	0% n=0	33.3% n=4	16.6% n=2	50% n=6

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree DK-I don't know D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree