The University of Southern Mississippi

The Aquila Digital Community

Fall 12-2016

Teacher Perceived Barriers to Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches

Casey M. Wright
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses

Part of the Disability and Equity in Education Commons, Educational Methods Commons, and the Special Education and Teaching Commons

Teacher Perceived Barriers to Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches

By Casey M. Wright

A Thesis

Submitted to the Honors College of

The University of Southern Mississippi

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of

Bachelor of Science

in the Department of

Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

December 2016

INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY APPROACHES

Approved By

_____

Audra I. Classen, Ph.D., Thesis Advisor

Assistant Professor of Special Education in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

_____

Mary Arial, Ph.D., Chair

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

_____

Ellen Weinauer, Ph.D., Dean

Honors College

Abstract

The aim of this undergraduate thesis is to identify the perceived barriers to Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches (IIDA) through the perspective of general education teachers. For decades, students identified as having special educational needs have not been adequately served in the classroom. This study reveals the best practices used to include students with disabilities in the general education classroom and why they are not being employed as often as they should be. Through use of survey, the researcher allowed for the opportunity to answer (a) Which IIDAs are used most often? (b) How much time per week do teachers spend engaged implementing IIDA? (c) What do teachers perceive as barriers to implementing IIDAs? and (d) What correlations exist between the IIDA employed and professional development experiences, pre-service training, years of teaching experience of general education inclusion teachers, content taught, and the severity of disabilities? Results show that insufficient staffing and class size were the most identified barriers to inclusion and collaborative consultation is the most employed strategy, although it is commonly misinterpreted as an inclusive approach. Therefore, professional development and pre-service teacher education programs geared towards the most effective inclusive practices break down the barriers.

Keywords: Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches, general education, special education, inclusion

Dedication

To coffee and Jesus:

Because without a little bit of coffee

And a whole lot of Jesus,

I wouldn't have finished.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take the time to express my sincere thanks to the Honors College faculty, specifically Dr. Weinauer and Mrs. Mathis for allowing me the opportunity and providing me with the advisement to complete something I would have never dreamed I could achieve as an undergraduate student.

To Dr. Bunch-Crump, thank you for guiding me through the beginning steps and seeing things through until the end with me. I appreciate your helpfulness and how much time you invested in me to make this the best thesis you knew I was capable of.

I would also like to thank Dr. Classen, my thesis adviser, for her guidance, time, continuous support, and contributions to my research. I could not have asked for a better mentor and none of this would have been possible without your willingness to learn alongside me. There are not very many offices I could handle visiting as often as I visited yours, so thank you for always having an open door and not shutting it when you saw me walking down the hallway because you know I am always full of questions. I hope to be like you when I grow up.

Finally, I could not have done this without the support of my fur child, Zoey. Thanks for keeping my feet warm and waking me up when I fell asleep at my computer, even if you put dirty socks in my face. Your love is unconditional.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IIDA	Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches
M	mean
MDE	Mississippi Department of Education
n	number
PI	principal investigator
PD	professional development
SD	standard deviation
SE	standard error
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

Teacher Perceived Barriers to Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches

Introduction

Students with special educational needs have not always been treated as equal

individuals. In fact, students that presented special educational needs were isolated

completely from the general education population and discriminated against for years. It

was not until the 1960s and 1970s that students with disabilities' educational rights were

advocated for in the United States Legislative process. Court cases such as *Brown v.*

Board of Education, *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth*

of Pennsylvania, and *Mills v. Board of Education* provided litigation that constituted

rights of marginalized individuals to education. In 1971 the federal government took a

step towards ending the unfair treatment of people with disabilities in the United States,

to include school-age individuals. Public Law 94-142, namely the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), was introduced into legislation in 1975 (Martin,

Martin, & Terman, 1996).

IDEA ensures that all children with disabilities are entitled to a free, appropriate

public education to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education,

employment, and independent living. In addition, students must be taught in the "least

restrictive environment", which often means that students are in inclusive classroom

settings. The continuum of least restrictive environment services should begin with the

inclusion of children with disabilities with children who are not disabled unless the nature

or severity of the child's disability is such that education in regular classes cannot be

achieved satisfactorily with the use of supplementary aids and services (IDEA, 1997).

These legislative mandates, called for a revision of the educational system (Samuels, 2015; Kilanowski- Foote, Press, & Rinaldo, 2010).

Review of Literature

Goal of Inclusion

Daniel and King (1997) indicate the goal of inclusion is to improve students with disabilities' academic and social behaviors. Students that are included in the general education classroom are more often being held to the same expectations as their peers without disabilities (Daniel & King, 1997; Tremblay, 2013). These expectations are often higher than the expectations for students with disabilities in a separate setting (Daniel & King, 1997; Smith, 2011; Quenemoen, Lehr, Thurlow, and Massanari, 2001). Quenemoen, Lehr, Thurlow, and Massanari (2001) conducted a synthesis of literature to identify emerging issues affecting students with disabilities in standard-based assessment and accountability systems. Just as Daniel and King (1997) indicated, Quenemoen, Lehr, Thurlow, and Massanari (2001) also concluded that expectations are high in the general education classroom. Along with the high academic expectations, these researchers stated that access to the general education curriculum, opportunity to learn, mastery of grade level material, and the accountability system found within general education, are positive outcomes that result from including students with special educational needs.

Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches (IIDA)

Theorists and researchers have theorized and empirically evaluated instructional methods teachers can employ to effectively include and support students with special needs in the general education classroom. Co-teaching is often viewed as the primary, or "premiere" format of inclusive education (Kilanowski-Foote, Press, & Rinaldo. 2010, p

46). During co-teaching two professionals (e.g., general education teacher and special education teacher) coordinate and deliver substantive instruction and have active roles (Cook & Friend, 1995). Cook and Friend (1995) have identified parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching as effective co-teaching instruction delivery approaches. The focus of this study will be on these inclusive co-teaching approaches and will hereafter be referred to as inclusive instructional delivery approaches (IIDA) as identified by Kilanowski-Press, Foote, & Rinaldo (2010).

Parallel teaching. Teachers demonstrate this type of instruction by teaching the same topic simultaneously. Students are divided into two groups and are taught the same material (Cook & Friend, 1995). Parallel teaching can be used to give more opportunity for response or when the content has potential to be difficult or cause many questions and individual attention.

Station teaching. Students are divided into groups equal to the number of stations set up by the teacher. Each teacher involved teaches a specific content area; therefore, the teachers are teaching separate contents simultaneously to each group. Each teacher constitutes a station (Cook & Friend, 1995) and students rotate amongst the stations. Different content is taught at each station, but the same content is taught to every group after rotation. Typically there are two stations, but more stations can be included to accommodate an independent working station.

Alternative teaching. This type of instruction is implemented as one teacher leads an activity or lesson that a targeted small group of students can afford to miss (Cook & Friend, 1995). The second teacher leads the small group in more specialized instruction. Alternative teaching is generally used for remediation, accelerated

instruction, or when a high level of mastery is required. Teachers are encouraged to reverse roles periodically.

Team teaching. This delivery approach is typically used so that one teacher is delivering the instruction while the other teacher is modeling, giving examples on an overhead, etcetera (Cook & Friend, 1995). "Both educators share in the instruction of students which allows both teachers to blend their teaching styles and expertise" (Rosario, Coles, Redmon, & Strawbridge, n.d.). Team teaching allows for more opportunity to appeal to all types of learners for these reasons.

Commonly Misinterpreted Approaches to Inclusive Education

In addition to the core inclusive approaches, identified by Cook and Friend (1995) (i.e., parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching), alternative approaches have emerged in practice (e.g., one teach- one observe, one teach- one assist/ drift, and collaborative consultation (Kilanowski-Press, Foote, Rinaldo, 2010; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007*)*. In these alternative instructional delivery approaches responsibility is often shared less than in the approaches identified by Cook and Friend (1995). The following alternative approaches are commonly misinterpreted as being the most effective IIDA; however, in true co-teaching, both teachers share the responsibility and role in teaching all students in the classroom.

One teach - one observe. The "one teach- one observe" approach occurs when one teacher designs and delivers the lesson and the other teacher observes a small group of students during instruction (Cook & Friend, 1996). This delivery approach occurs with targeted students, usually to check student progress or to help new teachers and students learn about each other. This delivery approach is beneficial because the observing teacher

can formally observe the model teacher as well as the students being taught (Cook & Friend, 1995).

One teach- one assist/ drift approach. In this approach, one teacher develops and delivers the content or leads the activity while the other teacher assists by drifting around the room offering help where needed (Cook & Friend, 1996). This delivery approach is important especially with a special education teacher and a target student or group of students that typically need assistance. When effectively implemented, this approach allows for materials to be distributed in a timely manner, behaviors to be monitored through proximity by the assisting teacher, and one-on-one help may be offered (Cook & Friend, 1996).

Collaborative consultation. This final alternative approach occurs when the special education teacher serves in a consultative role to a general education teacher who carries the primary responsibility for instruction (Iowa Department of Education, 2009). This model allows a special education teacher to partner with multiple general education teachers without being physically present in the same classroom at the same time (Cook & Friend, 1995; Iowa Department of Education, 2009).

Benefits of IIDA

In addition to increased instructional components, empirical data supports positive effects on students' academic and social skills as a result of participating in co-taught settings (e.g., Tremblay, 2013; Smith, 2011). Tremblay (2013) compared the effects of an inclusive co-taught setting versus a pull- out special education setting (solo special education teacher) on the academic achievement and attendance of students with learning disabilities and found significant differences. Students in inclusive co-taught settings

demonstrated a significant improvement in areas of reading and writing. The authors conclude that the inclusive setting was globally more effective for participants with learning disabilities.

Smith (2011) also evaluated inclusion programs and their effects on students identified as receiving special educational services. Participants (n=10) were assessed using standardized state assessments in the areas of reading and math over a three-year period and specifically focused on the levels of improvement and the relationship between a pull- out special education setting and the co-teaching model of inclusion. Findings showed that six out of the ten participants' math scores reflected positively, inferring that the remaining four would benefit from both the solo and co-taught setting. The same results were found for the reading assessments, with the exception of one student that reacted negatively to both programs. These findings allowed the researcher to state that not every student will benefit from the same program, which is an emphasized concept of inclusion. Smith (2011) concluded by stating that the co-teaching model of inclusion, "enables students to experience successful peer relationships, benefit from both the general education and special education teachers' instructional expertise, build a sense of self-efficacy, and learn the basic needed information without moving in and out of class."

IIDA Versus Alternative Inclusive Settings

Research comparing the effects of alternative instructional delivery approaches to the shared role approaches identified by Cook and Friend (1995) have found better outcomes for students and teachers when the shared role approaches are employed (Duchardt et al., 1999; Embry, 2010; Lindeman & Magiera, 2014). Embry (2010)

investigated the effects of multiple and varied IIDA on the academic engagement of

students with and without disabilities. Findings revealed that IIDA increased student

engagement when teachers employed teaching strategies such as parallel, team, and

station teaching compared to the one teach–one assist approach.

Dushardt, et al (1999) investigated the shared role approaches to co-planning and

IIDA and found positive outcomes for students and teachers. The research was conducted

through both formal and informal meetings in order to develop common collaborative

questions. Participants were asked a series of five questions in the categories of:

concerns, teaming, pre- and inservice teacher needs, planning time, and evaluation.

Answers to these questions became apparent throughout the semester and were

documented. Dushardt, et al (1999) concluded that there are nine positive co-teaching

model outcomes, in all of its forms. Those nine positive outcomes were identified as:

> (a) collaborating and developing trust, (b) learning to be flexible and collegial, (c)
>
> finding pockets of time to co-plan, (d) learning through trial and error, (e) forming
>
> teacher and learning partnerships, (f) challenging oneself and developing
>
> professionally, (g) solving problems as a team, (h) meeting the needs of diverse
>
> learners, and (i) meeting the needs of teachers as problem solvers (Dushardt, et
>
> al., 1999, p 187 fig. 1).

Through the collaboration of a team of teachers, it becomes apparent that both the

teachers and the students are benefitting from co-teaching inclusive approaches, in all of

its forms.

Researchers stated that both the general and special education teachers benefit

from the amount of support IIDA provides to each; however, each team member must be

fully invested in the student and in their collaboration (Lindeman & Magiera, 2014).

Teachers benefit from collaboration because of the shared professional respect,

communication, and accountability of high expectations for each other. The researchers

describe the inclusive goals and vision stating, "by having a team that communicated

well, respected each other's area of expertise, and set high expectations, a young deaf

child was able to thrive in an inclusive classroom, both academically and socially

(Lindeman & Magiera, 2014, p 45)."

Problem Statement

Despite research indicating the positive outcomes of IIDA, research also shows

that the most effective practices are often not employed in the classroom. Kilanowski-

Press, Foote, & Rinaldo (2010) investigated the state of inclusive practices in general

education classrooms in New York by surveying general education teachers on the

instructional practices (e.g., small group instruction, co-teaching, and one-to-one

instruction) they employ. The researchers specifically studied the relationship between

instruction practices, class size, number of students with disabilities, severity of students

with disabilities included in the classroom, teacher qualifications, teacher preparation,

professional development experiences, and teaching experience. The researchers found

variability among inclusive practices employed in inclusive classrooms. Kilanowski-

Press, Foote, & Rinaldo (2010) stressed the need to identify the frequency and duration at

which IIDA are employed in practice. They reported a limitation of their study to be

failure to explore why IIDA was rarely employed. There is a growing interest in

determining why IIDA is rarely employed, given all of the benefits for both students and

teachers. In addition to the need to quantify teacher time engaged in IIDA, there is a

need to identify what teachers perceive as barriers to employing specific IIDAs.
"Teachers' perceptions towards inclusive education is a fundamental aspect of the
practice's success in primary schools" (Hunter-Johnson, Newton, & Cambridge-Johnson;
2014, p.143).

Previous research points out several reasons for teachers' perceived barriers to
IIDA in the classroom. Studies suggest teachers often feel they lack knowledge of
inclusive best practices (Greyerbiehl, 1993; Kilanowski-Press, Foote, and Rinaldo, 2010;
Scruggs & Matropieri, 1996). Several studies have found that teachers identify a lack of
support as a barrier to successful inclusive practices (Kraska & Boyle, 2014; Muccio,
Kidd, White, & Burns, 2014; Shemesh, 2009). Teachers specifically reported often
feeling as if they are solely responsible for providing quality inclusive supports in their
classrooms (Kraska & Boyle, 2014). Policies and school culture were also perceived
barriers to successful inclusive practices (Angelides & Hajisoteriou, 2013; Greyerbeihl,
1993).

Studies have also found that teachers' perceptions of inclusive practices are
affected by demographic barriers, such as years of experience and age (Kraska & Boyle,
2014). Specifically, class sizes, severity of disability, student behavior, grade level, and
teaching experience have been cited as a perceived barrier to inclusion (Shemesh, 2009;
Weddell, 2005). There has not been a study to specifically identify teachers' perceived
barriers to implementing specific IIDA.

Purpose Statement

Therefore the purpose of this study is to investigate the use of IIDA (parallel
teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, team teaching, one teach- one observe,

one teach- one assist/ drift, collaborative consultation) and the perceived barriers amongst general education inclusion teachers in Mississippi. Specifically the research questions include: (a) Which IIDAs are used most often? (b) How much time per week do teachers spend engaged implementing IIDA? (c) What do teachers perceive as barriers to implementing IIDAs? (d) What correlations exist between the IIDA employed and professional development experiences, pre-service training, years of teaching experience of general education inclusion teachers, content taught, and the severity of disabilities?

Methodology

Survey methods were used (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009) to answer the research questions. The following section describes the survey instrument development, survey instrument, recruitment and dissemination procedures, and data analyses procedures used in this study.

Survey Instrument Development

Prior to survey development, the principal investigator (PI) created a defined purpose and specific research questions (listed above). The PI developed the survey, in collaboration with her instructor of record as part of the required coursework for The University of Southern Mississippi's Honors College. To develop the survey, the PI sought advice from four experts in the Special Education field and reviewed peer-reviewed research literature on inclusive education. In addition to research literature, the inclusive education training materials used by the Mississippi Department of Education were used to develop the survey instrument.

Information received from special education experts and research literature was summarized and a list of potential survey questions was created. Then four practitioners,

considered to be inclusion experts in the field, reviewed the draft questions to consider

wording biases, confusing directions, and fatigue factors. Questions were then revised

and entered into Qualtrics©, an online web-based survey program. Once the survey was

created in Qualtrics© a pilot was conducted with four practitioners, considered to be

experts, within The University of Southern Mississippi. The PI conducted the pilot survey

with pilot participants in a face-to-face setting, for the purpose of timing the survey from

start to finish. Pilot participants were encouraged to talk aloud as they completed the

online survey indicating any wording or formatting problems encountered. Then final

revisions were made based on the pilot participant's suggestions and the Qualtrics ©

survey software was set to prevent participants from taking the survey multiple times.

Survey Instrument

The final survey consisted of 32 questions and was anticipated to take

approximately 10-15 minutes to complete, according to the pilot study. The first set of

demographic questions ($n = 13$) verified that participants were general education teachers

with recent inclusive practice experience. Specifically, the questions asked participants

about their gender, race, ethnicity, age, years of teaching experience, amount of college

coursework regarding inclusion, amount of inclusive practice professional development

opportunities completed, number of years teaching in an inclusive setting, highest degree

earned, teacher licensure area, current occupational status, and current grade level, using

a variety of response methods.

The second section of questions contained classroom demographic questions ($n = 4$). This section included four areas: number of students in the classroom, number of

students with disabilities, number of students with mild-moderate disabilities, and

number of students identified as having severe disabilities.

The final survey section contained questions (n = 9) related to IIDA perceptions

of use and barriers. In this survey section, several scaled questions asked participants to

identify their use of inclusive instructional delivery methods. Explicitly, the survey asked

participants to identify the percentage of time they used IIDAs per week. The remaining

questions, in the form of checkboxes and open-ended options, asked participants to

identify perceived barriers to incorporating IIDA more often.

Study Recruitment and Dissemination Procedures

Participants were pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade general educators in the

state of Mississippi, identified through snowball sampling. Principals' contact

information was obtained from a public excel file found on the homepage of the

Mississippi Department of Education's (MDE) website. A letter requesting participation

in the study was e-mailed to principals (n=896) using MDE's listserv. The letter

requested that principals forward the included electronic Qualtrics © survey link to their

general education faculty members. Qualtrics © is the most cost efficient survey tool

available to the researchers. When faculty members accessed the survey link, a short

consent statement appeared and participants accepted or declined to participate.

Individuals consenting to participate in the study were prompted to complete the survey.

Individuals not consenting received a prompt thanking them for their time.

As mentioned previously, the first set of demographic questions verified that the

participants were general education teachers with recent inclusive practice experience.

There were 728 participants that began the study however; participants (n = 455) were

excluded for not meeting the inclusion criteria or not completing the study entirely. Specifically, individuals (n = 168) with responses indicating they were not general education teachers with inclusive practice experience were excluded. Researchers defined non-completers (n = 287) as those who did not complete or finish any part of the final IIDA section of the survey.

The Qualtrics © survey software was set to send reminders to non-responders three times before closing the survey. The wording within each reminder was formatted to create a progressive sense of urgency. In addition, after the survey was closed an additional survey link was sent to principals asking them to identify how many general education teachers they sent the survey to. The PI did this for the purpose of pinpointing an estimated response rate percentage. Contacts were personalized using the Qualtrics © software, to keep PI email contacts from being categorized as spam. The e-mail also contained a link that allowed participants to opt-out of future reminder e-mails.

Data Analyses Procedures

Data analyses procedures consisted of three phases: cleaning data, recoding data, and conducting statistical analyses (i.e., Descriptive, Correlation, ANOVA). First, the PI and the instructor of record loaded the data file into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 24, IBM 2015) and cleaned the data to exclude non-general education teachers and non-completers. Then, they made sure each column's heading was shortened and understandable. Zeros were entered where participants had not checked the box and open-ended responses were recoded. For example, some participants entered 40-50 for the open-ended age question, in which the researchers entered the median age 45. Or for some questions, like content area, the researchers entered values for the responses.

For example, 1= Math, 2= Science, 3= Social Studies, 4= English Language Arts/ Reading, 5= Technology/ Computer, 6= Physical Education, 7= Art, 8= Music, 9= Foreign Language, 10= other.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the first three research questions: (a) Which IIDAs are used most often? (b) How much time per week do teachers spend engaged implementing IIDA? (c) What do teachers perceive as barriers to implementing IIDAs? Correlation and ANOVA statistics were used to analyze the final question, (d) What correlations exist between the IIDA employed and professional development experiences, pre-service training, the years of teaching experience of general education inclusion teachers, content taught, and the severity of disabilities?

In summary, a survey questionnaire method was conducted with 273 general educators in K-12 public schools in Mississippi. The survey was created using Qualtrics © and distributed to principals' emails. Principals then forwarded the e-mail to their current faculty and staff. Teachers completed the survey using the Qualtrics © online survey program and answered a series of questions that identified their use of IIDA and their perception of barriers to the use of specific IIDA. With multiple modes of analyses, the findings result in quantitative analyses of the use of IIDA in general education classrooms. Including, trends in perceived barriers affecting teachers' use of IIDA and their relation to various factors (e.g., severity of students' disabilities, teachers' professional development experiences, teachers' pre-service training, and teachers' years of teaching experience).

Results

Descriptive analyses procedures were used to investigate participants'

demographics (e.g., gender, race, professional development, content area taught, grade

level taught, licensure area, teacher level of higher education). In addition, classroom

demographics (i.e., number of IEPs, number of students with mild-moderate, number of

students with severe-multiple); use of IIDA practices; and perceived barriers (i.e.,

relationship with a special educator, and insufficient funding, materials, and/or staffing)

for each IIDA practice are reported, respectively. Finally, correlation analyses and

ANOVA analyses were conducted to investigate correlating factors that may impact

instructional approaches used in classrooms.

Participant Demographics

Of the 273 completed surveys, 87.2% (n = 238) of respondents identified as

female general educators, while 12.8% (n = 35) identified as male general educators.

Participants were teachers at both the elementary, defined as Kindergarten through sixth

grade, and secondary levels, defined as seventh through twelfth grades, (elementary:

56.1%, n = 153; secondary: 43.9%, n = 120) at the time of the study. Participants

identified themselves as Caucasian (76.6%, n = 209), African American (20.1%, n=55),

Hispanic (.7%, n = 2), American Indian (.4%, n = 1), and other (e.g., prefer not to answer,

human: 2.2%, n = 6).

Table 1 shows how participants describe the number professional development

(PD) hours on inclusive education they obtained in the last five years. The table also

depicts the number of college courses, years of total teaching, and years of teaching in the

inclusive setting. In addition, participants identified the level of highest degree they

obtained at the collegiate level. Of the documented responses, .4% (n = 1) identified as having achieved an Associate's degree, 52.4% (n = 143) a Bachelor's degree, and 47.3% (n =129) had a Master's degree or higher.

Classroom Demographics

Classroom demographic information shows that on average seven students in the general education classroom currently have IEPs (M = 6.67; SD = 6.16). In addition, teachers reported that on average four students in each of their classes have mild to moderate disabilities (M = 4.38; SD = 4.19). Interestingly, the teachers reported having one student with severe or multiple disabilities (M = .57; SD = 1.43) on occasion.

Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches

Participants were asked to provide an approximate percentage of the amount of time spent in IIDA on any given day. Following this section of the survey, teachers were asked to pinpoint exactly what barriers prevent more use of each IIDA. The percentage of time teachers are spending in the different approaches is depicted in Table 1.

The data, shown above, answers the question of which IIDA are being used most often and how much time is being spent implementing each IIDA. Based on the mean provided for each of the listed approaches, collaborative consultation is the most used approach (31.6%), with one-teach-one assist (17.8%), and station teaching (15.0%) following. Participants also indicated implementing the one-teach-one observe (14.4%), parallel teaching (12.7%), alternative teaching (9.1%), and team teaching (6.4%) approaches

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher's (N = 273) Reports of Variables Professional Development, College Courses, Years Teaching, Years Inclusive Teaching, Content Area, Students with Severe Disabilities and Instructional Approaches

	Independent Variables: Demographics						**Dependent Variables: Instructional Approaches**						
	Training		Years		Other		Inclusive Delivery (4)				Misinterpreted (3)		
	PD	CC	T	IT	CA	SD	P	S	A	T	OO	OA	C
Mean	2.79	1.56	12.09	9.08	4.36	.57	12.65	15.03	9.08	6.40	14.37	17.81	31.64
Standard Deviation	1.37	.93	8.64	7.05	1.84	1.43	25.01	26.28	20.48	17.38	24.51	27.39	37.68
Range	1-5	1-4	0-44	0-43	0-6	0-10	All Instructional Approaches had a Range of 0 - 100						

Note: PD = Professional Development; CC = College Courses; T = Teaching; IT = Inclusive Teaching; CA = Content Area; SD = Students with Severe Disability; P = Parallel Teaching; S = Station Teaching; A = Alternative Teaching; T = Team Teaching; OO = One Teach One Observe; OA = One Teach One Assist; C = Collaborative Consultation

Perceived Barriers to IIDA Use

The third research question, was interested in teachers' perceived barriers to implementing IIDAs. Statistics reported in Tables 2 and 3 describe what teachers perceive as barriers to implementing IIDAs. The responses for this section of the survey were accumulated through a checklist. Participants selected all that applied and were also given a text box to explain or add to the perceived barriers. These text comments were categorized into one of the listed approaches during the recoding of responses.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics: Percentage of Teachers (N = 273) Reporting Types of Barriers for Parallel, Station, Alternative, and Team Teaching

Type of Barriers	Parallel Teaching			Station Teaching			Alternative Teaching			Team Teaching		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Insufficient Funding	39	14%	.351	39	14%	.351	43	16%	.365	47	17%	.378
Insufficient Materials	31	11%	.318	33	12%	.327	22	8%	.273	21	8%	.267
Insufficient Staffing	110	40%	.491	91	33%	.472	109	40%	.491	118	43%	.496
Insufficient PD	58	21%	.410	45	16%	.372	49	18%	.384	53	19%	.396
SPE Teacher Relations	16	6%	.235	15	05%	.228	23	8%	.278	17	6%	.242
Severity of Disabilities	14	5%	.221	14	05%	.221	11	4%	.197	9	3%	.179
Class Size	48	18%	.381	63	23%	.422	51	19%	.390	42	15%	.361

Note: SD= Standard Deviation; Percentages may be over 100% because participants were

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics: Percentage of Teachers (N=273) Reporting Types of Barriers for Inclusive Instructional Delivery Approaches

Type of Barrier	One Teach One Observe			One Teach One Assist			Collaborative Consultation		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Insufficient Funding	59	22%	.412	59	22%	.412	59	22%	.412
Insufficient Materials	37	14%	.343	37	14%	.343	37	14%	.343
Insufficient Staffing	133	49%	.501	133	49%	.501	133	49%	.501
Insufficient PD	71	26%	.439	71	26%	.439	71	26%	.439
SPE Teacher Relations	19	7%	.255	19	7%	.255	19	7%	.255
Severity of Disabilities	24	9%	.284	24	9%	.284	24	9%	.284
Class Size	85	31%	.464	85	31%	.464	85	31%	.464

Note: SD= Standard Deviation; Percentages may be over 100% because participants were allowed to choose more than one response.

Correlation and ANOVA Analyses Results for Instructional Approaches

The final research question was intended to fill a research gap that explains what factors may impact educators implementation of the best inclusive practices in their classrooms. In order to answer this question, the researchers analyzed correlations between the IIDA employed and (a) professional development, (b) pre-service college courses, (c) years of inclusive teaching experience, (d) content area taught, and (e) severity of the disability.

Table 4

Correlation Statistics: Teacher's (N = 273) Reports of Variables Professional Development, College Courses, Years Teaching, Years Inclusive Teaching, Content Area, Students with Severe Disabilities and Instructional Approaches

| | Independent Variables: Demographics | | | | | | Dependent Variables: Instructional Approaches | | | | | | | |
| | Training | | Years Teaching | | Other | | Inclusive Delivery (4) | | | | Misinterpreted (3) | | | |
	PD	CC	T	IT	CA	SD	P	S	A	T	OO	OA	C	α
1.	-													.75
2.	.306**	-												.73
3.	.148*	-0.016	-											.76
4.	.175**	0.064	.816**	-										.77
5.	-0.045	0.031	-0.016	-0.064	-									.76
5.	-0.002	-0.011	0.031	-0.018	-0.066	-								.76
6.	**.159****	0.055	0.030	-0.040	0.116	0.099	-							
7.	**.178****	**.183****	-0.032	-0.034	**.295****	0.021	.422**	-						
8.	0.115	**.131***	0.048	-0.022	0.100	0.112	.470**	.398**	-					
9.	**.125***	0.103	0.066	-0.010	0.077	0.001	.551**	.403**	.577**	-				
10.	0.023	0.000	-0.049	-0.112	-0.079	.125*	.366**	.255**	.365**	.342**	-			
11.	-0.022	0.029	-0.039	**-.120***	0.041	0.068	.351**	.295**	.434**	.365**	.557**	-		
12.	0.108	**.153***	-0.005	0.004	0.022	-0.009	.159**	.169**	.174**	.159**	0.005	0.018	-	.72

Note: ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Professional development hours. Findings revealed a correlation in the number of hours spent in professional development on IIDA (M = 2.79, SD = 1.37) and percentage of time spent using parallel (M = 12.65, SD = 25.01), station (M = 15.03, SD = 26.28), and team (M = 6.39, SD = 17.38) teaching. A Spearman's *r* data analysis revealed a strong positive correlation significant at the .01 level, for parallel (*r* = .16) and station teaching (*r* = .18). Team teaching (*r* = .13) was a strong positive correlation at the p = .05 significance level.

After a correlation analysis was conducted one-way between subjects, ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of PD hours (0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10 plus PD hours) on the percentage of IIDA used. There was a significant effect of PD hours on alternative teaching at the p<.05 level [F (8, 264) = 2.61, p = .01] which can be found in Table 5. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean difference for more than ten PD hours (M = 13.87; SE = 5.09) approached a significant difference (p = .06) when compared to no PD hours (M = 8.93, SD = 21.73). However, the other conditions for PD did not significantly differ from one another.

Number of pre-service college courses. Similarly, when surveyed about the number of pre-service college courses taken related to IIDA (M = 1.56, SD = .930) and percentage of time spent using station (M = 15.03, SD = 26.28), alternative (M = 9.088, SD = 20.48), and collaborative consultation (M = 31.64, SD = 37.68), correlations could be made. A Spearman's *r* data analysis revealed a strong positive correlation significant at the .01 level, for parallel teaching (*r* = .18). Alternative teaching (*r* = .13) and collaborative consultation (*r* = .15) was found to be a strong positive correlation at the .05 significance level.

23

A one-way between subjects, ANOVA was used to compare the number of college courses (0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10 plus) participants had taken on the percentage of IIDA used. The number of college courses teachers had taken was significant at the $p <$ .03 level. In addition, college courses had a significant effect on the collaborative consultation approach with a $p = .01$. Finally, post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the percentage of IIDA use is significantly impacted by the number of college courses taken. Specifically, when teachers reported three to seven college courses there was significant difference ($p < .04$) when compared to those that had only taken one to three college courses. For specific mean difference, standard error, and significance scores regarding these conditions see Table 6

Table 5

Interaction Between Teachers' Professional Development Hours, and College Courses with Use Percentages of Instructional Approaches

		Professional Development					College Courses				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inclusive Approaches											
Parallel	Between	5220.5	8	652.6	1.04	.40	6058.6	3	2019.5	3.31	.02**
	Within	164975.5	264	624.9			164137.4	269	610.1		
	Total	170195.9	272				170195.9	272			
Station	Between	8208.6	8	1026.1	1.51	.15	8456.3	3	2818.8	4.23	.01**
	Within	179670.1	264	680.6			179422.4	269	666.9		
	Total	187878.7	272				187878.7	272			
Alternative	Between	8347.3	8	1043.4	2.61	.01**	7675.0	3	2558.4	6.47	.00**
	Within	105746.6	264	400.6			106418.8	269	395.6		
	Total	114093.9	272				114093.9	272			
Team	Between	4808.9	8	601.1	2.05	.04*	5130.8	3	1710.3	5.98	.00**
	Within	77308.4	264	292.8			76986.7	269	286.2		
	Total	82117.5	272				82117.5	272			
Misinterpreted											
Observe	Between	9339.7	8	1167.5	2.00	.05*	3195.9	3	1065.3	1.79	.15
	Within	154098.2	264	583.7			160242.0	269	595.7		
	Total	163437.9	272				163437.9	272			
Assist	Between	7123.4	8	890.4	1.19	.30	3646.0	3	1215.3	1.63	.18
	Within	196876.0	264	745.7			200353.4	269	744.8		
	Total	203999.5	272				203999.5	272			
Consultation	Between	14421.3	8	1802.7	1.28	.25	15643.1	3	5214.4	3.79	.01**
	Within	371823.8	264	1408.4			370602.0	269	1377.7		
	Total	386245.1	272				386245.1	272			

Note: ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 6

Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison: Mean Difference of College Courses and Percentage of Instructional Approaches Used.

Dependent Variable	(I) College Courses	(J) College Courses	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Parallel	5-7	1-3	19.47*	7.36	.043	.43	38.50
		3-5	12.95	7.85	.353	-7.36	33.26
		7+	22.16	8.73	.056	-.41	44.74
Station	5-7	1-3	24.73*	7.69	.008	4.83	44.64
		3-5	19.63	8.21	.081	-1.60	40.87
		7+	15.58	9.13	.322	-8.02	39.18
Alternative	1-3	3-5	-9.90*	3.04	.007	-17.76	-2.03
		5-7	-19.56*	5.92	.006	-34.89	-4.23
		7+	-1.10	4.32	.994	-12.27	10.06
Team	5-7	1-3	19.80*	5.04	.001	6.76	32.84
		3-5	14.55*	5.38	.036	.64	28.46
		7+	16.87*	5.98	.026	1.41	32.33
Consultation	1-3	3-5	-13.93	5.67	.070	-28.60	.74
		5-7	-28.61*	11.06	.050	-57.22	-.01

Note: *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Teaching experience. Years of teaching experience (M = 12.09, SD = 8.64) and use of any IIDA revealed no significance. However, a strong negative correlation (r = -.12) was found between the number of years teaching in an inclusive setting (M = 9.08, SD = 7.05) and the one teach one assist approach (M = 17.81, SD = 27.39). This finding was significant at the .05 level.

A one-way between subjects, ANOVA was conducted to compare the years of teaching experience (0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10 plus) on the percentage of IIDA used. There was a significant effect of teaching experience on station teaching at the p = .02 level. [F (37, 235) = 1.65, p = .02] see Table 7. There was no significant effect found for years of inclusive teaching experience when using the ANOVA analyses.

Table 7

Interaction Between Participants' Total Years of Teaching, and Years of Inclusive Teaching with Use Percentages of Instructional Approaches

		Years of Teaching					Years Teaching in Inclusive Setting				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inclusive Approaches											
Parallel	Between	27043.3	37	730.9	1.20	.21	15659.6	29	539.9	.85	.69
	Within	143152.6	235	609.2			154536.3	243	635.9		
	Total	170195.9	272				170195.9	272			
Station	Between	38764.9	37	1047.7	1.65	.02*	20859.3	29	719.3	1.05	.41
	Within	149113.7	235	634.5			167019.4	243	687.3		
	Total	187878.7	272				187878.7	272			
Alternative	Between	18270.3	37	493.8	1.21	.20	11016.7	29	379.9	.89	.62
	Within	95823.6	235	407.8			103077.2	243	424.2		
	Total	114093.9	272				114093.9	272			
Team	Between	15064.3	37	407.1	1.43	.06	5122.6	29	176.6	.56	.97
	Within	67053.2	235	285.3			76994.9	243	316.9		
	Total	82117.5	272				82117.5	272			
Misinterpreted											
Observe	Between	19912.0	37	538.2	.89	.67	21503.8	29	741.5	1.27	.17
	Within	143525.8	235	610.7			141934.1	243	584.1		
	Total	163437.9	272				163437.9	272			
Assist	Between	27083.9	37	731.9	.98	.52	21655.3	29	746.7	.99	.48
	Within	176915.5	235	752.8			182344.2	243	750.4		
	Total	203999.5	272				203999.5	272			
Consultation	Between	38883.5	37	1050.9	.71	.89	33969.9	29	1171.4	.81	.75
	Within	347361.6	235	1478.1			352275.2	243	1449.7		
	Total	386245.1	272				386245.1	272			

Note: ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Content area. Participants were surveyed for the content area (M = 4.36, SD = 1.84) they taught and their percentage of the use of IIDA. Correlation analyses were conducted for all instructional approaches, which are depicted in Table 2. However, station teaching (M = 15.03, SD = 26.28) was found to have the strongest correlation with content area taught. A Spearman's r data analysis revealed a strong positive correlation significant at the .01 level, for station teaching (r = .30).

To compare the effect of content areas taught on the percentage of IIDA use, 0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10 plus content area conditions a between subjects one-way ANOVA was conducted. A significant effect of content area conditions was found on station teaching at the $p = .00$ [F (6, 266) = 4.02]; one teach- one observe [F (6, 266) = 4.19]; and one teach- one assist [F (6, 266) = 5.39] also shown in Table 8. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean difference for math (M = 26.74*, SE = 6.03) was significant at a $p = .00$ level when compared to any elective course for both one teach- one observe and one teach- one assist. In addition, math when compared to science and social studies also had a significant impact how often these same misinterpreted approaches were used see Table 9. Then researchers conducted another one-way ANOVA to determine the effect math had on all instructional approaches. A significant effect of $p = .05$ or less was found for all instructional approaches except collaborative consultation. This data is reported in Table 10.

Severity of disability. In addition, Spearman's *r* data analysis revealed a significant ($p < .05$) positive strong correlation ($r = .13$) was found between the number of students with severe disabilities reported in each general education teacher's class (M

= .57, SD = 1.43) and the percentage they used the one teach one observe approach (M = 14.37, SD = 24.51).

An ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of the number of students with severe disabilities in a class on the percentage of IIDA use, 0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10. There was a significant effect (p < .05) of students with severe disabilities on alternative teaching [F (8, 264) = 2.61, p = .01], team teaching [F (8, 264) = 2.05, p = .04], and one teach one observe [F (8, 264) = 2.00, p = .05]. The results from this ANOVA can be found below in Table 9.

Table 8

Interaction Between Content Area Taught, and Number of Students with Severe Disabilities with Use Percentages of Instructional Approaches

		Content Area Taught					Number of Students with Severe Disabilities				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inclusive Approaches											
Parallel	Between	5661.9	6	943.7	1.52	.17	5220.5	8	652.6	1.04	.40
	Within	164534.0	266	618.5			164975.5	264	624.9		
	Total	170195.9	272				170195.9	272			
Station	Between	15633.3	6	2605.5	4.02	.00**	8208.6	8	1026.1	1.51	.15
	Within	172245.4	266	647.5			179670.1	264	680.6		
	Total	187878.7	272				187878.7	272			
Alternative	Between	4888.3	6	814.7	1.98	.07	8347.3	8	1043.4	2.61	.01**
	Within	109205.6	266	410.5			105746.6	264	400.6		
	Total	114093.9	272				114093.9	272			
Team	Between	1937.2	6	322.9	1.07	.38	4808.9	8	601.1	2.05	.04*
	Within	80180.3	266	301.4			77308.5	264	292.8		
	Total	82117.5	272				82117.5	272			
Misinterpreted											
Observe	Between	14123.9	6	2353.9	4.19	.00**	9339.7	8	1167.5	2.00	.05*
	Within	149314.0	266	561.3			154098.2	264	583.7		
	Total	163437.9	272				163437.9	272			
Assist	Between	22098.7	6	3683.1	5.39	.00**	7123.4	8	890.4	1.19	.30
	Within	181900.7	266	683.8			196876.1	264	745.7		
	Total	203999.5	272				203999.5	272			
Consultation	Between	2116.1	6	352.7	.24	.96	14421.3	8	1802.7	1.28	.25
	Within	384128.9	266	1444.1			371823.8	264	1408.4		
	Total	386245.1	272				386245.1	272			

Note: ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 9

Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison: Mean Difference of Content Area and Percentage of Instructional Approaches Used.

Dependent Variable	(I) Content Area	(J) Content Area	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Observe	Math	Other	9.90	12.63	.986	-27.63	47.44
		Science	24.90*	6.53	.003	5.48	44.32
		SS/His	23.91*	6.61	.007	4.26	43.57
		ELA	18.00*	5.77	.033	.83	35.17
		Electives	26.74*	6.03	.000	8.82	44.66
		Multiple	18.33*	4.90	.004	3.77	32.90
Assist	Math	Other	34.55	13.94	.172	-6.88	75.99
		Science	24.34*	7.21	.015	2.90	45.78
		SS/His	29.63*	7.30	.001	7.94	51.33
		ELA	13.65	6.37	.332	-5.29	32.60
		Electives	30.09*	6.65	.000	10.32	49.87
		Multiple	34.55	13.94	.172	-6.88	75.99

Note: *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10

Interaction Between Math with the Use Percentages of Instructional Approaches

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inclusive Approaches						
Parallel	Between	2789.3	1	2789.3	4.51	.03*
	Within	167406.6	271	617.7		
	Total	170195.9	272			
Station	Between	12774.7	1	12774.7	19.77	.00**
	Within	175104.0	271	646.1		
	Total	187878.7	272			
Alternative	Between	3473.7	1	3473.7	8.51	.00**
	Within	110620.1	271	408.1		
	Total	114093.8	272			
Team	Between	1154.0	1	1154.0	3.86	.05*
	Within	80963.4	271	298.7		
	Total	82117.4	272			
Misinterpreted						
Observe	Between	7214.5	1	7214.5	12.51	.00**
	Within	156223.2	271	576.4		
	Total	163437.8	272			
Assist	Between	14520.0	1	14520.0	20.76	.00**
	Within	189479.4	271	699.1		
	Total	203999.4	272			
Consultation	Between	832.4	1	832.4	.58	.44
	Within	385412.6	271	1422.1		
	Total	386245.0	272			

Note: ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Discussion

This study offers findings that may fill the gap in literature which fails to explain why teachers do not employ the best inclusive practices, as identified by Kilanowski-Foote, Press, & Rinaldo (2010) and Cook & Friend (1995). Participants (n=273) completed a survey requiring participant demographics, classroom demographics, time spent implementing IIDA daily, and perceived barriers to IIDA.

Participants were general educators in both elementary (n = 153) and secondary (n = 153) educations. Results show that both male (n = 35) and female (n = 238) elementary and secondary general educations teachers identify as having barriers to implementing IIDA in the general education classroom. Along with gender, participants also identified their race, professional development hours related to inclusive approaches, number of college courses related to inclusive approaches, total years of teaching, and years of teaching in the inclusive setting. Participants also noted the highest level of highest degree obtained at the collegiate level.

The participants also recorded classroom demographics. The demographics recorded were related to identifying the total number of students with an IEP and then describing how many of those students are identified as mild to moderate and/or severe and multiple disabilities. Significance in the classroom demographic area is discussed later as a correlation between severity of disability and the IIDA employed in the classroom.

Daily percent of time implementing IIDA was documented as well. The data showed that collaborative consultation is the most used approach. One teach- one assist and station teaching approaches were documented as the second and third most used

approaches in the classroom. All approaches proved to be used in the classroom to some extent, but some were more prominent than others. Perceived barriers to these approaches included insufficient funding, insufficient materials, insufficient staffing, insufficient professional development, relationship with Special Education teacher, severity of disabilities, and class size. Findings in this study are similar to those found in other research that also identified co-teaching, or IIDA, as the least practices inclusive approach to education (Kilanowski- Foote, Press, & Rindaldo, 2010).

In an effort to understand why educators are not implementing IIDA regularly or at all, participants were asked to identify barriers to implementing the described approaches. The results show that insufficient staffing is the predominant barrier to implementing IIDA in every approach, even the misinterpreted alternative approaches. Class size was described as being the second most identified barrier in all but parallel and team teaching, in which insufficient PD was identified as the second most commonly identified barrier.

Correlations were also made between the IIDA employed and (a) professional development, (b) pre-service college courses, (c) years of inclusive teaching experience, (d) content area taught, and (e) severity of the disability.

Results of the correlation between IIDA implemented and approximate professional development (PD) hours suggest that high levels of PD do have an effect on the use of station teaching. Specifically, the results suggest that participants with more than 10 hours of IIDA PD, more frequently use station teaching. However, it should be noted that PD hours must be more than ten to see an effect.

In regards to the correlation between pre-service college courses and the time spent implementing IIDA, station teaching, alternative teaching, and collaborative consultation approaches are all affected significantly.

According to the data, total teaching experience has no significance in correlation with use of any IIDA. Although, results did suggest that a number of inclusive teaching experience years does affect implementation of the one- teach one- assist approach. In a separate correlation study, team teaching approached significance. These results also suggest that the number of inclusive teaching experience does affect team teaching.

While total teaching experience showed no significance, significance is identified in the correlation of content area taught and IIDA implemented. Specifically, results suggest that a math or English language arts class can positively affect the one-teach/ one-observe approach.

Severity of a disability was the final correlation used to identify barriers in IIDA. Considering the positive strong correlation found between the severity of disability reported and the percentage of identified time implementing the one teach- one observe approach, results suggest that the number of students with a severe disability in a class can have a positive effect on the use of the one teach- one observe approach.

Therefore, if teachers are not effectively exercising these approaches, this research can be used to educate and inform the population of educational professionals about the perceived barriers to inclusion. The data collected also provides future implications for research and for practice. Present research suggests professional development and pre-service training programs could benefit general educators in implementation of the best inclusive practices as identified previously.

Limitations

This study was not without limitations. One limitation is in the method of sampling used. The use of snowball sampling limited the number of participants due to the option by principals to send to their faculty. While the sample size seems to be large, the response rate was low considering how many faculty members should have received the e-mail.

Additionally, there was a large representation of elementary educators, while secondary was underrepresented, in comparison. Future research could consider separating the data into findings based on elementary and secondary educators, separately. This might show where IIDA is being implemented differently amongst grade levels. Sampling method could also be considered to eliminate this limitation.

Due to the purpose of the study and sampling method, all teachers were included in the initial contact, but all participants that identified themselves as anything other than general education teachers were excluded from the study, thus impacting the response rate as well.

The exclusion of all but general education teachers also created a limitation to the study in terms of the purpose of the survey. Special education teachers were not asked any questions after they were identified; therefore, they did not have the opportunity to document their barriers to implementation of IIDA. Future research could consider the opinions of special education teachers, administrators, etc.

There was a time constraint due to the IRB approval turnaround time and a transition to a new faculty advisor. The IRB approval was sent back before completely

approved with several revisions that needed to be made. The transition to a new faculty advisor also created a small time constraint.

Future Implications for Research

The presented study was conducted in an effort to bring awareness to the perceived barriers found amongst general education teachers in regards to implementing IIDA effectively. While the survey tool distributed and then completed by willing participants did answer the research questions presented by the primary researcher, the study can be seen as a primary framework for further research to build upon.

As a means of conducting further research, mixed methods including qualitative interviews or focus groups could provide quality insight to pinpointing exactly what teachers perceive as barriers to inclusion. Through interview, teachers would be able to describe their typical day in the classroom and provide a more detailed account of the barriers that they face.

In order to further investigate and build on the presented research, future research could consider the development of additional questions in the survey questionnaire asking participants what they feel would improve their use of IIDA. Example response options might include the observation of good IIDA implementation, podcasts, coaching on how to improve IIDA, or tips from model IIDA implementers regarding how they structure and manage time, build relationships, etc.

A suggestion for future research might be the addition of the affect of class size when implementing a specific IIDA as a research question. Correlations made between the IIDA employed and class size might also offer insight to what barriers exist in the implementation of IIDA often. Along with class size correlations, another correlation

could be made between IIDA and the support of administration. This would have to also be added to the questionnaire.

Implications for Practice

This study has great implications for practice. Per the findings of this study, educators would benefit from professional development opportunities and pre-service programs concerning the most effective inclusive approaches. Pre-service programs should consider increasing the attention of programs on the most effective approaches to inclusive education versus an emphasis on the misinterpreted approaches.

In addition, schools wanting effective implementation of IIDA should consider providing their teachers professional development opportunities to further their knowledge and understanding of the best inclusive practices as identified in research. Because there was no significance found in years of teaching experience and approaches used, professional development would be a positive opportunity to provide teachers with the insight and experience necessary to effectively implement the best approaches to inclusive education.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

Research has found an increase in students' academic and social skills with the implementation of inclusive practices (Tremblay, 2013; Smith, 2011). Although researchers have identified effective practices of inclusion (Friend & Cook, 1995), research has found that these practices are rarely implemented in the classroom (Kilanowski- Foote, Press, & Rinaldo, 2010). Research has identified barriers to the implementation of inclusive practices. The current study identified barriers to the implementation of specific effective IIDA. The findings of this study could be used by

pre-service and in-service professional development providers to enhance the training received by general education teacher candidates and teachers to help improve IIDA implementation and potentially improve educational services for elementary and secondary students with disabilities.

References

Angelides, P., & Hajisoteriou, C. (2013). Implementation Strategies of Inclusive

Education in Cypriot Classrooms. *Journal of the International Association of*

Special Education, 14, 22-33.

Braunsberger, K. & Gates, R. (2009). Developing inventories for satisfaction and Likert

scales in a service environment. *Journal of Service Marketing,* 23. 219-225.

Cook, L. & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: guidelines for creating effective practices.

Focus on Exceptional Children, 28, 1-16.

Friend, M. & Cook, L. (1996). *The Power of 2: Making a difference through co-teaching*

[Videotape]. (Available from the Forum on Education, Smith Research Center,

Suite 103, Indiana University/On-site, Bloomington, IN 47405-1006)

Daniel, L. G., & King, D. A., (1997). Impact of Inclusion Education on Academic

Achievement, Student Behavior and Self-Esteem, and Parental Attitudes. *The*

Journal of Educational Research, *91*, 67–80.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., Christian, L. M., & Dillman, D. A. (2009). *Internet, mail,*

and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ:

Wiley & Sons.

Duchardt, B., Marlow, L., Inman, D., Christensen, P., & Reeves, M. (1999).

Collaboration and Co-Teaching: General and Special Education Faculty. *The*

Clearing House, 72(3), 186-190. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org.lynx.lib.usm.edu/stable/30189441

Embry, D. C. (2010). Does Co-Teaching Work? A Mixed Method Case Study Evaluation

of Co-Teaching as an Intervention. ProQuest LLC

Greyerbiehl, D., & Quality Life Concepts, I. (1993). Educational Policies and Practices

That Support the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in the General Education

Classroom. *West Virginia Developmental Disabilities Planning Council,* 1-111.

Hunter-Johnson, Y., Newton, N. G. L., & Cambridge-Johnson, J. (2014). What does

teachers' perception have to do with inclusive education: a Bahamian context.

International Journal of Special Education, 29, 143-157.

IBM Corp. Released 2013. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0. Armonk,

NY: IBM Corp.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments (IDEA) of 1997, PL 105-17, 20

U.S.C. §§ 1400 *et seq*.

Iowa Department of Education. (Fall 2009). Why co-teaching and collaborative

consultation models? Retrieved from:

https://www.educateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/Iowa's%20Co-

teaching%20and%20Collaborative%20Consultation%20Models.pdfhttps://www.ed

ucateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/Iowa%27s Co-teaching and Collaborative

Consultation Models.pdf

Kilanowski-Press, L., Foote, C. J., & Rinaldo, V. J. (2010). Inclusion classrooms and

teachers: A survey of current practice. *International Journal of Special Education,

25*, 43–56.

Kraska, J. & Boyle, C. (2014). Attitudes of preschool and primary school pre-service

teachers towards inclusive education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,

42*, 228-246.

Lindeman, K. W., & Magiera, K. (2014). A co-teaching model: Committed professionals, high expectations, and the inclusive classroom. *Odyssey: New Directions In Deaf Education*, *15,* 40-45.

Martin, E.W., Martin, R., & Terman, D.L. (1996). The legislative and litigation history of special education. *The Future of Children, 6*, 25-39.

Muccio, L. S., Kidd, J. K., White, C. S., & Burns, M. S. (2014). Head Start Instructional Professionals' Inclusion Perceptions and Practices. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 34*, 40-48.

Public Law 94- 142 (1975) Education for All Handicapped Children Act

Quenemoen, R. F., Lehr, C. A., Thurlow, M. L., & Massanari, C. B. (2001). *Students with disabilities in standards-based assessment and accountability systems: Emerging issues, strategies, and recommendations* (Synthesis Report 37). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved May 13, 2016, from the World Wide Web: http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Synthesis37.htmlhttp://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Synthesis37.html

Rosario, Coles, Redmon, & Strawbridge (n.d.). *Co-Teaching in the Classroom.* Roanoke Rapids NC: William R. Davie Middle School. Retrieved October 3, 2016, from the World Wide Web: http://da.halifax.k12.nc.us/UserFiles/Servers/Server_102128/File/migration/CoTeachingInTheClassroomREVMAGPresentation.pdf

Samuels, C. A. (2015). Decades of Progress, Challenges Under Federal Special Education Law. Retrieved May 03, 2016, from

http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/11/11/decades-of-progress-challenges-under-federal-special.htmlhttp://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/11/11/decades-of-progress-challenges-under-federal-special.html

Scruggs, T. & Mastropieri, M. (1996). Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958-1995: A research synthesis. *Exceptional Children, 63*, 59-74.

Scruggs, T.E., Mastropieri M.A., & McDuffie, K.A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A meta-analysis of qualitative research. *Council for Exceptional Children, 73*, 392-416.

Shemesh, Y. R. (2009, January 1). "I Get by with a Little Help from My Friends": A Survey of Teachers' Perceptions of Administrative Support and Their Attitudes toward Inclusion in New Jersey. *ProQuest LLC*.

Smith, D. A. (2011). Evaluation of inclusion programming for special education students. *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.* 1-104.

Tremblay, P. (2013). Comparative outcomes of two instructional models for students with learning disabilities: inclusion with co-teaching and solo-taught special education. *Journal Of Research In Special Educational Needs*, *13*, 251-258.

Wedell, K. (2005), Dilemmas in the quest for inclusion. *British Journal of Special Education, 32*, 3–11.

Appendix A

Participant Consent

Hello, from the University of Southern Mississippi. I am an undergraduate Honors College student looking to complete my thesis, which includes a survey exploring general education teachers' perceived barriers to inclusive instructional delivery approaches. If you are a general educator in the state of Mississippi, I would like to invite you to participate in this brief survey. By clicking the link below, you will be prompted to answer several questions including information about the demographics of your classroom, background knowledge of you as an educator, and your perceived barriers to inclusive instructional delivery approaches. This survey should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and all information is strictly confidential. You may also stop the survey at any time. Survey is stored in a password protected online survey system, which is only available to the researcher and supervisor. The results of the study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but neither your identity nor the identity of your place of employment will be revealed.

By participating, you will be entered in a chance-to-win one of three Amazon gift cards at $50, $25, or $10, each.

I am happy to answer any questions you may have concerning the survey or if you would like a digital copy of the results after they are published you may contact me at the following email address: casey.wright@usm.edu. The project has been reviewed and been granted permission to complete by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the IRB at (601) 266-5997.

By clicking 'CLICK HERE TO PARTICIPATE' below, you agree to be a participant in this study and will be directed to the secure website where you may complete the survey.

CLICK HERE TO PARTICIPATE

If this link does not work, please copy and paste the following address:

https://usmep.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_78JCaSBzE0aZaJL

I appreciate your time!

Casey M. Wright   Audra I. Classen, Ph.D.

The University of Southern Mississippi

Honors College: Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

Appendix B

Survey Tool

Survey of Inclusive Instructional Delivery Methods

Q1 You are invited to take part in a research survey about your use of inclusive practices. Your participation will require approximately 10-15 minutes and is completed online at your computer. There are no known risks associated with this survey, however, the information that you provide will help in the identification of best practices to include students identified with special educational needs in the general education classroom. Upon completion of the survey, you may submit your name using the second link (provided in your email) to enter to win a drawing for a $50, $25, and $10 gift card for Amazon. You will be asked to provide your email address so that you may be contacted in the event that you win. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential as all digital data will be stored in secure computer files. Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. If you have questions or want a copy or summary of this study's results, you can contact the researcher at casey.wright@usm.edu. Please feel free to request an e-mailed copy of this consent page to keep for your records. Responding "yes" below indicates that you are 18 years of age or older, a Mississippi educator, and indicates your consent to participate in this survey.

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

Q2 Demographic Information
Gender (1)
Race/Ethnicity (2)
Age (3)

Q3 What is your current occupational status?

❍ Special Education Teacher (1)
❍ General Education Teacher (2)
❍ Resource/assistant/aid (3)
❍ Preschool Teacher (4)
❍ Administrator (5)
❍ Other (6)
If Special Education Teacher Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey. If Resource/assistant/aid Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey. If Preschool Teacher Is

Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey. If Administrator Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey. If Other Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q4 Does your classroom include at least one student identified as having special educational needs as documented with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP)? Answering yes will infer that you are an inclusion teacher.

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q5 Teaching Experience and Licensure Area

Years of teaching experience (1)
Number of years teaching in an inclusive setting (2)
Level of highest degree earned (3)
Teaching licensure area(s) (4)

Q6 How many hours of professional development on inclusive education have you accumulated in the last five years? Inclusive education is the inclusion of students identified as students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

- ❍ 0 (1)
- ❍ 1-3 (2)
- ❍ 4-6 (3)
- ❍ 7-9 (4)
- ❍ 10+ (5)

Q7 Approximately how many college courses (at all degree levels) have you completed that provided instruction on working with students with disabilities?

- ❍ 1-3 (1)
- ❍ 3-5 (2)
- ❍ 5-7 (3)
- ❍ 7+ (4)

Q8 What grade do you currently teach? Select all that apply.
- ❑ Pre-K (1)
- ❑ Kindergarten (2)
- ❑ 1st Grade (3)
- ❑ 2nd Grade (4)
- ❑ 3rd Grade (5)
- ❑ 4th Grade (6)
- ❑ 5th Grade (7)
- ❑ 6th Grade (8)
- ❑ 7th Grade (9)
- ❑ 8th Grade (10)
- ❑ 9th Grade (11)
- ❑ 10th Grade (12)
- ❑ 11th Grade (13)
- ❑ 12th Grade (14)

Q9 What content area(s) do you currently teach? Check all that apply.

- ❑ Math (1)
- ❑ Science (2)
- ❑ Social Studies (3)
- ❑ English/Language Arts (4)
- ❑ Computer (5)
- ❑ Reading (6)
- ❑ Physical Education (7)
- ❑ Art (8)
- ❑ Music (9)
- ❑ Foreign Language (10)
- ❑ Other (11) _____

Q10 Classroom Demographics

Total number of students in class (1)
Total number of students with IEPs (2)
Number of students with mild/moderate disabilities (3)
Number of students with severe disabilities (4)

Q11 Use the following draggable bars to indicate an approximate percentage of ONE school day that you are engaged in the respective approach to including students with disabilities in the general education classroom. If you do not use the approach, indicate that by selecting 0%. If you use an approach that is not described, select other, write in your response, and indicate an approximate percentage of ONE day that you spend engaged in that approach.   The sum of all answers combined must be less than or equal to 100%.

_____ One Teach-One Observe (1)
_____ One Teach-One Assist/Drift (2)
_____ Parallel Teaching (3)
_____ Station Teaching (4)
_____ Alternative Teaching (5)
_____ Team Teaching (6)
_____ Collaborative Consultation (7)
_____ Other (8)

Q12 The following questions will give you the opportunity to identify barriers you have encountered while implementing inclusive instructional delivery approaches. Select all that apply. If there are no additional barriers, select either "No barriers, I implement this

approach in my classroom" or "No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom". If you experience a barrier to implementing the approach that is not listed, select "other" and type the barrier in the corresponding text box.

Q13 One teach- One Observe allows one teacher to plan and instruct while the other observes a small, targeted group of students during instruction.   Describe the barriers related in implementing One Teach-One Observe (co-teaching): check all that apply.

- ❑ Insufficient funding (1)
- ❑ Insufficient materials (2)
- ❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
- ❑ Relationship with Special Ed Teacher (4)
- ❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
- ❑ Class size (6)
- ❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
- ❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
- ❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
- ❑ Other (10) _____

Q14 One Teach- One Assist/Drift occurs when teacher 1 plans and implements the lesson while teacher 2 drifts and helps where needed. Students are not targeted in this approach.   Describe the barriers related in implementing One Teach-One Assist/Drift (co-teaching): check all that apply.

- ❑ Insufficient funding (1)
- ❑ Insufficient materials (2)
- ❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
- ❑ Relationship with Special Ed Teacher (4)
- ❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
- ❑ Class size (6)
- ❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
- ❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
- ❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
- ❑ Other (10) _____

Q15 Parallel teaching is defined as the simultaneous teaching of the same topic. Both the general and special education teachers teach students the same material but in two

separate groups to allow opportunity for response. Describe the barriers related in implementing Parallel Teaching: check all that apply.

❑ Insufficient funding (1)
❑ Insufficient materials (2)
❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
❑ Relationship with Special Ed teacher (4)
❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
❑ Class size (6)
❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
❑ Other (10) _____

Q16 Commonly referred to as "centers", station teaching occurs when the content is divided amongst both teachers. Instruction is the same for each group of students that rotate to the stations but each teacher is teaching different content. Describe the barriers related in implementing Station Teaching: check all that apply.

❑ Insufficient funding (1)
❑ Insufficient materials (2)
❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
❑ Relationship with Special Ed teacher (4)
❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
❑ Class size (6)
❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
❑ Other (10) _____

Q17 Alternative teaching occurs when teacher 1 leads an activity while teacher 2 is working with a targeted group in specialized instruction. This approach is generally used

when a high level of mastery is required.   Describe the barriers related in implementing Alternative Teaching: check all that apply.

- ❑ Insufficient funding (1)
- ❑ Insufficient materials (2)
- ❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
- ❑ Relationship with Special Ed teacher (4)
- ❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
- ❑ Class size (6)
- ❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
- ❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
- ❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
- ❑ Other (10) _____

Q18 Team teaching is an approach that allows one teacher to instruct while the other provides modeling, examples on an overhead, etc.   Describe the barriers related in implementing Team Teaching: check all that apply.

- ❑ Insufficient funding (1)
- ❑ Insufficient materials (2)
- ❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
- ❑ Relationship with Special Ed teacher (4)
- ❑ Severity of disabilties (5)
- ❑ Class size (6)
- ❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
- ❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
- ❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
- ❑ Other (10) _____

Q19 Collaborative consultation allows the special education teacher to consult with several general education teachers without actively being present in the room during instruction. General education teachers are still the primary planner and delivers

instruction.   Describe the barriers related in implementing Collaborative Consultation: check all that apply.

- ❑ Insufficient funding (1)
- ❑ Insufficient materials (2)
- ❑ Insufficient staffing (3)
- ❑ Relationship with Special Ed teacher (4)
- ❑ Severity of disabilities (5)
- ❑ Class size (6)
- ❑ Insufficient professional development in relation to this approach (7)
- ❑ No barriers, I implement this approach in my classroom (8)
- ❑ No barriers, I choose not to implement this approach in my classroom (9)
- ❑ Other (10) _____

Appendix C

IRB Approval Form

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
  Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 16082911
PROJECT TITLE: Teacher Percieved Barriers to Instructional Inclusive Practices
PROJECT TYPE: New Project
RESEARCHER(S): Casey Wright
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Exempt Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 09/28/2016 to 09/27/2017
Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board