Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1995

Staff Attitudes Regarding Full Inclusion of Special Needs Children in Regular Education Classrooms

Levin Roxanne Beth Weiss
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

STAFF ATTITUDES REGARDING FULL INCLUSION OF SPECIAL NEEDS

CHILDREN IN REGULAR EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

ROXANNE BETH WEISS LEVIN

CO-DIRECTOR: MARTHA ELLEN WYNNE, PH.D.

CO-DIRECTOR: CAROL HARDING, PH.D.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1995

ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Martha Ellen Wynne, Dr. Carol Harding, Dr. Lenore Weissmann and Dr. Jack Kavanagh for their professional assistance, encouragement and support throughout this research project.

In addition I wish to thank Tammy Dee Jones for her patience and understanding. Dr. Judith Levinson and Mr. Hal Brun offered help and guidance and I thank them.

Special thanks must go to my four wonderful sons Matthew, Brian, Eric and Daniel who gave up a piece of mom with never a complaint in order for this project to reach completion. I never would have seen this project through to fruition had it not been for the love, and support of my husband Stuart who will never know how much his dedication to this project has sustained me. My extended family and friends have my love and gratitude for having gone through this process along with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Introduction

The history of special education programs is discussed by Zigmond (1994) and she explains that these programs were created to meet the needs of a population of children identified as having a disabling condition that made these children a burden to regular classroom teachers, vulnerable to academic failure and subject to ridicule by classroom peers. Historically, special education programs were often organized by disability category and operated apart from the mainstream. Teachers hired for these programs received special training in specific areas of exceptionality and these teachers were thought to have the skills to modify instructional goals and teach their students in nurturing, accepting environments. Zigmond notes that these early special education programs received little systematic evaluation. After the passage of PL94-142, federal regulations mandated program evaluation but these evaluations focused on compliance issues such as the numbers of students served and not on the effectiveness of these programs.

In the last decade a number of legal, financial, political and social pressures have made evaluating programs a priority. Many are calling into question the practice of providing separate, special education services. It has been suggested by some that children with special education needs can have those needs met in the regular education environment.

The idea of integrating children with special needs into regular education classrooms is not a new idea (e.g., Reynolds & Wang, 1981; Will, 1986). However, for some the present trend is toward a more extreme version of integration known as full inclusion. Full inclusionists see the regular education classroom as the only placement option for the provision of services to all students with disabilities ranging from mild to severe and profound disabilities.

Moderate proponents of inclusion see inclusion as an opportunity for students with disabilities to have access to the neighborhood school environment. Inclusion can allow for some or all of the student's special education and related services to be provided in regular education classes. These proponents recognize that no single type of placement option will meet the needs of all students and that placement decisions need to be made based on each child's individualized needs.

Mather and Roberts (1994) suggest that advocates and opponents of full inclusion share a desire to create successful environments for all students. Both groups would agree that all students should be provided with challenging and appropriate educational experiences as well as any support and assistance they might need. The differences arise when discussing whether or not these goals are attainable for all handicapped students in a regular education environment and in determining how and where supportive assistance is provided.

All children with disabilities are entitled to a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment as defined by The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973

(Dickman, 1994). This law guarantees a continuum of alternative placement options from inclusion or instruction in regular education classes through separate, specialized services in specialized institutions. Services to identified children are guaranteed to be provided on an individualized basis.

Radical inclusion proponents such as Stainback and Stainback (1992), Pearpoint and Forest (1989) suggest that Pl94-142 is not needed in an inclusive model. Mather and Roberts (1994) note that in some school districts, a continuum of alternative placement options no longer exists and all instruction is provided in the regular classroom. They point out the irony in this when they note that for some students, the regular classroom is more restrictive than separate, specialized instruction. Chapman (1992) explains that children who have learning difficulties are those whose educational needs have not been met in the general education environment. Inclusion in the mainstream for these children seems like exclusion from remedial help to him.

Lieberman (1988) in discussing the issue of inclusion recognizes that there are children who may need a special education program that is completely outside the purview of the regular classroom. His reasons are that:

1. Some disabled children need highly specialized skills taught by specially trained teachers.

2. Some disabled children might never respond to the demands of an academic curriculum and will require alternatives.

3. Some disabled children could participate in an academic curriculum but would require an inordinate amount of time and attention from a regular class teacher, such that it would be inequitable for the other children in the class.

4. Some disabled children need the support of a peer group that is more like they are, rather than being thrust into the "mainstream" and left to fend for themselves.

5. Some disabled children might experience school failure without a special education curriculum tailored to their needs.

6. Some disabled children need a pipeline of services that begins with special education and proceeds through all manner of social agency and support that may extend throughout life.

7. Some disabled children have greater opportunity to succeed in special education because there is greater emphasis on parental partnerships, parental cooperation and active parental participation in the education of the child.

8. Some disabled children need special education because without the quasi-legal support of Individualized Educational Program's (IEP), regular class teachers will not allow for different ways of responding to the dictates of a standardized curriculum (Lieberman, 1988, pp. 115-116).

There is concern about the feasibility of educating students with mild handicaps entirely within the classroom setting. Bryan, Bay and Donahue (1988)

argue that a good deal of data gathered suggests that many students with disabilities do differ from their normally achieving peers in the way they process information. They go on to suggest that regardless of teacher skill, classroom modifications alone are not adequate enough to meet the needs of this group.

Kauffman (1988) questions regular classroom teachers' willingness to welcome more difficult-to-teach students in their classrooms. He points out that data reflecting attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward proposed changes in special and regular education is conspicuously absent from the literature.

Byrnes (1990) asks regular classroom educators to consider the message inclusion suggests to special educators. Are inclusion proponents saying that the work of the special educators during the past two decades was simply wrong? Were their successes not real? Can the proponents of inclusion guarantee more student growth? In addition, Davis (1991) notes that on a daily basis teachers have witnessed and experienced the multiple and complex problems that already confront much of the regular education system. Given the special attention and unique needs of students with disabilities, he questions how it can be expected that these students will receive an "appropriate education" under the unitary system being proposed.

<center>Statement of the Problem</center>

There is growing support for the placement of students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms (Giangreco & Putnam, 1991; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1991; Thousand & Villa, 1990; Williams, Fox, Thousand & Fox, 1990; York & Vandercook, 1990). At the same time, the national

debate regarding the appropriateness of extending the general class placement option to students with disabilities is being questioned by some (Jenkins, Pious, & Jewell, 1990; Lieberman, 1988; Vergason & Anderegg, 1989). And this national debate regarding the appropriateness of general class placement for all students has remained theoretical and speculative (Giangreco, Dennis, Cloninger, Edelman, & Schattman, 1993).

Policy changes to extend the general class placement option to students with disabilities has potentially far-reaching effects for both regular and special education service providers and their students. Kauffman, et. al. (1988) specifically expressed concern for the lack of input from regular teachers. They state:

> strangely absent from the models of teaching that are implicitly assumed. . . is a realistic model of the cognitive operations of persons who actually teach. Our concern therefore is that enough respect be shown for regular classroom teachers, to ask them what they perceive, based on teaching practice, is feasible, desirable, and in the best interest of students (p. 9).

Semmel, Abernathy, Butera and Lesar (1991) recognize that the "street level bureaucrats," the school-based service deliverers, will ultimately determine the success or failure of educational policy changes. Therefore, it is imperative that their views be considered and respected.

Davis (1991) speaks for the special educators' confusion and frustration with respect to issues and concerns about changing the way service is delivered to special education students. Davis suggests that special educators have not been included in the discourse calling for a merger of regular and special education.

In an attempt to answer some of the questions raised in the literature on inclusion, a survey was developed to explore regular and special education teachers attitudes about full inclusion of handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education or maintaining current structures in special education. In addition, teachers were asked about their willingness to redefine their current job description to accommodate inclusionary practices. Also questioned, was teacher willingness to include a broad spectrum of children with handicapping conditions ranging from mild to severe and profound disabilities. Questions were asked about teaching and curriculum models and assessment procedures.

Questions to be Answered

Specific questions addressed in this research were as follows:

1. Is there a difference between regular and special educators' attitude regarding inclusion?

2. Are educators' willing to redefine their job description to accommodate inclusionary practices?

3. Is there a difference between regular and special educators in the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented?

4. How do educators' feel about cooperative learning, mastery learning and adaptive learning curriculum models?

5. How do educators' feel about co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance team teaching models?

6. Are current assessment procedures adequate to meet the needs of handicapped students in an inclusive model?

7. Is there a difference in teacher willingness to include students with certain handicapping conditions over students with other handicapping conditions?

Pilot Study

A pilot study of the survey was conducted at one kindergarten through fifth grade school in a midwest public school district with a heterogeneous population adjacent to Chicago, Illinois. The pilot study was implemented with permission from the district superintendent and school principal. Analysis of the data contained in the pilot survey was done using a personal computer based statistical package (SPSS-PC). Reliability of the instrument was addressed through the use of the Cronbach's Alpha statistical procedure. Standardized reliability scores ranged from 0.1406 to 0.9264 (see Table 1). A copy of the pilot instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1.--Pilot Study Alpha Reliability Scores

Scales	Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha
Attitude Toward Inclusion	.9241	.9264
Ways to Implement Inclusion	.4352	.4422
Redefine Job Description	.8762	.8978
Adequacy of Current Assessment Procedures	.7214	.7310
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	.7052	.6821
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	.7052	.6821
Funding	.1801	.1406

Procedure of the Study

After analyzing the pilot data, a revised survey was developed and administered to all educators in the remaining (kindergarten through grade eight) schools of the same midwest public school district with the superintendent's permission. This included nine kindergarten through fifth grade schools, three middle (grade six through grade eight) grade schools, one kindergarten through eighth grade school and one separate special education facility servicing children from age three through age twenty one. Of the 500 surveys distributed, 160 were returned (32 percent).

The final format of the survey consisted of nine sections, one consisting of demographic information. Six of the sections asked respondents to rate each statement on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Two sections asked respondents to answer questions about three curriculum models and three staff teaching models. One open ended question was included at the end of the survey to allow respondents to add additional comments. A copy of the survey distributed is found in Appendix B.

Assumptions and Limitations

The assumptions and limitations of research design affecting internal and external validity also affect the credibility of the researcher's findings. The basic assumptions that underlie the study were: that the conceptual framework was sound, that the scales used were accurate measures of teacher belief about inclusionary practices and the current structures of special education service, that the criteria for

subject selection aided in increasing the homogeneity of the sample, and that the types of teachers; regular education, special education and support staff including fine arts and physical education were different enough to establish categories for comparison.

Findings of this research are limited to the teachers participating in this study. Lack of a random sample and use of volunteers was expected to affect the external validity, and thus the generalizability of the study.

Statistics

The following quantitative tests and statistics were used:

1. Cronbach's Alpha to test the instrument's reliability

2. Frequency distributions and associated univariate statistics

3. Cross-tabulations and associated Chi-square statistics

4. Multivariate analysis of variance

5. Analysis of variance

6. Multiple regression

7. Discriminant analysis.

The SPSS statistical package and the IBM mainframe computer of Loyola University Chicago were used to determine the survey instrument's reliability and to answer question one through seven. It was determined that the statistical method of Cronbach's Alpha would be the appropriate statistical tool to determine reliability of the survey. The number of cases was 160, and the number of items analyzed, including the descriptive information was 133. It was felt that knowledge of certain factors relative to respondent's job description, years taught, level of education and

whether or not the respondents had experience with inclusion would provide valuable information in better understanding the seven research questions. Therefore the various statistical procedures were performed on these groups to look for similarities and differences and determine significance. A 0.05 or smaller level of significance was used for interpreting the various statistical analyses.

Importance of the Study

An increasing number of parents and educators are proposing that all students be integrated into the mainstream of regular education, including those who have traditionally been labeled severely and profoundly handicapped (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Ruttinman & Forest, 1986; Stainback & Stainback, 1987). This movement has gained momentum. The proposed policy changes required to change the education system have potentially significant effects for the regular and special service providers and their students. Stainback and Stainback (1992) suggest that research has indicated that the majority of general educators are willing to join special educators in making general education classes more flexible and conducive to the needs of students with disabilities if they are involved in the planning process and have choices about the design and types of support and assistance they will receive. They go on to say that classroom teachers overwhelming reject accepting students with disabilities into their classes when they are not involved in the planning process or have few choices. In contrast, Coates (1989) surveyed regular classroom teacher perceptions about including handicapped students and this survey suggested the teachers surveyed were

not supportive of inclusionary practices and were satisfied with current special services programs.

The school district surveyed has been considering implementing inclusionary practices. This research provides general as well as district specific information regarding the attitudes of staff regarding implementation of inclusionary practices and maintaining current structures in special education.

<div align="center">Definition of Terms</div>

Many different terms have been used to describe inclusion of handicapped children in the regular education environment. The following definitions are provided for the more significant terms used in this study.

<u>Mainstreaming</u>

Mainstreaming has been used to describe the process of placing a student with mild to moderate disabilities into one or more regular education classes. Mainstreamed students are usually expected to meet the same standards as non-identified students with minor modifications in curriculum or methodology. Prerequisite skills are generally felt to be necessary since the same standards for success are being applied to all students and mainstreaming has typically been practiced with children identified as having mild or moderate disabilities (Freagon, et. al., 1993).

<u>Least Restrictive Environment</u>

Least restrictive environment, applies to the placement of eligible special education students in the educational environment that least restricts their interactions

with students not identified as eligible. For most students this would be an age appropriate classroom in the school he or she would attend if not identified as eligible for special education. Before a child moves to a more restrictive placement, there is documentation that the student's needs cannot be met in the regular classroom with necessary aids and supports (Freagon, et. al., 1993)

Regular Education Initiative

The Regular Education Initiative (REI) was first referenced by Madeline Will, former U. S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) Director when President Reagan was in office. Often called REI, this term refers to the unification of regular and special education that are seen as existing as two separate systems. REI efforts generally take two forms. First, pre-referral intervention strategies are used for students not yet identified as eligible for special education in the regular classroom, to avoid a referral to special education. Second services are delivered in a less restrictive way for students already identified as eligible, utilizing such methods as collaboration, consultation and service in general education classrooms with aids and supports (Freagon, et. al., 1993).

Integration

Integration involves placement out of a special education environment for part of the school day. Traditionally in special education, this meant including children with moderate and severe disabilities in general education non-academic classes such as lunch, homeroom, art, recess or physical education for social purposes. The student must meet certain academic prerequisites before he or she is felt to be

appropriate for integration. This practice has not typically been associated with students who are identified as having mild disabilities (Freagon, et. al., 1993)

Inclusion

An inclusive school or classroom educates all students in the mainstream. Integrated general education classes include students with learning and physical disabilities, at-risk, homeless and gifted. All students are provided appropriate educational experiences that are challenging yet geared to their needs and all students are provided any support and assistance they or their teachers require. These provisions are delivered within the mainstream of regular education. The common characteristics of inclusive schools are as follows:

1. Handicapped students attend the school they would attend if they did not have a disability, thus allowing for a natural or normal proportion of students with disabilities.

2. A school philosophy or mission statement that all children can learn and belong in the mainstream of school life is employed.

3. A curriculum accommodating for individualized participation and learning based on viewing students as individuals rather than members of categorical groups. Curriculum is adapted when necessary, to meet the needs of any students for whom the standard curriculum is inappropriate.

4. Specialized services and supports are provided in general education settings to anyone who requires them.

5. Cooperation and collaboration among students and among staff members is
   valued.

6. Special educators generally integrate themselves into general education
   classrooms.

Inclusion involves placement in the home school and in the general education environment with appropriate support, aides, and curricular adaptations designed individually for each student eligible for special education services (Freagon, et. al., 1993).

Co-Teaching

Co-teaching or team teaching is a concept where a regular education teacher and a special education teacher are assigned to a class of children with and without disabilities for all or part of the day. Both teachers share responsibilities equally (Falvey, Coots, Biship, & Grenot-Scheyer, 1989).

Consultation

Consultation is a model where a special education teacher communicates with a regular education teacher to assist in modifying curriculum for students with disabilities. The regular education teacher directly does the teaching (Falvey, Coots, Biship, & Grenot-Scheyer, 1989).

Teacher and Student Assistance Teams

Teacher and student assistance teams involve a group of people coming together to problem solve and assist a teacher and/or a student requiring help. The

team might include two or more people consisting of students, administrators, parents, classroom teachers and special services personnel (Stainback & Stainback, 1989).

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a model where students work together in small heterogeneous teams. The team members are interdependent. They must work together in order to accomplish individual group goals.

Mastery Learning

Mastery learning is a combination of small group and individualized instruction. Each student has individual objectives that are taught and tested through criterion referenced tests. If the objective is not met, additional teaching occurs and retests are administered (Stainback, Stainback, & Slavin, 1989).

An Adaptive Learning Environment Model

An adaptive learning environment model involves a variety of instructional methods and learning experiences that are matched to the learner's characteristics and needs. The curriculum combines teacher directed and informal teaching. (Wang, 1988.)

PL 94-142 Education for All Handicapped Children Act

This law legislates that all handicapped children shall receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. The initiative calls for non-discriminatory evaluation and assessment, an annual review of a required Individualized Educational Plan, and the involvement of parents. It requires

cooperation of state, local and private agencies, and requires the states and agencies to apply for funds (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989).

Individual Education Plan (IEP)

An IEP is a written statement for an exceptional child that provides at least a statement of: the child's present levels of educational performance, annual goals and short-term instructional objectives; specific education and related services; the extent of participation in the regular education program; the projected dates for initiation of services; anticipated duration of services; appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures; and a schedule for annual determination of short-term objectives (From 122-Illinois Revised Statues 34-1.02.)

Special Education

Special education refers to instruction that is specifically designed to meet the individual needs of the handicapped student. The types of labels of students who are usually though of as handicapped include mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, behavior disordered, blind, partially sighted, deaf, hard of hearing, speech impaired, gifted and physically or other health impaired. Special education is also possible for a student to have a combination of these handicapping condition (Taylor & Sternberg, 1989).

Dual System

A dual system refers to the two separate educational systems. The first system is special education for children identified with handicapping conditions and the second system is regular education.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I included an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the procedure of the study, a description of the importance of the study and definitions of terms that were integral to the understanding of this research. Chapter II provides an overview of the literature, a discussion of special education, the school reform movement leading to the inclusion movement and the role of the teacher in terms of inclusion. In Chapter III, a detailed description of the procedures used to conduct this study is presented. Chapters IV and V presented results, discussion, conclusions and recommendation for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

The methods utilized in the literature search for this dissertation were implemented as a means to guarantee an exhaustive and comprehensive presentation of related literature. Materials referred to within the contents of this presentation were secured through a number of computer searches and manual methods. The results of this search produced studies, books, and articles related to the topic of inclusion. Information directly relevant to the perceptions of teaching staff regarding implementation of inclusionary practices was limited to a few studies that will be discussed.

A review of the literature on inclusion revealed differences in perspectives and in beliefs that has placed some regular and special educators in adversarial positions. Many recognize that special education must redefine its relationship with regular education (Lieberman, 1985; Kauffman, 1988; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). There is general agreement regarding the need for educational reform based on effective schools data gathered on all school children. The heightened demands of preparation for the new world of the twenty-first century makes the need to reconceptualize the construct of schooling more compelling (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989). Tracing the history of special education and of school reform is useful in understanding the

19

evolution of the inclusion movement. In order to facilitate this writing, the literature presented is divided into the following basic areas: An Overview of the History of Special Education, The History of School Reform, Regular Education Initiative, The Evolution of the Dual System, The Categorical System, The Individual with Disabilities in Education Act, Inclusion and, The Role of the Teacher.

The History of Special Education

There have been historical attempts to include all students in the mainstream of education. For most students considered poor, minority, and/or disabled in North America, they first needed to receive an education. Although his plan was rejected, Thomas Jefferson, as early as 1779, proposed a plan to educate the poor of Virginia (Sigmond, 1983). A century later Horace Mann persuaded the affluent that the education of the "lower" classes was in their best interest and publicly supported education was adopted (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989).

When blacks and native Americans were educated, they were educated in a separate system of education. Students identified as disabled were, for the most part, also excluded from the public schools. Tracking by academic ability became popular in schools and disadvantaged and poor children were routinely placed in lower, non-academic tracks (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989).

Benjamin Rush, an American physician, was one of the first North Americans to introduce the concept of educating the disabled, but it was not until 1817 that the first such educational program was established by Thomas Gallaudet, in Connecticut at the American Asylum for the Education and Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb.

Samuel Howe advocated for the education of all children in the mid-1800's but this idea did not reach fruition until over a century later in the United States with the passage of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989).

Even with the passage of compulsory attendance laws in the early 1900's, many children with disabilities continued to be excluded from the public schools ". . . almost all children who were wheelchair-bound, not toilet trained, or considered ineducable were excluded because of the problems that schooling them would entail" (Sigmond, 1983, p. 3). For those allowed to attend public schools, a movement began with the goal of establishing special classes to meet their needs.

Not until the 1950's and 1960's special classes in public schools become the preferred educational delivery system for most students with disabilities. Special schools and residential institutions still remained the norm for educating blind, deaf and physically handicapped students (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989). Although the situation was improving for some disabled students, those considered severely or profoundly developmentally handicapped were often still denied educational services of any type.

The 1950's and 1960's was also a time of increased recognition and respect for the human dignity of all citizens regardless of their individual differences. There was a powerful movement away from segregated options for educating minority students (e.g., Brown v. Board of Education decision). Breaking down the exclusionary policies toward ethnic and racial minorities also led the way toward

increased study of exclusionary policies for students with disabilities (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989). During these decades parents of students with disabilities organized (e.g., National Association for Retarded Citizens) and initiated advocacy activities for educating their children. The federal government funded legislation supporting increased education for students considered disadvantaged, low income, and/or handicapped.

Public Law 89-750, enacted in 1966, and Public Law 91-230 in 1970 were attempts "to encourage the states to develop special education resources" (Turnbull, 1990). When progress was slow in coming, Congress increased federal aid for special education and applied more stringent controls on the use of federal funds. Later legislation such as PL 93-380, enacted in 1974, required the states to adopt a goal of providing complete educational opportunities to all handicapped children (Vergason & Anderegg, 1992).

In 1973, the Rehabilitation Act, Section 504, and later amendments guaranteed the rights of the handicapped in employment and in educational institutions that used federal money. Subsequently in 1975 PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was passed (and enacted in 1978). This law states that no child, regardless of disability, can be denied an appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. By 1976, all states had passed laws subsidizing public school programs for students with disabilities.

During the 1970's, public pressure for the integration of children with severe and profound disabilities increased. The Commission on Emotional and Learning

Disorders in Children suggested that educational facilities minimize the isolation of children with emotional and learning disorders and plan programs for these children within the regular education curriculum (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989).

By the late 1970's and early 1980's, mildly and moderately handicapped students began to be integrated into regular class placements on at least a part time basis (Biklen, 1985). Many severely and profoundly handicapped students began to receive educational service in regular neighborhood schools with involvement in regular school environments like the school lunch room, playground, library, and rest rooms (Stainback & Stainback, 1985).

Despite this trend toward including all students into the mainstream of regular education, there have also been attempts to slow, stop and even reverse this trend (Brooten, Kauffman, Brooten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988). Opponents feel that attempts toward increased mainstreaming reflect a misinterpretation of the least restrictive environment. In their view, the original focus of PL 94-142 was never to place more children in mainstream classes but to protect a continuum of service options and to provide and advocate for instruction to handicapped children provided in the environment that least restricts the child's potential for benefiting from instruction (Vergason & Anderegg, 1992).

Byrnes (1990) recognizes that students span a wide range of abilities and skill levels. She feels it is our responsibility to identify children with significant learning problems and provide the maximum amount of help to those students. And, there are times when segregation in her view might be the best educational plan for a child.

Hegarty (1981) cautions that integration of handicapped students in the mainstream cannot become a dumping ground for children. He states:

> Integration is not a self-evident goal and must be justified in a rational way. . .. The essential criterion must be the development and well being of the pupil (p. 14).

The current inclusion debate centers around whether children with mental, physical, emotional and learning disabilities are educated traditionally in special education facilities with trained special education teachers, or included into regular education settings.

History of School Reform

Increasingly, concern has been expressed about the quality of our educational system and researchers have suggested ways to reform or improve it. The 1980's were considered by Lipsky and Gartner, et. al. (1991) to be the first wave of school reform and it focused on external factors. There was concern for establishing higher standards of education such as strengthened graduation requirements, competency statements and attendance rules. New and often mandated curricula was established, teacher certification requirements were strengthened and per pupil expenditures increased.

In 1986, the United States Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the U.S. Department of Education, called for reform of special education service delivery through the Regular Education Initiative (Will, 1986). The purpose of this initiative was to find ways to serve students classified as having mild and moderate disabilities in regular education classrooms by encouraging special education

to form a partnership with regular education (Reynolds & Birch, 1988; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1987).

The 1990's wave of reform centers on adult roles. The focus of attention has shifted from state capitals to districts and individual schools and from mandated activities to collaborative, cooperative efforts such as teacher empowerment, school-based management and parental choice (Lipsky & Gartner, 1991).

The waves of reform according to many have produced limited improvement in student performance. "A Nation at Risk" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), <u>Horace's Compromise</u> (Sizer, 1984), <u>A Place Called School</u> (Goodlad, 1984), and <u>High School</u> (Boyer, 1983) all emphasize the need for excellence in schools. All conclude that the schools are not functioning well and that there are serious and pervasive problems in the nature and quality of educational services (Keogh, 1988). The authors of these analyses were concerned with the functioning of all students and not with the particular issues of special education.

Neither the changes of the first or second wave of reform gave particular attention to handicapped students (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989). There are a number of reports indicating the educational outcomes for such students are poor (see Table 9 of Wagner & Shaver, 1989; see Table 18 of Tenth Annual Report, 1988; Wagner, 1989). Many suggest reform include making fundamental changes in the way that students with mild to moderate handicaps, as well as students with other special needs, are educated. These changes include educating handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education.

P. L. 94-142 legislates that all exceptional children shall receive an appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. Some believe that the intent of the law is not being realized in the case of significant numbers of learning disabled, emotionally disturbed and educably mentally retarded students (Hallahan, Kauffman, Lloyd, & McKinney, 1988). These professionals are of the opinion that many more handicapped children can receive all their education in general education settings than is currently the case. Some believe that pullout programs for mildly handicapped students are not necessary (Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Thousand & Villa, 1989). Barbara Keogh (1988) raises some interesting questions when she discusses this issue. She states:

> It is disturbing that the national reports are unanimous in their conclusion that the present system does not provide quality education to regular students. Can we assume that in its present form it will be adequate to incorporate the educational needs of pupils with learning and achievement problems? This is a particularly compelling question in that pupils now served in special programs for mild handicaps are those who have not been successful in regular programs. Indeed they have been referred out of the regular system. It is rather strange logic that calls for the regular system to take over the educational responsibility for pupils it has already demonstrated it has failed (p. 20).

Regular Education Initiative

The movement to limit the use of special placements has received most of its impetus from the Regular Education Initiative. Although it probably has roots in earlier anti-labeling and deinstitutionaliztion movements, the REI can be traced at least as far back as 1981 to a position paper discussing restructuring special school programs given by Maynard Reynolds and Margaret Wang (Reynolds & Wang, 1981). It is important to note that REI is a concept and not a legal term such as

LRE. The concept received more formal recognition in 1985 at a conference when

the Assistant Secretary for the United States Office of Special Education and

Rehabilitative Services, Madeline C. Will, stated that:

> so-called 'pullout' 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 called for a partnership between special education and general education

challenging a number of existing practices and noting that general and special

education had evolved into separate education systems.

In 1986, the Carnegie Forum Report made clear the idea that public policy that

supports tracking, labeling and sorting of students will lead to a two class society and

a permanent underclass (Lilly, 1986). Opponents feel that the regular education

classroom is not always the appropriate placement for a student. Some students may

need alternative instructional environments, teaching strategies and/or materials that

can not or will not be provided within the context of a regular classroom placement

(LDA News Brief, 1993). In their view decisions regarding educational placement of

students with disabilities must be based on the needs of each individual student.

Although, at its onset, REI advocated for mild and moderately handicapped

students to be included in the mainstream, some educators now advocate that all

students be integrated into the mainstream of regular education, including those who

have been labeled severely and profoundly handicapped (Stainback, Stainback, &

Bunch, 1989). They argue that the instructional needs of students do not warrant the

operation of a dual system of regular and special education, that maintaining a dual

system is inefficient and that the dual system fosters an inappropriate and unfair

attitude about the education of students classified as disabled.

Dual System

Lipsky and Gartner (1989) in summarizing Will's report noted that, there

seems to be two kinds of students, normal and abnormal and we have created a dual

system each with its own pupils, teachers, supervisory staff and funding system. In

discussing the dual system and the potential merger to a unified, integrated system,

Stainback and Stainback (1984) stated:

> Dichotomizing students into two basic types (special and regular),
> maintaining a dual system of education, separate professional
> organizations, separate personnel preparation programs, and separate
> funding patterns does little to foster the values inherent in the
> mainstreaming and integration movement of the past decade (p. 10).

They go on to reason that we have been attempting to integrate students while

separating them into two kinds of learners and without integrating programs,

personnel and resources. The issue for them is not whether there are differences

among students. There obviously are differences, even extreme differences. The

differences, however, should not be used as a justification to label, segregate, or

maintain a dual system of education in their view.

Gilhoal (1976) alluded to the possibility of a merger of regular and special

education when he said:

> We are approaching the day when, for each child, the law will require that the
> schooling fit the child, his needs, his capacities, and his wishes; not the child
> fit the school. Thus, special education may become general and general
> education, special (p. 13).

Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg (1986) in discussing the Regular Education

Initiative feel that the present (dual) system consists of:

1. flawed classification and placement

2. disincentives for program improvement

3. excessive regulatory requirements

4. fragmentation and lack of coordination of programs

5. loss of program control by school administration (p. 248).

Kauffman, Gerber and Semmel (1988) note that two assumptions underlying

the articles supporting the REI and dismantling the dual system are that most of the

students now served by special education are not appropriately considered

handicapped and that there is a "schism" between regular and special education that is

widening. Shepard (1987) notes that 90 percent of the children served by special

education are mildly handicapped and at least half of the learning disabled population

have difficulties that are not appropriately considered handicaps at all. Kauffman,

Gerber and Semmel (1988) refer to "never-ending referrals to special education" and

suggested that "caps on the percentage of mild handicaps would stop runaway over

identification" (p. 328). Lilly (1986) supports this view and suggests that students

who have difficulty learning and behaving in school need special support services, but

says that "for virtually all such students, we need not and should not offer these

services through special education" (p. 10).

Kauffman, Gerber and Semmel (1988) reason that the schism between regular

and special education may be based on the philosophical position one holds and the

data that one chooses to attend. They support this position by observing not only a leveling off in national numbers of students identified as handicapped, but a decline in the percentage of children receiving service that challenges the concern about escalating referral and identification rates Sheppard raises. Also noted from the federal data (U.S. Department of Education Ninth Annual Report) was that the majority of students identified as mildly handicapped were receiving most of their education in general education settings (Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988, p. 7).

It is important to remember that PL 94-142 guarantees an appropriate education and does not require that all pupils to be educated in ordinary schools. While education is expected to be nonrestrictive, it must also be appropriate. Lieberman (1991) defends the dual system and urges preserving the continuum of service options for identified children because he feels there is a range of disabled people with a range of needs, many that cannot possibly be met in the regular classroom. Destroying this range, in his view, is a fundamental denial of reality "that plays well with some budget-cutting bureaucrats and some fanatical parents" (p. 22).

Lipsky and Gartner (1991) state that separate regular and special education systems have created stigmatization of students who then have low expectations of success, fail to complete tasks. They feel students believe that failures are caused by their personal inadequacies that sustain a negative learning cycle. Others would argue the opposite, that placement in regular education for some would create stigmatization and these students would suffer more.

Placement decisions in determining appropriate services for students in Lipsky and Gartner's view lead to battles between parents and schools. In light of such practices, these reformers call for experimental programs for students with learning problems, programs that incorporate increased instructional time, support systems for teachers, empowerment of principals to control all programs and resources at the building level, and new instructional approaches that involve shared responsibility between general and special education (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1987).

The Categorical System

The dual educational service delivery system, in the view of opponents, is based on a categorical system for classifying and providing service to handicapped students. Opponents see this system as dysfunctional, ineffective and excessively costly (Lilly, 1986; Reynolds & Wang, 1983; Stainback & Stainback, 1984). They have stated that our current service delivery system has been fragmented by the proliferation of separate programs for students with "special needs," a phenomenon Reynolds and Wang (1983) refer to as "disjointed incrementalism" (p. 191). They argue that this disjointedness produces excessive "proceduralism" (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987, p. 392) that burdens the schools with costly, unnecessary and scientifically questionable classification and placement procedures when effective mainstream options are available (McKinney & Hocutt, 1988, p. 12).

Deno (1978) states, that categorization is:

> . . .deeply entrenched in the social commitments of categorically defined special-interest advocacy groups; in the structure of health, education and welfare at direct service levels; in the staffing of teacher training programs; and in general public thinking (p. 39).

Bilkin and Zollers (1986), Reynolds, et. al. (1987), and Stainback and Stainback (1984) argue that the problems of classification, over identification and poor student outcomes can be attributed to the categorical system of special education. The obvious solution for these theorists then becomes elimination of the present categorical system.

Stainback, Stainback and Bunch (1989), acknowledge the inefficiency and expense of the dual categorical system. They state:

> It becomes necessary with a dual system to determine who belongs in which system. Considerable time, money, and effort are currently expended to determine who is "regular" and who is "special" and into what "type" or category of exceptionality each "special" student fits (p. 18).

Lieberman (1991) reasons that categorizations that lead to the current pullout models of providing special services to identified students does not necessarily work to their benefit. He reasons that this is not because the continuum of services is conceptually faulty nor is it a commentary on pullout models. The pullout system is not working in his view, because the interface segment of the continuum has never been adequately defined. Therefore special education resource classrooms need to work more closely with their regular education counterparts in terms of curriculum.

Vergason and Anderegg (1989) recognize that there are flaws in the assessment and determination of eligibility of students for special education services but this in their view, does not constitute a valid argument for dismantling the special education system and integrating all handicapped children into regular education full time.

Non-categorical models of service to special education students is problematic to some parents and educators. Some want assurance that children identified with handicapping conditions are served by specialists (LDA Scope, 1993-4). They also oppose any consideration of the removal of the term "continuum " and believe that all language regarding the least restrictive environment be in concert with the Federal Regulations.

Education for All Handicapped Children's Act

Public Law 94-142 guarantees an appropriate public education to all children. Two provisions were included in P L 94-142 supporting the intent of the framers of this document to provide for the protection of the civil rights of handicapped children. The first provision (Federal Regulations, Sections 300.500-300.556) Least Restrictive Environment, refers to educational instruction that provides a reasonable expectation of benefit from instruction and that is based on the child's individual needs. Each state is required to establish procedures assuring that:

> . . .special classes, separate schools, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (PL 94-142, Section 1412 (5b), p. 169).

Congress recognized that there would be children whose handicaps would preclude a regular education placement. That recognition, note Vergason and Andregg (1992), is further underscored by the section of the Federal regulations, entitled "Continuum of Alternative Placements." These regulation provide the means for reaching the goals of LRE.

The second provision includes protection of the civil rights of handicapped children through requirements that each child be provided a free appropriate public education. It reads:

> The term "free appropriate public education means special education and related services which (a) have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge (b) meet the standards of the state educational agency (c) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the state involved, and (d) are provided in conformity with the Individualized Education Program required under section 1414(d)(a)(p. 5).

Thus special education and related services are to conform to the boundaries of the Individualized Education Program developed specifically to meet each learner's needs and not to conform to setting boundaries (Vergason & Andregg, 1992). These authors note that grouping learners with similar individual needs is an administrative decision made to maximize the use of available resources, not an instructional decision made to meet the specific child's needs.

At the same time, it is important to remember that PL 94-142 is a product of the time that it was written. At that time, court cases were being resolved dealing with exclusion from education based on a disability (e.g., Mills case). The law passed when the rights of a disabled person to participate in the community were beginning to be voiced (Walker, 1987). At the time, institutionalization was being questioned but public policy of the history of services and the knowledge of disability were limited. Disabled citizens and a new generation of parents with disabled children, energized by the civil rights movement, began to fight for what they felt were their rights (Mills v. DC Board of Education 348 F. Supp. 866, 1972).

The intent of PL 94-142 was to establish public policy to protect disabled children from exclusion and discrimination in the public school setting. Disabled students were to be dealt with as individuals assessing their needs individually. At the same time, these students were seen as a group presumed to need special and individualized services that were different from the kinds of services non-disabled students require.

PL 94-142 established the right of students with handicapping conditions to be treated equally and on an individual basis in determining their school needs. Walker (1987) suggests that PL 94-142 served to reinforce the dual system because it did not adjust the organization of services within school or change attitudes about disability. He goes on to infer that what is needed is a way to alter the state and local funding. Walker feels this would allow educators to more easily view disabled students as part of the mainstream. In addition, he suggests collapsing the categorical definitions that define handicapping conditions.

The Learning Disabilities Association believes consideration of placement of all children with disabilities in the regular classroom is as great a violation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as is the placement of all children in separate classrooms on the basis of their type of disability. This organization urges moving deliberately and reflectively in school restructuring, using IDEA as a foundation, being mindful of the best interests of all children with disabilities (LDA 1993).

Two federal laws deal with special education (but do not specifically address inclusion). These are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. These two laws only mandate that students receive a free and appropriate education in "the least restrictive environment."

Like the IDEA, Illinois law also requires that all children should be educated in the "least restrictive environment." LRE means that to the maximum extent appropriate, children and youth with disabilities are to be educated with non-disabled children.

Inclusion

Many feel that separateness in education is unequal (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Flynn, Kowalczyk, & McPhee, 1989). Authors like Stainback and Stainback suggest that one way to solve the problems created by maintaining two education systems is to merge special and regular education into one unified system of regular education structured to meet the unique needs of all students. The movement toward merging the two systems into a unified system has been termed inclusion. Reynolds and Birch (1982) have pointed out that "the whole history of education for exceptional students can be told in terms of one steady trend that can be described as progressive inclusions" (p. 27).

There are many descriptions of inclusive education systems. The basic components of full inclusion include:

1. all students attending the school they would go to if they had no disability

2. there is a natural proportion of students with disabilities at any school site

3. there exists a zero-rejection philosophy meaning that typically no students would be excluded on the basis of type or extent of disability

4. there are age and grade appropriate school and general education placements, with no self-contained classes operating at the school site

5. special education supports are provided within the context of the general education class and in other integrated environments

6. strategies such as cooperative learning and peer instructional methods are used in general instructional practice at the school site (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990).

Halvorson and Sailor explain (1990) that inclusion is not:

1. dumping children with disabilities into regular classes without the support and services they need to be successful there

2. Trading off the quality of child's education for inclusion or the intensive support services the child may need

3. doing away with or cutting back on special services

4. ignoring each child's unique needs

5. all children having to learn the same thing, at the same time, in the same way

6. expecting regular education teachers to teach children who have disabilities without the support they need to teach children effectively

7. sacrificing the education of typical children so that children with disabilities can be included (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990).

For special education, an inclusive system is based on "including" students rather than "mainstreaming" them. Mainstreamed students pass in and out of general education classrooms throughout the day. Mainstreamed students are frequently assigned to the school that houses the district's program for their disability category, not necessarily their home school and they may be isolated from where their siblings and friends attend. For instance, a school district might designate one school to house the program for the "behavior disordered" and all children qualifying for that program are then bused to that school for instruction.

On the other hand, inclusion means that students attend their home school with their age and grade peers. It follows that the proportion of students labeled for special services is relatively uniform for all of the schools within a particular school district, and that this ratio reflects the proportion of people with disabilities in society at large (NASBE, 1992). As opposed to being more isolated in special classes or wings of a school, included students receive their in-school educational services in the general education classroom with appropriate in-class support.

Schools in an inclusive, restructured system look very different from typical schools that exist today. Students are grouped heterogeneously based on the lesson being taught. Not all students work on the same tasks at the same time, rather

curricular goals are achieved through a variety of methods. (Thousand & Villa, 1992).

The National Association of State Boards of Education (1992) recognize that the key to this type of schooling is that teachers, parents and other educators must shift their thinking about how they define instruction. Schooling becomes more student-centered as opposed to teacher centered. Student centered environments provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate a variety of developmental accomplishments beyond academic achievement. Students work side by side in a more fluid atmosphere allowing a variety of professionals to work with students. These professionals include the classroom teacher, special education teacher, and other support personnel, such as occupational therapists, physical therapists, speech therapists, etc.

Shifting from categorical educational programs (e.g., regular classroom, special classes pullout resource service) into a single unified system results in the redefinition of job functions (Thousand & Villa, 1990). Job titles and the formal or informal role definitions that accompany them determine, to a degree, the way a staff member behaves within a school. A resource teacher, for instance, by job title incorporates a set of expectations. This teacher likely has his or her own room where he or she works with only those students identified as eligible. This same resource teacher in an inclusive model becomes a "support person" who provides technical assistance to a number of educators in the school building through consultation, team teaching and collaboration. In theory, this change in job definition results in an

exchange of skills between professional educators and thus increases the number of students whose needs could be met in a heterogeneous classroom.

The curricular component is another piece of the organizational structure of the traditional American school that changes in an inclusive model. Proponents of inclusion (Thousand & Villa, 1990; NASBE, 1992; Stainback & Stainback, 1991) feel that curriculum that is bound to age-grade levels or "lock-step" curriculum creates arbitrary limits on student achievement. They reason that with such an approach, what students are taught is determined not by their assessed individual needs but by the grade level that they are assigned. Students are placed in a grade according to their age and are expected to master the predetermined curriculum by the end of the school year. If they fail, they are retained, referred for special education or compensatory education services and pulled out of the regular classroom for at least part of their day. In an inclusive school, "covering the curriculum" is not the primary goal. Fewer subjects are covered in greater detail to reach instructional objectives. Proponents reason that this encourages students to gain a deep understanding of the material as opposed to memorizing superficial facts for a test and forgetting the content soon after. This idea facilitates the inclusion of special education students because classroom material is presented in context and is closely linked to concepts that the students understand (NASBE, 1992).

Several different curriculum approaches have been tried in inclusive schools. Cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1981) is a model where students work together in small heterogenous, interdependent groups. Team members must work

together to accomplish individual and team goals. Mastery learning (Falvey, Goots, Bishop, & Gronot-Scheyer, 1989) is a combination of small group and individualized instruction. Each student has individual objectives that are taught and tested through criterion referenced tests. Additional instruction is provided for those who have not met the objective and retests are administered. An adaptive learning environment model (Wang, 1989) involves a variety of instructional methods and learning experiences that are matched to the learner's characteristics and needs. This curriculum combines teacher directed and informal teaching.

The Role of the Teacher

It is apparent that the proposed policy changes from providing special services in traditional ways to considering including handicapped students in general education classes have potentially broad effects for both regular and special education service providers, their students and families. Semmel, Abernathy Butera and Lesar (1991) note that "beyond the rhetoric of academicians, little empirically oriented attention has been focused on the views of these educators" (p. 10). Kauffman, Gerber, and Semmel (1988) comment that regular and special educators' attitudes toward proposed changes in the structure of general and special education are curiously absent from the literature. They recognize also that these experts' views must be considered when making decisions regarding teaching practice as well as what is in the best interest of students.

Impact on Special Education Teachers

The inclusion debate is recognized in both the professional literature and at professional conferences. William Davis (1991) in discussing the implication of the REI for special education teachers, noted:

> There remains limited discussion relative to the impact that this debate is having on special education teachers. Both proponents and opponents continue to present their views. However front line personnel, special education teachers, are rarely invited to join in this discourse. Nor is the impact which this debate is likely having upon them rarely discussed (p. 27).

Davis notes that many special education teachers are feeling frustrated about inclusion. They feel confused, angry, and essentially helpless with respect to the inclusion debate. Proponents of inclusion, many of whom are special educators themselves (and even former or present professors within their discipline), are asking special education teachers to alter some very basic philosophical and educational beliefs as well as practices. Veteran teachers may feel especially betrayed because what they had been taught to believe in and advocate for, a strong special education system, is necessary in order to serve students with disabilities. This position is now being criticized and characterized by some of these same individuals as inefficient, ineffective, and possibly even "dangerous" or "immoral" (p. 28).

Because of the criticisms currently being levied against the field of special education as part of the inclusion dialogue, many special education teachers understandably are interpreting this movement as casting a very negative light upon what they have been doing professionally, and what they truly believe in, some, for many years. The message they very well could be receiving is that what they have

been doing (special education practices) has not only been unnecessary or incorrect, but also, in fact, may have been very harmful to students (Davis, 1991). Davis suggests that it is likely that some special education teachers view inclusion "as little more than rhetoric or just the latest fad in the long line of bandwagon approaches which have been witnessed in the field of education during the past fifty years" (p. 28).

Davis goes on to reason that special educators, while not necessarily agreeing with all aspects of inclusion, seem to welcome the opportunity that inclusion discussions have provided, to stimulate their own professional thinking on issues and practices related to the field of special education (e.g., the potential, harmful consequences of extensive pullout programs for students, or the time and costs involved in student assessment).

Some special educators are understandably threatened by inclusion. Along with their professional identity being threatened so are their jobs. If regular education teachers assume responsibility for special education programs, there may no longer be a need for special education teachers.

Not all special educators are trained in or believe in the collaborative and/or the consultative model that is an important component for successful inclusion programs and even for many of them who do, there is uncertainty regarding job security within the current school setting (Davis, 1991). Therefore, especially during these economically difficult times, it is easy to appreciate why some special education teachers are experiencing feelings of uneasiness. This inclusion debate has aggravated

these feelings. The field of special education has become the recipient of attacks in recent years because it is seen as being costly to taxpayers (Zirkel, 1990).

It is possible that many special educators feel that the regular education system is not ready to meet the needs of many students with special instructional or behavioral needs (Davis, 1991). They feel this way based on their experience having viewed and experienced the complex problems confronting the regular education system.

In addition, Davis (1991) recognizes the advocacy role and responsibility special educators have always felt for handicapped students. He reasons that with all the paperwork and meetings required in their position, special educators feel they are fulfilling a necessary advocacy role for their students. When presented with the possibility that they no longer will be required, or expected, to function in the role of student advocate it is easy to see why many special educators are expressing suspicion about what inclusion might mean if it is fully operationalized.

Impact on Regular Educational Teachers

Regular educators, who constitute the largest single group to be affected by inclusion, have not had significant input according to McKinney and Hocutt (1989). Yet the successful implementation of inclusion is dependent upon the collaboration and support of regular educators. Based on this fact alone, McKinney and Hocett question the wisdom of implementing inclusion on the basis of anything except an experimental scale until we know the stance and support of our colleagues in regular education.

Semmel, Abernathy, Butera and Lesar (1991) surveyed 381 special and regular educators regarding their perceptions and opinions surrounding the Regular Education Initiative. Factors in this study describe issues related to preferred placement of students with mild disabilities, teachers' responsibility and ownership of special education students, teacher preparedness for meeting the needs of these students, achievement outcomes for all students and the changes that would result from adopting a consultant model of providing special education services within the regular classroom environment rather than a pullout program of service to special education students. Results favored current special education practices of pullout programs in elementary schools. The results of this survey supported the need for further systematic study of the status and needed modifications in the perceptions and skills of service providers before any substantial reform of current practices is mandated.

Leyser and Kapperman (1993) explored teacher attitudes regarding placement of students with disabilities in regular educational settings. They did a comparison of attitudes held by teachers between 1977 and 1988 when PL 94-142 was in its early stages of implementation and of teachers studied fifteen years later. They found that teacher views about including students with disabilities in regular education settings have become more favorable.

Coates (1989) asserts that changing current practices making classroom teachers responsible for educating handicapped students is premature. He anticipates widespread resistance from regular teachers and this would, in his view, doom any chance of successfully reintegrating large numbers of students with handicaps into

full-time regular education. Attempting to force these changes on teachers through legislation would not solve the problem, in his view, and, in fact, could be disastrous. Barbara Larrivee (1982) suggests that administrators tend to have positive attitudes toward integration but teachers have ambivalent feelings and negative attitudes. Studies attempting to relate teacher attitude toward the practice of mainstreaming have shown both positive (Harasymico & Horne, 1976; Higgs, 1975; Larrivee, 1981) and negative results (Bradfield, Brown, Kaplan, Rickeret, & Stannard, 1973; Shotel, Iano, & McGettingan, 1972).

Regular educators, notes Davis (1989), have had a limited role in the discussions about merging regular and special education. Lieberman (1985) criticized Stainback and Stainback's (1984) call for merging regular and special education by likening the merger to "a wedding in which we, as special educators, have forgotten to invite the bride (regular education)" (p. 513). Lieberman goes on to reason (1985):

> This proposed merger is a myth, unless regular educators. . . decide
> that such a merger is in their own best interest. . .. They will have to
> come to it in their own way, on their own terms, in their own time.
> How about a few millennia (p. 513)?

Conclusion

Based on this review of literature, this study was designed to address the questions raised regarding teacher perceptions about the issue of inclusion as well as teacher satisfaction with current special education structures as it pertains to the school district surveyed. In the next chapter, I explain the methods and procedures used in my attempts to address these issues.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methodology used to collect the data used in the study. The procedures used to analyze the data are also examined. The areas addressed in this chapter include:

1. the research questions

2. the research design

3. the research instrument

4. the pilot study

5. permission of the school system

6. the population of the study

7. data gathering procedures

8. statistical treatment of the data and

9. summary.

This study investigated teachers' attitude regarding various aspects of inclusion and attitude regarding current structures in special education. The survey instrument was designed to address teachers' attitude about: inclusionary practices, ways to implement inclusionary practices, willingness to modify job description, perceptions

about three staff teaching models, perceptions about three curriculum models, assessment procedures and handicapping conditions.

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1. Is there a difference between regular and special educators' attitude regarding inclusion?

2. Are educators' willing to redefine their job description to accommodate inclusionary practices?

3. Is there a difference between regular and special educators in the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented.

4. Is there a difference in teacher willingness to include students with certain handicapping conditions over students with other handicapping conditions?

5. How do educators' feel about cooperative learning, mastery learning and an adaptive learning curriculum models?

6. How do educators' feel about co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance team teaching models?

7. Are current assessment procedures adequate to meet the needs of handicapped students in an inclusive model?

Research Design

A descriptive research design was chosen for this study. Descriptive research is designed primarily to describe, rather than to explain a set of conditions, characteristics, or attributes of people in a population based on measurement of a sample (Alreck & Settle, 1985). A descriptive investigation permits exploration of

relationships without manipulation of variables. While this design has its limitations, it allows the researcher to collect a large amount of data relating to the research questions. It can also generate hypotheses for future experimental and quasi-experimental research. Normative measures, that is measures obtained with tests and scales, were used in this study.

The survey method of research was chosen as the type of descriptive research for this investigation. As this study's purpose was to gather and to examine perceptions, opinions, attitudes and beliefs surrounding the issue of inclusion of handicapped students in regular education environments or maintaining the current special education structures, the survey method was appropriate (Kerlinger, 1973).

The Research Instrument

A structured survey, used to obtain data, was developed by the researcher (See Appendix A). Recommendations were made by the researcher's committee members and the Director of Research of the school district surveyed. These recommendations were incorporated into the research instrument in a final revision following analysis of the pilot study.

The research instrument contained eight sections, six that used a Likert-type scale. Two sections had respondents choose between curriculum and staff teaching models. The survey was designed to obtain ordinal data. In addition, a page was designed and included to obtain demographic information on the respondents. Included on this page were questions that provided the researcher with the following information about each respondent: type of job in the school system, years of

teaching experience, level of education, gender, year of birth and various ways each respondent learned about the concept of inclusion. The last part of the survey allowed for optional open ended, additional personal thoughts about the issue of inclusion.

<div align="center">Pilot Study</div>

A pilot study was conducted prior to the distribution of the final survey instrument. A sample of one school, that was not included in the final survey group, was selected and used in the pilot study. A pilot survey (see Appendix A) was placed in the mailbox of each professional employee at this designated school. Two cover letters (included in Appendix A), one from the Director of Research of the school district surveyed and another by the researcher, were included with the survey. A total of 43 surveys were distributed in May, 1993. Respondents were given two weeks to return their completed instrument in individual return envelopes that were provided. A total of 27 surveys were returned (63 percent). The 27 pilot cases were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for a personal computer. The reliability of the pilot study instrument was determined through the use of Cronbach's Alpha (see Table 1).

The section on funding was eliminated from the final draft of the instrument based on its poor reliability in the pilot study. The section on ways to implement inclusion was kept in spite of the low alpha level, due to the small number of respondents in the pilot sample. Given a larger sample size, it was hoped that the reliability would improve. Since the reliability of the remaining sections was closer

to or greater than 0.70 they were considered adequate for this research. Respondents felt that the section on staff teaching models and curriculum models was visually overwhelming and confusing. These sections were redesigned. By translating into changes the information shared by respondents, the instrument was sharpened in terms of face validity (Kerlinger, 1973). The revised questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisted of eight sections totaling 86 closed-ended questions. In addition, seven questions were asked in order to obtain demographic information. A final page was included asking one open-ended question seeking general comments concerning the research topic.

Permission of the School System

Before the survey was undertaken, the researcher contacted the Director of Research of the school district surveyed to obtain permission to conduct a survey of employees in the school system. A meeting was set up between The Director of Research and the researcher to outline the nature and intent of the survey. The Director of Research agreed to write a cover letter to the school district staff encouraging their participation. The researcher also contacted the Director of Special Services of the school district and obtained his permission. It was agreed that the research findings would be shared with the school district surveyed and there was full cooperation on the part of the school district.

The Population of the Study

The target population included all professional employees of the school district surveyed. This includes ten kindergarten through grade five schools (although one

was not included as the population had been used for the pilot study), three middle schools serving grades six through eight, one kindergarten through eighth grade laboratory school and one separate special education facility serving students from preschool through age twenty-one.

Five hundred surveys were distributed. Included with each survey were two cover letters (included in Appendix B), one from the school district and one from the researcher, each explaining the survey and a return envelope. Participants were told their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain confidential.

Data Gathering Procedures

Prior to beginning data collection procedures, principals of each school were contacted by the Director of Research of the school district surveyed. The Director of Research informed each principal of the District's approval of the researcher's request to conduct this research project. They were informed of the nature of the study and each principal's support was elicited. Each principal was also told that the researcher would take responsibility for distribution and collection of all surveys. Following the Director of Research's initial contact, the researcher visited each school to distribute surveys. At each school, a survey along with a cover letter from the Director of Research, a cover letter from the researcher and a return envelope was placed in individual mailboxes of each professional employee. A collection box was left on the counter of each school office with directions to place completed surveys in the collection box. The researcher left donuts for staff alongside the collection box in each school as a gesture of gratitude for voluntary participation.

Principals were informed that the completed surveys would be picked up two weeks after distribution by the researcher and each principal was thanked by the researcher for his or her cooperation. A total of 500 surveys were distributed to the participating schools. Of the 500 distributed, 160 were returned. The overall return rate was 32 percent.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

Data analysis was done on both an IBM 3081K mainframe computer and a personal computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Release 4) was used to analyze the data on both platforms. The SPSS program is designed to provide a broad range of statistical procedures suitable for survey data interpretation.

Frequency distributions and univariate statistics were obtained for each variable in each section. This yielded a description of the respondents as a whole and of each subgroup. The researcher attempted to conceptualize the data by creating various groupings of respondents in order to answer the research questions. Respondents were divided into groups according to: job description, years of teaching experience, education level and grade taught based on information obtained from the frequency distributions. Schools were also grouped according to whether or not they had piloted a form of inclusion. These groupings became the independent variables used for further analysis.

A scale was created for each of the following survey sections: attitude, ways to implement inclusion, teachers' willingness to redefine their job description, adequacy of current assessment procedures, behavior disorder inclusion and inclusion

of children with various broad range handicapping conditions. To create each scale, individual responses to each question were totaled and divided by the number of questions in each section after variables with low reliability (based on Cronbach's Alpha) were removed.

Cross tabulation tables were obtained for each variable according to the groups created. This allowed for contingency tables to be created that list cell frequencies for data classified by at least two variables. Cross tabulation tables show a cell for every combination of categories of the two variables. The statistic to assess significance is the Chi-square value. The more the two variables are related to one another, the larger the Chi-square value will be.

To examine the research questions, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed. This provides the investigator with a technique for simultaneously testing whether the means of two or more population groups are significantly different. In addition, when appropriate, discriminant analyses were obtained for further analysis. The objective of a discriminant analysis is to measure the degree and direction of influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable, and to obtain an equation that would permit the researcher to predict the category of the dependent variable when it is not known based on the known value of the independent variable (Alreck & Settle, 1985). The technique of regression was also employed and it enabled the investigator to make predictions regarding a respondent's performance on one variable given that respondent's performance on another variable.

The first research question asks, "Is there a difference between regular and special educators' attitude regarding inclusion?" The first section of the survey titled *Attitude* containing eighteen questions was designed to gather information about various perceptions of special education, special education teacher training, needs of children with handicapping conditions and benefits of including handicapped students with their non-handicapped peers.

The second research question asks, "Are educators' willing to redefine their job description to accommodate inclusionary practices?" The section titled *Job Description* was designed to answer this question. Questions of willingness to collaborate, consult and co-teach were asked of respondents as well as questions of managing the additional work often associated with implementation of inclusionary practices.

The third research question asks, "Is there a difference between regular and special educators in the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented." Five questions were designed to answer this question. Each question posited a different model or way to implement inclusion.

The fourth research question asks, "How do educators' feel about cooperative learning, mastery learning and adaptive learning curriculum models?" Each model was briefly described. To answer this questions, eight questions were designed asking educators what model(s) require teacher training prior to implementation, result in added responsibility, require curriculum change, would meet curriculum goals, require added financial resources, result in lowering student achievement

expectations, would increase self esteem in a special needs child, and would require a change in assessment practices.

The fifth research question asks, "How do educators' feel about co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance team teaching models?" Each model was briefly described. To answer this question, eight questions were designed and respondents were asked what model(s) require the most training, the greatest time commitment, responsibility, and additional financial resources. They were also asked what model(s) would eliminate the need for ability grouping, would facilitate teacher communication, lower student expectation and reduce the stigma often associated with special needs children.

The sixth research question asks, "Are current assessment procedures adequate to meet the needs of handicapped students in an inclusive model?" To answer this question, eight questions were asked of respondents. Questions pertained to the adequacy of current assessment procedures, test bias, the value of criterion referenced assessment, and the relationship of assessment to social competencies of students were explored. The respondents were also asked to determine problems that cannot be resolved in a regular classroom setting.

The seventh research question asks, "Is there a difference in teacher willingness to include students with certain handicapping conditions over students with other handicapping conditions?" Two sections were designed to answer that question. Teachers seem quite concerned about including children with acting out behaviors (e.g., behavior disordered students) in regular education classes. Four questions were

designed to obtain feedback about concerns regarding this population of students. In addition, eighteen handicapping conditions were presented to respondents and they were asked to rate how easily they felt children with each of these eighteen handicapping conditions could be included in the mainstream of regular education.

Summary

Chapter III reviewed the methodology of this study. The method of collecting the data for this survey was by means of a survey. This instrument was designed by the researcher and pilot tested at one school in a midwest public school district with a heterogeneous population adjacent to Chicago by 27 respondents. It was revised and then distributed by the researcher to the remaining fourteen schools in the same school district where the pilot study was conducted, with the total number of respondents being 160 (32 percent).

The survey was designed to collect information about teacher attitudes around the issue of inclusion of handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education and maintaining current structures in special education. Commentaries were made on the design, the subjects and the procedure of this study.

Chapter IV employs the procedures presented in this chapter in order to answer the questions under investigation. Chapter V contains a discussion of the results found in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of the survey as they relate to the research questions are presented in this chapter. This chapter provides a presentation of the demographic data and the results of research question one through question seven. Percentages and frequencies of grouped scores were utilized. Multivariate analysis of variance was used and will be discussed. A display of the correlation matrix for the performance variables of attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, job description, adequacy of current assessment procedures, behavior disorder inclusion and broad range handicapping condition inclusion along with their represented means and standard deviations are provided. In addition, two stepwise discriminant functions analyses were performed to discriminate among the two populations of teachers; regular education teachers and special educators, and kindergarten through fifth and sixth through eighth grade teachers. Multiple regression analyses were also employed and will be discussed.

Section one of the survey (see Appendix B) consists of items that were designed to address teacher attitude regarding inclusion. There were eighteen questions and cross tabulations were used to analyze data in this section as well as a comparison of means.

Section two of the survey contains ten questions looking at teacher willingness to assume broader job responsibilities and data was analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance, analysis of variance, discriminant analysis and regression procedures.

Section three of the survey contains five questions intended to elicit responses relevant to teacher preference of inclusion models. Nationwide models were presented and respondents were asked to rate each of them. The data in this section was analyzed using cross tabulations.

Section four explored respondent feelings about the curriculum models of cooperative learning, mastery learning and an adaptive learning environment with another eight questions. Responses to questions pertaining to curriculum models were analyzed using analysis of variance techniques.

Section five contains eight questions, and explored feelings about the three staff teaching models of: co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance teams. Analysis of variance was used to analyze data in this section.

Section six contained eight questions related to assessment procedures. The scale developed from these eight questions proved unreliable (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.2258, Standardized Item alpha = 0.2884) (see Table 5). Therefore, it was not possible to interpret responses to questions in this section in a meaningful way.

Section seven consists of two parts. The first contains four questions related to the inclusion of children who exhibit inappropriate classroom behaviors and was analyzed using cross tabulations. This section also listed eighteen handicapping

conditions and respondents were asked to indicate how easily they felt students with each of these conditions could be included in regular education classrooms. This second part was analyzed using cross tabulations.

The final portion of the survey contained seven questions. These questions contained items related to demographic data.

A five point Likert Scale was used to obtain responses to specific items in five of the seven survey sections excluding the section on staff teaching models and curriculum models and excluding demographic data collection.

All of the respondents did not answer all of the questions. However, in every instance, percentages and totals are a reflection of the actual number of responses received for each particular question.

The presentation of the demographic data, the results of the research questions, implications of the findings and a summary of the results are presented in this chapter.

Demographic Information

The study included nine primary schools, three middle schools, one kindergarten through eighth grade laboratory school and one separate special education facility servicing children from pre-school age through age twenty-one. All of these schools are located in a midwest public school district with a heterogeneous population adjacent to Chicago, Illinois. This community is a multi-racial, multi-ethnic community that has been referred to often as a microcosm of the City of Chicago.

Demographic information on the respondents (see Table 2) regarding gender indicated a predictably heavy weighing of females as teaching historically has employed more women than men. Of the 160 respondents, 137 were female (86 percent) and 22 were male (14 percent). One respondent did not indicate gender. The population of respondents included 80 (50 percent) classroom teachers, 42 (26 percent) special education teachers and 38 (24 percent) other teachers. The population of special education teachers included those specializing in teaching: learning disabilities, speech-language disorders, behavior disorders, developmental and cross-categorical classes. The teachers falling into the other category were teaching the fine arts, physical education as well as reading specialists, school social workers and school psychologists. Only those teachers working with students identified as handicapped and receiving special education services were included in the group of special education teachers.

Classroom teachers were asked to indicate the grade they taught. Thirty-two respondents (20 percent) were kindergarten through second grade teachers, 28 respondents (18 percent) were third through fifth grade teachers, and 19 respondents (12 percent) were sixth through eighth grade teachers. Eighty-one respondents were in the other category that includes teachers who taught more than one grade level and therefore were excluded.

Special educators often teach more than one grade level. When including the population of special education teachers and those in the category of other teacher to determine a grade level representation of the total population, 101 respondents (63

percent) taught kindergarten through fifth grade students, 34 respondents (21 percent) taught sixth through eighth grade students, leaving 25 respondents or 16 percent still in a third category as their assignment crossed this grade level division.

The population of respondents was an experienced staff with 35 percent having taught between one and ten years, 37 percent having taught between eleven and twenty years and 26 percent having taught more than twenty years and 3 respondents not indicating how long they taught. This also was a well educated population as only 11 percent were college graduates without additional graduate work, 77 percent held Master's Degrees and 13 percent had done graduate work toward or held Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees.

In the school district surveyed, the public schools have been encouraged to develop their own way to implement inclusion. Many of the respondents, 46 percent, work in schools that are implementing some inclusionary practices. These schools are referred to in this study as pilot schools. Forty-five percent of the respondents are working in schools that are not piloting any inclusionary practices and are referred to as non-pilot schools. The remaining 10 percent of the represents work at the separate special education facility in the district surveyed.

Respondents were asked to indicate how they learned about the concept of inclusion. As a group they were aware of the concept as only 6 respondents had no prior knowledge of the issue. They learned about the issue in the following ways: school based in-service (55 percent), district wide in-service (47 percent), community lectures (8 percent), professional literature (54 percent), and parent organizations (8

percent). Respondents were encouraged to indicate other ways they learned about inclusion and some of the ways they indicated were through: university courses, first hand experience, principals, and communicating with colleagues. Out of the 14 schools that responded there was some variance in the response rate by school, therefore some schools are better represented than others (see Table 3).

Table 2.--Demographic Characteristics

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	22	13.8
Female	138	86.2
Grade Level Taught		
Kindergarten - Second Grade	32	20.0
Third Grade - Fifth Grade	28	17.5
Sixth Grade - Eighth Grade	19	11.9
Other	81	50.6
School Level Taught		
Primary (Kindergarten - Fifth Grade)	101	63.1
Middle (Sixth Grade - Eighth Grade)	34	21.3
Other	25	15.6
Years of Teaching Experience		
1 to 10 Years	56	35.7
11 to 20 Years	59	37.6
21 or More Years	42	26.8
Educational Level of Respondent		
B.A.	17	10.6
M.A.	123	76.9
Ph.D.	20	12.5
Participation in Inclusion Program		
Pilot	73	45.6
Non Pilot	72	45.0
Special Education	15	9.4
Teacher Job Type		
Classroom	80	50.0
Special Education	42	26.3
Other	38	23.8
Ways Respondents Learned About Inclusion[1]		
No Prior Knowledge	6	3.7
School Based In Service	87	54.4
District Wide In Service	75	46.9
Community Lecture	13	8.1
Professional Literature	87	54.4
Parent Organization	12	7.5
Other Means	48	30.0

[1] Multiple Responses total 328, representing 160 valid cases

Table 3.--Number of Respondents per School

	N	Percent
School 1	16	10.0
School 2	12	7.5
School 3	11	6.9
School 4	11	6.9
School 5	4	2.5
School 6	8	5.0
School 7	7	4.4
School 8	5	3.1
School 9	14	8.8
School 10	8	5.0
School 11	26	16.3
School 12	11	6.9
School 13	12	7.5
School 14	15	9.4

The survey instrument was divided into sections designed to measure attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, teacher willingness to broaden job description, curriculum and staff teaching models, adequacy of current assessment practices, handicapping behaviors and inclusion of children with various handicapping conditions. Several adjustments were made after examining the correlation matrix of variables for each section (see Table 4). A Cronbach's Alpha was computed on the variables in each section (see Table 5). In the first section on attitude toward inclusion, items ten and eighteen were eliminated. In the section on ways to implement inclusion, one variable, question five was removed. In the section on assessment practices, questions two, seven and eight were eliminated, however, the overall reliability remained very poor.

Table 4.--Scale Correlations

	Attitude about Inclusion	Ways to Implement Inclusion	Job Description	Adequacy of Current Assessment Procedures	Behavior Disorder Inclusion	Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion
Attitude Toward Inclusion	1.0000					
Ways to Implement Inclusion	-.2926	1.0000				
Redefine Job Description	-.4776**	.5223**	1.0000			
Adequacy of Current Assessment Procedures	-.0442	-.0258	.0299	1.0000		
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	-.2243	.1955	.1787	.0101	1.0000	
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	-.6308**	.2019	.3876*	-.0548	-.0259	1.0000

1-tailed Significance   * p ≤ .01, ** p ≤ .001

Table 5.--Study Alpha Reliability Scores with Between Measures Variation

Scales	Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha	F Statistics	Probability
Attitude Toward Inclusion	.8925	.8915	56.000	.000
Ways to Implement Inclusion	.6248	.6261	9.876	.000
Redefine Job Description	.8937	.9010	114.724	.000
Adequacy of Current Assessment Procedures	.2258	.2884	13.109	.000
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	.5132	.5048	69.781	.000
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	.8959	.8966	128.002	.000

Results of the Research Questions

To examine the research questions, cross tabulations with Chi-square, multivariate analysis of variance, one way analysis of variance, discriminant analyses and multiple regression analysis was used. The results of each research question will be provided descriptively followed by a general discussion.

Research Question One: Is there a difference between regular and special educators' attitude toward inclusion?

Items one through eighteen in the first section of the survey were designed to answer this question. The first question asked if respondents believe that as long as there are disabled children, there is a need for separate special education. When looking at the total population of respondents, 51 (32 percent) strongly agreed with that statement. When combining those respondents who said they agreed with those

described above who strongly agreed, a total of 119, approximately 74 percent of the total 160 respondents, believe there is a need for separate special education.

Items two, six, nine and sixteen were designed to elicit responses regarding various aspects of the current service delivery model. Item two asks respondents if they feel students succeed in self contained special education classes due to smaller class size. Item six asks if disabled children benefit from support provided by peers with similar needs. Item nine asks if disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in special education because of special educators' training and item sixteen asks if school districts should maintain more restrictive placement options. These items were combined as a scaled variable to measure the aspects of the current service delivery model for analysis and the results of the statistical procedures applied to this combined measure appears below (see Table 6).

Table 6.--Attitude Toward Aspects of the Current Service Delivery Model by Regular or Special Educator

	Regular Education Teacher (N=75)		Special Education Teacher (N=39)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Attitude Toward Current Service Delivery Model	2.3875	.7192	2.3512	.7243

These two groups seem to agree with the status quo as there is not a significant difference in the means of the two groups. A mean of two indicates that respondents agree with these statements as the Likert scale ranged from one, strongly agree, to five, strongly disagree.

Models of inclusion are based on several common beliefs. These beliefs were incorporated into five survey questions. Item three asked respondents if full inclusion can teach all children to understand individual differences. Item four asked if school inclusion prepares students for integrated community living. Item five asked if supportive services are best provided in the regular education classroom. Item eleven asked if severely disabled children should attend their neighborhood schools in regular education classrooms and item thirteen asked if respondents believe all children can learn in the mainstream of school life. Again these items were combined as a scale variable for analysis and the results of the statistical procedures applied to this combined value appears below (see Table 7). The responses to these questions were recoded inverting the responses; therefore, a low number suggests disagreement with the statements that would not be supportive of inclusion and again there are not significant differences between the groups.

Table 7.--Models of Inclusion by Regular or Special Educator

	Regular Education Teacher (N=80)		Special Education Teacher (N=42)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Models of Inclusion	2.8775	.7574	2.7667	.8144

Items fifteen and seventeen asked the educators if they felt each school should develop a time line toward inclusion of students and if the superintendent should encourage schools to increase their inclusion efforts. The responses to these questions were recoded inverting the responses and were then combined as a scaled variable. A

low number suggests disagreement and there are not significant mean differences

between groups (see Table 8).

Table 8.--Efforts Toward Inclusion by Regular or Special Educator

	Regular Education Teacher (N=80)		Special Education Teacher (N=42)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Efforts Toward Inclusion	2.7813	1.0276	2.8214	1.0922

Items seven, twelve and fourteen asked if respondents felt regular educators

were as skilled as special educators in handling children with special physical,

intellectual and social emotional needs. As stated above, these variables were recoded

and combined as a scaled variable. Lower numbers suggest disagreement.

Respondents in both groups appear to recognize a difference in the training of regular

and special educators as there are not significant mean differences between the two

groups (see Table 9).

Table 9.--Regular Educator Teaching Skills by Regular or Special Educator

	Regular Education Teacher (N=80)		Special Education Teacher (N=42)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Teacher Skills	1.9500	.6794	2.0476	.7636

Several schools in the school district surveyed have been piloting inclusionary

practices. A cross tabulation was employed to compare pilot and non-pilot schools in

order to determine any differences in respondents' attitude toward inclusion and a

Chi-square statistic was obtained (see Table 10). Teachers were divided into three

groups based on their experience with inclusion. The first group included schools

piloting inclusion, the second included those employing traditional special services

delivery practices and the third group represented the separate special education

facility. While no respondents were strongly in agreement with the statements, which

would reflect a positive attitude about inclusion, there was a difference of opinion

between the pilot schools and the other two groups. The group reflecting an attitude

against inclusion was made up of approximately 40 percent of the pilot group, 61

percent in non-pilot and 83 percent at this school districts separate special education

facility.

Table 10.--Attitude Toward Inclusion by Program Type

Attitude	Pilot Program (N=69)		Non-Pilot Program (N=61)		Separate Special Education Facility Program (N=12)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly Disagree with Inclusion	5	7.2	3	4.9	4	33.3
Disagree with Inclusion	23	33.3	34	55.7	6	50.0
Neutral	35	50.7	20	32.8	2	16.7
Agree with Inclusion	6	8.7	4	6.6	0	0.0
Strongly Agree with Inclusion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Chi-square = 19.095, $p \leq .004$

Research Question Two: Are educators' willing to redefine their job description to accommodate inclusionary practices?

Respondents were divided into three groups according to the number of years they have taught. The three groups represented teachers having taught from one to ten years, eleven to twenty years and twenty one or more years. Job description as a variable concerned teacher willingness to broaden and redefine their job description to implement inclusionary practices. Broadening their job description might include collaboration, consultation, co-teaching and other practices described in the survey (see Appendix B). A cross tabulation was computed and a Chi-square statistic was obtained (see Table 11).

Table 11.--Willingness to Redefine Job Description by Number of Years Teaching

Willingness	One to Ten Years (N=54)		Eleven to Twenty Years (N=56)		Twenty-One or More Years (N=38)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Unwilling	1	1.9	2	3.6	2	5.3
Unwilling	2	2.7	0	0.0	4	10.5
Neutral	15	27.8	15	26.8	12	31.6
Willing	21	28.9	25	44.6	19	50.0
Very Willing	15	27.8	14	25.0	1	2.6

Chi-square = 15.775, p ≤ .05

Within the group of teachers having taught between one and ten years, 29 percent are willing to redefine their job description and 28 percent are very willing, meaning a total of 57 percent are open to changing their job responsibility. In the

group of teachers teaching from eleven to twenty years, 45 percent are willing, 25 percent are very willing giving a total of 70 percent willing to redefine their job description. While this total percentage seems very close to those of the newer teachers in the first group with only a 3 percent difference, the ratio between these two groups and a third group representing the more experienced teachers drops to 53 percent. The percentages of willingness in the third group are 50 percent willing and only 3 percent very willing. This third group as a whole is less willing than the other two groups to redefine their job description to accommodate inclusion.

Respondents were also divided into three groups according to their job description. In the first group were classroom teachers, the second group were special educators in regular school buildings and the third group contained special educators working in the separate special education facility with only handicapped students. A cross tabulation was computed and a Chi-square statistic was obtained (see Table 12).

Table 12.--Willingness to Redefine Job Description by Regular by Special or Separate Special Education Facility Educator

Willingness	Classroom Teacher (N=35)		Special Education Teacher (N=78)		Separate Special Education Facility Teacher (N=38)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Unwilling	5	14.3	9	11.5	17	44.7
Unwilling	16	45.7	37	47.4	12	31.6
Neutral	11	31.4	25	32.1	8	21.1
Willing	2	5.7	3	3.8	1	2.6
Very Willing	1	2.9	4	5.1	0	0.0

Chi-square = 19.793, p ≤ .01

Looking at the total unwillingness to redefine their job description by group, 46 percent of the classroom teachers are unwilling to change and 14 percent of the classroom teachers are very unwilling to change, totaling 60 percent unwillingness. Special education teachers in public school buildings answered with 47 percent unwilling, 12 percent very unwilling, totaling 59 percent. The third group is at 32 percent unwilling and 45 percent very unwilling, totaling 77 percent unwilling to redefine their role. It should also be noted that the communities separate special education facility teachers in group three seem more opinionated as their neutral position represents 21 percent compared to 32 percent neutral response of classroom and special education teachers neutral position.

In addition, a one factor multivariate analysis of variance procedure (MANOVA) was run and the researcher compared regular and special educators on

the five dependent variables of: attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement

inclusion, job description, behavior disorder inclusion and broad range handicapping

condition inclusion. The MANOVA was found to be significant with a Wilks' value

of 0.89913 (exact $F = 2.60266$, $p \leq 0.028$, power $= 0.78$) (see Table 13). To

analyze further, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 13.--MANOVA Univariate F-Tests by Regular or Special Educator

Measures	F	Significance of F	Power
Attitude Toward Inclusion	0.00030	.986	.003
Ways to Implement Inclusion	0.22051	.640	.046
Redefine Job Description	9.13181	.003	.849
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	1.49244	.224	.225
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	2.48464	.118	.346

In addition, a stepwise discriminant function analysis was performed to

discriminate among the two population groups of regular and special educators. Six

variables were measured in an attempt to discriminate between the two groups. The

variables were: attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, job

description, adequacy of current assessment procedures, behavior disorder inclusion

and broad range handicapping condition inclusion. The criteria for selecting variables

at each step in the discriminant analysis was the minimization of the Wilks' Lambda

statistic.

Table 14.--Independent Variable Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Regular or Special Education Teacher

	Regular Education Teacher (N=80)		Special Education Teacher (N=42)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Attitude Toward Inclusion	2.4664	.6606	2.4643	.6855
Ways to Implement Inclusion	3.2281	.6926	3.2917	.7427
Redefine Job Description	3.5175	.8393	4.0000	.8352
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	2.3656	.7692	2.5357	.6500
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	2.4118	.6109	2.6071	.7203

Table 14 above contains the mean and standard deviation of each variable for both the regular and special educators. As can be seen from the output of the means and standard deviations, the difference between teacher groups appears to be greatest for the variable job description. This variable might then be expected to be an eventual discriminator.

By using a discriminant analysis, the researcher can extract functions from the independent variables that maximally differentiates the groups formed by the dependent variables.

Regarding the independent variables, job description discriminated best among the two groups followed by attitude (see Table 15).

Table 15.--Independent Variable Order of Discrimination by Regular of Special Educator

Step	Variables In	Wilks'-Lambda	Significance
Redefine Job Description	1	.92928	.0031
Attitude Toward Inclusion	2	.90917	.0035

The standardized discriminant function is displayed below:

Attitude Toward Inclusion	-0.55781
Redefine Job Description	1.14261

The discriminant function evaluated at the group centroids follows (see Table 16).

Table 16.--Discriminant Function and Group Centroids for Regular or Special Educators

Group	Function
1	-0.22714
2	0.43265

The classification results suggest that overall, correct classification of cases would occur 61 percent of the time. However, it appears that classification into group one, classroom teachers, is slightly more accurate than classification into group two, special educators, 64 percent and 57 percent respectively (see Table 17).

Table 17.--Discriminant Function Classification Results for Regular or Special Educators

| Actual Group | Total Number of Cases | Predicted Group Membership | | | |
| | | Regular Education Teacher | | Special Education Teacher | |
		N	%	N	%
Regular Education Teacher	80	51	63.8	29	36.3
Special Education Teacher	42	18	42.9	24	57.1
Ungrouped Cases	38	22	57.9	16	42.1

In summary, a stepwise discriminant analysis was performed on two teacher groups using six potential discriminating variables. Of these, job description, accounts for most of the variability. The overall accuracy produced is such that one could feel moderately comfortable using this model to predict membership of a particular case into one of the two groups.

Research Question Three: Is there a difference between regular and special educators in the way they would like inclusionary practices implemented?

Models implementing inclusionary practices were presented to respondents. Although there were no significant differences between the two teacher groups in terms of the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented, when the population was reconceptualized according to those educators piloting inclusionary practices and those not, the results changed. A cross tabulation was computed and a Chi-square statistic was obtained, revealing significant differences (see Table 18).

Table 18.--Ways to Implement Inclusion by Program Type

	Pilot Program (N=70)		Non-Pilot Program (N=71)		Special Education Program (N=15)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Most Likely to Fail	1	1.4	1	1.4	0	0.0
Likely to Fail	6	8.6	9	12.7	6	40.0
Neutral	23	32.9	25	35.2	7	46.7
Likely to Succeed	35	50.0	34	47.9	2	13.3
Most Likely to Succeed	5	7.1	2	2.8	0	0.0

Chi-square = 16.030, p ≤ .04

Only 10 percent of the respondents in the group piloting inclusion do not feel the ways presented would be successful if implemented, while 57 percent of this group agree that the ways presented could being successful. The remaining respondents (33 percent) are neutral. This is in contrast to non-pilot teachers. In this group slightly over, 14 percent disagree with the ways to implement inclusion being potentially successful, 51 percent agree and 35 percent were neutral. None of the respondents from this school districts separate special education facility strongly agree or strongly disagree with the ways to implement inclusionary practices. At this school districts separate special education facility 13 percent agree, 47 percent are neutral and 40 percent disagree with the ways presented.

<u>Research Question Four: How do teachers feel about the three curriculum models of cooperative learning, mastery learning and an adaptive learning environment model (ALEM)?</u>

A one way analysis of variance was performed for each model. Several conceptual groupings were used to analyze the data. They included regular and special educational teachers, education level, years taught, program type (pilot, non-pilot, and the separate special education facility) and grade taught. Significant differences at the 0.05 level were found when comparing cooperative learning by the variable program. The three groups included schools that were piloting inclusion programs, those that were not and a separate special education facility (see Table 19).

Table 19.--Cooperative Learning Model by Program Type

	Pilot Program (N=73)		Non-Pilot Program (N=72)		Separate Special Education Facility Program (N=15)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Cooperative Learning	3.1781	1.4176	2.6806	1.6853	3.8667	1.6417

$F = 4.2662$, $p \leq .0157$

Since the ANOVA does not specify where the differences between the grouping variables lay, Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) was used to make multiple a posteriori comparisons of the differences between means. This was done to determine where the sources of significant effect of grouping variables were located and to permit exploration of their means. The higher group mean of the

respondents from the separate special education facility suggest that respondents feel cooperative learning requires additional time, funding and responsibility but might facilitate teacher communication and reduce the stigma associated with being a special needs child.

Research Question Five: How do educators' feel about the three staff teaching models of co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance teams?

Each model was briefly described and eight statements were presented. Respondents indicated what model(s) fit each statement presented. One way analysis of variance was performed for each model. Again several conceptual groupings were used to analyze the data. They included group (regular or special educational teachers), education level, years taught, program type (pilot, non-pilot, and the separate special education facility), and grade taught. Significant differences at the 0.05 level were found when comparing teacher and student assistance teams by program (see Table 20). The three groups compared were schools that were piloting inclusion programs, schools that were not and a separate special education facility.

Table 20.--Teacher/Student Assistance Team Models by Program Type

	Pilot Program (N=73)		Non-Pilot Program (N=72)		Separate Special Education Facility Program (N=15)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Teacher/Student Assistance Teams	4.1370	1.5484	4.4583	1.5192	5.2000	1.7809

$F = 3.0581$, $p \leq .05$

Since the ANOVA did not specify where the differences between the grouping variables lie, Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) was used to make multiple a posteriori comparisons of the differences between means. This was done to determine where the sources of significant effect of grouping variables were located and to permit exploration of their means. The high group mean of the separate, special education facility suggests concerns respondents may have about the responsibility as well as additional requirement needed to implement teacher and student assistance teams.

Research Question Six: Are current assessment procedures adequate to meet the needs of handicapped students in an inclusive model?

The sixth research question asked how teachers feel about the adequacy of current assessment practices for handicapped students. It is not possible to interpret this section of questions in a meaningful way as the reliability was so poor for this section of questions.

Research Question Seven: Is there a difference in teacher willingness to include students with certain handicapping conditions over children with other handicapping conditions?

Four questions concerned respondent attitude about including students with inappropriate classroom behaviors in the mainstream. A cross tabulation was performed examining primary and middle school teacher groups, and a Chi-square statistic was obtained (see Table 21). Significance differences were noted.

Table 21.--Behavior Disorder Inclusion by School Level Taught

Attitude	Primary (K through 5th) (N=97)		Middle (6th through 8th) (N=32)	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly Disagree with Inclusion	2	2.1	5	15.6
Disagree with Inclusion	27	27.8	9	28.1
Neutral	50	51.5	16	50.0
Agree with Inclusion	18	18.6	2	6.3
Strongly Agree with Inclusion	0	0.0	0	0.0

Chi-square = 10.520, p ≤ .01

Approximately half of the respondents in each group were neutral while 19 percent of the primary grade teacher respondents took a favorable position to including this population of students compared to 6 percent of the middle school educator respondents. When viewing the opposing position, those who disagree, 2 percent were primary school teacher respondents compared to 16 percent who were middle school teacher respondents. Respondents taking a neutral position combined with those somewhat opposed comprised 79 percent of the kindergarten through fifth grade primary school teachers and 78 percent of the sixth through eighth grade middle school respondents.

A second cross tabulation and Chi-square statistic was computed on the survey section referred to as broad range handicapping condition inclusion (see Table 22). This section asked respondents to indicate how easily they felt children with certain disabilities could be included into the regular education environment. Respondents

were presented with eighteen handicapping conditions and asked how easily students with these disorders could be included in regular education. Teachers were grouped according to primary and middle school teaching assignments.

Table 22.--Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion by School Level Taught

Inclusion Difficulty	Primary (K through 5th) (N=101)		Middle (6th through 8th) (N=34)	
	N	%	N	%
Included Very Difficultly	0	0.0	0	0.0
Included Difficultly	31	30.7	10	29.4
Neutral	53	52.5	13	38.2
Included Easily	17	16.8	9	26.5
Included Very Easily	0	0.0	2	5.9

Chi-square = 8.237, p ≤ .04

In this analysis, neither group took an extreme position or felt students would be included very easily or with great difficulty. Thirty-one percent of the primary school teachers felt these students would be included with difficulty compared to 29 percent of the middle teachers. However, 17 percent of the primary school teachers compared to 33 percent of the middle school teachers felt students could be included easily or very easily.

A multivariate analysis of variance was computed and the researcher compared primary grade and intermediate grade educators on the five dependent variables of: attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, job description, behavior

disorder inclusion, and broad range handicapping condition inclusion. The MANOVA was found to be significant with a Wilks' value of 0.90879 (exact $F = 2.60266$, $p \leq 0.029$, power 0.78) (see Table 23). Univariate ANOVA's were computed and the results are found in Table 23 below.

Table 23.--MANOVA Univariate F-Tests by School Level Taught

Measures	F Value	Significance of F	Power
Attitude Toward Inclusion	2.18518	.142	.311
Ways to Implement Inclusion	3.39387	.068	.447
Redefine Job Description	.92689	.337	.173
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	4.32461	.039	.539
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	2.31616	.130	.327

In addition, a stepwise discriminant function analysis was performed to discriminate among the two population groups of primary and middle school educators. Five variables were measured in any attempt to discriminate between the two groups.

The variables included were: attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, job description, behavior disorder inclusion, and broad range handicapping condition inclusion. The criteria for selecting variables at each step in the discriminant analysis was the minimization of the Wilks' Lambda statistic. Table 24 below contains the means and standard deviation of each variable for the two groups.

Table 24.--Independent Variable Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by School Level Taught

| | Primary (K through 5th) (N=101) | | Middle (6th through 8th) (N=34) | |
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Attitude Toward Inclusion	2.5507	.6332	2.3673	.5982
Ways to Implement Inclusion	3.3267	.6593	3.0735	.7870
Redefine Job Description	3.6822	.8813	3.5147	.8652
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	2.4926	.7232	2.6193	.7539
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	2.4180	.5795	2.693	.8802

Regarding the independent variables, behavior disorder inclusion discriminated best among the two groups followed by broad range handicapping condition inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, and attitude toward inclusion.

Table 25.--Independent Variable Order of Discrimination by School Level Taught

Step	Variables In	Wilks' Lambda	Significance
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	1	.96851	.0395
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	2	.93410	.0111
Ways to Implement Inclusion	3	.91866	.0109
Attitude Toward Inclusion	4	.91052	.0154

The standardized discriminant function is displayed below:

Attitude Toward Inclusion	0.40528
Ways to Implement Inclusion	0.36825
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	0.52758
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	-0.81528

The discriminant function evaluated at the group centroids follows:

Table 26.--Discriminant Function and Group Centroids for School Level Taught

Group	Function
1	0.18054
2	-0.53630

The classification results suggest that overall, correct classification of cases would occur 70 percent of the time. However, it appears that classification into group one, primary grade teachers, is slightly more accurate than classification into group two, middle school teachers, 70 percent and 68 percent respectively (see Table 27).

Table 27.--Discriminant Function Classification Results for School Level Taught

| Actual Group | Total Number of Cases | Predicted Group Membership | | | |
| | | Primary (K through 5th) | | Middle (6th through 8th) | |
		N	%	N	%
Primary (K through 5th)	101	71	70.3	30	29.7
Middle (6th through 8th)	34	11	32.4	23	67.6
Ungrouped Cases	25	15	60.0	10	40.0

In summary, a stepwise discriminant analysis was performed on two teacher groups using five potential discriminating variables. Of these, behavior disorder inclusion accounts for most of the variability. Based on the overall accuracy of prediction, one could feel comfortable using this model to predict membership of a particular case into one of the two groups, primary or middle school teachers.

In addition to the above discussed statistics, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted (see Table 28). Again, the independent variables were ways to implement inclusion, job description, behavior disorder inclusion, and broad range handicapping condition. Attitude toward inclusion was the dependent variable in the regression equation. The following variables came into the model: job description explaining 0.23160 of the variance, followed by behavior disorder inclusion explaining an additional 0.07152 of the variance, broad range handicapping condition inclusion that explains an additional 0.03396 of the variance and lastly ways to

implement inclusion explaining the remaining 0.02452 of the variance. The overall predictiveness of the model is 36 percent.

Table 28.--Regression Model with Attitude Toward Inclusion as Dependent

	R Square	F	Significance of F	B
Redefine Job Description	.23160	47.622	.0000	.197344
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	.30312	34.144	.0000	.225032
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	.33708	26.441	.0000	.215032
Ways to Implement Inclusion	.36160	21.949	.0000	.147564
(Constant)				.158034

A second stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted using attitude toward inclusion, ways to implement inclusion, behavior disorder inclusion and broad range handicapping condition inclusion as independent variables and job description as dependent (see Table 29). As might be expected, attitude toward inclusion explained the bulk of the variance at 0.23160. This was followed by broad range handicapping condition inclusion explaining an additional 0.06802 and behavior disorder inclusion explaining the remaining variance at 0.03442. Ways to implement inclusion did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the prediction model. The overall predictiveness of the model is 33 percent.

Table 29.--Regression Model with Willingness to Redefine Job Description as Dependent

	R Square	F	Significance of F	B
Attitude Toward Inclusion	.23160	47.622	.0000	.365559
Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion	.29962	33.581	.0000	.350995
Behavior Disorder Inclusion	.33404	26.082	.0000	.237325
(Constant)				1.313618

A third stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with the above mentioned independent variables and behavior disorder inclusion as the dependent variable (see Table 30). This model was considerable less powerful than the previous two models with attitude toward inclusion explaining only 0.19093 of the variance, followed by job description explaining an additional 0.04597. Ways to implement inclusion, and broad range handicapping condition inclusion did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the model. The overall predictiveness of the model is 24 percent.

Table 30.--Regression Model with Behavior Disorder Inclusion as Dependent

	R Square	F	Significance of F	B
Attitude Toward Inclusion	.19093	37.285	.0000	.356260
Redefine Job Description	.23690	24.369	.0000	.213500
(Constant)				.809322

Lastly, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted using broad range handicapping condition inclusion as dependent (see Table 31). This model like

the one above was also considerably less powerful, explaining only 23 percent of the variance. Job description entered the model first explaining 0.18474 of the variance. This was followed by attitude toward inclusion in the model explaining the remaining 0.04624 variance. Ways to implement inclusion and behavior disorder inclusion did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the model.

Table 31.--Regression Model with Broad Range Handicapping Condition Inclusion as Dependent

	R Square	F	Significance of F	B
Redefine Job Description	.18474	35.802	.0000	.235455
Attitude Toward Inclusion	.23098	23.577	.0000	.236862
(Constant)				1.031420

Summary

In summary, the results of the survey provided insight into the respondents' attitudes about inclusion of handicapped students and satisfaction with current structures in special education. The respondents were mature, well educated professionals. A significant percentage had master's degrees. They represented classroom teachers, a variety of special education disciplines, fine arts and physical education teachers. Most respondents were females. The study explored teacher perceptions about aspects of inclusion including attitude, models for implementation, willingness to assume broader job responsibilities, staff teaching models, curriculum models, assessment procedures and inclusion of children with various handicapping conditions. Results of this research suggest that there are minimal differences

between the teacher groups concerning their perceptions about the various aspects of inclusion.

In general, teachers are cautious about embracing the concept. Teachers feel there is a need to maintain separate special education opportunities for those children who need it. They feel it has value. They feel there is a difference in the training between classroom teachers and special educators and that such training benefits children with handicapping conditions. At the same time, teachers acknowledge the social benefits inclusion offers disabled children who are schooled with their non-disabled peers. They feel strongly about maintaining the continuum of placement options for servicing disabled students.

Differences were noted between regular and special educators in terms of job description or changes in the role of the teacher in terms of assuming broader responsibility as determined by a multivariate analysis of variance procedure. A second multivariate analysis of variance showed differences between primary and intermediate grade level educators on the variable of handicapping conditions, this variable pertains to including students with behavior disorders.

There were differences noted between groups when comparing those schools piloting inclusion, those not and the separate special education facility in the school district surveyed when viewing staff teaching models and curriculum models. The higher group means of the separate special education facility suggest concern on the part of the respondents about extra responsibilities required for implementation of the models.

In conclusion, the research findings resulting from this investigation suggest a cautionary posture on the part of all educators in this community regarding aspects of inclusion of handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education. While, in general, respondents acknowledge the social benefits, they are concerned about the added responsibility and question the universal benefits to all students.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The focus of this chapter will be to discuss and analyze the results reported in Chapter IV. For the convenience of the reader, a summary of the study will be provided initially. This will be followed by discussion of both the theoretical and practical implications of the findings of this study. Limitations of this research will also be covered. Finally, possible directions for future research will be presented.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate teacher perceptions and beliefs about the inclusion of handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education. The subjects of the study were 160 professional educators in a midwest public school district with a heterogeneous population adjacent to Chicago, Illinois, who worked in one of nine of the ten kindergarten through fifth grade, three middle schools, one kindergarten through eighth grade or one separate special education school in this community. A survey design was implemented for data collection purposes. The study investigated respondents' attitude regarding the issue of implementing a full inclusion model or maintaining current structures in special education.

Respondents were questioned about their attitude regarding the concept of inclusion, various models of implementing inclusion, their willingness to redefine

their job description, staff teaching and curriculum models, staff willingness to include children with various handicapping conditions and staff attitude about current assessment practices.

Review of the Literature

The call for reform of current special education service delivery systems gained momentum with the Regular Education Initiative. REI advocates reasoned that instructional services for disabled children should be delivered within the regular classroom environment. Proponents argued that special education "pullout" programs were not working well (e.g., Semmel, Gottlieb, & Robinson, 1979) and that there were better delivery techniques suggested from the study of effective schools (e.g., Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). These proponents have argued that there is insufficient evidence to support the need to implement special techniques for children with disabilities (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Many have suggested that effective instruction practiced by general education teachers in regular education classrooms can be implemented for all children and can accommodate the individual differences among students now identified as disabled (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Lilly, 1988; Lipsky & Gartner, 1987; Pugach, 1987, 1988; Reschly, 1988; Reynolds & Wang, 1983; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984, 1988; Taylor, 1988; Wang & Birch, 1984; Wang, 1988; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986; Will, 1986).

In the statistics released for the 1989-1990 school year, 4,817,503 students with disabilities were served under Part B of IDEA and by Chapter I of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). This was a 23 percent increase from 1976 to 1977, the year when IDEA first took effect. To teach this increasing number of students, many additional special educators were hired: from 179,000 in 1976 to 1977 (Singer & Butler, 1987) to 304,626 in 1989-90 (U.S. Department of Education, 1992), which represented 13 percent of the U.S. teaching force in that year (U.S. Department of Education, in Singer, 1993).

Some critics saw this significant increase as evidence that the leadership in special education was more interested in empire building than in effective teaching. More special education students lead to more teachers resulting in more programs, dollars and power for special education (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

The former Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education outlined specific problems with the current special education delivery system and proposed solutions within the regular education setting (Will, 1986). In this document, a framework was presented for re-evaluating the delivery of services to children with disabilities. Will identified negative aspects of current programs when she cited fragmented educational approaches caused by pullout programs and problems with a "dual system" of regular and special education. Students with mild disabilities served by pullout programs were described as not typically receiving consistent and continuous instruction in curriculum areas. The dual system was seen as separating regular and special education thus minimizing communication between regular and special classroom teachers (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991).

Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) go on to explain that "burgeoning enrollments and crowded classrooms in many places are making a mockery of special education's historic and noble intent to differentiate and enhance instruction for students with disabilities" (p. 294). They see this as a problem along with inaction on the part of special education expressed by infrequent evidence to support the effectiveness of special education. Over the years, special education has grown into a second system complete with its own teachers, administrators, credentialing process, programs and budgets. At the same time, it has developed "a sense of autonomy and independence and a penchant for doing things unilaterally even when issues and problems seem to demand bilateral actions" (p. 295). Failure to correct this problem the Fuchs' suggest is partly due to organizational, physical and psychological separation from general education. This failure they believe is the source of the special education systems' problems. Some now are recognizing the need for a meaningful relationship between regular and special education (Behrmann, 1992; Hales & Charles, 1992; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

REI and inclusion advocates explain that labeling students with disabilities and segregating them from regular classrooms results in stigmatization. These children are said to harbor feelings of inferiority resulting from this process (Biklen & Zollers, 1986; Hobbs, 1975; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Wang & Birch, 1984). REI and inclusion efforts have been viewed as a means for reducing the need for assessment of students with lower levels of functioning, thereby eliminating harmful labeling practices. Rather than categorizing students, regular education classes would be

adapted to meet the needs of all individual learners. All children would be considered different in intellectual, physical and psychological characteristics, but capable of learning in most environments (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987).

Kauffman, et. al. (1988) suggests that students are frequently misunderstood and stigmatized because they fail to meet acceptable performance standards set by teachers and peers. This outcome is believed to be independent of whether or not they are labeled or served by special education. Also, the general demand for more effective schools has resulted in increased pressures for improved achievement test scores and a consequent push for accelerated classroom academic instruction. In such academic environments, it remains unclear how students will overcome feelings of stigmatization when their academic performance remains significantly below the means of their classroom and school peers. (Gerber & Semmel, 1984; Semmel, 1986; Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991).

Lieberman (1991), in responding to Gartner and Lipsky, argues that the flexibility demanded by REI and inclusion is rarely encountered. He rationalizes that the school system is not for individuals. Individuals drop out. Students who respond to the system succeed. Educational reformers suggest that there are no unique methods for use with students labeled exceptional that differ in kind from those used with normal children. All students are individuals, yet we teach them the same way. If students are different, they all learn differently and we need to teach them differently according to Lieberman's thinking.

General education has been accused of a lack of willingness or capacity to accommodate more of its students, therefore, it has been suggested that general education needs to make fundamental changes in its teaching and learning process. General education must draw on the skills of building based special educators, Chapter I and bilingual teachers, and other professionals working with them to create a more coordinated school program responsive to fast and slow learners alike (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). Only when all teachers and support staff work together will general education become sufficiently competent and confident to grant special educators small enough caseloads so they can work with identified students' intensively.

REI proponents tried to interest general education in special education's concerns (Pugach & Sapon-Shevin, 1987; Lieberman, 1985). REI inspired activity of the 1980's changed special education in some places, but in general reform making tended to parallel rather than converge with general education (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). In the 1990's the new movement to bring regular and special education into synergistic alignment is inclusion. Some are optimistic and suggest general education now appears interested in special education. At the same time, there are those who support a strong, independent special education (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988; Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd, & Bryan, 1988; Kauffman, 1989; Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Keogh, 1988).

REI and inclusion advocates have described various models for providing special education services within the regular classroom environment, such as consultation, collaborative teaming and co-teaching (Thousand & Villa, 1990; Idol,

1986). These models provide processes that special and regular education teachers, parents and other school staff collaborate to plan, implement and evaluate instruction conducted in regular classrooms. The intent is to reduce the need for pullout special education programs by enabling the regular education teacher to instruct children with special needs successfully (Huefner, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1986; Thousand & Villa, 1990). Implementation of these teacher models requires retraining of both general and special educators. Problem solving in the regular classroom demands skills in personal communication and team teaching as well as familiarity with large-group instruction and curriculum frameworks (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Huefner pointed out, "turf conflicts may arise, in which it is not clear who is responsible for the performance of a given student" (p. 404).

Discussion about reform initiatives has also concerned the potential impact on the academic achievement of all students under the above proposed service delivery models. Inclusion and REI advocates have contended that disabled students have failed to demonstrate significantly increased achievement levels under pullout and separate special education models. On the other hand, some have argued that the placement of such children in regular classrooms demands specific teaching skills in individualized instruction for students who require more time to achieve classroom goals (Humphreys & Hall, 1980), who may respond passively to challenging learning tasks (Torgesen & Houck, 1980) and who may fail to generate task-appropriate learning strategies (Ryan, Short, & Week, 1986). Therefore, some opponents of inclusion and REI feel that if students with disabilities are placed in regular education

classes on a full-time basis, the additional variance in student learning styles and achievement levels and the associated demand for increased instructional attention and teaching skill could result in compromised effect on the achievement levels of students with and without disabilities (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991).

The reform movement has changed as it progressed from REI to inclusion (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). Initially, there were two groups advocating for the Regular Education Initiative. The larger of the two groups represented those with interest in the high incidence group of students (e.g., learning disabled, mild-moderate mental retardation) along with those advocating for children at-risk without diagnosed disabilities. The second group of REI proponents advocated for students with severe intellectual disabilities. The exclusive concern of this group was to help integrate these children into neighborhood schools whereas proponents of the first group recognized that they must coordinate and collaborate with regular education as they, special educators, were part of the larger system. A few members of the second group of reformers also felt special education should coordinate and collaborate with general education and a few argued to push for elimination of special education. The second group began to proceed parallel to the first group as they saw REI as a policy initiative for children with high incidence disabilities. By the mid 1990's the second group had changed their thinking from "mainstreaming" to "neighborhood schools." This change to neighborhood schools is one of the basic tenets of inclusion.

The goals have also changed somewhat as the movement has gone from REI to inclusion. REI advocates called for a merger of special education and general

education into an inclusive system. This required a fundamental restructuring of the relationship between general education and special education that would unite the educational system. Merger would also circumvent the need for an eligibility process accused of using invalid test instruments, and psychologically harmful labels to pigeonhole children into educationally questionable classifications (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). Leaders of the inclusive movement have similar goals but some of these new leaders say inclusion necessitates elimination of special education and its continuum of placements. ". . .the inclusion option signifies the end of labeling, special education and special classes, but not the end of the necessary supports and services. . .in integrated classroom" (Pearpoint & Forest, 1992, p. XVI). These advocates say they are not "dumping" disabled students into general education classrooms because they recognize the need for appropriate support. Specialists would follow children into the mainstream where services would be available to any student, previously labeled or not, who may be in need (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

These inclusion proponents hope to enhance students' social competence and to change the attitudes of teachers and students without disabilities who one day will be parents, taxpayers and service providers. The Fuchs' (1994) point out that this socialization focus is in sharp contrast to REI proponents focusing on strengthening the academic performance of students with disabilities and those at risk for school failure.

Clearly the issues surrounding REI and inclusion and the concomitant policy changes proposed have potentially significant effects for both regular and special

education service providers and the students they serve. Educators' views of REI have not been adequately considered according to some (e.g., Singer, 1988; Kauffman, 1989; Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Coates (1989) in discussing results drawn from mail surveys of a sample of teachers from Iowa, suggested that general education teachers did not dislike pullout programs and were not very supportive of REI. Semmel and Gerber (1990) felt too little evidence of regular and special educators' views of issues were reflected in the REI debate. Semmel, et. al. (1991) states that the "street level bureaucrats," the school-based service deliverers, will ultimately determine the success or failure of the proposed policy changes.

Anderegg (1989) recognized there was little evidence of regular and special educators' views of the issues reflected in the REI debate. Larrivee (1982) suggested that teachers had ambivalent feelings about mainstreaming. Giangreco, et. al. (1993) describes the experiences of general education teachers who have had a student with severe disabilities in their class. In Giangreco's study, teachers' initially acknowledged negative reactions to the placement of a child with severe disabilities in their classrooms, however, a significant number of teachers in this study describe transforming experiences of a more positive nature once they were able to work with these children.

Davis (1989) suggest that the issue of REI and inclusion is not one of who is the right or what is right. Rather it must be an issue of open, honest dialogue that more meaningfully involves practitioners as well as researchers and scholars.

Teachers need to be listened to, their views and ideas valued and respected. Teachers (both regular and special) must be convinced of the real need and value of changing to implement REI and inclusion if it is to be successful.

<div style="text-align: center;">Discussion and Conclusions</div>

This study was conducted to gather information on educators' views of inclusion because such information is noticeably lacking in the existing literature. The data was gathered from a population of teachers in a midwest public school district with a heterogeneous population adjacent to Chicago, Illinois. One hundred sixty educators responded to the survey. Conclusions resulting from the study are presented below. Each research question is discussed separately with conclusions that are supported by the data presented. General conclusions regarding this study are presented following the research questions.

<u>Research Question One Findings</u>

The first research question asked: Is there a difference between regular and special educators' attitude regarding full inclusion? It was hypothesized that regular education teachers might be more cautious than special educators in their support of inclusion and that this caution would be reflected their attitude scores. This is because they, classroom teachers, would ultimately be charged with the responsibility of implementing the proposed widespread change as well as charged with the accountability of the academic success of all their students, including the disabled. Classroom teachers, in the Semmel, et. al. (1991) study, had indicated feeling that full-time placement of disabled students in regular classroom environments would not

have social benefits to disabled students. Inclusion proponents feel that including disabled students in regular education classrooms has social benefit although many respondents to this survey supported Semmel's research. Classroom teachers in Semmel's study also expressed concern about lacking the specific skills necessary to teach disabled children. Similar beliefs and concerns were expressed by respondents in this survey.

The research hypothesized that special educators might be more amenable in their attitude toward inclusion. Davis (1991) noted that many special educators' view themselves as "child advocates" and inclusion might be viewed by them as another way they can serve as advocates for their students. At the same time, it was thought that special educators might be less supportive than classroom teachers of innovations like inclusion if they perceived that change as suggesting impact on their present job definitions, their classroom practices, and instructional time allocations.

Respondents were asked eighteen questions concerning their attitude about inclusion. To avoid biasing the instrument, both negatively and positively phrased items were constructed. Summary statistics, mean and standard deviation for each of the survey items pertaining to attitude toward inclusion are presented in Table 32 below. These scores range from one to five, with one representing a view of strongly agree and five strongly disagree. This Likert scaling, it should be noted, might possibly have increased the respondents' tendency toward socially acceptable or noncommittal mid scale responses. As can be seen from inspection of this table, teachers' responses on a significant number of the items are in the direction of

disagreement with the concept of inclusion. Respondents felt the strongest about maintaining IDEA (item 18) and maintaining more restrictive placement options (item 16) and feel special education as operated today has value as it allows disabled children to meet with success.

The data when comparing regular educators' attitude to special educators' attitude towards inclusion showed no significant differences. The overall mean of the attitude toward inclusion scale for regular educators was 2.4 as compared to 2.3 for special educators (see Table 6). This finding indicates the possibility that both groups are not generally dissatisfied with the current special education service delivery model and are cautious about inclusion.

A cross tabulation was also performed and Chi-square statistic obtained to ascertain the differences between the expected and observed frequency of respondents grouped according to whether or not they had been piloting some form of inclusionary practices at their school (see Table 10). It was hypothesized that experience with a wide range of students in inclusive programs might impact a respondent's attitude about the issue of inclusion. This may be the case. When comparing respondents in non-pilot, Park school and pilot school, those in the pilot schools showed a somewhat less negative view or more neutral position. Sixty percent of the pilot respondents answered neutrally or positively in their attitude compared to 39 percent in the non-pilot group and 17 percent in the separate special education facility group. This may supports Grangreco's (1993) research where he suggests that once teachers have experience with inclusion, their views become more positive.

Table 32.--Attitude Toward Inclusion Item Mean Scores

Item	Description	Mean	St. Dev.
18	Keep Idea	1.725	.87
16	Maintain more restrictive options	1.881	1.63
9	Disabled kids succeed because of special education	2.019	.97
1	Need special education	2.088	1.03
10	Special education kids need a special education curriculum	2.125	1.10
2	Smaller class size	2.575	1.11
4	Prepare for integrated community living	2.575	1.19
3	Understand individual differences	2.600	1.15
6	Handicapped kids need support of peers with similar needs	2.863	.96
17	Encourage all schools to increase inclusion efforts	2.900	1.16
5	Provide support in regular classroom	3.394	1.15
13	All kids can learn in the mainstream	3.438	1.21
15	Every school should have a time line toward inclusion	3.525	1.25
11	disabled kids should attend neighborhood school	3.806	.95
14	Regular education teachers are as skilled as special education teachers in handling special social-emotional needs	3.819	1.03
8	Separate special education violated human rights	3.881	.90
12	Regular education teachers are as skilled as special education teachers in handling special cognitive-intellectual needs	3.944	1.01
7	Regular education teachers are as skilled as special education teachers in handling special physical-motor needs	4.241	.88

Research Question Two Findings

Question two asked if educators were willing to redefine their job description to facilitate inclusionary practices. It was hypothesized that there might be differences in teacher willingness to redefine their job description such that it would allow them to co-teach in classrooms, collaborate with colleagues and consult with one another, which are aspects of all inclusionary models. It was hypothesized that these differences might depend on the grades being taught, the type of job the teacher had, level of teacher education or years taught. There were differences found between regular and special educators' willingness to redefine their job description.

As a group, special educators were less willing than regular educators to change their job description (see Tables 12 & 33). This supports Davis' (1989) view that special educators might view inclusion in a negative light as some educators may feel inclusion negates their basic philosophical and educational beliefs and practices. Several regular educators commented in answer to the open ended question at the end of the survey that they were willing to collaborate and consult about children and that they did in fact already do so. Their concern was that enough supports be built into an inclusion plan to allow for adequate planning time and adequate personnel.

Table 33.--Willingness to Redefine Job Description Mean Scores by Regular or Special Educator

	Regular Education (N=80)		Special Education (N=42)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Redefine Job Description	3.5175	.8383	4.0000	.8352

F = 5.2849, p ≤ .006

Several theorists identify several keys to the success of inclusive education (Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Davis, 1989; Snell & Sailor, 1991). Among them is a model of regular and special educators working side by side with heterogeneous groups of students and teachers sharing their specialties. It was therefore encouraging to note that many regular educators in this district are willing and in fact practice these strategies.

No significant differences were found in willingness to redefine teacher job description when looking at the length of time a teacher taught (see Table 11) or teachers' level of education. It was hypothesized that teachers who had recently become certified might differ in their willingness to expand their job description from teachers who had not. This was because it was felt that teachers recently certified might have taken university teacher preparation course work that might have included the theory behind the concept of inclusion as well as strategies for teaching in inclusive environments. It was also felt that teachers who had been in the system longer might be more comfortable with the status quo and therefore less open to inclusion. It is possible that the longer one is in the teaching system the easier it

becomes to get confident and perhaps complacent about one's teaching style and thus less willing to change or redefine one's role. As one respondent said, "If I wanted to work with handicapped children, I would have become a special education teacher." Another respondent expressed her concern about changing her role in this way:

> education is like a pendulum and one of my fears is that inclusion will take place prior to properly preparing teachers. And, after having all teachers change everything they do now to be prepared to include children with special needs (the district) will decide inclusion is not something that's going to work and they'll change their minds again. I'm not a special education teacher and I do not want that job. I'd be set up to fail and that scares me.

Research Question Three Findings

The third research question asked: Is there a difference between regular and special educators in the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented? There were no significant differences found between teacher groups in the way they would like to see inclusionary practices implemented. Perhaps this was due to the concerns on the part of both teacher groups about the ability of any inclusion model to meet the needs of diverse groups of students. One respondent said, "I'm against any model of inclusion. It is not for all students. Self contained schools are necessary." Another added, "I see all these models as a cheap way to educate children. Are we going back to the 1950's?" Another respondent suggested that, "parents and state legislators who suggest inclusion models do not understand the realities of the classroom and legislate as if the teachers were the enemy."

It was interesting to note that there seemed to be differences in the way inclusionary models were implemented based on teacher experience with inclusion (see Tables 18 & 34). Some of the surveyed schools have piloted inclusionary

practices. Each school's way to implement inclusion is unique to that school as the practices have been developed in response to the unique needs of the participating schools. Giangreco, et. al. (1993) describes teachers' initial negative reactions to the placement of children with severe disabilities in their classrooms as being transformed by their experiences into more positive feelings. Raynes, Snell and Sailor (1991) also report that the overall tone in schools piloting inclusion becomes positive. A one way analysis of variance was performed with the following results.

Table 34.--Ways to Implement Inclusion Mean Scores by Program Type

| | Pilot Program (N=73) | | Non-Pilot Program (N=72) | | Separate Special Education Facility Program (N=15) | |
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Ways to Implement Inclusion	3.3493	.7226	3.2326	.7198	2.6833	.5784

$F = 5.4352, p \leq .005$

There were three groups used in this analysis. Group one represents those schools piloting inclusionary practices. Group two represents schools providing traditional special services to disabled students. Group three represents the separate special education school. There is not a significant difference between the means of Group one and Group two. The mean of their responses to the models presented suggested non-committal, mid-scale responses. Again perhaps this is due to the Likert scaling increasing respondent tendency toward socially acceptable or politically correct responses. There did not seem to be a transformation as Giangreco found

with this sample. The mean of the third group (the separate, special education

facility) was significantly lower indicating that this group felt that the models

presented were more likely to fail if implemented. As a group the educators in this

third group work exclusively with a disabled population, many of their students are

severely disabled and multiply handicapped. They may feel that any model of

inclusion could cause potential harm to disabled children as they may perceive those

children failing to receive the special services he or she needs in a regular classroom.

Many believe in fact that it is not possible to adapt a general education curriculum so

that this population of students can participate and work at their own levels. One

respondent in this third group explained:

> some students need specialized training that cannot be offered in a regular
> education setting. The outcomes of special education are dismal but inclusion
> is not the answer. Students need quality programs that will train them for life
> and the regular classroom milieu cannot provide this.

It is possible that respondents were theoretically wary of choosing a model of

inclusion not so much because they felt the models unworkable but because they felt

strongly that they needed to be contingent upon other factors like additional financial

resources, additional personnel and specific materials that might be needed. One

classroom teacher stated that she was wary of choosing a model likely to work as:

> in an ideal world where money and teachers' time were endless, any of these
> models would be nice. I'm very concerned about implementing a model
> without sufficient financial resources and planning time and aides in regular
> classrooms. Besides, I do not think the regular classroom is the best place for
> certain types of disabled children.

Research Question Four Findings

The fourth research question asked how educators' feel about cooperative learning, mastery learning and the adaptive learning curriculum model. In order to analyze responses to this question, a one way analysis of variance was performed on each model. Significant differences were found at the 0.05 level when comparing cooperative learning by the various program types: those schools piloting a form of inclusion, those employing traditional special education practices, and those representing this school districts separate special education facility (see Table 19).

Cooperative learning involves assigning a group a common goal in that the participating students are called upon to coordinate their skills and efforts to achieve the goal. Cooperative learning has been suggested as a method to bring students of various achievement and intellectual levels together in a positive way, while at the same time allowing each student to work at his or her own intellectual level and pace (Johnson & Johnson, 1986). In theory, positive integration and enhanced achievement among students would be realized since, if the group's goal is to be reached, all students must coordinate their efforts to achieve the goal.

The school district surveyed has employed consultants in recent years to educate and encourage teachers to use cooperative learning strategies. It is interesting that respondents at non pilot schools felt more favorable than those at pilot schools or the separate special education facility about cooperative learning. This might be due to the different population of students making up the cooperative learning groups. Those respondents at pilot schools might have more challenging populations of

students participating in cooperative learning groups. The survey did not specifically ask if respondents had experience using any of these curriculum models and this might have been interesting to know.

Mastery learning, as conceptualized by Bloom (1968) is a theory of instruction and learning based on the premise that every student can be successful in learning, so long as he or she is provided with sufficient help when learning difficulties are first encountered. Inherent to this concept are the setting of criteria or mastery levels for meeting identified learning objectives, and the provision of corrective feedback (Wang, 1980). The belief that all children can learn successfully given an appropriate learning environment is the foundation of many school mission statements and it was thought that because of this most respondents would feel comfortable and positive with this model. Perhaps this is why there were not significant differences between groups responding to mastery learning statements as most respondents had similar views.

The adaptive learning environment model (ALEM) is also based on the premise that students learn in different ways and at different rates and this model matches instructional methods and learning experiences to individual student learning characteristics and needs (Wang, 1980). Curriculum in ALEM classrooms combines teacher directed instruction (e.g., Bloom, 1976) with aspects of informal education geared to generating inquiry, self-management, responsibility for learning, and social cooperation (Wang, 1980). One teacher said, "I'm afraid I will not have enough time to meet the needs of my regular education students in this model because special

education student needs would take up so much of my time." It was hypothesized that special educators might be more cautious than regular educators in their views regarding how easily these children could be included in a regular educational setting. Several respondents said they would have liked more of an explanation as they were not familiar with ALEM but in general, respondents did not express this concern. Again, it would have been interesting to know if respondents had experience using this model with their students.

Research Question Five Findings

The fifth research question asked how educators' feel about the three staff teaching models of co-teaching, consultation and teacher and student assistance teams. A one way analysis of variance was performed on each model to analyze this question and significant differences were found at the 0.05 level when comparing teacher and student assistance teams by program type (see Table 20). The three groups included in program type are: those schools piloting inclusion, those using traditional forms of special service delivery and this school districts separate special education facility.

Teachers in the school district surveyed have been encouraged during the past few years to develop new partnerships between regular and special education staff. One method suggested has been a co-teaching model. Learning disabilities resource room teachers have tried to partner with a classroom teacher for a year of shared responsibility. Sometimes these regular and special education teachers teamed together and they shared responsibility for a class of children with and without

disabilities. In some schools this was successful and it was hypothesized that perhaps this success led to staff willingness to pilot one form of inclusion.

It has been suggested that the model of consultation has operated theoretically as part of the dual system (Lipsky & Gartner, 1992). In this model, specialists assist general education teachers to enhance their ability to educate students in a mainstreamed setting. Some classroom teachers welcome the opportunity to gain the perspective of a special education colleague (e.g., in terms of modifying curriculum for a student with disabilities). Others resent what they see as an implication that they need help with a student. It was therefore hypothesized that there might be differences between regular and special educators (the group variable) in terms of consultation. This did not prove to be so.

It was also hypothesized that there might be differences between respondents in the schools grouped as pilot and those employing traditional special services delivery. It was felt that staff who had piloted inclusion might differ in their responses from staff who had not. Again, this was not so. It would have been interesting to have included a question to enable the researcher to know whether or not respondents had practiced the consultation model.

Teacher and/or student assistance teams (TSAT) are another way to provide support for students and/or teachers in regular education classes. Support teams involve a group of people such as students, administrators, parents, classroom teachers, aides, school psychologists, speech and hearing specialists, and/or learning and behavior consultants who come together to brainstorm, problem solve, exchange

ideas, methods, techniques and activities directed at assisting a teacher and/or student requiring help (Stainback & Stainback, 1989). The TSAT model is not intended to function as a special education referral system and is not a multidisciplinary assessment and placement committee. Rather, it's goal is as a support system to teachers and students.

One respondent expressed her view of teacher and student assistance teams by saying, "until we have strong leadership, a logical plan, additional money, time, classroom support, changes in our job descriptions and decent contract language, do not talk to me about this." Other teachers expressed that their preference was to teach alone and they were not interested in this model.

It was hypothesized that there might be a difference between teachers new to teaching and those who have taught many years in their perception and willingness to implement new models such as the TSAT model. It was thought that teachers new to the profession might be more familiar with inclusion and therefore more willing to implement one of the models, but this was not proven true.

There were differences noted when comparing pilot and non-pilot schools, however (see Table 20). Those respondents piloting inclusion had a somewhat more favorable view of TSAT's than non-pilot or the separate special education facility. Again, it is not known if respondents had experience using TSAT or were feeling open minded about the concept, and again, this would have been useful information to have.

Research Question Six Findings

The sixth research question concerned assessment procedures and, as has been noted, due to the scale's poor reliability, the questions in this section could not be analyzed in a meaningful way. The researcher was attempting to determine the adequacy of current assessment practices for use with disabled children. Perhaps the questions in this section were not worded clearly or did not allow respondents to understand clearly what the intent of the questions was.

Research Question Seven Findings

The seventh research question asked if there was a difference in respondent willingness to include students with certain handicapping conditions over students with other handicapping conditions. Two survey sections were used to answer this question. The first pertained to including students with inappropriate classroom behaviors. It was hypothesized that there might be a difference in willingness to include these students based on job description with classroom teachers being less willing. It was thought that this might be due to the fact that they would be the ones who would be responsible for a classroom of students and fear teaching time would be taken away from the class in order to intervene with a student who might be acting inappropriately. This hypothesis was not supported as significant differences between these groups were not found.

It was also thought that there might be differences between groups based on the grade being taught with the assumption that teachers of younger students, assigned to lower grade levels, might be more open to including students with behavior

problems (see Tables 21 & 22). It was hypothesized that younger children would have less of a school history and teachers might be more hopeful about impacting positive change. This seems to be supported by the data.

Teachers of older students tend to be more cautious about including students with inappropriate classroom behaviors compared to their primary school teacher colleagues (see Table 21). Teachers may feel more hopeful, with younger children, about being able to change the behaviors of young children whereas by the time these students reach middle school, the behaviors have become more habitual and complex and resistant to change leading middle school teachers to be more cautious.

The second component to this question presented respondents with eighteen handicapping conditions and asked respondents how easily students with theses conditions could be included in regular education classrooms. It was hypothesized that there might be differences between regular and special educators in the ease that they felt these children could be included with special educators being more cautious. This was based on Davis' (1989) argument that special educators tend to be more protective of their students. It was also thought that the reverse could be possible; that classroom teachers, fearing the additional responsibility, might be less willing to include this population of students. Neither of these assumptions were supported as no significant differences between these two groups were indicated.

Teachers of students in middle school seem to indicate that it is easier to include students with disabling conditions compared to primary teachers (see Table 22). However, 53 percent of primary teachers take a neutral position, perhaps

because they are unsure or wish to take a politically correct position. As noted in Chapter IV about 30 percent of respondents, representing both categories feel these students would be included with difficulty. It appears that middle school respondents may not be saying including these students gets easier as they get older rather they may be moderately more optimistic. Middle schools have a different configuration than primary schools and responsibility for students is also different. Primary schools have heterogeneous populations of students who are mostly self contained for the school day meaning classroom teachers are responsible for a group of students all day. Middle schools have departmentalization and teachers have responsibility for a greater number of students but for less time. It is interesting to note that this is the opposite of what was found when comparing primary and middle school teachers' perceptions of including students with inappropriate classroom behaviors. In this analysis, primary school teachers were more willing as has been discussed.

It was also thought that there might be differences based on whether or not teachers had piloted inclusion and therefore had first hand experience with handicapped students. It was hypothesized that, if so such experiences might have the transforming effect Giangreco, et. al. (1993) describes. This was not proven true by the data as there were no significant differences between these two groups.

Summary of Findings

In summary, as a group the population of teachers in this study seem to indicate a cautionary posture regarding the issue of inclusion of handicapped students in the mainstream of regular education. Teachers seem to value the separate special

education service delivery model that the school district surveyed currently practices. Teachers also seem to respect and value the different training between classroom and specialized teachers.

Differences were noted between groups of regular and special educators in terms of changing their job description with special educators being less willing. Differences were noted between primary and middle school educators' willingness to include students with inappropriate class behaviors with differences of primary teachers being more willing. Differences were also noted when comparing schools piloting inclusion, those using traditional service delivery and the separate special education facility comparing curriculum and staff teaching models. Respondents in the group representing the separate special education facility seem more cautious than the other groups to implement the models of cooperative learning and teacher and student assistance teams.

Limitations

This study was limited to 160 educators who responded to this survey. All of the individuals were employed by the midwest public school district surveyed. The finding are limited to the educators employed by this district who responded to this survey and any findings of this study should not be applied to other educators in other school districts where student populations may differ and educators may or may not be familiar with or have had experience with inclusionary practices.

Recommendations

Several principles of responsible inclusion that are consistent with the results of this survey have been identified by Mercer and Lane (1994). The goal of special education, regardless of setting, should be to provide the knowledge and skills identified students need to lead full and independent lives. For many students, the best least restrictive environment to accomplish this goal is full inclusion in the regular education classroom. For others, it may mean educational support in special classes for all or part of the school day. The priority must be meeting the needs of the students.

The first axiom Mercer and Lane recommend is that any fundamental change in school policy must begin with consensus among school personnel. Once there is consensus and staff is committed to inclusion, school staff must generate shared definitions of the roles and responsibilities of individual teachers and administrators. Teachers and administrators involved might develop common set of expectations of one another. Individual students could be identified and IEP goals discussed in terms of who, when and where services would be provided. There is a need to secure adequate funding prior to implementation of any inclusion plan as flexibility of funding could diminish serves to students with disabilities.

Some respondents to this survey indicated the need for in-service training prior to implementation of an inclusion model. Mercer and Lane (1994) recognize one of the common obstacles to successful inclusion is inadequate preparation of personnel prior to beginning a program of inclusion. Ongoing staff development is also

recognized as an essential component of responsible inclusion. One option for personnel training is an in-service framework. Several teachers are taught the essentials of one component of inclusion, (e.g., behavior management, collaboration, curriculum modification). These teachers then train the other teachers and provide support in the implementation of that component. This approach promotes continuous, expert training and personnel support at the building level as well as establishes a network of highly skilled teachers (Mercer & Lane, 1994).

Some respondents to this survey did not have an interest in collaborating with colleagues. Collaboration is a vital component of successful inclusion programs. Because collaboration is a voluntary practice, it seems important to identify those teachers who are willing. Those willing then may be trained in effective collaboration skills.

Some inclusion proponents when criticizing current structures in special education, suggest that special education programs have been based on the availabilities of existing programs rather than on specific student needs. Placement decisions should be driven by a student's Individualized Educational Program with placement decisions based on specific student need. Sometimes this will mean the regular education classroom but this may not always be the case.

The respondents to this survey strongly feel the need to maintain a continuum of alternative placements for disabled children. Mercer and Lane (1994) are in agreement stating their feeling that it is reckless to assume that all students' needs can be met adequately in the regular education classroom. They reason that a continuum

of alternative placements provides appropriate choices for educators, parents and students.

<div align="center">Areas of Further Research</div>

Due to the exploratory nature of this research and the use of a non-random sample, generalizations to the larger population of teachers cannot be made. However, a major purpose of this type of research is to generate ideas for further research, and this purpose has been achieved.

Perhaps another study could be done comparing a geographically representative, larger sample of teachers and this might confirm the relationships among variables found in this study. A similar study using a larger number of subjects for each of the subgroups could be done to facilitate further comparisons between subgroups. Another study may seek to compare schools or school districts' employing successful inclusion programs to those who are not. A comparative study of perceptions of attitude and willingness to include students with handicapping conditions between these groups could be done. Another interesting study could examine the perceptions and attitudes of the students involved in programs of inclusion and traditional special services provision. Attitude and perceptions of the success of such programs could be examined by developing scales such as the ones used in this study that would be appropriate for students. It also would be interesting to explore parents' perceptions of the effects of inclusion programs on their children and this could be compared to the students' perceptions. It would be interesting to

assess if inclusion programs are more successful with children in a specific age group and if this is so, where, when and why this success is or is not sustained.

The assessment scale can be completely reworked as can the funding scale used in the pilot study. Additional valid and reliable instruments could be administered to subjects to increase internal validity by decreasing error variance. Additional measures could be taken to control sources of extraneous variance. Specific experience with various teaching and curriculum models could be determined. A determination could be made as to respondent experience programming for, or being part of a team planning for a child included in a regular classroom.

Finally, experimental research, where data is collected prior to implementing an inclusion model could be obtained. This data could be gathered at the beginning of a school year, prior to implementing a model and again after the intervention has taken place and the researcher could explore possible changes in perceptions of specific respondents after implementation of inclusion efforts.

In conclusion, inclusion in the general education classroom can be an appropriate goal for many disabled students. This goal can be achieved in a responsible manner when goals and decisions are shared by all concerned, school personnel is adequately trained, voluntary participation is respected and all involved focus on meeting the needs of identified students.

APPENDIX A.

PILOT STUDY SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

April 30, 1993

Dear {FIELD}School ~ Teachers:

{FIELD}School ~ has approved a request by Mrs. Roxanne Levin to conduct a research project as part of her doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago.

As a teacher in this district, Mrs. Levin knows your time is limited, but hopes you will take some time over the next few days to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Should you have any questions about this study, please call Mrs. Levin at 272-9644.

Sincerely yours,

{FIELD}Name ~
Director, Research & Evaluation

JL/md

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student in educational psychology and I am very interested in the idea of inclusion of children with disabilities in the school system. State and local school districts are examining the advantages and disadvantages of the concept of inclusion. Enclosed is a pilot survey. The purpose of this survey is to gain information on your attitudes and needs regarding inclusion. I am requesting your assistance to help me achieve this goal. Your participation is this survey is voluntary and will help ensure that your perspective is considered. The majority of the questions are easily completed by circling your preference.

Please return your completed survey in the envelope provided. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Roxanne Levin

Currently special education services are provided in the least restrictive environment appropriate for a student's specific learning needs as mandated by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Placement decisions are made on an individual basis and considered after a team approved Individualized Education Program is developed for a child. A continuum of service possibilities exists ranging from a self contained facility to a fully integrated regular classroom setting.

Full inclusion is a concept meaning including in regular education classes, all students with mild, moderate and severe handicapping conditions. No student would be excluded from his home school. No self contained classes would exist in neighborhood schools and special education supports would be provided within the context of the regular education class.

The following are statements regarding the issue of implementing a full inclusion model of maintaining current structures in Special Education. Please circle the number that best expresses your feelings about each statement.

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	As long as there are disabled children, there will be a need for separate special education.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in a self contained special education classroom because of smaller class size.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Full inclusion of disabled students in the regular classroom can teach all children to understand individual differences.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	In order for some disabled children to participate in an academic curriculum extra attention from a regular teacher would be required.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	School inclusion of disabled students prepares students for integrated community living	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Necessary supportive services are best provided when the student remains in the regular classroom.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
7. Disabled children need the support of a peer group of others with similar needs rather than being placed into the mainstream.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8. Regular educators are a skilled as special educators in handling children with special physical-motor needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9. Separate special education for disabled students violates civil rights.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10. Disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in special education because of the training of special education teachers.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
11. Disabled children would experience failure in regular education classrooms without a special education tailored to their needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
12. Children with severe impairments should attend their neighborhood schools, in regular classrooms.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
13. Disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in special education because there is a greater emphasis on parental cooperation.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
14. Regular educators are skilled as special educators in handling children with special cognitive-intellectual needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
15. All children can learn in the mainstream of school life.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Key: [1] = Strongly agree
[2] = Agree
[3] = Neutral
[4] = Disagree
[5] = Strongly disagree

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
16. School districts should provide in-service training on inclusion practices prior to implementation of school based inclusion efforts.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
17. There needs to be flexibility in class size based on the individuals' needs of students.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
18. Regular educators are as skilled as special educators in handling children with special social-emotional needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
19. In general, the goals of special education do not parallel the goals of the regular school curriculum.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
20. Each school should develop a specific time-line toward full inclusion of all students.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
21. School districts should maintain more restrictive placement options (e.g., self contained special education classes.)	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
22. The superintendent should encourage all schools to increase their inclusion efforts.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
23. School staff has to be committed for inclusion to be successful.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
24. Rather than "full inclusion" of every handicapped child in a regular education classroom, the Individuals With Disabilities Act, which provides a continuum of placement from most restrictive to least restrictive, should be further developed.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Below are several nationwide models for implementing inclusion. Please rate each model as though your district were to implement full inclusion.

Key: [1] = Most likely to succeed
[2] = Likely to succeed
[3] = Neutral
[4] = Likely to fail
[5] = Most likely to fail

		Most likely to succeed	Likely to succeed	Neutral	Likely to fail	Most likely to fail
1.	A 5 year phase-in model gradually including all district schools	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Begin at kindergarten and include one grade each year	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	A pilot K-5 school	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	A pilot middle school	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	All district schools simultaneously become inclusive schools.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Job Description

If there is school restructuring for inclusion often there is a change in the role of all teachers. Classroom teachers, specialized teachers and support staff all assume broader responsibilities.

Using the scale below please circle the number that describes how willing you are to:

Key: [1] = **Very willing**
[2] = **Willing**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Unwilling**
[5] = **Very unwilling**

		Very willing	Willing	Neutral	Unwilling	Very unwilling
1.	Collaborate with other staff members:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Consult with other staff members:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Co-teach in a classroom:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Work with a small group of students:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	Tutor individual students:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Create a single job description "teacher" for all professional educators including support service providers:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Have all professional educators collaborate to plan for, teach and share responsibility for all students in a school:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Be responsible for facilitating an inclusion in-service program for all teachers and para-professionals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9.	Assist teachers with individualized, inclusion oriented, instructional improvement goals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	Manage support service paperwork to aid inclusion.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
11.	How willing would you be to have your school be one of full inclusion?	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Curriculum Models

Full inclusion leads to more heterogeneous classroom populations. As a result, teachers are adapting their classrooms to accommodate wide diversity among students in physical, intellectual, psychological, and social characteristics. Along with addressing the unique needs of each class member, the challenge is to maintain education excellence for all students.

Cooperative learning is a model where students work together in small heterogeneous teams. The team members are interdependent. They must work together in order to accomplish individual and group goals.

Mastery learning is a combination of small group and individualized instruction. Each student has individual objectives that are taught and tested through criterion referenced tests. If the objective isn't met, additional teaching occurs and retests are administered.

An adaptive learning environment model involves a variety of instructional methods and learning experiences that are matched to the learner's characteristics and needs. The curriculum combines teacher directed and informational teaching.

Using the scale below please circle your response to each statement about each model.

Key:
[1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

	Cooperative Learning					Mastery Learning					Adaptive Learning				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. requires teacher training prior to implementation.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2. results in added responsibilities for teachers.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3. requires curriculum change.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4. is an effective way to meet current curriculum goals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5. requires additional financial resources.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6. results in lowering student achievement expectations.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7. would increase the self esteem of special needs children.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8. would require a change in assessment practices.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Staff Teaching Models

Successful inclusion involves educators working together in new ways. Several teaching models are presented below.

Co-Teaching or team teaching is a concept where a regular education teacher and a special education teacher are assigned to a class of children with and without disabilities for all or part of the day.

Consultation is a model where a special education teacher communicates with a regular education teacher to assist in modifying curriculum for students with disabilities. The regular education teacher directly does the teaching.

Teacher and student assistance teams involve a group of people coming together to problem-solve and assist a teacher or a student requiring help. The team might include two or more people consisting of students, administrators, parents, classroom teachers, and special service personnel.

Using the scale below please circle your response to each statement about each model.

Key:
[1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

	Co-teaching	Consultation	Teacher and Student Assistance Teams
1. requires training prior to implementation.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
2. requires an additional time commitment on the part of the teachers involved.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
3. results in additional responsibility for the teachers involved.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
4. results in lowering expectations for students.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
5. requires additional financial resources.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
6. eliminates the need for ability grouping.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
7. will help facilitate communication between teachers.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
8. reduces the stigma often associated with special needs children.	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]	[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Assessment

Using the scale below please circle the number of the category that best describes your feelings about each statement.

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	Familiar categories of exceptionality (e.g., L.D., B.D., E.M.H.) have limited value in planning educational programs for exceptional children.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	If we change the current classification system for identifying handicapping conditions, many students will fall through the cracks.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Intelligence testing procedures over identify handicapped children because they aren't sensitive to cultural differences.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Assessment should be directly related to social competencies such as peer relationships, on task behavior, ability to ask and answer questions effectively and ability to work independently.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	The current classification system for identifying handicapping conditions leads to fragmentation of services.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Criterion Referenced Assessment has direct classroom applicability in terms of determining specific intervention.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Assessment for identification of disabilities should be directly related to curriculum areas of reading, written expression, spelling and math.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Intelligence tests show a strong relationship with achievement in the classroom.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9.	One criterion for determining whether a student has a mild educational disability could be the degree that the problem exhibited cannot be resolved in the regular classroom.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	Current intelligence testing procedures miss a significant number of at-risk children who don't fit the criteria for labeling.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Funding

In order to facilitate full inclusion, restructuring of financial resources is often necessary. Please respond to the following statements related to funding.

Using the scale below please circle the number of the category that best describes your feelings about each statement.

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	Regular education and special education funds should be merged into a general school fund that would meet the needs of all students from gifted to severely impaired.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Financial resources should be redistributed by increasing personnel funds (to provide in-class assistance to included students) and reducing transportation funds (as a result of returning students to neighborhood schools).	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Funding should be linked to special programming rather than be linked to assigning disability labels to children in order to identify them for service.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Extra district resources should not be used as an incentive to schools willing to pilot inclusion plans.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Handicapping Conditions

Inappropriate classroom behaviors are an important factor in the referral of students to special education. These children have commonly been referred to as having behavior disorders.

Using the key below, please circle the number that best describes how you feel about each statement.

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	We don't have adequate procedures for a classroom teacher to manage an individual with inappropriate behaviors while at the same time attending to the instructional needs of an entire group.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Regular class placement for B.D. students is a realistic option if the classroom teacher is provided a paraprofessional aid.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	The benefits of appropriate social role models in regular education settings for B.D. students outweighs the disadvantages of including them.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Prior to development of management procedures and strategies, children with inappropriate behaviors should not be considered for inclusive settings.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

If a school district adopts a model of full inclusion, it is possible that students with all levels of disabilities will be returning to neighborhood schools. Please circle the number that best represents how you feel about including students with each of the following needs.

Key: [1] = Included very easily
      [2] = Included easily
      [3] = Neutral
      [4] = Included with difficulty
      [5] = Included with much difficulty

		Included very easily	Included easily	Neutral	Included with difficulty	Included with much difficulty
1.	Mild learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Moderate learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Severe learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Educable mentally retarded	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	Trainable mentally retarded	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Autism	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Severe language disability	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Non-verbal	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9.	Non-ambulatory but cognitively intact	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	Non-ambulatory but cognitively impaired	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
11.	Visually impaired - limited vision	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
12.	Visually impaired - no vision	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
13.	Hearing impaired - sign communication only	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
14.	Hearing impaired - limited hearing	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
15.	Medically fragile	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
16.	Behavior disordered	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
17.	Emotionally disturbed	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
18.	Multiple handicaps	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Descriptive Information

1.   How many years have you been employed as a teacher? _____

2.   Are you employed: [ ] full time   [ ] part time

3.   Which of the following best describes your job:

    (1) [ ] Classroom teacher: Please indicate the grade you teach ___
    (2) [ ] Specialized teacher: a) [ ] B.D.
                                      b) [ ] L.D.
                                      c) [ ] Developmental
                                      d) [ ] Cross Categorical
                                      e) [ ] Foreign Language
                                      f) [ ] Fine Arts
                                      g) [ ] P.E.
    (3) [ ] School psychologist
    (4) [ ] Speech and language pathologist
    (5) [ ] School social worker
    (6) [ ] Teacher's aide
    (7) [ ] Administrator
    (8) [ ] Occupational therapist
    (9) [ ] Physical therapist

4.   What best describes your level of education?

    (1) [ ] college graduate
    (2) [ ] graduate work toward Master's degree
    (3) [ ] Master's degree
    (4) [ ] Educational Specialist
    (5) [ ] graduate work toward Ph.D.
    (6) [ ] Ph.D.
    (7) [ ] graduate work toward Ed.D.
    (8) [ ] Ed.D.
    (9) [ ] Other

5.   Are you: 1. [ ] male   2. [ ] female

6.   What is the year of your birth?   19___

7.   Please check the box containing the statement(s) that indicate how you learned
      about the concept of inclusion.

    (1) [ ] No prior knowledge
    (2) [ ] School based in-service
    (3) [ ] District wide in-service
    (4) [ ] Community lecture
    (5) [ ] Professional literature e.g., journal article
    (6) [ ] Parent organization
    (7) [ ] Other: Please describe _____

Is there anything you would like to add about the issue of inclusion? If so, please use the space below.

Your time and cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated. Please return you completed survey in the envelope provided.

APPENDIX B.

FINAL STUDY SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

November 3, 1993

Dear {FIELD}School~ Teachers:

{FIELD}School~ has approved a request by Roxanne Levin to conduct a research project as part of her doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago. Her research is under the auspices of Loyola University. The questions have been generated from her study of inclusion in conjunction with Loyola staff. She hopes that her work will be valuable for school districts and help them understand this important special education issue.

As a teacher in this district, Mrs. Levin knows your time is limited, but hopes you will take some time over the next few days to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Should you have any questions about this study, please call Mrs. Levin at 272-9644.

Sincerely,

{FIELD}Name~
Director
Research, Evaluation and Planning

JL/md

Encl.

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student in educational psychology and I am very interested in the idea of inclusion of children with disabilities in the school system. State and local school districts are examining the advantages and disadvantages of the concept of inclusion. Enclosed is a pilot survey. The purpose of this survey is to gain information on your attitudes and needs regarding inclusion. I am requesting your assistance to help me achieve this goal. Your participation is this survey is voluntary and will help ensure that your perspective is considered. The majority of the questions are easily completed by circling your preference.

Please return your completed survey in the envelope provided. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Roxanne Levin

Currently special education services are provided in the least restrictive environment appropriate for a student's specific learning needs as mandated by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Placement decisions are made on an individual basis and considered after a team approved Individualized Education Program is developed for a child. A continuum of service possibilities exists ranging from a self contained facility to a fully integrated regular classroom setting.

Full inclusion is a concept meaning including in regular education classes, all students with mild, moderate and severe handicapping conditions. No student would be excluded from his home school. No self contained classes would exist in neighborhood schools and special education supports would be provided within the context of the regular education class.

The following are statements regarding the issue of implementing a full inclusion model of maintaining current structures in Special Education. Please circle the number that best expresses your feelings about each statement.

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	As long as there are disabled children, there will be a need for separate special education.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in a self contained special education classroom because of smaller class size.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Full inclusion of disabled students in the regular classroom can teach all children to understand individual differences.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	School inclusion of disabled students prepares students for integrated community living	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	Necessary supportive services are best provided when the student remains in the regular classroom.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Disabled children need the support of a peer group of others with similar needs rather than being placed into the mainstream.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Regular educators are a skilled as special educators in handling children with special physical-motor needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Separate special education for disabled students violates civil rights.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Key: [1] = **Strongly agree**
[2] = **Agree**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Disagree**
[5] = **Strongly disagree**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
9.	Disabled children have greater opportunities to succeed in special education because of the training of special education teachers.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	Disabled children would experience failure in regular education classrooms without a special education tailored to their needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
11.	Children with severe impairments should attend their neighborhood schools, in regular classrooms.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
12.	Regular educators are skilled as special educators in handling children with special cognitive-intellectual needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
13.	All children can learn in the mainstream of school life.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
14.	Regular educators are as skilled as special educators in handling children with special social-emotional needs.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
15.	Each school should develop a specific time-line toward full inclusion of all students.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
16.	School districts should maintain more restrictive placement options (e.g., self contained special education classes.)	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
17.	The superintendent should encourage all schools to increase their inclusion efforts.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
18.	Rather than "full inclusion" of every handicapped child in a regular education classroom, the Individuals With Disabilities Act, which provided a continuum of placement from most restrictive to least restrictive, should be further developed.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Below are several nationwide models for implementing inclusion. Please rate each model as though your district were to implement full inclusion.

Key: [1] = **Most likely to succeed**
[2] = **Likely to succeed**
[3] = **Neutral**
[4] = **Likely to fail**
[5] = **Most likely to fail**

		Most likely to succeed	Likely to succeed	Neutral	Likely to fail	Most likely to fail
1.	A 5 year phase-in model gradually including all district schools	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Begin at kindergarten and include one grade each year	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	A pilot K-5 school	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	A pilot middle school	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	All district schools simultaneously become inclusive schools.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Job Description

If there is school restructuring for inclusion often there is a change in the role of all teachers. Classroom teachers, specialized teachers and support staff all assume broader responsibilities.

Using the scale below please circle the number that describes how willing you are to:

Key:
    [1] = Very willing
    [2] = Willing
    [3] = Neutral
    [4] = Unwilling
    [5] = Very unwilling

		Very willing	Willing	Neutral	Unwilling	Very unwilling
1.	Collaborate with other staff members:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Consult with other staff members:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Co-teach in a classroom:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Work with a small group of students:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	Tutor individual students:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Have all professional educators collaborate to plan for, teach and share responsibility for all students in a school:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Be responsible for facilitating an inclusion in-service program for all teachers and para-professionals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Assist teachers with individualized, inclusion oriented, instructional improvement goals.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9.	Manage support service paperwork to aid inclusion.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	How willing would you be to have your school be one of full inclusion?	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Staff Teaching Models

Successful inclusion involves educators working together in new ways. Several teaching models are presented below.

Key: **1 = Co-teaching** or team teaching is a concept where a regular education teacher and a special education teacher are assigned to a class of children with and without disabilities for all or part of the day.

2 = Consultation is a model where a special education teacher communicates with a regular education teacher to assist in modifying curriculum for students with disabilities. The regular education teacher directly does the teaching.

3 = Teacher & student assistance teams involve a group of teacher(s) and students coming together to problem solve and assist a teacher and or a student requiring help. The team might include two or more people consisting of students, administrators, parents, classroom teachers, and special services personnel.

Using the scale above please circle the number(s) that best describe you feelings about each model:

		Co-teaching	Consultation	Teacher & student assistance teams
1.	Which model(s) require the most training prior to implementation?	[1]	[2]	[3]
2.	Which model(s) require the greatest time commitment on the part of the teachers involved?	[1]	[2]	[3]
3.	Which model(s) result in the greatest responsibility for the teachers involved?	[1]	[2]	[3]
4.	Which model(s) will lower student expectations the most?	[1]	[2]	[3]
5.	Which model(s) requires the most additional financial resources?	[1]	[2]	[3]
6.	Which model(s) are most likely to eliminate the need for ability grouping?	[1]	[2]	[3]
7.	Which model(s) are most likely to help facilitate communication between teachers?	[1]	[2]	[3]
8.	Which model(s) are most likely to reduce the stigma often associated with special needs children?	[1]	[2]	[3]

Curriculum Models

Full inclusion leads to more heterogeneous classroom populations. As a result, teachers are adapting their classrooms to accommodate wide diversity among students in physical, intellectual, psychological, and social characteristics. Along with addressing the unique needs of each class member, the challenge is to maintain educational excellence for all students.

Key: **1 = Cooperative learning** is a model where students work together in small heterogeneous teams. The team members are interdependent. They must work together in order to accomplish individual and group goals.

2 = Mastery learning is a combination of small group and individualized instruction. Each student has individual objectives that are taught and tested through criterion referenced tests. If the objective isn't met, additional teaching occurs and retests are administered.

3 = An adaptive learning environment model involves a variety of instructional methods and learning experiences that are matched to the learner's characteristics and needs. The curriculum combines teacher directed and informal teaching.

Using the scale above please circle your response to each statement about each model or models

Which model(s):

		Cooperative learning	Mastery learning	Adaptive learning
1.	requires teacher training prior to implementation.	[1]	[2]	[3]
2.	results in added responsibilities for teachers.	[1]	[2]	[3]
3.	requires curriculum change.	[1]	[2]	[3]
4.	is an effective way to meet current curriculum goals.	[1]	[2]	[3]
5.	requires additional financial resources.	[1]	[2]	[3]
6.	results in lowering student achievement expectations.	[1]	[2]	[3]
7.	would increase the self-esteem of special needs children.	[1]	[2]	[3]
8.	would require a change in assessment practices.	[1]	[2]	[3]

Assessment

Using the scale below please circle the number of the category that best describes your feelings about each statement.

Key: [1] = Strongly agree
      [2] = Agree
      [3] = Neutral
      [4] = Disagree
      [5] = Strongly disagree

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	Familiar categories of exceptionality (e.g., L.D.,B.D., E.M.H.) have limited value in planning educational programs for exceptional children.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	If we change the current classification system for identifying handicapping conditions, many students will fall through the cracks.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Intelligence testing procedures over identify handicapped children because they aren't sensitive to cultural differences.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Assessment should be directly related to social competencies such as peer relationships, on task behavior.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	The current classification system for identifying handicapping conditions leads to fragmentation of services.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Criterion Referenced Assessment has direct classroom applicability in terms of determining specific intervention.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	One criterion for determining whether a student has a mild educational disability could be the degree that the problem exhibited cannot be resolved in the regular classroom.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Current intelligence testing procedures miss a significant number of at-risk children who don't fit the criteria for labeling.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Handicapping Conditions

Inappropriate classroom behaviors are an important factor in the referral of students to special education. These children have commonly been referred to as having behavior disorders.

Using the key below, please circle the number that best describes how you feel about each statement.

Key: [1] = Strongly agree
[2] = Agree
[3] = Neutral
[4] = Disagree
[5] = Strongly disagree

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. We don't have adequate procedures for a classroom teacher to manage an individual with inappropriate behaviors while at the same time attending to the instructional needs of an entire group.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2. Regular class placement for B.D. students is a realistic option if the classroom teacher is provided a paraprofessional aid.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3. The benefits of appropriate social role models in regular education settings for B.D. students outweighs the disadvantages of including them.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4. Prior to development of management procedures and strategies, children with inappropriate behaviors should not be considered for inclusive settings.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

If a school district adopts a model of full inclusion, it is possible that students with all levels of disabilities will be returning to neighborhood schools. Please circle the number that best represents how you feel about including students with each of the following needs.

Key: [1] = Included very easily
     [2] = Included easily
     [3] = Neutral
     [4] = Included with difficulty
     [5] = Included with much difficulty

		Included very easily	Included easily	Neutral	Included with difficulty	Included with much difficulty
1.	Mild learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
2.	Moderate learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
3.	Severe learning disabilities	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
4.	Educable mentally retarded	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
5.	Trainable mentally retarded	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
6.	Autism	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
7.	Severe language disability	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
8.	Non-verbal	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
9.	Non-ambulatory but cognitively intact	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
10.	Non-ambulatory but cognitively impaired	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
11.	Visually impaired - limited vision	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
12.	Visually impaired - no vision	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
13.	Hearing impaired - sign communication only	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
14.	Hearing impaired - limited hearing	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
15.	Medically fragile	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
16.	Behavior disordered	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
17.	Emotionally disturbed	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
18.	Multiple handicaps	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Descriptive Information

1. How many years have you been employed as a teacher? _____

2. Are you employed: [ ] full time   [ ] part time

3. Which of the following best describes your job:

   (1) [ ] Classroom teacher: Please indicate the grade you teach _____
   (2) [ ] Specialized teacher: a) [ ] B.D.
                                     b) [ ] L.D.
                                     c) [ ] Developmental
                                     d) [ ] Cross Categorical
                                     e) [ ] Foreign Language
                                     f) [ ] Reading Specialist
                                     g) [ ] Fine Arts
                                     h) [ ] P.E.
   (3) [ ] School psychologist
   (4) [ ] Speech and language pathologist
   (5) [ ] School social worker
   (6) [ ] Teacher's aide
   (7) [ ] Administrator
   (8) [ ] Occupational therapist
   (9) [ ] Physical therapist

4. What best describes your level of education?

   (1) [ ] Some college
   (2) [ ] College graduate
   (3) [ ] Graduate work toward Master's degree
   (4) [ ] Master's degree
   (5) [ ] Educational Specialist
   (6) [ ] Graduate work toward Ph.D.
   (7) [ ] Ph.D.
   (8) [ ] Graduate work toward Ed.D.
   (9) [ ] Ed.D.

5. Are you: 1. [ ] male   2. [ ] female

6. What is the year of your birth?   19___

7. Please check the box containing the statement(s) that indicate how you learned about the concept of inclusion.

   (1) [ ] No prior knowledge
   (2) [ ] School based in-service
   (3) [ ] District wide in-service
   (4) [ ] Community lecture
   (5) [ ] Professional literature e.g., journal article
   (6) [ ] Parent organization
   (7) [ ] Other: Please describe _____

Is there anything you would like to add about the issue of inclusion? If so, please use the space below.

Your time and cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated. Please return you completed survey in the envelope provided.

REFERENCES

Alreck, P. L. & Settle, R. B. (1985). The Survey Research Handbook. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Anderegg, M. L. (1989). Regular Educators' Responses to Three Issues of the Regular Education Initiative: An Investigation of Regular Educators' Experiences. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

Bloom, B. S. (1976). Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High School: a Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bradfield, H. R., Brown, J., Kaplan, P., Rickert, E., & Stannard, R. (1973). The Special Child in the Regular Classroom. Exceptional Children, 39, 384-390.

Breakthrough or Barricade. (1994, May/June). IEA Advocate, pp. 8-9.

Byrnes, M. (1990). The Regular Education Initiative Debate: A View from the Field. Exceptional Children, 56, 345-351.

Chapman, J. W. (1992). Learning Disabilities in New Zeland: Where Kiwis and Kids with LD can't Fly. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25, 362-367.

Davis, W. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative Debate: its Promises and Problems. Exceptional Children, 55, 440-446.

Davis, W. (1990). Broad Perspectives on the Regular Education Initiative: Response to Byrnes. Exceptional Children, 56, 349-351.

Davis, W. (1991, April). Implications of the Regular Education Initiative Debate for Special Education Teachers. Paper Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children's 69th Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Deno, E. (1978). Educating Children with Emotional, Learning, and Behavior Problems. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Support Systems Project.

Dickman, G. E. (1994). Inclusion: a Storm Sometimes Brings Relief. Perspectives: Orton Dyslexia Society, 20(4), 3-6.

Feldman, E. (1991). Guidelines Regarding Integration of Students with Identified Special Education Needs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343311, EC 300990)

Ferguson, D., Meyer, G., Jeanchild, L., Juniper, L., & Zingo, J. (1992). Figuring out What to Do with the Grownups: How Teachers Make Inclusion "Work" for Students with Disabilities. Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps, 17, 281-226.

Flynn, G. & Kowalczyk-McPhee, B. (1989). A School System in Transition. In W. Stainback, S. Stainback, & M. D. Forest (Eds.), Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education (pp. 29-42). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Freagon, S., Keiser, N., Kincaid, M., Atherton, L., Peters, W., Leininger, R. C. & Doyle, M. (1993). Some Answers for Implementers to the Most Commonly

Asked Questions Regarding the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in General Education. Unpublished manuscript, IL Planning Council on Development Disabilities Grant.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs L. (1988). Response to Wang and Walberg. Exceptional Children, 55, 138-146.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1989). The Yoke of Special Education: How to Break It. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Giangreco, M., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've Counted Jon": Transformational Experiences of Teachers Educating Students with Disabilities. Exceptional Children, 59, 359-372.

Giangreco, M. F. & Putnam, J. (1991). Supporting the Education of Students with Severe Disabilities in Regular Education Environments. In L. H. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), Critical Issues in the Lives of Persons with Severe Disabilities (pp. 245-270). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Gilhoal, T. (1976). Changing Public Policies: Roots and Forces. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), Mainstreaming: Origins and Implications (pp. 8-13). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.

Greenburg, David E. (1987). A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education: a Review for Administrators. Reston, VA:

The Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 211)

Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., Loyd, J. W., & Mckinney, J. D. (1988). Introduction to the Series: Questions about the Regular Education Initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 3-5.

Harasymuv, S. J., & Horne, M. D. (1976). Teacher Attitudes Toward Handicapped Children and Regular Class Integration. Journal of Special Education, 10, 393-400.

Hegarty, S., & Pocklinton, K., with Lucas, D. (1981). Educating Pupils with Special Needs in the Ordinary Schools. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities.

Higgo, R. W. (1975). Attitude Formation Contact or Information? Exceptional Children, 41, 496-497.

Integration of Students with Special Needs into Regular Classroom: Policies and Practices That Work. (1992, May/June). IEA ADVOCATE, pp. 1-77.

Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Jewell M. (1990). Special Education and the Regular Education Initiative: Basic Assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56, 479-491.

Kauffman, J. M., Gerber, M. M. & Semmel, M. I. (1988). Arguable Assumptions Underlying the Regular Education Initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 6-11.

Keogh, B. K. (1988). Improving Services for Problem Learners: Rethinking and Restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 19-22.

Keogh, B. K. (1994). What the Special Education Research Agenda Should Look like in the Year 2000. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 9(2), 62-69.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research. Orlando: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Larrivee, B. (1981). Effect of Inservice Training Intensity on Teachers' Attitude Toward Mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48, 34-39.

Larrivee, B. (1982). Factors Underlying Regular Classroom Teachers' Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 374-379.

Lieberman, L. (1985). Special and Regular Education: a Merger Made in Heaven? Exceptional Children, 51, 513-517.

Lieberman, L. (1992). Preserving Special Education for Those Who Need It. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education, Divergent Perspectives (pp. 13-25). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lieberman, L. M. (1988). Preserving Special Education for Those Who Need it. Dewtonville, MA: Glo Worm.

Lerner, J. (1987). The Regular Education Initiative: Some Unanswered Questions. Learning Disabilities Focus, 3, 3-7.

Leyser, Y. & Kapperman, G. (1993). Teacher Support for Mainstreaming: Variables Associated with Their Attitudes. Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Quarterly, 42(2), 7-15.

Lilly, S. (1986). The Relationship Between General and Special Education: A New Face on an Old Issue. Counterpoint, 6, 10.

Lipsky, D. K. & Gartner, A. (1992). Achieving Full Inclusion: Placing the Student at the Center of Educational Reform. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education: Divergent Perspectives (pp. 3-12). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Mather, N. & Roberts, R. (1994). The Return of Students with Learning Disabilities to Regular Classrooms. Perspectives: Orton Dyslexia Society, 20(4), 3-6.

Mckinney, J. D. & Hocult, A. M. (1988). The Need for Policy Analysis in Evaluating the Regular Education Initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 12-17.

Mills v. Washington DC Board of Education, 348 F. Supp. 866 (1972).

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Pearpoint, J., & Forest, M. (1992). Forward. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Curriculum Considerations in Inclusive Classrooms: Facilitating Learning for All Students (pp. xv-viii). Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Orton Dyslexia Society. (1994). Perspectives on Inclusion [Special Issue]. Perspective: Orton Dyslexia Society, 20(4).

Raynes, M., Snell, M. & Sailor, W. (1990). A Fresh Look at Categorical Programs for Children with Special Needs. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 326-331.

Regular Education Initiative a Statement by the Teacher Education Division Council

    for Exceptional Children. (1986). Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 198-

    197.

Reynolds, B. J., & Birch, J. W. (1988). Adaptive Mainstreaming: A Primer for

    Teachers and Principals (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Reyonold, M. C., & Wang, M. C. (1983). Restructuring Special School Programs:

    a Position Paper. Policy Studies Review, 2, 189-212.

Ruttman, A., Forest, M. (1986). With a Little Help from My Friends: The

    Integration Facilitator at Work. Entourage, 1, 24-33.

School District 65. (1990). 122 Documents Illinois Revised Statutes 34-1.02.

    Documentation presented at inservice training of School District 65, Evanston,

    IL.

Shatel, J. R., Iano, R. P., & Mcgettingan, J. F. (1972). Teacher Attitudes

    Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children. Exceptional

    Children, 38, 677-683.

Shepard, L. A. (1987). The New Push for Excellence: Widening the Schism

    Between Regular and Special Education. Exceptional Children, 53, 327-329.

Sigmon, S. (1983). The History and Future of Educational Segregation. Journal for

    Special Educators, 19, 1-13.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High

    School. Boston: Houghton Mifflen.

Staff. (1993, March/April). [Special issue]. L.D.A. Newsbrief, 28(2).

Staff. (1993, May/June). Position Paper on Full Inclusion of all Students with Learning Disabilities in the Regular Education Classroom. L.D.A. Newsbrief, 28(3), 18-19.

Staff. (1993-94, Fall/Winter). [Special issue]. L.D.A. Scope, 25(2).

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1972). Teaching in Inclusive Classroom Communities: Curriculum Design, Adaptation and Delivery. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1985). The Merger of Special and Regular Education: Can it be Done? Exceptional Children, 51, 517-521.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1987). Integration Versus Cooperation: A Commentary on "Educating Children with Learning Problems: A Shared Responsibility." Exceptional Children, 54, 66-68.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1992). Curriculum Considerations in Inclusive Classroom: Facilitating Learning for All Students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1994). A Rational for the Merger of Special and Regular Education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

Stainback, W., Stainback S., & Bunch, G. (1989). Introduction and Historical Background. In W. Stainback, S. Stainback & M. D. Forest (Eds.), Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education (pp. 3-14). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Taylor, R. L. & Sternberg L. (1989). Exceptional Children: Integrating Research and Teaching. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Thousand, J. & Villa, R. (1990). Sharing Expertise and Responsibilities Through Teaching Teams. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support Networks for Inclusive Schooling: Integrated and Interdependent Education (pp. 151-166). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Thousand, J. & Villa R. (1990). Strategies for Educating Learners with Severe Disabilities Within Their Local Home Schools and Communities Focus on Exceptional Children, 23, 1-24.

Thousand, J. & Villa, R. (1991). A Futuristic View of the Rei: A Response to Jenkins, Pious, and Jewell. Exceptional Children, 57, 556-564.

Trunbull, H.R., IL. (1990). Free Appropriate Public Education: The Law and Children with Disabilities. Denver: Love.

U.S. Department of Education. (1988). Tenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Educator of the Handicapped Act. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1992). Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act Washington. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vergason, G. A., & Anderegg, M. L. (1992). Preserving the Least Restrictive Environment. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial Issues

Confronting Special Education: Divergent Perspectives (pp. 45-54). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wagner, M. (1989). The School Programs and School Performance of Secondary School Students Classifies as Leaning Disabled: Finding from the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students. Menlo Park, CA: Sri International.

Wagner, M. & Shaver, D. M. (1989). Educational Programs and Achievement of Secondary Special Education Students: Finding From the National Longitudinal Transition Study. Menlo Park, CA: Sri International.

Wang, M. & Walberg H. (1988). Four Fallacies of Segregationism. Exceptional Children, 55, 128-137.

Wang, M. C. (1980). Adaptive Instruction: Building on Diversity. Theory into Practice, 19, 122-127.

Wang, M. C. & Birch, J. W. (1984). Effective Special Education in Regular Classes. Exceptional Children, 50, 391-398.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Rethinking Special Education. Educational Leadership, pp. 26-31.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. & Walberg, H. J. (1987). Repairing the Second System for Students with Special Needs. Paper presented at the Winspread Conference on the Education of Children with Special Needs, Racine, WI.

Williams, W., Fox, T., Thousand, J. & Fox, W. (1990). Level of Acceptance and Implementation of Best Practices in the Education of Students with Severe

Handicaps in Vermont. <u>Education and Training in Mental Retardation</u>, <u>25</u>, 120-131.

<u>Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools</u>. (1992). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

York, J. & Vandercook, T. (1990). Strategies for Achieving an Integrated Education for Middle School Students with Severe Disabilities. <u>Remedial and Special Education</u>, <u>11</u>(5), 6-16.

Zirkel, P. (1990). Backlash Threatens special Education. <u>Education Week</u>, <u>9</u>(40), 64.

VITA

The author, Roxanne Beth Weiss Levin, is the daughter of Homer Leo Weiss and Miriam (Fuenfer) Weiss. She was born on January 21, 1951 in Chicago, Illinois.

Her elementary school education was received in the public schools of Chicago, Illinois. Her secondary education was completed in 1968 at Stephen Mather High School, Chicago, Illinois.

In 1972 she received the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education degree, with honors, from the University of Illinois. Her major was special education with a concentration in the area of Learning Disabilities. In 1987, she received her Masters of Education degree from the Erikson Institute. In 1989, she enrolled in a doctoral program in the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology at Loyola University Chicago.

The author began teaching learning disabilities in Hoffman Estates, Illinois, in 1972. There she also participated in creating an early intervention program for the Schaumburg, Hoffman Estates Community. In 1973 she took time off to begin her family and resumed work for the Evanston Public School System in 1987, when she worked in an early childhood screening program. In addition to this position, in 1989 she resumed teaching a primary learning disabled population in the Evanston Public Schools. While at Willard Public School in Evanston, Illinois she co-authored an Illinois state grant proposal on inclusion, which provided money to further inclusion

169

efforts at Willard School. She also has implemented an inclusion plan for special education students at Willard.

She has also helped organize the sixth annual seminar series on Children and Learning for the Center for Children and Families at Loyola University Chicago. She secured speakers for the series of three discussions on inclusion. In addition, she helped plan and implement the second annual Anne M. Juhasz Conference on Families on the topic of inclusion. Currently she is helping to plan the seventh annual seminar series, Bridges for Communication, Year III at Loyola University Chicago, further exploring aspects of inclusion.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Roxanne Beth Weiss Levin has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Martha Ellen Wynne, Co-Director
Associate Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Carol Harding, Co-Director
Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Jack Kavanagh
Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Lenore Weissmann
Director, Special Projects, and
Director, Infant-Parent Program, Center for Children and Families
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_11/28/94_
Date

_11/28/94_
Date

Carol Harding
Co-Director's Signature

Martha Ellen Wynne
Co-Director's Signature