DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 215 EC 307 908

AUTHOR Romano, Kathryn; Chambliss, Catherine
TITLE K-12 Teachers' and Administrators' Attitudes toward Inclusive Educational Practices.
PUB DATE 2000-00-00
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes toward Disabilities; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Student Placement; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship; Teacher Surveys; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

In this study, 28 K-12 educators and administrators were surveyed about their beliefs concerning the inclusion of students with special needs in the general education classroom. Participants were asked to respond to a survey that measured their beliefs about the implementation of inclusive learning and the academic and social implications of this type of educational setting on the general education students and their peers with disabilities. There were no significant differences on the three subscales (special needs benefits, general student benefits, and teacher benefits scales) when general and special educators were compared. There were also no significant differences found between those with high and low levels of teaching experiences on the three subscales. Teachers did not show differential beliefs about inclusion based on their teaching experiences or the student population with which they work. Responses to individual items suggest differences among those working in rural, suburban, and urban communities, and differences between those teaching in elementary and secondary schools. Elementary educators had more experience working in inclusive settings and enjoyed working with general education students and students with special needs in inclusive settings more than secondary educators did. The survey used is included. (Contains 20 references.) (Author/CR)

K-12 Teachers' and Administrators' Attitudes Toward Inclusive Educational Practices

Kathryn A. Romano

Catherine Chambliss

Ursinus College

2000

Abstract

In this study twenty-eight K-12 educators and administrators were surveyed about their beliefs concerning the inclusion of special needs students in the general education classroom. Participants were asked to respond to a survey that measured their beliefs about the implementation of inclusive learning and the academic and social implications of this type of educational setting on the general education students and their special needs peers. There were no significant differences on the three sub-scales (Special Needs Benefits, General Student Benefits and Teacher Benefits scales) when general and special educators were compared. There were also no significant differences found between those with high and low levels of teaching experience on the three sub-scales. Teachers did not show differential beliefs about inclusion based on their teaching experience or the student population with which they work. Responses to individual items suggest differences among those working in rural, suburban, and urban communities, and differences between those teaching in elementary and secondary schools.

Introduction

According to the United States Department of Education, forty-five percent of all special needs students between the ages of six and twenty-one were fully included in general education classes in 1997 (Lipsky and Gartner, 1998). Full inclusion refers to the placement of all students, those with and without disabilities, in the same classrooms. Special needs students are considered equal members of the general education class in a fully inclusive environment. The classroom teacher or assistant provides any necessary special education services within the general education class (Allen, 1999). Other types of inclusion include random inclusion, clustered inclusion, and mainstreaming. Random inclusion involves the random assignment of special needs students to general education classrooms. Clustered inclusion entails the placement of special needs students into a specific number of classrooms at each grade level. Mainstreaming is considered to be partial inclusion; it involves the assignment of special needs students to a special education resource room for part of the school day. During the other part of the day, special needs students participate in general education classes with their non-disabled peers (Daniel and King, 1997).

Prior to 1975, special needs students were fully integrated into the general education curriculum. Only severely disabled students were not educated with their non-disabled peers. These individuals were placed into institutional settings for education and residential living (Elliot and McKenney, 1998). In 1975,

Congress passed PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This law stated that all special needs students should be placed in a classroom that is considered to be the least restrictive environment within which that student can learn (Daniel and King, 1997).

The least restrictive environment is one that allows special needs students to be educated with their non-disabled peers. Although the law stresses the education of all students in one classroom, the law does allow for the placement of disabled students in segregated settings. Special needs students can be placed in a segregated setting if their disabilities are so severe that adaptations to the general education environment are not adequate to sustain proper levels of education (Yell, 1998).

Congress amended the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and reintroduced it as the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1991 (IDEA). It states that by law, all special needs students have the right to a free and appropriate public education. Students were also granted the right to appropriate assessment and fair hearings and appeals when school districts are developing their educational curriculum (Daniel and King, 1997). According to IDEA, disabled children are eligible for special education and related services. Disabilities designated by the IDEA include autism, hearing impairments, mental retardation, orthopedic impairments, health impairments, emotional impairments, specific learning disabilities, speech and language impairments, and visual impairments (U.S. Department of

Health and Human Services 1997).

The Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1991 was amended in 1997. There were two principles emphasized in the revised act. First that, special needs students should participate in the same educational setting as their non-disabled peers. Its mandated that special needs students be taught within the general education curriculum whenever it is most productive for them to do so (Strong and Sandoval, 1999). The second principle of the revised act states that whenever possible, special needs students should be held accountable in the same ways as their non-disabled peers (Lipsky and Gartner, 1998).

According to inclusion specialists at the Montgomery County Intermediate Unit, there are nine essential components to inclusive educational programs. These include committed leadership, a global vision of success for all students, collaboration between faculty and administration, proper planning and preparation of lessons, proper adaptations to the school curriculum and environment when necessary, peer support, and parental involvement (Merves and Matilisky, 1999).

The National Center for Educational Restructuring and Inclusion surveyed administrators in one thousand school districts throughout the Untied States. Administrators designated seven factors that they believed necessary for the successful implementation of an inclusive school program. These included visionary leadership, collaboration between general and special education teachers, different types of achievement assessment,

support staff that helps to foster the education of special needs students, appropriate funding levels, parental involvement, the use of effective programs as models, and appropriate adaptations in curriculum and instruction (Lipsky and Gartner, 1998).

After conducting a study concerning the benefits of inclusion to special needs students, Idol concluded that there are specific ways to include special needs students within the general education curriculum. One of these involves giving special needs students the opportunity to experience general education programs and the teaching strategies employed in these programs. The general education environment allows special needs students to interact with age-appropriate, non-disabled peers, be involved in all aspects of school life, and helps students learn to interact properly with others in a larger community (Heimann and Margalit, 1998).

Certain practices have been developed to help special needs students succeed within the general education curriculum. These practices include cooperative learning and performance-based assessment. Cooperative learning gives students the opportunity to work with a diverse group of students. It gives students a greater chance for academic success, while they collaborate with others to increase shared knowledge. Performance-based assessment facilitates a working relationship between special educators and their general education counterparts by defining goals for all students and identifying ways to evaluate the performance of all students working in an inclusive classroom. Cooperative learning

and performance-based assessment have been shown to increase self-esteem of middle school students working in an inclusive classroom (Elliot and McKenney, 1998).

According to Leslie Farrow, an important way to support inclusive education is to give students and teachers ownership in their classrooms. This is accomplished by making all students feel that they are integral parts of the classroom. This can be achieved by assigning everyone specific classroom responsibilities throughout the day. It is important to give teachers the confidence to utilize their own experience while working with special needs students and their non-disabled peers in the same environment (Farlow, 1996).

In a 1993 study, Fuchs showed that teachers need specific types of support to increase the effectiveness of their teaching in an inclusive classroom. These supports include proper funding, in-service training, and technical assistance (Katsiyannis, Conderman and Franks, 1995). General education teachers have acknowledged another important type of support for successful inclusive education: the presence of another individual in the classroom to assist the general education teachers throughout the school day (Marks, Schrader and Levine, 1999).

Kathy Allen, a general education teacher involved in an inclusive classroom, stated that special educators are present in her classroom to help support the learning of all of her students (Allen 1999). According to Allen, studies by Doyle, French and Picket, as well as Giangreco, Edelman, Luiselli and McFarland,

showed that school districts have responded to the needs of educators by hiring para-educators to assist teachers in inclusive classrooms. Para-educators have many responsibilities within the inclusive classroom setting. Responsibilities include providing instruction about academic and social skills to the special needs student, helping educators make proper curricular adaptations for the special needs student, helping students manage their behavior on a one-to-one basis, and overseeing the teamwork of the special needs student and his or her classmates during a shared task (Marks, Schrader and Levine, 1999).

Many educators have argued over the positive and negative effects of inclusion on special needs students and their non-disabled peers. Most inclusion supporters believe that inclusion benefits special needs students academically and socially (Daniel and King, 1997).

Academic achievement is one of the benefits of inclusive education most often cited by proponents of inclusion. According to O'Neil's 1993 study, students with special needs who participated in inclusive classrooms experienced higher levels of academic achievement than their disabled peers taught in resource rooms. One reason for the included students' greater success is that they had to work towards higher standards than their peers educated in resource room environments (Daniel and King, 1997).

Consistent with this, in a 1995 study, Baker, Wong and Walberg showed that there was a small increase in the social and academic abilities of special needs students involved in

inclusive classrooms compared to their special needs peers educated in a resource room (Trent, 1998).

Waldron and McLesky's 1998 study showed that students involved in an inclusive setting achieved higher scores on the reading portion of the Basic Skills Samples test than those students taught in resource rooms (Waldron and McLesky, 1998). It is important for special needs students to be given the opportunity to reach and maintain higher levels of academic achievement. Providing opportunity for achievement is imperative because special needs students have less of a chance than their non-disabled peers to graduate from high school, maintain employment, or live without outside assistance (Daniel and King, 1997).

The need to provide optimal socialization of special needs students is another reason for introducing them into the general education curriculum. According to a 1994 study conducted by Wilkes, special needs students are given a greater chance to model age-appropriate social skills in an inclusive classroom than they are within the resource room counterpart. With inclusive classrooms, special needs students are also allowed greater opportunities to interact with peers from their neighborhoods and to make friends with disabled and non-disabled peers (Daniel and King, 1997).

Although much research is strongly supportive of inclusive education practices, there are critics of the inclusive education model. In a 1994 review of inclusive programs, it was also some

argue that often collegiate researchers debate the inclusion issue without any contributions from professionals working within the school system (Katsiyannis, Condermann and Franks, 1995). In their 1994 study, Fuchs and Fuchs concluded that many special education programs are more productive than inclusive programs for some children (Trent, 1998). Muscott and College (1995) argue that the educational system is not yet prepared for full implementation of inclusive education. Opponents feel that the philosophy and implementation of inclusive education is incompatible with the structure of the existing school system (Heiman and Margalit, 1998).

Another criticism of inclusive education is that the placement of a special needs student in an inclusive setting limits that student's opportunity to receive necessary academic support services (Katsiyannis, Conderman and Franks, 1995). It has been shown that learning disabled students have not succeeded academically in inclusive classrooms, even when curricular modifications were implemented to help ensure their success (Klingner et al, 1998).

When discussing inclusion, it is necessary to look at the potential benefits and drawbacks for non-disabled students as well. Teachers, administrators, and parents have questioned the detrimental effects of inclusive education on high achieving non-disabled students. They fear that the presence of special needs peers will hinder the academic progress of high achievers. Refuting this argument, a 1998 study conducted by Klingner and

colleagues showed that high achieving students succeeded in making greater than average gains in reading skills while learning in an inclusive environment. However, while high achieving students succeeded in an inclusive environment, low to average non-disabled students did not show significant progress in reading achievement throughout the school year (Klingner et al, 1998). Therefore, it is important to make sure that the needs of low to average achieving students are not overlooked while they are being educated in an inclusive classroom.

In her article A Quartet of Success Stories: How to Make Inclusion Work, Leslie Farrow shared the story of a group of high school sophomores working in an inclusive classroom. The special needs student made gains in pro-social behavior and academic achievement. The non-disabled peers in the class also benefited from the setting. Classroom procedures were adapted to include cooperative learning groups and collaborative learning strategies. These techniques allowed the class to be run in a more interactive way. The increase in student interaction mobilized students to interact socially with peers across ethnic groups to a much greater degree. The new teaching styles increased the entire class's ability to stay on task during lessons and activities for a greater length of time (Farrow, 1996).

Teachers are faced with the challenge of implementing inclusive practices in their classrooms on a daily basis. Therefore it is imperative to understand how their beliefs affect

the implementation of inclusion and the success of all of their students. Eccles and Wigfield (1985), Pajares (1992), and Stipek (1996) all stated that teachers' beliefs about student academic performance have an effect on student achievement. Teacher beliefs have influenced students' perceptions of their own competence (Wigfield et al 1999). Pajares (1992) went on to say that a teacher who feels a student lacks ability will shy away from giving that student tasks that may be challenging. This is detrimental to the student, because challenging tasks may increase that student's ability to complete even more challenging tasks (Wigfield et al, 1999).

In their 1996 study, Scruggs and Mastropieri said that teachers generally supported teaching in inclusive settings. However, these teachers also felt they did not possess the time, skills, training, or resources necessary to ensure the successful implementation of an inclusive educational program (Mamlin, 1999). An article written by Robert Solomon illustrates an effective inclusive training model. The Baltimore Public School District implemented the model he speaks of in 1995. Fifty general elementary educators were involved in the training sessions for three weeks. These training sessions were designed to help educators gain the necessary information for implementing inclusive education models in their schools.

After the training sessions, teachers introduced suggestions for implementing inclusive programs in a positive manner. Teachers felt it was important for special educators to assist

their general education colleagues when introducing inclusive practices into a school environment. They also believed it was important to have an inclusion expert on hand at all times while a general educator is becoming acclimated to an inclusive setting. Teachers also felt it was necessary to involve all faculty in the planning and implementation of a program (Solomon, 1996).

Teachers are the major instruments through which inclusive education is implemented and sustained. Therefore, it is necessary to understand how teachers feel about working in an inclusive classroom. The purpose of this study was to measure teachers' beliefs about inclusion on three scales. These scales include the Special Needs Student Benefits Scale, the General Education Student Benefits Scale, and the Teacher Benefits Scale. The hypothesis tested in this study was that special educators and those with more teaching experience would score more positively on all three scales than their general education counterparts and those with less teaching experience.

Method

Participants

Twenty-eight teachers and administrators were involved in this study. Twenty-one females and seven males participated. Twelve of the participants were special education teachers and fourteen were general education teachers. Two administrators also participated in the study. The median years of teaching

experience for the participants were sixteen, with a range of one to thirty-seven years teaching. Three of the participants indicated that they worked in rural school districts, fourteen worked in suburban districts, and nine of the participants were employed in urban school districts.

Apparatus

The survey used to measure teacher beliefs about inclusive education was developed specifically for this study. The survey was made up of six demographic questions and nineteen Likert-type items. The statements dealt with issues related to the implementation of inclusive school practices (see Appendix A). The General Student Benefits, Special Needs Student Benefits, and Teacher Benefits scales were generated by combining items that pertained to a particular scale. The General Student Benefits Scale was comprised of an individual's responses to items 7, 17, 22 and 23. The Special Needs Student Benefits scale was made up of responses to items 10 and 11. The Teacher Benefits Scale was made up of responses to items 19, 21, 22 and 23. High scores indicate positive attitudes.

Procedures

The survey was posted to fifty Internet sites that deal with teaching issues. The sites were chosen because of their user-friendly message boards and large audience of K-12 special and general educators. Respondents answered the survey and e-mailed their answers to the researchers.

Results

Directionally adjusted scores on the three sub-scales (Special Needs Student Benefits, General Student Benefits and Teacher Benefits Scales) were calculated for all respondents. A median split on years of teaching experience was used to create high (n=14) and low (n=14) experience groups (the median number of years teaching was 16). Between-subjects t-tests were performed on the three benefits scale scores and responses to individual items in order to assess differences between the high and low teaching experience groups. No significant differences were found on the General Student Benefits Scale, the Teacher Benefits Scale, or on responses to individual items. Scores showed a trend on the Special Needs Student benefits scale ($p=.08$); scores on this scale were higher for those with greater teaching experience.

Between-subjects t-tests were performed on the three benefits scale scores and responses to individual items to assess differences between general education teachers (n=12) and special education teachers (n=14). No significant differences were found on the General Student Benefits Scale, the Special Needs Benefits Scale, and the Teacher Beliefs Scale or on responses to individual items.

An ANOVA was performed on the three benefits scales, as well as responses to individual items, to assess any differences between elementary and secondary teachers. Elementary teachers were those who taught kindergarten through sixth grade (n=15).

Secondary teachers taught grades seven through twelve (n=13). No significant differences were found on the three benefits scales. Significant differences were found on responses to items 9, 20, 21 and 25. A significant difference was shown on item 9 (p=.03). Elementary teachers' mean response to that item was 4.13 with a standard deviation of 1.06. Secondary teachers' mean response to that item was 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.58. A significant difference was found at item 20 (p=.003). Elementary teachers' mean response was 4.87 with a standard deviation of .3519. Secondary teachers' response to the item was 3.3077 with a standard deviation of 1.84. A significant difference was found at item 21 (p=0.01). Elementary teachers' mean response to that item was 4.07 with a standard deviation of 1.44. Secondary teachers' mean response was 2.62 and the standard deviation was 1.50. A significant difference was also found on item 25 (p=.02). Elementary teachers' mean response to item 25 was 4.53 with a standard deviation of .92. Secondary teachers' mean response was 3.30 and the standard deviation was 1.70. Elementary teachers responded more positively to items 9, 20, 21 and 25 than their secondary education colleagues.

An ANOVA test was performed to detect any differences in the three sub-scales and responses to individual items with respect to the participants' gender. There were no differences between males and females on the General Students' Benefits Scale, the Special Needs Students' Benefits Scale, or the Teacher Benefits Scale. There was a significant difference in the mean response of

women (n=21) and men (n=7) on items eight (p=.028) and eighteen (p=.017). The women's mean response to item eight was 4.5714 with a standard deviation of .9258. The mean response for men on the item was 3.4286 with a standard deviation of 1.6183. The mean response of women to item eighteen was 3.5714 with a standard deviation of 1.2479. Men's mean response to item eighteen was 2.2857 with a standard deviation of .7559. The women responded more positively to question eight, while men responded more positively to question eighteen.

An ANOVA test was used to detect any differences in the three sub-scales and responses to individual items with respect to the community surrounding the participants' school. These locations were rural (n=5), suburban (n=14) and urban (n=9). There were no significant differences on sub-scale scores. A significant difference was found at teachers' responses to item eight. Teachers working in a rural community had a mean response of 4.6000 and a standard deviation of .547. Teachers working in suburban communities had a mean response of 3.7143 with a standard deviation of 1.4899. Teachers working in urban communities had a mean response of 5.0000 with no standard deviation. Teachers working in an urban community strongly agreed with item eight. Teachers working in a rural setting agreed with item eight and suburban teachers felt more neutral about the item.

Discussion

The hypothesis tested in this study stated that special educators and those with more teaching experience would have higher scores on the three scales. There were no significant differences on scores for the General Student Benefits Scale, the Special Needs Student Benefits Scale or the Teacher Benefits Scale based on the population that educators worked with. There were no significant differences on the General Student Benefits Scale or the Teacher Benefits Scale scores with respect to teaching experience; however, there was a trend on the Special Needs Student Benefits Scale scores. Those with seventeen or more years of teaching experience had higher scores than their colleagues with sixteen or less years of experience. This indicates that experience is associated with more positive beliefs about the impact of inclusive educational practices on special need students.

There were significant differences between groups with respect to responses to individual survey items. Gender, educational setting, and grades presently teaching all were associated with differences in reactions to specific items. Women agreed moreso than men with item 8 of the survey, which states that the inclusion process is more successful when its implementation is considered part of a schools' overall philosophy (M=4.57, SD=.93). Men felt neutral about the statement (M=3.43, SD=1.61). This difference is important in light of Merves' and Matilisky's insistence that a shared vision of

success for all students is an essential component of an inclusive educational program. Solomon's research indicates that teachers believe a school's faculty should work together in the implementation of an inclusive educational program (Solomon, 1996).

There was also a difference between the responses of men and women with respect to item 18, stating that "general education teachers do not possess the skills and experience needed to work with a learning disabled student in an inclusive setting". The mean response for men was M=2.29, SD=.76, while women's mean response was M=3.57, SD=1.25. Men felt general educators could work successfully with learning disabled students. Women were neutral on the subject. It is important to address the issue of educating learning disabled students in an inclusive setting. The research of Klingner and her colleagues has shown that learning disabled students have not succeeded academically in an inclusive setting (Klingner et al, 1998).

Teachers working in rural, suburban and urban settings responded differently to item 8. Teachers working in urban settings all agreed that inclusion must be part of a school's overall philosophy (M=5.00, SD=0.0). Teachers working in rural communities agreed with the statement to a lesser degree (M=4.60, SD=.55). Teachers employed in suburban districts responded more neutrally to this item (M=3.71, SD=1.49).

Elementary and secondary educators showed significant differences in their mean responses with respect to items 9, 20,

21 and 25. Item 9 states that general education students have a greater understanding of special needs peers in an inclusive setting. The mean response of elementary educators showed they agreed with the statement (M=4.13, SD=1.06), while secondary educators felt neutral about the item (M=3.00, SD=1.58). The implications of these mean responses are interesting. During elementary education all students benefit by understanding differences of all of their peers. When students reach secondary levels of education, they do not appreciate the differences of others in the classroom. The work of Leslie Farrow shows the opposite situation than do the results of this study. She told the story of a sophomore students learning in an inclusive setting. They learned to appreciate the differences of all members of their class. This appreciation led to the formation of friendships across ethnic groups, where none existed before (Farrow 1996). An understanding of student differences is important because it may have an effect on the socialization of special needs students in an inclusive classroom. Socialization is seen by many inclusion supporters as an important reason to incorporate special needs students into the general curriculum. Research conducted by Wilkes shows that special needs students are given a greater chance to interact with disabled and non-disabled peers in the inclusive environment (Daniel and King, 1997).

Item 20 states "I have been involved in inclusive settings". Elementary educators had more experience working in inclusive

settings (M=4.87, SD=.35) than their secondary education colleagues (M =3.31, SD=1.84). Item 21 may be one of the most important items in the survey. It says "I enjoy working with general education and special education students in an inclusive setting". Elementary educators agreed with the statement (M=4.07, SD=1.44). Secondary educators disagreed with this statement (M=2.62, SD=1.50). Elementary teachers enjoyed working in inclusive environments, while their secondary education colleagues did not. It is imperative to realize why elementary educators feel positively about inclusion and what can be accomplished to facilitate positive feelings about inclusive education for secondary educators. It is important to catalyze positive feelings about inclusion because teachers' feelings will have an effect on the success of an inclusive program and the students involved. Scruggs and Mastropieri have shown that teachers may not enjoy working in an inclusive environment if they feel they do not have enough time, the necessary skills and training or proper resources to implement effective inclusive programs (Mamlin, 1999).

Elementary and Secondary educators showed a significant difference in their mean responses to item 25, which says "cooperation and communication among parents, teachers and administrators is strongly encouraged in my school". Elementary educators agreed with the statement (M=4.53, SD=.92). Secondary educators were neutral about the statement (M=3.31, SD=1.70). Inclusion specialists from the Montgomery County Intermediate

Unit and administrators surveyed by the National Center for Educational Restructuring and Inclusion listed parental involvement and collaboration among faculty, administration and school staff as important components of inclusive education (Merves and Matilisky), (Lipsky and Gartner, 1998).

The results of this study illustrate teacher beliefs about inclusive education. Mean scores for all teachers on the General Student Benefits Scale, the Special Needs Student Benefits Scale, and the Teacher Benefits Scale fell within the neutral range. This study would benefit from a larger number of participants. Further research on teacher beliefs about inclusion is warranted. It is important to investigate teachers' willingness to be involved in inclusive educational practices. It is essential to expand research on the components of successful inclusive programs. It is also important to develop additional research concerning the academic and social benefits of inclusion on special needs and general student populations. The findings of future research must be integrated into the educational curriculum to ensure that students are being educated in ways that successfully increase their academic and social achievement.

References

Allen, K. (1999).
http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/ddc/incl/allen.html

Elliot, D. and McKenney, M. (1998). Four inclusion models that work. Teaching Exceptional Children. 54-58.

Daniel, L.G., King, D.A. (1997). Impact of inclusion education on academic achievement, student behavior and self-esteem and parental attitudes. The Journal of Educational Research, 91, 67-80

Farlow, L. (1996). A quartet of success stories: how to make inclusion work. Educational Leadership, 51-55

Heiman, T. and Margalit, M. (1998). Loneliness, depression and social skills among students with mild mental retardation in different educational settings. The Journal of Special Education, 32, 154-163

Janney, R. and Snell, M. (1997). How teachers include students with moderate and severe disabilities in elementary classes: the means and meaning of inclusion. The Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps, 22, 159-169

Katsiyannis, A., Condermann, G. and Franks, D. (1995). State

practices on inclusion: a national review. Remedial and Special Education, 16, 279-287

Klingner, J., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M., Schumm, J., and Elbaum, B. (1998). Outcomes for students with and without learning disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice,13, 153-161

Lipsky, D., and Gartner, A. (1998). Taking inclusion into the future. Educational Leadership,
78-81

Mamlin, N. (1999). Despite best intentions: when inclusion fails. The Journal of Special Education, 33, 36-49

Marks, S, Schrader, C., and Levine, M. (1999). Para-educator experiences in inclusive settings: helping, hovering or holding their own. Exceptional Children, 65, 315-328

Merves, and Mailisky. Philosophy of successful inclusion. Handout.

Nunley, K. (1999). Learning disabilities.
http://help4teachers.com/ld.htm

Solomon, R. (1996). Inclusion in practice. Journal of Staff

Development, 17. 32-35

Strong, K, and Sandoval, J. (1999). Mainstreaming children with a neuromuscular disease: a map of concerns. Exceptional Children,65, 353-366.

Trent, H. (1998). False starts and other dilemmas of a secondary general education collaborative teacher: a case study. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31. 503-513

United States Department of Health and Human Services. (1997). Including children with significant disabilities in head start. Training Guides for the Head Start Learning Community.

Waldron, N, and McLesky, J. (1998). The effects of an inclusive school program on students with mild and severe learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 64, 395-405

Wigfield, Galper, Denton and Seefeldt. (1999). Teacher beliefs about former head start and non-head start first grade children's motivation, performance and future educational prospects. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 91, 98-104

Yell, M. (1998). The legal basis of inclusion. Educational Leadership, 70-73

Appendix A

Inclusion Survey

sex

general education teacher, special education teacher or administrator

grade presently teaching

years teaching experience

community surrounding school i.e. rural, suburban, urban

personal definition of inclusion

All responses to these statements are in Likert-type format from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with the statement.

The most productive form of inclusion is the placement of special education students into the general education classroom where those students would benefit the most academically (i.e., classes where they excel or show great interest).

The inclusion process is most successful when its implementation is considered part of a school's overall philosophy.

General education students have a greater understanding of special education students and their disabilities after working together in an inclusive classroom.

Increased social interaction is the most important benefit to special education students involved in an inclusive classroom.

Increased academic achievement is the most important benefit to special education students involved in an inclusive

classroom.

One-on-one teacher aides (i.e., para-professionals) are important in the inclusion of special education students into the general education classroom.

The relationship between the para-professional and the special needs student detracts from the relationship between the special needs student and the classroom teacher.

The implementation of team teaching (including general and special education teachers in the same inclusive classroom) is a productive was to facilitate the inclusion process in a classroom.

Inclusion is most beneficial to those special needs students with mild physical impairments.

Inclusive classrooms are not appropriate learning environments for those students with learning disabilities.

General education students involved in inclusive classrooms lean to interact more comfortably with people who are different.

General education teachers do not possess the skills and experience needed to work with a learning disabled student in an inclusive setting.

Special education teachers can best meet the needs of a special needs student in the resource room environment.

I have been involved in situations where special education students have participated in an inclusive setting.

I enjoy working with general education and special education students in an inclusive classroom.

Time spent helping a special needs child understand a lesson is a hindrance to students who master the material more quickly.

The behaviors of some special education students distract the rest of the class and take away from time spent teaching.

I prefer working in more homogenous (less inclusive) classrooms.

Communication among parents, teachers and administrators is strongly encouraged in my school.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: K-12 Teachers' and Administrators' Attitudes Toward Inclusive Educational Practices

Author(s): Romano, Kathryn. & Chambliss, Catherine

Corporate Source: Ursinus College

Publication Date: 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, →

Signature: [signature]

Printed Name/Position/Title: Catherine Chambliss, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology

Organization/Address: Dept. of Psychology, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA 19426

Telephone: (610) 409 3000

FAX: (610) 489 0627

E-Mail Address: cchambliss@ursinus.edu

Date: 5/22/00

(over)