

REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS' CONCERNS
REGARDING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN
THE REGULAR EDUCATION CLASSROOM

By

Bethanie A. Pick-Bowes

A Research paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
With a Major in
Education

Approved: 2 semester credits

Dr. Amy Schlieve
Investigation Advisor

The Graduate School
University Wisconsin-Stout
June, 2003

The Graduate College
 University Wisconsin-Stout
 Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

ABSTRACT

Pick-Bowes	Bethanie	A
<hr/>		
(Writer) (Last Name)	(First Name)	(Initial)
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS' CONCERNS REGARDING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE REGULAR EDUCATION CLASSROOM		
<hr/>		
Education	Dr. Amy Schlieve	April 2003
63		
<hr/>		
(Graduate School)	(Research Advisor)	(Month/year) (No. of Pages)
American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual		
<hr/>		
(Name of Manual Used in this study)		

In an on going effort for students with disabilities to be placed in the regular education classroom, and to assist students with disabilities in receiving an equal education to that of their peers, the term inclusion was created and has become one of the most important topics in special education. The purpose of this study was to examine the concerns of regular education teachers in regards to providing appropriate and effective inclusionary practices and as those practices pertain to their regular education classroom. This study took place at a small, rural school district in South Eastern Minnesota in the spring of 2003.

Data was collected via a survey that included a five point Likert-type scale, as well as a 10-point questionnaire. The survey was given to all regular education teachers at a middle school and high school in this southeastern Minnesota community. The request for participation as well as instructions were included on the questionnaire that

was distributed to all regular education teacher's mailboxes at both the middle school and the high school in a small, southeastern Minnesota community. They were instructed to return the surveys to a box that was positioned near the teacher's mailboxes. The surveyors remained anonymous as their surveys did not contain any identifying information. The data was collected by hand after nine full school days.

This research examined the concerns of regular education teachers' toward including special education students. This study targeted regular education teachers' concerns in the areas of their training with students with disabilities, if they believed that students with disabilities improve their social skills by inclusion, and if they believed that students with disabilities appropriately and effectively learned in a special education classroom rather than a regular education classroom.

The results of this study offered valuable information regarding regular education teachers' concerns toward having students with disabilities in their classroom. It also provides valuable information for public school systems, future educators, administrators, as well as other people advocating students with disabilities.

It is hoped that this study will provide useful information in order for students with disabilities to have a more successful and appropriate educational experience in the inclusionary process throughout their public education schooling experience.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people I wish to thank that assisted me in completion of this project. I would like to thank Dr. Amy Gillett who gave me direction as well as feedback throughout my research project. I would like to thank Dr. Gillett for her positive encouragement at the beginning of this project that gave me the confidence I needed to complete this research project.

I would also like to thank my research advisor, Dr. Amy Schlieve. Dr. Schlieve has been a positive influence throughout my journey to be a special educator as well as giving me professional input and guidance for this research project, which I greatly appreciate. She is a great role model for all future special educators.

I would especially like to thank my parents for being supportive throughout both of my college careers, as well as providing me with assurance and encouragement to complete this master's degree. They were never doubtful of me completing this degree and constantly gave me positive feedback and encouragement during this education experience - for which I greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank my wonderful husband, Tim, who gave up much of his time to assist me in pursuing my educational dreams to become a special education teacher and receive my master's degree. I would like to thank him for all the part-time jobs he worked besides his own teaching job in order for me to pursue my career. Throughout my graduate education he never complained to me or doubted my returning to school once and for that I truly thank him. I could not of accomplished this degree without his support.

I would like to thank my daughter, Anna Ruth, who is the most precious gift I have ever received. I thank her for putting up with my many hours of typing, textbook reading and class work during her first eighteen months of life. I hope that Anna pursues her life dreams and I wish her much happiness as she precedes life's journey.

Last but not least, I would like to dedicate this paper to my sister, Amy, who was diagnosed with breast cancer while I was pursuing this degree. She has been a breast cancer survivor for over one year and has been one of the most courageous and strongest people that I have ever known.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Assumptions and Limitations.....	7
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
Introduction.....	9
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Subject Selection and Description.....	21
Instrumentation.....	21
Data Collection.....	22
Data Analysis.....	23
Limitations.....	23
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Demographic Information.....	25
Item Analysis.....	25

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	37
Summary.....	37
Discussion.....	37
Results and Conclusions.....	40
Recommendations.....	41
Summary.....	42
References.....	44
APENDICES	
A IRB Approval	47
B. Request for Participation and Consent.....	48
C. Survey	49
D. Data Charts.....	51

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In an on going effort for students with disabilities to be placed in the regular education classroom, and to assist students with disabilities in receiving an equal education to that of their peers, the term inclusion was created, and has become one of the important topics in special education. Inclusion may be defined as having students with disabilities being active participants in regular education by attending regular education classes to the greatest extent possible. Inclusion is part of the legislation known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Students with a disability have a legal right to a free and appropriate education (IDEA) that was initially guaranteed through the *Education for All Handicapped Children Act* of 1975 (P.L. 94-142; Friend & Bursuck,1999).

IDEA requires that students are placed in the least restrictive educational environment and are included in the regular education classroom when deemed appropriate. The law requires that:

To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities ...are educated with children who are not disabled, and that special education classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular environment occurs only when the nature of severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be attained satisfactorily (*Including students with disabilities in general education classrooms*, 1993, p. 1)

There are many different views on inclusion, how it is carried out can vary from school to school, district to district, and state to state. In order for inclusion to be successful, there are a number of different factors that must be present. Some factors that have been present when inclusion has been effective are supportive administrators, peer acceptance, teacher's attitudes and skills, as well as collaboration between regular education teachers and special education teachers (Knight, 1999). Those who are advocates for inclusion believe that all students have the legal right to attend regular classes just like their peers do. Another area they agree upon is that through inclusion, the student with a disability may learn social skills by observing the appropriate skills of their peers. According to Friend and Bursuck (1999), another reason people advocate for inclusion is when students go to a special education classroom they may be more vulnerable to be labeled as a student with a disability. Despite these benefits, educators continue to have mixed views on whether inclusion is beneficial to the student with a disability, as well as the other regular education students in the classroom (Knight, 1999; Chelsey & Calaluce, 1997).

To examine the effectiveness of appropriately including the student with a disability into the regular education classroom, one must first look at the concerns of the regular education teacher regarding delivering appropriate academics when including a student with a disability into their classroom. Regular education teachers play a vital role in the inclusion process. These regular education teachers concerns, as well as their attitudes, toward inclusion, are very important in order for inclusion to be successful. According to Silberman, teachers attitudes of attachment, concern, indifference and rejection have been found to directly and differentially impact students' educational

experiences and opportunities. These four categories emerged from analyses of interviews with 32 teachers regarding their descriptions and feelings toward students in their classes” (cited in Cook, 2001, n.p.). According to Knight (1999), many of the concerns that regular education teachers have are in regards to inclusion. Some of these concerns include: teachers expected to handle large class sizes, variations in student skills as well as teaching to students with disabilities who have a variety of needs and are accustomed to being in a more segregated setting.

Knight is not the only researcher with these concerns. According to Salend (2001), he found similar issues regarding regular education teachers and inclusion. He found that teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion depended on their teaching experience, differentiating teaching practices, and class sizes (Salend, 2001).

Research reveals (Cook, 2001; Chesley & Calaluce, 1997; Heflin & Bullock, 1999) that there are common concerns regarding the attitude of regular education toward inclusion. One concern may be not having enough time to spend teaching with the student with disabilities. All students qualified for special education have an Individualized Education Plan or IEP that is a legal document between the schools and the parents that ensures individualized education programming for students with disabilities. These IEP plans are mandated contracts that ensure students with disabilities are receiving an adequate education based on their individual needs. These IEP plans can be very difficult for a regular education teacher to carry out due to the amount of regular education students that are in their regular education classes. With school budget problems, large class sizes are very common, and for a regular education teacher to have extra time to devote to one of many students could be nearly impossible.

Some teachers have reported that the student with a disability is negatively affecting the other students' learning. If the student with a disability is a distraction to other students to the point that class is being interrupted, then this probably is not a positive inclusive situation (Heflin & Bullock, 1999). Another concern that may arise is the regular education teacher not having the training to work with students with disabilities (Monahan, Marino & Miller, 2000; Lanier & Lanier, 1996). Some regular education teachers have reported that they have not had enough experience working with a student with a disability. Like many other colleges, the University of Wisconsin- Stout in Menomonee, Wisconsin, requires future teachers to take a survey course on inclusion. This is a beneficial course, but this may not be enough training when it comes to working with a variety of students with different needs and accommodations.

According to Shier (2002), in an unpublished thesis study for the University Wisconsin Stout, regular educators training may play a significant part in how they view inclusion. She examined the attitudes of future educators regarding the Inclusion course that is offered through the University Wisconsin-Stout. Through her research (Shier, 2002, p. ii) she stated that "future educators believed that this course prepared them to work with children with exceptional needs and they completed the course equipped with resources that they planned to utilize in their upcoming professions."

There is also the issue of students with disabilities not attending the smaller class sizes, along with more individualized services that tend to be with a classroom that is set up specifically for students with disabilities. Knight (1999, p. 4) has stated the question "Is inclusion appropriate for all students to be included in regular classrooms or will some students actually be worse because of the lack of services?" Some students may

not benefit from inclusion. “Some studies indicate that certain students with disabilities are not given specially designed instruction to meet their academic needs in inclusion programs and perform better in pull-out resource programs”(Salend, 2001, p. 26).

This aspect of regular education teachers’ concerns regarding inclusion is not emphasized enough and may possibly be the determining factor of a student with disability being successful in the regular education classroom.

Statement of Problem

Regular education teachers have important roles when it comes to inclusion. The regular education teacher may have issues or concerns regarding the student with a disability being in their classroom. These issues need to be addressed so the student can have a successful classroom learning experience.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the concerns of regular education teachers’ regarding appropriately educating students in their classroom with disabilities. This study will take place in a small rural school district in southeastern Minnesota and will include both middle and high school teachers. This study will survey teachers during the spring of 2003.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be targeted in this study:

1. Do regular education teachers believe that they have had enough training to appropriately include students with disabilities into their classroom?
2. Do regular education teachers believe that a special education room may be a more appropriate setting for a student with a disability?

3. Do regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities improve their social skills by being in the regular education classroom.

Definition of Terms

The working definitions used for this study were as follows:

Collaboration-“A style of interaction professionals use in order to accomplish a goal they share, often used in inclusive schools” (Friend & Bursuck, p. 486). A term used when discussing teamwork and how well people work together.

Disabilities – For the purpose of this study, the term disability will be defined as it is stated in the IDEA Act of 1992. The only way a student with special needs can receive individual instructional activities and related services is if she meets the eligibility criteria for one of the disabilities categories listed under IDEA. They include visual impairment, hearing impairment, deafness and blindness, orthopedic impairment, other health impairments, mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, serious emotional disabilities or language impairment, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and autism (McCormack, Frome Loeb, & Schiefelbusch, 1997, p. 76).

Inclusion - Can be defined as including students who have disabilities in the regular education classroom with their fellow peers. “It seeks to establish collaborative, supportive, and nurturing communities of learners that are based on giving all students the services and accommodations they need to learn as well as respecting and learning from each other’s individuals differences” (Salend, 2001, p. 5).

Least restrictive environment (LRE) - A setting for a person who has a disability that allows the individual to be as independent as possible. This could be a school setting for a student who has a disability that is as much like a setting for a student that does not have a disability, with appropriate accommodations (Friend & Bursuck, 1999).

Paraprofessional-A noncertified staff member who is there to assist certified staff in carrying out educational plans for student who have disabilities (Friend & Bursuck, 1999).

Pull-out system - A resource room available for students who have disabilities to receive extra assistance and possibly supplemental instruction from a resource room teacher (Salend, 2001).

Special education-“Specially designed instruction provided by a school district or other local education agency that meets the unique needs of students identified as disabled” (Friend, & Bursuck, 1999, p. 493).

Assumptions

There are a number of assumptions that will be made for the purpose of this study. The first is that the teachers who are surveyed will answer the questions as honestly as possible. The second is that the teachers surveyed have had a student with a disability in their classroom. The third is that the teachers will take the time to fill out the survey.

Limitations

One limitation to this study is that the survey will only be given to middle and high school teachers in a small rural southeastern Minnesota school district that contain

be a small sample of teachers. Another limitation is that with a survey, the questions targeted may be not include all the concerns that teachers have regarding including a student with disabilities in their classroom. Likewise, it may not include all the positive aspects of including a student with disabilities in their classroom. The survey will only contain questions that the study is targeting.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

The following literature review will explore in some detail, regular education teachers' concerns regarding including students with disabilities in their classroom. The first part of this literature review will discuss the importance of the regular education teachers' role in the inclusion process. The second part of this literature review will focus on three specific areas of concerns among regular education teachers regarding including students with disabilities into their classroom. These areas include: regular education teachers lack of training in the area of disabilities, regular education teachers concerns regarding appropriateness of placement of the students with special needs, and the socialization gains that students with disabilities make when included with regular education students in the regular classroom.

Regular education teachers' role in the inclusive process

Over the years, schools in the United States have changed the way they deliver special education services to students with disabilities. With the passing of the *Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975* (Friend & Bursuck, 1999), the intent was for students with disabilities to be included in the regular education classroom to the extent appropriate. Since this was not enforced to the extent it is now, schools had different views on how students with disabilities should be included in the regular education classroom. Schools were inconsistent with providing necessary educational services for students with disabilities. With the passing of IDEA, it has now become a legal requirement "that a continuum of placement options be available to meet the needs of

students with disabilities” (*Including students with disabilities in general education classroom*, 1993, p. 1). Including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom is the premise for inclusion.

Advocates for inclusion believe that inclusive education provides “ greater academic expectations, a richer learning environment, more effective teaching strategies, and modeling by more peers would enhance learning” (Peterson & Hittie, 2003, p. 36). Advocates for successful inclusion believe that there are academic advantages, socialization gains and that there is even a positive effect on the other regular education students in these schools (Bradley, King-Sears, & Tessier-Switlick, 1997).

Regular education teachers play a vital role in the success of inclusion programs and numerous studies have been conducted (Cook, 2001; Lanier, & Lanier, 1996; Monahan, Marino, & Miller, 2000) to investigate concerns of general and special education teachers toward inclusive education. Most teachers agree that a student with a disability has the right to attend a regular education class if deemed appropriate for that student. However, regular education teachers may have issues regarding the placement of a student with a disability in their classroom and oftentimes these issues are not adequately addressed.

According to Giangreco and Doyle (2000) many regular education teachers state they are more of the “host” for the student with a disability, rather than the teacher. They express that they are expected to have a student with a disability in their classroom, but that the educational assistant or the special education teacher will be the person responsible for teaching the material to the student with a disability.

When the concerns of the regular education teacher are not addressed, it could have a negative effect on the student's education, as well as the overall success for the inclusion experience. According to Giangreco and Doyle (2000, p. 55),

attitudes, decisions, and actions of general education teachers are critical factors in determining the success of a student with a disability in the regular education classroom. The general education teacher may be the single most important school staff member in determining the success of a student with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Regular education teachers training to work with persons with disabilities

Advocates for inclusion state that students are more alike than different, and training teachers effectively should enable them to teach all of their students in their classroom. Some even state that the training needed to instruct students with disabilities is not any different than the training for regular education non-disabled students (Mock & Kauffman, 2002). According to Knight (1999), teachers who use effective teaching methods in the classroom can use those same methods to teach students with disabilities. Some of these methods include: being sensitive to the students' academic needs, adapting materials to meet student needs, using a variety of different teaching approaches to meet student needs, and adapting instruction for different learning styles.

Other researchers (Cook, 2001; Mock & Kauffman, 2002; Buell, Hallum & Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999) would agree that effective teaching methods are important, but would also emphasize the importance of the regular education teachers receiving training on appropriate teaching strategies for students with disabilities. It is assumed that most special education teachers have received pedagogical training in

teaching children with disabilities so that they may work effectively with the students with disabilities. Including students in the regular education classroom is assuming regular education teachers, who often have had very little training in the area of disabilities, to now be responsible for teaching a wide variety of students with varying types of disabilities, as well as the other students in the classroom. There are complete college courses for future special education teachers on teaching methods for students with disabilities. For example, at the University Wisconsin Stout, for a person to become certified in special education in the area of mental retardation, they are required to take multiple courses on appropriate methods for students with disabilities. Included in these course requirements are three curriculum and instruction courses focused on the areas of academics, functional living skills, and transitional planning as it pertains to teaching students with mental retardation. Other course requirements include classroom management, teaching in special education as well as courses in psychology of the exceptional child. It is also a requirement that future special education teachers in mental retardation participate in two different field experiences in the special education classroom working with a variety of disabilities as well as their capstone teaching experience in a special education classroom that last approximately eighteen weeks, before they graduate and receive a teaching certification (UW-Stout Undergraduate Course Bulletin, 2001-2003, p. 156). This is a good deal of specialized training that future special educators must complete in order to teach students with disabilities in the schools.

Regular education teachers on the other hand, also have a great deal of training, in their field of study. It is required that they take a certain number of courses in their

certification area to become specialized in their field. However, most universities do not require teachers to take more than one survey course about individuals with disabilities before becoming a regular education teacher. The University Wisconsin-Stout in Menomonie offers one survey course entitled *Inclusion of Students With Exceptional Needs* that is designed to assist future regular education teachers to be better prepared when working with students with disabilities in their classroom (UW-Stout Undergraduate Bulletin, 2001-2003, p. 156). This course is extremely beneficial to education students in their movement toward becoming regular education teachers. However, this is typically the only course most of these teachers take before they receive a teaching position compared to the multiple courses and hours that is required of the student preparing to be a special education teacher.

Mock and Kauffman (2002) explain this difference in training between the special education teacher and the regular education teacher in greater detail. They state that expecting regular education teachers to meet the needs of all the students in the classroom can be compared to general medical practitioners who need to meet the needs of all of their patients. Although they will be able to assist the patients to some degree, there will be some patients who require a more specific type of care. Mock and Kauffman (2002) went on to explain that a person who needs to have a major surgery may see someone else who is more specialized besides their general physician. Most people would go see a specialist or a doctor with a certain degree or training. Additionally, the authors stated that this was comparable to regular education teachers and special education teachers in regards to inclusion. Both teachers have a great deal of training and knowledge, it would only make sense that the special education teacher has

more pedagogical knowledge when it comes to working with students with disabilities. The special education teacher has the most pedagogical training in order to appropriately and effectively teach students with disabilities and most of the time the special education teacher is not in the regular education teacher's classroom. Instead, the regular education teacher has had the least amount of pedagogical training in teaching students with disabilities and yet is responsible for teaching the student with a disability and including them in his/her classroom.

Mock and Kauffman (2002) discussed the significant amount of pedagogical training that the special education teacher receives. They used an example of a teacher who is training to be a specialist in teaching children with learning disabilities. The teacher must learn the components of direct instruction, mnemonic training, and strategies for reading comprehension. Mock and Kauffman (2002) emphasized the importance of this specialization training and how it benefits the student with disabilities. They stressed how regular education teachers do not receive this kind of specialized training.

In a research study conducted by Buell, Hallum, Gamel-McCormick, and Sheer (1999), they discovered that training was one of the biggest areas of concern among regular education teachers in regards to inclusion. After surveying numerous regular education teachers, they found that general education teachers indicated a need for training in "program modification, assessing academic progress, adapting curriculum, managing student's behavior, developing IEP'S and using assistive technology" (Buell, Hallum, Gamel-McCormick, & Sheer, 1999, p. 9). Buell, Hallum, Gamel-McCormick, and Sheer (1999) also concluded that regular education teachers needed some training prior to

working with students with disabilities, preferably in college, prior to teaching, in order to work successfully with students with disabilities in their classroom.

Regular education teachers believe that the special education room may be a more appropriate place for a student who has a disability

Inclusionists argue that students with disabilities are only considered “included” in the regular education room if they are only receiving their education in the regular education room and are not going to a special education room during their school day (Chelsey, & Calaluce, 1997). Most teachers would agree that students with disabilities should have the right to attend regular education classes with their high school peers. What happens when this setting is not appropriate? Knight (1999, p. 4) asked the question “Can the instruction and resources needed by students with special needs be provided within the context of the regular school environment?”

According to (Knight, 1999; Chelsey & Calaluce, 1997) students with disabilities can actually learn more from a segregated setting, as they will receive more individualized instruction. According to Knight (1999), in some inclusive situations, a student with a severe disability, could actually be more excluded because the student’s needs are not being met and the services that are being provided in the regular education classroom are not meeting the student’s needs.

Some researchers (Chelsey & Calaluce, 1997) would argue that students with have disabilities are not learning the skills necessary for life when they graduate because they attended regular education classes that did not include functional living skills. Students who are placed in these regular education classrooms are not guaranteed that

they will learn useful, practical skills that will help them adjust as they enter their adult life. Chelsey and Calaluce (1997) indicated that many students are graduating from high school without the skills that are necessary for them to be successful in the adult world. Chelsey and Calaluce (1997) discussed a situation where the parents of a child who was totally included for his entire school career, petitioned for an out-of-state placement his senior year. His parents claimed that they changed their minds about what they had advocated for their son for all of these years and that their son was not prepared to enter the adult world (Chelsey & Calaluce, 1997).

A paraprofessional oftentimes is assigned to assist the student with disabilities in the general education classroom, which can ease the caseload of the regular education teachers. Critics of inclusion not only are concerned about whether the placement in a regular education class for the student with disabilities is appropriate, but they are also concerned regarding who is actually teaching the students with disabilities (Mock & Kauffman, 2002; Knight, 1999; Chesley & Calaluce, 1997). Many students with disabilities need specific modification in order to successfully complete a high school regular education course. Unfortunately, sometimes the work is not modified or cannot be appropriately modified by the paraprofessional and the paraprofessional may be completing the work instead of the student. Chelsey and Calaluce (1997) reported that they had a parent complain who had a son with a severe disability because he received less than an A in the class. The parents were upset with the educational assistant for not following the regular education teacher directions close enough. Chelsey and Calaluce (1997) questioned whether anyone really cared if that student was actually learning anything.

In today's large class sizes, regular education teachers are extremely busy with their students. Sometimes regular education teachers state they are too busy to devote one-on-one time with a special education student. However, it is a legal requirement for all teachers to carry out what the IEP has set up for the student with a disability no matter what the situation may be for that regular education teacher. When a paraprofessional is in the classroom, the paraprofessional may be the one who is teaching the students the assignments, not the regular education teacher. According to Giangreco and Doyle (2000), experts in the field, state that there could be problems when the paraprofessional assumes the role of the teacher. They used an example of a student with very complex challenging learning problems who was receiving the majority of his instruction through a paraprofessional.

The paraprofessional is usually the staff member that has the least amount of training. Many paraprofessionals do not have college degrees or any specialized training on working with students with disabilities. Some areas that may require specialized training when working with students with disabilities included modifications. Special education teachers receive college coursework along with training on modifying students with disabilities assignments to meet their needs while paraprofessionals may not receive any such training. Although paraprofessionals may be of great assistance to the student with a disability who is attending a regular education classroom, they can also have issues regarding whether the placement is appropriate for the individual. Griangreco and Doyle (1999) state that educational assistants may be taking on too much of the "teacher" role and therefore not giving the actual regular education teacher the responsibility of teaching the material to that student.

Sometimes the only modifications that are being made to the classroom that the student with disabilities is in, is that they have a paraprofessional that assists the student. That is the only modification. A study conducted by Dory, Dion, Wagner, and Brunet (2002) revealed that teachers do not mind including students with disabilities in their classroom, as long as their workload is not increased. Unfortunately for the regular education teachers, in order for students with disabilities to be appropriately successful in the regular education classroom, it may be necessary for the regular education teacher to take on extra work such as assisting in modifying assignments, regular contact with the special education teacher, and adapting instruction to meet the needs of all the different learning abilities of students in his/her room. Center and Ward reported that teachers were positive about including students with disabilities in their classroom, as long as they did not require any extra instructional or management skills on the part of the teacher (cited in Lanier & Lanier, 1996).

Students with disabilities socialization gains in the regular education classroom

One of the misconceptions of inclusion is that by being in a regular education classroom, students with disabilities will make social gains, as well as improve their social skills by being with their non-disabled student peers. Some people would argue that the social gains are more important than the educational gains when it comes to including a student with disabilities in the regular education classroom. Proponents of inclusion may even feel that as long as the student with disabilities is placed in a classroom with non-disabled students, they will be more accepted by their non-disabled peers (Friend & Bursuck, 1999).

Despite these high social expectations for these students with disabilities who are placed in the regular education classroom, many people would tend to disagree that a result of inclusion is peer acceptance. Students without disabilities have various views about those students who have disabilities who share the same classroom with them.

According to Peck, Donaldson, and Pezzol, “Students without disabilities in an inclusive classroom were concerned about noise level, about physical and behavioral characteristics of some of the students with disabilities, and about being asked to be caretakers” (cited in Salend, 2001, p. 29).

A study was conducted by Hendrickson, Shokoohi, Nietupski, and Gable in which the results indicated that most high school students adopted a moral point of view, as the students felt that they had an obligation to make an effort to be friends with the students with disabilities so that they would not be socially isolated (cited in Dory, Dion, Wagner, & Brunet, 2002).

Additionally, a case study conducted by Dory, Dion, Wagner, and Brunet (2002), they researched adolescents with disabilities, specifically mental retardation, to see if it was possible to achieve social integration with their non-disabled regular education student peers. The study followed two students who attended a self-contained class from the beginning of the school year until spring break. After the break, they were integrated full-time into the regular education classroom until the end of the school year. The aspect of social integration was part of this study and was done through observation in the cafeteria of the two students interacting with their regular education peers, as well as interviewing the regular education teachers.

The results of the study was only a slight improvement from the students interactions prior to inclusion. The teachers also observed the social interactions of these two students with their regular education peers as unsatisfactory. The teachers stated that these students remained socially isolated and the teachers reported that they needed to intervene directly to attempt to encourage appropriate interactions in the classrooms (Dory, Dion, Wagner, & Brunet, 2002).

Dory, Dion, Wagner and Brunet (2002) concluded that their study yielded similar results to that of Hilton and Liberty who found that interactions between students with mental retardation and their regular education classmates is often superficial and brief (cited in Dory, Dion, Wagner & Brunet, 2002).

According to Simpson, he noted four factors that are crucial in understanding attitudes of general education students toward students with disabilities. The first factor is that discriminatory acts may be normal and that they may be a natural response to developmental characteristics. The second is that attitudes toward students with disabilities may exist due to labels. These may exist because of their lack of social skills. The third is that attitudes toward students with disabilities could be due to their peers. The fourth is that these attitudes towards students with disabilities could have multiple reasons such as social, physical, and experimental factors (cited in Wood, 1998).

Regardless of the reasons for possible negative attitudes of regular education students toward students with disabilities, most would agree that they do exist. Therefore, it is difficult for the student with a disability to make long lasting friendships with their non-disabled regular education students peers.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter will include the information about how the sample was selected, a description of the sample, and the instrumentation that was used for this study. In addition, data collection and data analysis procedures will be given. The chapter will conclude with methodological limitations.

Subject Selection and Description

The subjects for this study were regular education teachers at a middle school and a high school, located in the same school district in a small rural, southeastern Minnesota community. The teachers for this study included first year teachers to the more experienced veteran teacher. The teachers in the high school as well as the middle school, were asked to participate in this study through a letter, along with a consent form, that was attached to the survey. (See Appendix A and B for copy of letter, consent form along with the survey).

Survey

The survey was a ten-question survey with a Likert-type response scale. The survey was approved by the Protection of Human Subjects Board or IRB at the University Wisconsin Stout. (See Appendix A for a copy of the letter). This survey was kept as short as possible to facilitate a greater rate of returns. (See Appendix B for a copy of the survey). The regular education teachers who responded had the opportunity to

indicate whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed and the teachers were asked to circle their responses. The questions that were used for this survey were created to address the specific research questions of this study which were:

1. Do regular education teachers believe that they have had enough training to include students with disabilities into their classroom?
2. Do regular education teachers believe that a special education room may be a more appropriate setting for a student with a disability?
3. Do regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities improve their social skills by being in the regular education classroom?

Data Collection

The researcher used a survey method to collect data from the teachers at this middle school and high schools. (See Appendix C for copy of survey). They were given a consent form that was attached to the survey that explained that the survey reflected regular education teachers' concerns about inclusion and having students with disabilities in the regular education classroom. (See Appendix B for copy of request and consent form). They were also told through this consent form that this data was being collected from them because it was going to be used as a research project to meet a requirement toward the completion of the Master's of Science Degree through the University Wisconsin-Stout. (See Appendix B for a copy of request and consent form).

The survey collection was aimed specifically at the high school and middle school in a small, rural, southeastern Minnesota community. Regular education teachers were the only teachers included in this study. Special education teachers, as well as

members of the administration, were not asked to complete this survey. The surveys were placed in the teachers' mailboxes. A box labeled "surveys" was placed next to the teachers' mailboxes where the completed surveys were returned. The teachers were given three days to return these surveys. After three days, this researcher collected the survey return boxes from the schools.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using *The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (2002). The data was ordinal in nature; therefore all appropriate descriptive statistics were utilized. In addition, cross tabulations were done to compare high school and middle school teacher's responses.

Limitations

The biggest limitation to this study was that the population being sampled was small and therefore will not yield generalizable results. This study was small and limited to one school district with only a certain number of teachers who were available to participate in the study.

Another limitation was that this study was measuring a concern. Concerns, like attitudes or perceptions, may be very difficult to measure because there are many factors that can affect these issues. These areas can be affected at any given moment, so if a teacher had a bad day or if a teacher had a good day with a particular student, it could affect the way he or she answered the question, even though in the long term it may not be as accurate a picture of what he/she believes about an issue.

Another limitation that this study had was the fact that it was a school district from a smaller community. The results may have been different if it would have been

conducted at a larger school district in a bigger community. The information gathered in this study may be difficult to generalize to other school districts due to the fact that many special education departments within school districts are operated differently and consequently, inclusion is carried out differently.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the concerns of regular education teachers regarding including students with disabilities in their classroom. This chapter will include the results of this study. This chapter will include demographic information and item analysis. This chapter will conclude with the research questions that were used for this study.

Demographic Information

There were 105 regular education teachers that were given surveys via their school mailboxes. Of those, 30 regular education teachers returned completed surveys. This represented 29% of the total number participants. Of the 30, 16 (53%) teachers responded from the middle school and 14 (47%) responded from the high school.

Item Analysis

The following results are based on the responses to the ten-question survey. Respondents were asked to mark their choice for each question. The choices were numbered as follows (1) *Strongly agree*, (2), *Agree*, (3), *Neutral*, (4), *Disagree*, (5) and *Strongly Disagree*. (See appendix C for copy of survey).

Question 1: *Regular education teachers have and enough training regarding working with students with disabilities in the regular education classroom.*

Over eighty-three percent (83.3%) of the total teachers surveyed, indicated that they “disagree” or “strongly disagreed” that they have had enough training with students with disabilities in the regular education classroom. Neutral responses were at 10% while 6.7% agreed that they have had enough training with students with disabilities.

Table 1

Question 1: Regular Education Teacher Training

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	6.7
Agree	0	0
Neutral	3	10
Disagree	18	60
Strongly Disagree	7	23.3

Question 2: Regular education teachers receive in-service training on working with students with disabilities on a yearly basis.

Over eighty-six percent of the respondents (86.7%) “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that they have had any in-service training on a yearly basis on working with students with disabilities. Ten percent indicated that they agreed that they had in-service training on a yearly basis and 3% responded that they were neutral.

Table 2

Question 2: Inservice Training

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree		
Agree	3	10
Neutral	1	3.3
Disagree	12	40
Strongly Disagree	14	46.7

Question 3: *Students with disabilities improve their social skills when they participate in the regular education classroom.*

Over forty-six percent (46.7%) agreed, while 16.7% strongly agreed that social skills had been improved for students with disabilities who were placed in the regular education classroom. Thirty percent were neutral while 6.7% disagreed that students with disabilities improved their social skills when placed in the regular education classroom. No one strongly disagreed for this question.

Table 3
Question 3: Improve Social Skills

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	5	16.7
Agree	14	46.7
Neutral	9	30
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly Disagree		

Question 4: *Students with disabilities are accepted by their non-disabled regular education peers*

Over forty six percent (46.7%) agreed or strongly agreed that students with disabilities were accepted by their non-disabled peers, while 40% were neutral, and 13.3% disagreed that students with disabilities are accepted by their non-disabled peers. No one indicated that they strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 4

Question Number 4: Accepted by Peers

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	6.7
Agree	12	40
Neutral	12	40
Disagree	4	13.3
Strongly Disagree		

Question 5: *Students with disabilities develop friendships with regular education students.*

Ten percent of those surveyed strongly agreed with this question while 50% agreed with this statement, while 30% were neutral and 10% disagreed with this statement. No one indicated that they strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 5

Question 5: Develop Friendships

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	3	10
Agree	15	50
Neutral	9	30
Disagree	3	10
Strongly Disagree		

Question 6: *Students with disabilities can receive better academic instruction in a special education room rather than in a regular education room.*

Fifty-three (53.3 %) percent of the teachers that were surveyed indicated that they agreed (33.3%) or strongly agreed (20%) that students with disabilities receive better academic instruction in a special education room. While 33.3 % responded that they were neutral as well as 13.3% indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that students with disabilities receive better instruction in the special education room.

Table 6

Question 6: Better Instruction in the Special Education Room.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	6	20
Agree	10	33.3
Neutral	10	33.3
Disagree	3	10
Strongly Disagree	1	3.3

Question 7: *Regular education teachers would rather send a special education student to a special education room to get additional assistance that may be necessary for the regular education class.*

Over seventy percent (72.4%) of those teachers that responded indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with sending a student to a special education room to receive additional assistance, 20% indicated a neutral response, while 6.7 % disagreed that they would rather send a student to the special education room for additional assistance and no one indicated that they strongly disagreed.

Table 7

Question 7: Additional Assistance in Special Education Room

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	4	13.3
Agree	17	56.7
Neutral	6	20
Disagree	2	6.7
Strongly Disagree		

Question 8: *Students with disabilities require more assistance and time than the regular education teacher can provide*

Over seventy-three percent (73.3%) strongly agreed or agreed that students with disabilities require more assistance than the regular education teacher can provide, while 13.3 % were neutral, and 13.3 % disagreed that the students with disabilities required more assistance. No one disagreed with this statement.

Table 8

Statement 8: Require More Assistance

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	7	23.3
Agree	15	50
Neutral	4	13.3
Disagree	4	013.3
Strongly Disagree		

Question 9: *Regular education teachers believe that it is difficult to meet the needs of students with disabilities in their regular education classroom.*

Over sixty-three percent (66.7%) indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with this statement while 23.3% were neutral and 13.3 % strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement.

Table 9

Question 9: Difficult to Meet the Needs

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	5	16.7
Agree	14	46.7
Neutral	7	23.3
Disagree	3	10
Strongly Disagree	1	3.3

Question 10: *Students with disabilities benefit from being included in the regular education classroom.*

Over sixty percent (66.7%) indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with students with disabilities benefiting from being in the regular education classroom, while 30% were neutral and only 3.3% disagreed that students with disabilities benefited from being in the regular education classroom.

Table 10

Question 10: Benefit

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	7	23.3
Agree	13	43.3
Neutral	9	30
Disagree	1	3.3
Strongly Disagree		

Research Questions

Research Questions #1-*Do regular education teachers believe that they have had enough training to include students with disabilities into their classroom?*

Survey items 1 and 2 dealt with this objective. Over eighty three percent, 83.4% (25 out of 30 teachers) of the teachers responded that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this question.(See appendix D under Research Questions for more data).

Research Question #2-*Do regular education teachers believe that a special education room may be a more appropriate setting for a student who has a disability?*

Survey items 7, 8, and 9 dealt with this question. Ten (33%) of the people that responded answered 1 (strongly agree) to 2.00 (agree) to this research question. (See appendix D under Research Questions for more data).

Research Question # 3-*Do regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities improve their social skills by being in the regular education classroom?*

Survey items 3, 4 and 5 dealt with this question. Over fifty five percent (56.7) were between 1 and 2.33 for answering this research question. The other responses were between 2.67-3.76, which was 43.4%. (See appendix D under Research Questions for more data).

Chapter 5

Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the concerns of regular education teachers regarding including students with disabilities in their classroom. The study took place in a southeastern Minnesota community in spring of 2003. Data was collected via a survey that was given to regular education teachers at a middle school and high school in this Southeastern Minnesota community. Teachers received the survey in their mailboxes and had nine days to return them.

Discussion

The first research question that this researcher proposed was if regular education teachers believed that they had enough training to work with students with disabilities in their classroom. Responses to questions one " *Regular education teachers have had enough training to work with students with disabilities*" and question 2 " *Regular education teachers have in-service training on a yearly basis* " supported this research question. Within these statements, for question number one pertaining to regular education teacher training the majority of teachers (83%) disagreed to strongly disagreed that they had enough training to work with students with disabilities in their classroom. Question number 2 pertained to regular education teachers having in-service training on working with students with disabilities on a yearly basis. Over eighty-six percent of teachers responded that they strongly disagreed or disagreed that they had training on working with students with disabilities on a yearly basis. This was the most significant of

the studies findings. These results would support that one of the biggest concerns that regular education teachers have regarding inclusion is their lack of training. Teachers in this southeastern Minnesota community responded similarly to those studies found in Cook (2001), Mock & Kauffman (2002), Buell, Hallum , Gamel-Mccormick, & Scheer (1999) who emphasized the importance of regular education teachers receiving training on working with students with different disabilities.

The second research question that this researcher proposed was if regular education teachers believed that the special education room might be a more appropriate setting for students with disabilities. Responses to questions 6, 7, 8 and 9 supported this research question. Within these statements the majority of subjects agreed that the special education room is a more appropriate setting for students with disabilities. Question number 6 “*Students with disabilities receive better academic instruction in a special education room rather than a regular education room*” had 53.3% of teachers surveyed indicate that they strongly agreed or agreed with students with disabilities receive better academic instruction in the special education room rather than the regular education room. Question number seven “*Regular education teachers would rather send a special education student to a special education room to get additional assistance that may be necessary for the regular education class*” had 72.4% of teachers surveyed indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with sending a student to a special education room for additional assistance. Question number 8 “*Students with disabilities require more assistance and time than regular education teachers can provide*” was at 73.3% of teachers responding that they strongly agreed or disagreed that students with disabilities require more time than what the regular education teacher can provide. Question number

nine “*Regular education teachers believe that it is difficult to meet the needs of the students with disabilities in their regular education classroom*” was at 66.6% of teachers responding that they strongly agreed or agreed that it is difficult for the regular education teacher to meet the needs of the student with disability in their classroom. Over 50% of all four of these questions responded in strongly agree to agree in regards to students receiving services in the special education room instead of the regular education room. These results would support that regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities may receive better instruction in a special education room instead of the regular education classroom. This research would support that teachers from this southeastern Minnesota community agree with studies done by researchers Knight (1999) and Chelsey & Calaluce (1997) who stated that students with disabilities may learn more from a segregated setting as they will receive more individualized instruction.

The third research question that this researcher proposed was regarding students with disabilities improving their social skills by being in a regular education classroom. Survey items 3, 4 and 5 supported this research question. Question number 3, “*Students with disabilities improve their social skills when placed in the regular education classroom*” had 63.4% teachers respond that they strongly agreed and agreed about this statement. For question number 4, “*Students with disabilities are accepted by their non-disabled peers regular education peers*” was at 46.7 % strongly agreeing or agreeing with this statement. Question number 5, “*Students with disabilities develop friendships with regular education students*” was at 60% of teachers responding that they strongly agree or agree with this statement. A little over half the teachers surveyed reported that students improve their social skills when placed in a regular education classroom. This

research would support that a positive result of inclusion may be that the student will develop social skills which is similar to what researchers Friend and Bursuck (1999) found as they believed that students with disabilities may learn more social skills by observing the appropriate social skills of their peers. These findings do not support the study done by Dory, Dion, Wagner, & Brunet (2002) who believed that interactions between students with disabilities and their regular education classmates do not improve as the interactions is usually brief and superficial.

Results and Conclusions

The questions pertaining to the amount of training regular education teachers had received for teaching students with disabilities was the most significant of this studies findings. Twenty-five out of thirty teachers responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had sufficient training to work with students with disabilities. School districts may want to implement inclusionary training for working with students with disabilities for regular education teachers. This is essential if inclusion is to be successful so the regular education teacher will feel more confident and prepared to assist the students with disabilities in their classroom.

The results for the research questions 2,” *Do regular education teachers believe that a special education classroom may be a more appropriate setting for students with disabilities*” and 3 “*Do regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities improve their social skills when placed in the regular education classroom*” definitely would need more research before conclusions could be made. It is difficult to draw conclusions from this study and to generalize to the larger population primarily due to the low return rate. This study only had a 29% return rate out of 30 respondents, which was

not very high. It is very difficult to draw conclusions or to make statement regarding this particular school district or to generalize this information to other school districts when the sample was so small.

This study also had questions from the several of the respondents who indicated that the survey questions were too general and vague and therefore, made it more difficult for them to answer. Several teachers commented that because the survey didn't distinguish and separate disabilities, they chose to not complete it. One teacher commented to this researcher that each case is so different that it was difficult to fill out the survey when it was including all the students with disabilities that were in his classroom. He stated that a student with a disability success in his classroom sometimes determines if this student has an educational assistant to help him.

Recommendations

There are a number of recommendations this researcher has as a result of this study.

- 1) This researcher would recommend a bigger sample size. This researcher believes that this study might have been more accurate if it was done with an entire school district.
- 2) This researcher would recommend that surveys would be given at the beginning of the year and not at the end of the year when teachers are busy. The return rate may have been higher also if they would have been hand delivered or given after an in-service instead of submitted to their mailboxes. Many of the teacher's positions just were terminated or cut in this school district, which would result in attitudes possibly being more negative.

3) This study had survey questions that were general pertaining to inclusion, but the special education department may want to do another survey to examine teachers concerns in greater detail, especially staff training when working with students with disabilities. This school district may want to get more detailed feedback on what training is actually needed and in what areas. The school district may want to do an entire survey that just focuses on staff training.

4) Another recommendation for this study maybe to have a survey that is aimed toward one particular disability as some of the teachers expressed concern over generalizing all disabilities when answering this survey. Once it is aimed at one particular disability, than the questions could be more specific which would allow the teachers to answer the questions more specifically.

5) Another recommendation would be for this survey would be to include questions in regards to educational assistants in the regular education classroom. Appropriate assistance in the regular education room with use of an educational assistant, can help a student with a disability a great deal in the classroom. This survey didn't include educational assistants in the classroom, which could have affected the results. Some of the way teachers answered the questions could have been if the student with the disability had an educational assistant in the class.

Summary

The most significant result of this study, was that of regular education teachers stating their lack of training when working with students with disabilities. These results are similar to other researchers (Cook, 2001; Mock & Kauffman, 2002; Buell, Hallum & Gamel-Mccormick, & Scheer, 1999) who emphasized the importance of the regular

education teachers receiving training on teaching to students with disabilities. The practice of including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom is allowing regular education teachers, who may have had very little training in teaching in the area of children with disabilities, to be responsible for teaching a wide variety of students with varying types of disabilities, as well as other students in the classroom.

These findings are similar to research conducted by Buell, Hallum, Gamel-McCormick and Sheer (1999), who stated after surveying numerous regular education teachers regarding inclusion, that one of the biggest concerns regarding regular education teachers when working with students with disabilities is lack of training. Buell, Hallum, Gamel-McCormick and Sheer (1999) concluded their study by stating that regular education teachers need some training prior to working with student with disabilities, preferably prior to teaching, in order to be successful with students with disabilities in their classroom.

This study addressed concerns of regular education teachers toward appropriately including students with disabilities in their classrooms. The results would indicate that more work needs to be done regarding the concerns of regular education teachers and appropriately including students with disabilities in their classroom especially in the area of regular education teacher training on working with students with disabilities in their regular education classroom.

REFERENCES

- Bradley, D. , King-Sears, M., & Tessier-Switlick, D. (1997). *Teaching students in inclusive settings: From theory to practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Buell, M., Hallum, R., Gamel-Mccormick, S., & Sheer, S. (1999, June). A survey of general and special education teachers' perceptions and inservice needs concerning inclusion. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 46 (2),143-156. Retrieved March 22, 2003, from:
http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single.jhtml?nn=28
- Chesley, G., & Calaluce, P. (1997, December). The deception of inclusion. *Mental Retardation*, 35 (6), 488-490.
- Cook, B. (2001, Winter). A comparison of teachers' attitudes toward their included students with mild and severe disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34 (4), 203-213. Retrieved February 6, 2003, from:
http://vnweb.hwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_singles.jhtml?nn=22
- Dory, R., Dion, Y., Wagner, S., & Brunet, J. (2002, Spring). High school inclusion of adolescents with mental retardation: A multiple case study. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 37(3), 253-261. Retrieved February 25, 2003, from:
http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single.jhtml?nn=12
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. (1999). *Including students with special needs. A practical guide for classroom teachers*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Company.

- Giangreco, M., & Doyle, M. (2000). Curricular and instructional considerations for teaching students with disabilities in the regular education classrooms. In S. Wade (Ed.), *Inclusive education: A casebook of readings for prospective and practicing teachers* (pp. 51-70). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heflin, J., & Bullock, L. (1999, Spring). Inclusion of students with emotional/behaviorial disorders: A survey of teachers in general and special education. *Preventing School Failure*, 43(3), 103-111. Retrieved February 25, 2003, from: http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single.jhtml?nn=12
- Including students with disabilities in general education classrooms.* (1993). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 677)
- Knight, B. (1999, February). Towards inclusion of students with special education needs in the regular classroom. *Support of Learning*, 14 (1), 3-6.
- Lanier, N., & Lanier, W. (1996, Winter). The effects of experience on teachers' attitudes toward incorporating special students into the regular classroom. *Education*, 117, 234-240. Retrieved March 2, 2003, from: http://vnweb.hwwilson.com/hww/results/results/_single.jhtml?nn=11
- Mccormack, L., Frome Loeb, D., & Schiefelbusch, R. (1997). *Supporting children with communication difficulties in inclusive settings*. Needham Heights, MA.
- Mock, D., & Kauffman, J. (2002, Winter). Preparing teachers for full inclusion: Is it possible. *The Teacher Educator*, 37 (3), 202-215. Retrieved February 15, 2003, from: http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single.jhtml?nn=5

- Monahan, R., Marino, S., & Miller, R. (1996, Winter). Teacher attitudes toward inclusion: Implications for teacher education in schools 2000. *Education, 117*, 316-320. Retrieved March 2, 2003, from:
http://vn.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single.jhtml?nn=16
- Peterson, J., & Hittie, M. (2003). *Inclusive teaching: Creating inclusive schools for all learners*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Salend, S. (2001). *Creating inclusive classroom . Effective and reflective practice* (4th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Shier, E. (2001). *Preparing future educators to support inclusion college students' attitudes following pre-professional preparation*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie.
- The Statistical Package for Social Services for Windows (Computer software). (2002) Chicago, Ill: Authors.
- University Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie Undergraduate Bulletin. (2001-2003)
Retrieved April 25, 2003, from:
http://www.uwstout.edu/ugbulletin/ug_spd.html
- Wade, S. (2000). Inclusive education. *A casebook of readings for prospective and practicing teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wood, J. (1998). *Adapting instruction to accommodate students in inclusive setting*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.



Appendix A

Date: April 28, 2003

To: Bethanie Pick-Bowes

cc: Dr. Amy Schlieve
Education

From: Sue Foxwell, Research Administrator and Human
Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional
Review Board for the Protection of Human
Subjects in Research (IRB)

Subject: **Protection of Human Subjects--Expedited Review**

Your project, "Regular education teachers concerns regarding having students with disabilities in their classrooms," has been approved by the IRB through the expedited review process. The measures you have taken to protect human subjects are adequate to protect everyone involved, including subjects and researchers.

This project is approved through April 24, 2004. Research not completed by this date must be submitted again outlining changes, expansions, etc. Annual review and approval by the IRB is required.

Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB and best wishes with your project.

***NOTE: This is the only notice you will receive – no paper copy will be sent.**

Appendix B

Project Title: Regular education teachers' concerns regarding students with disabilities in their classrooms.

Beth Pick-Bowes of the Education Department at the University Wisconsin-Stout is conducting a research project titled, Regular Education Teachers Concerns Regarding Students with Disabilities in their Classroom. We would appreciate your participation in this study.

It is not anticipated that this study will present any medical or social risks to you. The information gathered will be kept confidential and any reports or findings of this research will not contain you name or any other identifying information. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. If at anytime you wish to stop participating in this research, you may do so, without coercion or prejudice. Just inform the researcher.

Once the study is completed, the analyzed findings would be available for your information.

Questions or concerns about this research study should be addressed to Beth Pick-Bowes, the researcher, at (651)385-8327 or Dr. Amy Schlieve, the research advisor, at (715)834-0270. Questions about the rights of research subjects can be addressed to: Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonee, Wi., 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

I understand that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary and I may discontinue my participation at any time without prejudice.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to investigate the problem, concerns of regular education teachers toward having students with disabilities in their classroom.

I further understand that any information about me that is collected during this study will be held in the strictest of confidence and will not be part of my permanent record. I understand that in order for this research to be effective and valuable certain personal identifiers need to be collected. I also understand that the strictest confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study and that only the researchers will have access to the confidential information. I understand that at the conclusion of this study all records, which identify individual participants, will be destroyed. I am aware that I have not and am not waiving any legal or human rights by agreeing to this participation.

By signing below I verify that I am 18 year of age or older, in good mental and physical condition, and that I agree and understand the conditions listed above.

Signature _____ Date _____

****Please return completed survey to survey box in mailroom by Thursday May 8
THANK YOU!**

Appendix C

Concerns Regarding Students With Disabilities In The Regular Education

Classroom

This survey will reflect concerns of regular education teachers toward student's with disabilities in their classroom. Please complete the survey and return to the box that is located by the mailboxes labeled **SURVEYS**. Responses will be collected and examined in anonymity. Thank you for participating in this survey. Remember, at anytime you may choose to stop participating in this survey, it is completely voluntary.

Please circle the choice that indicates your opinion for each question.

1-Strongly agree 3-Neutral
2-Agree 4-Disagree 5-Strongly Disagree

1) Regular education teachers have had enough training regarding working with students with disabilities in the regular education classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

2) Regular education teachers receive in-service training on working with students with disabilities on a yearly basis.

1 2 3 4 5

3) Students with disabilities improve their social skills when they participate in the regular education classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

4) Students with disabilities are accepted by their non-disabled regular education peers

1 2 3 4 5

5) Students with disabilities develop friendships with regular education students.

1 2 3 4 5

6) Students with disabilities can receive better academic instruction in a special education room rather than in a regular education room.

1 2 3 4 5

7) Regular education teachers would rather send a special education student to a special education room to get additional assistance that may be necessary for the regular education class.

1 2 3 4 5

8) Students with disabilities require more assistance and time than the regular education teacher can provide

1 2 3 4 5

9) Regular education teachers believe that it is difficult to meet the needs of students with disabilities in their regular education classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

10) Students with disabilities benefit from being included in the regular education classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix D
Data
Percentages and Frequencies

- 1) Regular education teachers have had enough training regarding working with students with disabilities in the regular education classroom.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
Agree				
Neutral	3	10	10	16.7
Disagree	18	60	60	76.7
Strongly Disagree	7	23.3	23.3	100
Total	30	100	100	

- 2) Regular education teachers receive in-service training on working with students with disabilities on a yearly basis.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree				
Agree	3	10	10	10
Neutral	1	3.3	3.3	13.3
Disagree	12	40	40	53.3
Strongly Disagree	14	46.7	46.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

- 3) Students with disabilities improve their social skills when they participate in the regular education classroom.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
Agree	14	46.7	46.7	63.3
Neutral	9	30.0	30.0	93.3
Disagree	2	6.7	6.7	100
Strongly Disagree				
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

- 4) Students with disabilities are accepted by their non-disabled regular education peers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
Agree	12	40	40	46.7
Neutral	12	40	40	86.7
Disagree	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
Strongly Disagree				
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

5) Students with disabilities develop friendships with regular education students.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	3	10.0	10.0	10.0
Agree	15	50.0	50.0	60.0
Neutral	9	30.0	30.0	90.0
Disagree	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree				
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

6) Students with disabilities can receive better academic instruction in a special education room rather than in a regular education room.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	6	20.0	20.0	20.0
Agree	10	33.3	33.3	53.3
Neutral	10	33.3	33.3	86.7
Disagree	3	10.0	10.0	96.7
Strongly Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

7) Regular education teachers would rather send a special education student to a special education room to get additional assistance that may be necessary for the regular education class.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	4	13.3	13.8	13.8
Agree	17	56.7	58.6	72.4
Neutral	6	20.0	20.7	93.1
Disagree	2	6.7	6.9	100.0
Strongly Disagree				
Total	29	96.7	100.0	
Missing system	1	3.3		
Total	30	100.0		

8) Students with disabilities require more assistance and time than the regular education teacher can provide

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	7	23.3	23.3	23.3
Agree	15	50.0	50	73.3
Neutral	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
Disagree	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
Strongly Disagree				
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

9) Regular education teachers believe that it is difficult to meet the needs of students with disabilities in their regular education classroom.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
Agree	14	46.7	46.7	63.3
Neutral	7	23.3	23.3	86.7
Disagree	3	10.0	10.0	96.7
Strongly Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

10) Students with disabilities benefit from being included in the regular education classroom.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	7	23.3	23.3	23.3
Agree	13	43.3	43.3	66.7
Neutral	9	30.0	30.0	96.7
Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Strongly Disagree				
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Research Questions

1) Do regular education teachers believe that they have had enough training to include students with disabilities into their classroom?

Survey Questions 1 and 2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.50	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
3.00	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
3.50	2	6.7	6.7	16.7
4.00	11	36.7	36.7	53.3
4.50	9	30.0	30.0	83.3
5.00	5	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

2) Do regular education teachers believe that a special education room may be a more appropriate setting for student with a disability? Survey Questions 7, 8,9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	2	6.7	6.9	6.9
1.25	1	3.3	3.4	10.0
1.75	3	10.0	10.3	20.7
2.00	4	13.3	13.8	34.5
2.25	4	13.3	13.8	48.3
2.5	9	10.0	10.3	79.3
2.75	3	10.0	10.3	89.7
3.25	1	3.3	3.4	93.1
3.50	2	6.7	6.9	100.0
Total	29	96.7	100.0	
Missing	1	3.3		
total	30	100		

3) Do regular education teachers believe that students with disabilities improve their social skills by being in the regular education classroom?

Survey Question 3, 4 and 5

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.33	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
1.67	4	13.3	13.3	20.0
2.00	4	13.3	13.3	23.3
2.33	7	23.3	23.3	56.7
2.67	5	16.7	16.7	73.3
3.0	5	16.7	16.7	90.0
3.33	1	3.3	3.3	93.3
3.67	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	