

Fall 2007

Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper

Stephanie Schubmehl
St. John Fisher College

[How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schubmehl, Stephanie, "Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper" (2007). *Education Masters*. Paper 56.

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit <http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations>.

This document is posted at http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters/56 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.

Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper

Abstract

There are many different types of classrooms in schools today. With more and more children entering schools, the need for different types of classrooms has changed. There are people who feel as though separating students based on educational need is not beneficial. They believe that every child should have an equal chance of success. This can either be accomplished by separating students with special needs or keeping them included in the general education classroom. In an inclusive setting, students are educated in the general education classroom. There are usually less students with more teacher assistance. People are either for or against the notion of inclusive education. The research in my proposal is going to look at the views of different parties involved with this educational classroom setup. The reason for this research and literature review is to conclude whether or not inclusion is beneficial in the general educational classroom. The literature review section of this paper will look at the research in which has already been analyzed. It will take an in-depth look at the opinions of the school personnel, parents and students involved in this educational setup. Within all of these parts, the researcher will pick apart exactly what people do and do not like about inclusive education. It will find out if there are situations in which inclusion is more useful than others. This will allow the researcher to decide if any specific type of student with special needs is more likely to succeed when being placed in the general education classroom. The literature will state what people are concerned with and what they feel confident about when it comes to inclusion in the general education classroom.

Document Type

Thesis

Degree Name

MS in Special Education

Department

Education

Subject Categories

Education

10-1-2007

Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper

Stephanie Schubmehl
St. John Fisher College

Follow this and additional works at: http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schubmehl, Stephanie, "Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper" (2007). *Education Masters*. Paper 56.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education at Fisher Digital Publications. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Masters by an authorized administrator of Fisher Digital Publications.

Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom? A Capstone Paper

Abstract

There are many different types of classrooms in schools today. With more and more children entering schools, the need for different types of classrooms has changed. There are people who feel as though separating students based on educational need is not beneficial. They believe that every child should have an equal chance of success. This can either be accomplished by separating students with special needs or keeping them included in the general education classroom. In an inclusive setting, students are educated in the general education classroom. There are usually less students with more teacher assistance. People are either for or against the notion of inclusive education. The research in my proposal is going to look at the views of different parties involved with this educational classroom setup. The reason for this research and literature review is to conclude whether or not inclusion is beneficial in the general educational classroom. The literature review section of this paper will look at the research in which has already been analyzed. It will take an in-depth look at the opinions of the school personnel, parents and students involved in this educational setup. Within all of these parts, the researcher will pick apart exactly what people do and do not like about inclusive education. It will find out if there are situations in which inclusion is more useful than others. This will allow the researcher to decide if any specific type of student with special needs is more likely to succeed when being placed in the general education classroom. The literature will state what people are concerned with and what they feel confident about when it comes to inclusion in the general education classroom.

Degree Type

Thesis

Degree Name

MS in Special Education

Department

Education

Subject Categories

Education

Running head: IS INCLUSION BENEFICIAL IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION

Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Educational Classroom?
A Capstone Paper

Stephanie Schubmehl

GSED 595
Fall 2007

Table of Contents

Introduction to Capstone Paper	4
Research of the Literature	5
Introduction	5
Statistical Data	9
Perspectives on Inclusion	14
Parents Perspectives on Inclusion	17
Teacher/Administrative Perspectives on Inclusion	20
Student Perspectives on Inclusion	23
Inclusion of Students with Mental Retardation	26
Conclusion	30
Research Analysis	31
Methodology	31
Results	33
Discussion	37
Conclusion	38
References	42
Appendix	A-1

Introduction to Capstone Paper

There are many different types of classrooms in schools today. With more and more children entering schools, the need for different types of classrooms has changed. There are people who feel as though separating students based on educational need is not beneficial. They believe that every child should have an equal chance of success. This can either be accomplished by separating students with special needs or keeping them included in the general education classroom. In an inclusive setting, students are educated in the general education classroom. There are usually less students with more teacher assistance. People are either for or against the notion of inclusive education. The research in my proposal is going to look at the views of different parties involved with this educational classroom setup.

The reason for this research and literature review is to conclude whether or not inclusion is beneficial in the general educational classroom. The literature review section of this paper will look at the research in which has already been analyzed. It will take an in-depth look at the opinions of the school personnel, parents and students involved in this educational setup. Within all of these parts, the researcher will pick apart exactly what people do and do not like about inclusive education. It will find out if there are situations in which inclusion is more useful than others. This will allow the researcher to decide if any specific type of student with special needs is more likely to succeed when being placed in the general education classroom. The literature will state what people are concerned with and what they feel confident about when it comes to inclusion in the general education classroom.

The research part of this capstone paper will be the researchers own study. It will take place in the surrounding community. Different teachers who are involved in school settings will be interviewed. These questions will be created prior to the interview. These will allow the researcher to see the different opinions of educators. The research part of this capstone will focus solely the educator's opinions. Interviews are being administered to see if and how inclusive education affects their lessons and daily classroom structure. In doing so, this research will show if teachers are in support of or against inclusion. In order for this method of teaching to work, everyone must be positively involved. The literature and research portions of this capstone paper will decipher whether or not inclusive education in the general educational classroom is beneficial.

Through both literature research and research done by the author, this capstone will conclude if inclusion is beneficial to every student involved in this process. All of the information will be solely based on opinions of people and not statistical facts. The researcher will create a fact sheet based on the information that has been obtained.

Research of the Literature

Introduction:

Inclusion of all students in the general education classroom has been a very controversial topic. Inclusion is "an approach in which students with disabilities receive the services and supports appropriate to their individual needs within the general education classroom" (Hardman, Drew & Egan, 2006, p.59). Some people feel that all students should be placed there, including students with special needs. This literary

review is going to look at the positive and negative perspectives of this teaching method. The focus will be on parents, students and teachers/administrators. Next, a deeper look will be taken at the different perceptions when the classification of the student is Mental Retardation.

Many people have different ideas of what inclusion actually is. Julian U. Stein (2004) states that “many people use the term “inclusion” not as full inclusion, but rather as “including” in or “integration” into regular classrooms” (p.21). This is slightly different than the definition of Wayne Sailor and Blair Rogers (2005), in which they state, “it provides needed supports, services, adaptations and accommodations to students with disabilities in order to preserve and enhance their educational participation in the LER” (p.503). LER stands for Least Restrictive Environment. The definition of LER is “the principle that, to the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities are to be educated with their peers who are not disabled” (Hardman, 2006, p.34). It makes sure, by law, that students are being placed in the classroom that benefits them the most.

Although these definitions are similar, they differ slightly. Throughout my paper, I am going to use the definition stated by Hardman, Drew and Egan. With these varying definitions of this practice, people have different opinions on where to place students. How a person feels about inclusion depends on the individual need of the child. In addition, how much a person has been exposed to this concept affects their judgment.

Inclusion does not mean that all students are expected to learn at the same rate. Students with special needs are “included in regular education classrooms. It matters not whether a child can do the academic work of the class, learn the concepts, master basics, perform skills, or keep up with non-disabled classmates” (Stein, 1994, p.21). This is very

important for people to understand. While including students with special needs, the goal is to have them experience the same lessons as the general education students do. The main objective is “to provide students with disabilities opportunities to be with and interact with non-disabled peers, primarily to foster social skills, to stimulate linguistic development and to build self esteem and self image” (p.21). The severity of a child’s disability may affect the rhythm of a classroom in a negative way. This concerns many people, including parents and educators.

According to Hardman (2006), there are different levels of inclusion. The lowest level is when a student participates in classes such as physical education and art, but they learn their core curriculum in a special education classroom. The next level includes more specialized classes. “Full inclusion is the type in which students with disabilities receive all instruction in a general education classroom; support services come to the student” (Hardman, 2006, p.59). The student will receive all of their education in the general education environment. The method implemented in an individual child’s daily routine depends on many different factors. These may include the parents opinion as to where they want them placed, the severity of their disability, whether the general education teacher is properly trained to teach every student and if the curriculum they need is available (p.59). These issues are very important to look at before placing a student into the wrong environment. The concepts of inclusion and mainstreaming are often used interchangeably, but should not be. Mainstreaming involves placing a student in the general education classroom for part or all day, but they do not learn the same information that the general education students do (p.59). It focuses only on the placement of the student, to increase the social interactions of special education students.

Often times, the students are mainstreamed and not included because they cannot learn the same material as the general education students. Inclusion goes beyond placement. It incorporates learning the same materials as well as interacting with students.

When focusing on inclusion, it is important that all personnel are involved, not just the general education teacher. “Both special and general education teachers are required to “fundamentally shift” their roles in an inclusive school” (Dukes & Dukes, 2005, p.55). These teachers need to work together to create the best possible setting, not only for the special education student, but also for all the students in the classroom. This means that all of the people involved with the student’s life need to be part of their education plan. These people would include the general education teacher, special education teacher, parent, school psychologist, the student, related service specialists and school administrators (Hardman, 2006, p.65). They will set up different goals for the student to meet. A meeting every few months is necessary to make sure that the student is benefiting from the inclusive setting. In addition, for inclusion to be successful, schools need to provide supplementary aids and services, individualized programming, support within the school and special instruction with appropriate adaptations (Stein, 1994, p.22).

Co-teaching is one method of inclusion where both of the general educator and special educator share the responsibilities in the classroom. Although they are both teaching, their roles are usually different. The “one teach/one assist” method is “where one teacher (usually general educator) assumes teaching responsibilities and the special educator provides individual support as needed” (Scruggs, Mastropier & McDuffie, 2007, p.392). This is not always the case in a co-taught classroom, but occurs most often.

Teachers do have concerns with this method of teaching. “Sufficient planning time, mastery of content by special educators, large class sizes and high-stake testing are challenges to co-teaching success” (p.393). Both educators are having a difficult time reaching every student with his/her classroom because of these issues. In addition, the need for administrative support, establishing co-teaching rules, effective planning, shared classroom management and appropriate assessments are all important for this type of classroom to run smoothly (p.394).

Statistical Data:

Statistical data for inclusion of special education students in Monroe County, New York State differs for various school districts. Below are statistical data for four different districts within the county. They are being compared to the county as a whole. Each of the school districts compares the percentage of students in different types of inclusive classrooms. Each chart compares the school district to Monroe County. This information on each of the four charts represents only the special education students. The percentages of each box are comparing that data against the total number of special education students in each school district. Here are the results:

Rochester School District

Student counts as of Dec 1, 2004	This District	This District	Total of All Public School Districts
Student Placement: Time outside a Regular Classroom	Count of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities
20% or less	3338	53.7%	54.1%
21% to 60%	206	3.3%	12.1%
More than 60%	2292	36.9%	27.4%
Separate Settings	382	6.1%	6.4%

(New York State School Report Card provided this data for Students with Disabilities as reported on December 1, 2004 off the New York State Department of Education Website)

The information being collected in this chart is the number of students who are placed in an inclusive classroom and how much of their time is spent there. For example, there are 3338 students spending 20% or less time outside the regular classroom. This represents 53.7% of the total number of students with disabilities. The Rochester Central School District places 36.9% of their students with special needs outside the regular classroom more than 60% or less of the time. This is above the average for Monroe County, whose statistics were 27.4%. This means that the Rochester School District has more students with needs in the special education classroom for the majority of the school day than the average school in this county does. In addition, only 6.1% of their students are placed in totally separate settings. This is better than 6.4% of the students in all of Monroe County. In conclusion, this graph implies that the majority of students

either spent most of their day in the general education classroom or the majority of their day outside of it. There is a small percentage falling between these extremes.

Greece Central School District

Student counts as of Dec 1, 2004	This District	This District	Total of All Public School Districts
Student Placement: Time outside a Regular Classroom	Count of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities
20% or less	907	71.2%	54.1%
21% to 60%	237	18.6%	12.1%
More than 60%	102	8.0%	27.4%
Separate Settings	27	2.1%	6.4%

(New York State School Report Card provided this data for Students with Disabilities as reported on December 1, 2004 off the New York State Department of Education Website)

The information for the Greece Central School District is different than that for the Rochester Central School District. Greece places the majority of their students with special needs in the general education classroom for most of the day. Of the total number of special education students, 89.8% of them are included in the general education classroom for 60% or less of the school day. This is above the average number of students with special needs in Monroe County, whose total is 66.2%. From these statistics, I can conclude that more students in Greece are included in the general education classroom than in most of Monroe County.

Webster Central School District

Student counts as of Dec 1, 2004	This District	This District	Total of All Public School Districts
Student Placement: Time outside a Regular Classroom	Count of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities
20% or less	640	60.0%	54.1%
21% to 60%	227	21.3%	12.1%
More than 60%	143	13.4%	27.4%
Separate Settings	56	5.3%	6.4%

(New York State School Report Card provided this data for Students with Disabilities as reported on December 1, 2004 off the New York State Department of Education Website)

The Webster School District is above the average for Monroe County in the placement of most students with special needs. They do put about 1% less students in separate settings. The major difference is that only 13% of students are placed outside the regular classroom 60% of the time compared to 27.4% of students in Monroe County. This district also places students in the general education classroom for more of the school day. About 35% of students spend more than 20% of the school day outside of the regular education classroom.

Pittsford Central School District

Student counts as of Dec 1, 2004	This District	This District	Total of All Public School Districts
Student Placement: Time outside a Regular Classroom	Count of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities	Percentage of Students with Disabilities
20% or less	440	72.8%	54.1%
21% to 60%	81	13.4%	12.1%
More than 60%	59	9.8%	27.4%
Separate Settings	24	4.0%	6.4%

(New York State School Report Card provided this data for Students with Disabilities as reported on December 1, 2004 off the New York State Department of Education Website)

Pittsford is more closely related to the Greece School District. They place 86.2% of the students with special needs in the general education classroom for at least 60% of the school day. This is above the average for Monroe County. Only 4.0% of their students are in totally separate settings. A conclusion can be drawn that Pittsford implements inclusion more in their school district than other districts in Monroe County.

I have chosen the larger school districts in Monroe County for my comparisons. Although the districts I opted to use did use inclusion in their classrooms for the majority of special education students, this does not mean that Monroe County is a strong advocate of this teaching strategy. The graphs above show that about half of the time, students are placed outside of the general education classroom more than 20% of the

school day. 27.4% of students are in separate settings more than 60% of the school day.

This means that about one out of every four students with special needs in Monroe

County spends the majority of the school day in special education classrooms. This

statistical data only pertains to Monroe County in New York State, not the state itself.

People who are advocates of inclusion think that more needs to be done to increase the

number of students with special needs in regular classrooms. Those who oppose this idea

will be satisfied with these findings.

Perspectives on Inclusion:

There are many different opinions as to whether or not every student should be

included in the general education classroom. In general, advocates of inclusion think the

general education setting is the best place for every type of student. They question “how

individuals with disabilities can be prepared for community living and society at large if

they know nothing but special programs and segregation” (Stein, 1994, p.22). Inclusion

would provide them with the knowledge of social skills that cannot be taught in a book.

This will help them learn how to interact with others. They feel that being in the general

education classroom will give them the skills they will need in order to obtain a job after

their schooling is complete.

“Inclusion can also provide opportunities for expanding social networks and

forming friendships” (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2001, p.265). These friendships cannot be

formed if they are limited to only the special education classroom. The social

involvement of all students in the general education classroom is necessary. These

interactions will help students with special needs learn how to socialize with others. As a

result, they will know how to act in the right manner in a job setting. Learning out of the book is not the only benefit of schools. Social interactions are a crucial part of a teenager's learning. Special education students also need these interactions.

“Proponents of total inclusion see special education as more harmful than helpful...the separation of these students is not only unequal, but is also detrimental to the development of all students” (Chow, Blais & Hemingway, 1999, p.460). Students do not learn the same information in special education classrooms. This can be harmful to them in the long run. They may not learn the basics that are needed to survive in everyday life once high school is over. Proponents realize that the severity of the individual's special needs would determine the appropriate placement for each student.

People who are against inclusion for all students feel that teaching special needs students in the regular education classroom will create problems for everyone who is involved. First, students with more severe disabilities would need to have a one-to-one aid. They may work at a slower rate than the rest of the class, so other supplements may need to be implemented. “This practice not only segregates special education students within the general education classroom, but also creates a distraction that has a detrimental effect on the general and special education student” (Sailor and Rogers, 2005, p.505). People who are against inclusion strongly believe this. They think that including a student with special needs will disrupt the regular flow of the classroom for the teacher and for the students. They do not think this is fair to any of the parties involved.

Opponents also think that these students are not prepared to learn the material in the classroom, especially in secondary school. Mastropieri and Scruggs state “teachers may feel that the techniques promoting inclusion success interfere with the demand for

extensive content coverage” (Mastropieri and Scruggs, 2001, p.273). Not every student will be able to learn the information at the same rate and special education students may slow down the other students. The normal flow of the classroom will be interrupted. “Students with learning disabilities who require “intense systematic instruction” that cannot be found in general education classrooms” (Chow et al., 1999, p.460). Opponents do not want every student to be placed into an inclusive setting that they are not prepared to handle. School is usually hard enough for students with disabilities; they do not want to make it any more difficult.

People who are against inclusion often worry about the motives of schools that want to place every child with a disability into the general education classroom. They fear that the economic costs of having two classrooms may be a factor. Chow et al. (1999) feel “total inclusion is a strategy to “dump” disabled students, regardless of need into regular education classrooms to save money (p.460).” It is more cost effective to educate all students in the general education setting. Administrators may try to place everyone in the same classrooms in order to keep school costs down. Opponents do not think it is fair to set aside what is best for the student, simply due to money issues.

Another possible negative aspect of inclusive education is that “it requires general educators to assume more responsibility for the design, implementation, and evaluation of students’ educational programs” (Lamar-Dukes & Dukes, 2005, p.55). They feel that the general education teacher is not prepared to teach students with special needs. In addition, they do not want the responsibility of more students in their classroom. Lamar-Dukes and Dukes (2005) also states “special educators need to learn how to work more effectively as collaborators in support of students’ participation in general education

classes” (p.55). Not only do the general education teachers need to be prepared for these changes, but the special education teachers also need to adjust to a new norm. Opponents do not think that they are ready to do so in our schools today. Once again, this will affect the quality of education that the student is receiving.

There are different people who are affected by the placement of a student in school. The parents of a student, the students themselves and teachers/administrators all have a part in deciding which classroom is the most effective for a child. Many of these people disagree for a number of different reasons on what is the most beneficial placement. Although their opinions on placement differ, they all want what is best for the child.

Parents Perspectives on Inclusion:

“Reasons parents were supportive of inclusion included beliefs that the child would learn more in a general education classroom” (Palmer, Fuller, Arora, & Nelson 2001, p. 467). Parents fear that their child may not be learning all the information they need to know in the special education classroom. “Special education classrooms are seen by some of these parents as limiting their child’s development due to the lack of a challenging curriculum or higher functioning role models” (p.473). Advocates were very pleased at the education their child was receiving in the general education classroom. They learned how to act in real-life situations that they can use in their post high school years.

“Parents responded with very positive perceptions reporting many academic, behavioral, and social outcomes that they attributed to their child being in the general

education class” (Gallagher, Floyd, Stafford, Taber, Brozovic & Alberto, 2000, p.136). They felt that their child’s needs were being fully met in a regular classroom. They were allowed to explore all aspects of school when they are not segregated. “Some general education parents report the positive social and academic benefits for their children due to involvement with persons with disabilities and the increase in instructional support in the classroom (Tichenor, Heins & Piechura-Couture, 2000, p.570).” Adherents also see the benefits of inclusion for those students without disabilities. They are also being influenced positively. Parents feel that when their child is placed in the general education classroom, peer relationships will help them socially.

Parents in support of inclusion feel that relationships that their child forms in the general education classroom are very important for them. They help them learn how to socialize and interact with others. Parents who have children that are involved in inclusion stated that their child had more self-esteem and social skills (Tichenor et al., 2000, p.573). In addition, they feel that the material being taught in the special education classroom does not teach them everything they need to know. Parents want their child in the general education setting because they feel they will emulate other students and want to act more like them (Gallagher et al., 2000, p.145). This will help their child know how to behave in a real life setting. It is known that if students can be successful in the classroom, they have a far greater chance of succeeding in the work place (Smoot, 2004, p.16). As a result, the child will be better prepared for society.

Another reason parent’s support inclusion in the general education classroom is because they feel the regular education students can become more sensitive to students with special needs (Palmer et al., 2001, p.473). This will teach students about diversity

and how to interact with different types of people. “Peers may serve as powerful natural supporters for students with disabilities in both academic and social areas (Hardman et al., 2006, p.66).” Often times, peers have the most influence on a child’s growing capabilities.

There are parents who are against having their child placed in an inclusive environment. They have concerns that their child with a disability will be a burden to the teacher and other students in the classroom (Palmer et al., 2001, p.480). In addition, they think that the needs of their child are too demanding for the regular classroom. As a result, regular classrooms will be more harmful than helpful. Their child will not only slow down the teacher, but also affect the learning rate of other students in the classroom. This will create “a place where the teacher is overworked, overwhelmed, and under-trained” (p.480). As a result, the teacher will have too much preparation work for his/her classroom. The result will be a negative learning environment for everyone.

Opponents worry that their child will not have access to appropriate therapies that their disabilities demand access to (Welsey, Buysse & Tyndall, 1997, p.446). As a result, regular classrooms will be more harmful than helpful. In addition, the overwhelming large class size, poor teaching conditions and demands related to teaching special education students in the general education classroom is asking too much for a teacher (Palmer et al., 2001, p.473).

Another negative aspect that concerns parents is their child will be ridiculed if they are included (p.473). Peer acceptance is very important to students. Special education students will shut down in the general education classroom if they feel they are being ridiculed. There are more academic and social challenges in this setting and some

parents feel it is too much for students with special needs. Parents who have children that are already in the general education classroom worry that their child will receive a “watered down” education (Tichenor et al., 2000, p. 570). This will be the result of teachers trying to adjust their lesson plans for everyone to succeed in their classroom.

School is demanding and stressful for students. Parents do not want to add more pressure to increase their child’s anxieties that may result from inclusion. In addition, opponents of inclusion are concerned that the lack of structure in the general education classroom will create more chaos than is needed. This could mean “teachers will spend too much time on disciplining and managing students with behavior problems or working with slower students” (Tichenor et al., 2000, p.570). Parents are worried that the general education teacher will be interrupted and students will not receive the education they deserve. They realize that the severity of a child’s disability may be a factor. The more severely disabled student may have fewer options.

Teacher/Administrative Perspectives on Inclusion:

The personnel within schools have mixed feelings about including everyone in the general education classroom. They feel that in order for inclusion to work, “a group of professionals, parents, and /or students must join together to plan and implement an appropriate educational program” is necessary (Hardman, 2006, p.65). Even though special educators and principals do not agree on many issues in my article, they agree on this. Cook, Semmel and Gerber (1999) state, “positive attitudes of key school personnel were seen as critical prerequisites for successful inclusion” (Cook et al., 1999, p.199). The main focus is to describe the different opinions that special education teachers,

general education teachers and principals have on inclusive education. Teachers are the most skeptical about inclusive education. Obviously, they are most directly involved in the classrooms.

School personnel in support of inclusion feel that it is beneficial to all students in the classroom. They see the positive influence it has on both the general and special education student. "Secondary-level teachers usually display a less positive attitude towards educational inclusion than do elementary-level teachers" (Mastropieri and Scruggs, 2001, p.267). This is because the course material is more demanding in later years of education. Teachers that are pro-inclusion feel that with extra planning time, inclusion can be successful (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996, p.64). Students with special needs typically learn better when they are being taught with "real life" information. Teachers need to adjust lesson plans so they are more hands-on.

Teachers do have some demands when including every student in their classroom. They would like "administrative support, flexibility in scheduling time, level of pre-service and in-service training and special/general education collaboration" (Villa, Thousand, Meyers & Nevin, 1996, p.41). These are things that need to be implemented before a successful inclusion program can occur. Administrators need to be supportive and supply resources that are necessary for students to succeed in the general education classroom (Scruggs et al., 2007, p.400). More staff and training may be needed for this to occur. In order for inclusion to work, classrooms must have the resources to teach every student in their class. "Limited resources decrease the educational opportunities of included students with mild disabilities" (Cook et al., 1999, p.205). Classrooms need to

be set up with the appropriate materials to teach students with disabilities in order for inclusion to be a good idea.

Both teachers and administrators should have at least 4-6 years of training in how to understand and educate students with special needs (Villa et al., 1996, p.42). Teachers do not feel they have enough training to be able to meet the needs of these students. It will not only be hard on the teacher, it could negatively affect the students learning. This is the number one concern of most teachers who are starting to practice inclusion. Special educators do not feel that regular education classrooms are prepared yet to successfully teach these students. Cook et al. (1999) state, "Positive attitudes of key school personnel were seen as critical prerequisites for successful inclusion" (Cook et al., 1999, p.199). For inclusion to be successful, teachers strongly believe that they need the help of school personnel, especially the special educator.

The opinions of principals and teachers do differ when it comes to whether or not inclusion is beneficial. In Cook et al.'s (1999) research, they noticed that far more principals than teachers felt that students were improving academically in the general education classroom (p.204). In addition, they did not feel that resources were beneficial in deciding whether or not inclusion was working. This was the opposite of the opinions of the special education teachers. Principals were more in support of academic outcomes than they were in ways to reach these outcomes (more resources and training for teachers). "Administrators need to study and understand the change process and recognize that it takes more time for new cultures and education practices to replace the old" (Villa et al., 1996, p.42). Administrators need to understand inclusion as much as

the teacher does. They need to be supportive and have the necessary resources available for teachers to use in their classrooms.

Many people are concerned that principals are more interested in trying to cut costs within schools than they are with what is best for each individual student (Cook et al., 1999, p.204). Teachers are concerned that principal's and other school personnel support inclusion because it is more cost efficient. Being cost efficient is a consideration, but not what is most important in schools. The number one priority should always be the education of the students.

Student Perspective on Inclusion:

Lastly, the opinion of students is very necessary for inclusion to work. If the students do not want to be in a certain school setting, they can shut down academically. The child may not work to his or her full potential. The opinions of students are based more on the social aspect of school, rather than the educational benefits. Research has been done that shows the "positive relationship between learning and classroom climate factors such as class cohesiveness, establishment of formal rules, goal directives, and satisfaction with class relationships" (Hansen & Boody, 1998, p.611). They are learning behavioral lessons in the general education classroom that cannot be learned in the special education setting. A number of studies have shown evidence of support that repeated contact with students with intellectual disabilities in a general education setting has had a positive impact on general education students (Siperstein, Parker, Bardon & Widaman, 2007, p.436). Students with special needs are learning not only educational material, but also how to socialize and befriend others. This is crucial for them to

succeed in life after high school. "Educating students with and without disabilities in the same classrooms would provide more opportunities for social interaction (p.436).

Supporters also feel that the relationships they are creating with the general education students are positive. "Students in special schools are expected to have poorer social skills, more difficulty in establishing social friendships and a higher level of emotional distress and signs of depression" (Heiman & Margalit, 1998, p.157).

Advocates feel that separating students with disabilities not only is harmful to them academically, but also socially. "Students in pull-out programs are much more likely to be stigmatized" (Hardman et al., 2006, p.60). Supporters feel that it may take more work, but a student will only benefit from an inclusive setting. Students with disabilities may need extra time to complete the same tasks as their classmates, so this should be given to them. Allow students to succeed in the general education classroom and they will.

Advocates against inclusion feel differently. They are concerned with a student's emotional well being. "Loneliness, truancy, dropping out of school, juvenile delinquency, adult crime, psychopathology, poor job performance, and suicide have all been associated with low peer acceptance in childhood" (Cook et al., 1999, p.50). People who are against inclusion feel that the general education students are not accepting students, which is creating a negative learning environment. Studies have shown that even though students are being placed in the same classroom, their opinions and social interactions outside of the classroom has not changed (Siperstein et al., 2007, p.452). There are a few students who will interact with students with special needs outside of a school setting (p.452). This shows people that are against inclusion that students in the

general education classrooms are not learning how to interact and befriend students with special needs.

“Students perception of rejection or of being ignored and their resulting feelings of isolation and disconnection often are manifested in feelings of perceived loneliness” (Pavi & Luftig, 2000, p.9). These advocates do not want students to be social outcasts in the general education classroom. In addition, students are more willing to accept students with special needs in nonacademic classes before they are for academic classes (Siperstein et al., 2007, p.452). If students do not feel accepted by their peers, they may shut down and not perform well academically (Smoot, 2004, p.19).

Depending on a child’s disability, their behavior may be the reason for their segregation. “When students with minor disabilities exhibit atypical and potentially threatening behavior, it may lead to peer rejection rather than be excused or accepted” (Cook et al., 1999, p.51). If a student is disrupting a class, this may result in the other students disliking the individual. Those against inclusion think that a student’s disability may make them more disruptive and their peers will look negatively at this behavior. Students with emotional/behavioral disorder (ED) may create disruptions in the classroom that will affect the learning of students without the disorder. There is the fear that the general education students will grow to resent those with ED.

Both supporters and non-supporters feel that if inclusion is implemented in schools, new strategies need to be placed in the classroom. It is known that if students can be successful in the classroom, they have a far greater chance of succeeding in the work place (Smoot, 2004, p.16). As a result, teachers need to focus on both the academic and social skills of students with disabilities. Smoot states “teachers can include the

student with special needs in collaborative group activities or communication exercises (p.16). This creates an open classroom for every student and gives special education students the opportunity to create relationships with the general education students. In addition, peer tutoring will build relationships, boost self-esteem, and increase the acceptance of students with disabilities in the inclusive setting (Hardman et al., 2006, pg.67). It is essential for students to feel welcome by everyone in order for them to do well in the classroom. Other students may notice that these mentors are accepting of students with disabilities, so they will be as well.

Another way to increase the acceptance of students with special needs is to have teachers educate students about disabilities. Such a course might include, “information about methods of dealing with possible negative attitudes and fears of non-handicapped students” (Certo, Haring & York, 1984, p.118). Non-disabled students will be taught how to interact and accept different types of people. They would also educate the general education students by “arranging for positive interactions between non-handicapped and handicapped students, and exposure to media that provide students with information about handicaps” (p.118). These would all help the integration process of all students.

Inclusion of Students with Mental Retardation:

Everyone involved with a child should have a say in his or her placement in school. Supporters and advocates against inclusion feel strongly about their individual opinions. It is important that everyone is listened to so these differences can one day be worked out. The severity of a child’s disability is a strong factor on placement.

“Teachers are more willing to include students with mild disabilities than students with

more severe disabilities” (Hardman, 2006, p.80). The more severe the child’s disability, the more time an educator needs to spend with a child. Students with mental retardation can range in degrees from mild to profound. Mental retardation (MR) is defined as:

A disability characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior as expressed in conceptual, social and practical adaptive skills. This disability originates before age 18 and with an IQ of approximately 70-75 and lower (Hardman et al., 2006, p.274)

Students with mental retardation can be included in the classroom, but only up to a certain degree. Those who are classified as “trainable” have IQs between 40 and 55, are non-educable and can only be trained outside of a school setting (Hardman, 2006, p.277). They do not have the mental capacity to retain information. These students do not have the option of being in an inclusive environment. Students who are “educable” can be taught and may be able to handle some of the academic demands in the classroom (p.277). These students may have the opportunity to be in an inclusive environment, but will have difficulties. They may need the assistance of a teacher’s aide and the general education teacher will need to put extra time into lesson planning in order to meet their needs.

“Some children with mental retardation are included for only a part of the school day and attend only those general education classes that their individual education program (IEP) team feels fits their functioning level” (p.297). These classes may include physical education and art. There are other students who are included for the full day in the general education classroom. “The number of children with mental retardation who were placed primarily in separate classrooms and facilities (greater than 60% of the time)

decreased by approximately 40,000 from 1990 to 2000” (Cameron & Cook, 2007, p.353). This is a large step towards inclusion of every student in the general education classroom. The severity of the disorder decides the placement of the student in these cases.

Mental retardation has a wide range, so placement needs to be decided based on the IQ of the student. Since you diagnose a person with MR by an IQ test, a student may also have another disability along with it. Possibilities may include autism, traumatic brain injury and emotional disorders. This is known as having multiple disabilities, “the combination of which causes such severe educational needs that the individual cannot be accommodated in special education programs designed solely for one on the impairments” (Hardman et al., 2006, p.338). When someone with MR has multiple disabilities, inclusion is hard to implement.

There are many different opinions on how people feel about including students with mild and severe mental retardation. Critics are worried that “teachers do not know how to provide instruction that meets the unique needs of students with obvious disabilities” (Cook, 2001, p.211). These students need to be in a separate setting because they need the one-to-one aide constantly. Their mental capacity is weak resulting in student’s forgetfulness. Important ideas need to be taught and re-taught. The special education classroom can provide a student with MR this extra time. “If inclusive teachers feel that they do not know how to appropriately instruct students with severe and obvious disabilities, they will hold low expectations for them” (p.211). Inclusion does not benefit a student with MR if the teacher is holding them to low expectations. They will fall behind.

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) conducted a case study on how teachers perceived inclusion. They took twenty-eight investigations over the years from 1958 to 1995. Their research was based on different journal articles that had been published. They stated that one study concluded that of 71.9% of teachers who supported inclusion; only 22.8% were in favor of mainstreaming educable mental retardation” (Scruggs et al., 1996, p.63). These findings were similar throughout all of the journals. The conclusion was that the support of mainstreaming/inclusion was dependant upon the severity of a student’s disability and the amount of additional teacher responsibility required (p.63). The conclusion that was drawn from this case study was that teachers were more supportive of including students with mild disabilities versus severe disabilities.

“When severely handicapped students are placed within an integrated public school, a significant amount of time must be spent with the handicapped student” (Certo et al., 1984, p.11). It is necessary for all school administrations to supply additional aides in the general education classroom. “If these crucial factors are not in place, and not aggressively maintained, one could predict a decline in school personnel acceptance of and commitment to the least restrictive environment concept” (p.74). Students with MR need the extra time in and outside the classroom. Teachers feel this may be too much if outside help is not implemented.

Students with MR also have peer acceptance issues. “Because adolescents with mild MR encounter difficulties in acquiring social knowledge and in performing social skills, they are likely to have difficulties establishing appropriate relationships with their peers” (Heinman & Malka, 1998, p.156). Like peer acceptance with students with disabilities, those who are classified as MR also have problems becoming friends with the

general education student. They are often not accepted in the classroom. Students may get aggravated because MR children need extra explanations. This slows the flow of the classroom. Students with mental retardation are more accepted in middle and high school compared to elementary school (p.156). As a result, students are more prone to become depressed (p.156).

Parents' perspectives also vary, depending on the severity of their child's MR. Their main concern is that the general education classroom does not have the services necessary to provide for their child. Teachers do not have enough time in class to give their child the additional assistance they need. "Parents are more likely to agree with professionals if the system adopts and implements procedures that serve severely handicapped children in integrated settings, according to their unique needs" (Certo et al., 1984, p.317). Some parents do support inclusion for their children with MR. Others do not want their child with MR in the general education classroom, feeling they do not benefit from an inclusive setting.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, an inclusive education for all students is a controversial topic. Both sides have very compelling reasons why or why not a child should stay in the special education classroom. The degree of disability may determine whether inclusion is positive or negative. Those with more severe problems may not benefit from an inclusive environment. They need more one-to-one time with the teacher that will not be provided in the inclusive setting. On the other hand, many students who are being secluded in school are capable of handling a general education environment. They

deserve the same opportunities that the general education student receives. Children are different and their unique needs must be met, either in the general education classroom or the special education classroom.

Research Analysis

Methodology:

The research part of this capstone was taken by individual surveys. The study was held in a school setting in the upstate NY area. The surveys were passed out to three different school districts in this area. To ensure the participants did not feel uncomfortable answering any of the questions, no other person was present at the time of the interview. There were twenty surveys passed out. The surveys were administered at the school buildings. Teachers were given one week to fill out their surveys. This gave them time to think about their answers. The surveys were placed in teacher's mailboxes in these school districts. The surveyor chose ten surveys to use in the study. The ten were chosen at random. They took place in both urban and suburban settings.

Each survey consists of an introduction letter, eight inclusion-based questions, and a consent form (A-1 to A-6). Teachers were asked to answer as many questions as they felt comfortable answering. They were told to skip any question that did not relate to their teaching position. In addition, any question that made them feel uneasy, they were told to skip. The educators were asked to be as honest and precise as possible when answering every question. They were given a consent form that they had to sign stating that any information that they wrote could be used as research, but their name would

never be listed. All answers are confidential. Out of the eight questions, the researcher evaluated four of them. This information was put into separate charts. The data was then analyzed and discussed by the researcher.

The sample of the research was strictly teachers. Although the literary review included parents and students, they were not questioned in the research portion of this capstone. These teachers were from both urban and suburban settings. Special educators and general educators were interviewed. All responses were from female teachers. This was not intentional. The educators that were questioned were between the ages of 25 to 55. The researcher received fifteen surveys back out of twenty and ten were used for research. Each completed surveyed showed that individual's opinion on inclusive education.

The first school district surveyed was in an urban setting. The surveys were taken at the elementary grade level. Four surveys were taken from this school district. The second school district that was used for research was in a suburban area. The setting was at the elementary grade level. Three surveys were chosen from this district. The last school district surveyed was also located in a suburban area, but in the secondary grade level. There were three surveys chosen from this school district. All ten questionnaires show a minor percentage of opinions compared to the districts as a whole.

All of the information received from these districts was put into chart form to be analyzed. Although there will be more than ten surveys received, the surveyor only chose ten in use for statistical information. When reviewing the information, the researcher noted both positive and negative answers received from the teachers being surveyed.

Results:

The ten surveys were collected and analyzed. The researcher chose the four questions to focus on. Many of the participants are involved in a co-taught classroom setting. This may have influenced their opinions on inclusive education. All of the participants agreed that inclusion was beneficial in the general education classroom, but not all of the time. One educator who answered the survey stated that she did not get along with the educator that she co-teaches with, so inclusion was not beneficial for her students. The educators had positive things to say about inclusion, but were concerned about which students with special needs were being pushed into the general educational classroom. A few stated that students with significant learning needs did not benefit in their classrooms. In addition, students with behavioral problems disrupt the classroom atmosphere. These were the two major situations that many of the educators stated as being problematic.

Many of the educators had similar answers to their questions. Grade level and geographical locations did not affect the responses. Here is the statistical data that was taken from the surveys. (Many of the teachers who answered these surveys partake in co-taught classrooms).

Question 1:
What are the benefits of inclusion? What are the negatives of inclusion?

Benefits	# Responses	Negatives	# Responses
Monitoring students easier/ Better management	6	Teachers do not get along/ Do not want to co-teach	2
Smaller student/teacher ratio	5	Limited planning time	2
Students learn how to work with all types of students	4	Students with behavioral problems disrupt classroom	2
More individual attention	3	Spec. Ed. Students may need more individual time with teachers	2

From this information, the reader can see that six out of the ten teachers felt that having two educators in the classroom decreased behavior problems. Having “two sets of eyes” in the classroom helped students stay on task because one teacher can monitor while the other one teaches the lessons. Since there are two people in the classroom, half of the educators believed that their students got more one-on-one attention. In addition, students also have the opportunity to work with all kinds of students in the classroom. This helped the general educational and the special educational students interact socially with each other.

There were also concerns that these educators have. In a co-teaching setting, in order for it to work, the two teachers need to get along and have the same basic philosophy in the classroom. A few teachers complained that they did not get along with their partner. This made it very difficult to teach. Two of the ten teachers stated that another problem that had arisen is limited planning time for them to individualize each lesson to include every student. Students need to be included in the lessons, but may

need alternative assessments to grasp ideas. Extra planning time is needed to personalize their lesson plans to fit the needs of their students with learning delays. Two other educators stated that students with severe behavior problems disrupt the learning process in their classroom. This affects their teaching routines and the concentration of other students in their classroom. Last, two educators mentioned that there are situations where the special education student needs more one-on-one time with them. Students receive this when they are in the special education classroom setting because there are fewer students there. When being included in with the general education population, lessons go faster and students may get lost.

All in all, the teachers all felt that inclusion was beneficial for most students, but not all. Some students need more individual time and extra resources for them to succeed in the classroom. There was not a teacher who felt that inclusion was a negative idea. They all agreed that is a great concept when properly implemented in schools.

**Question 2:
How do students interact in your inclusive setting?**

Teacher Responses	# of Teachers who Responded
Fine, they are not old enough to understand	2
All the students interact fine together	7
They make fun of the special education students	1

Another concern that people have when placing special education students in the general population is that these students will not interact positively with each other.

From the responses of the surveys, nine out of ten educators stated that their students all

interact fine with each other. Two out of these nine stated this was because their students are too young to understand differences yet. Only one educator stated that the special education students get “picked on” in their classroom. This concludes that students do not have a problem interacting with each other when placed together in a classroom. These teachers were pleased with the interactions all of their students have with each other.

**Question 3:
Is classroom management different in an inclusive classroom setting?
Explain.**

Teacher Responses	# of Teachers who Responded
Yes, classroom management is different	9
No, classroom management is the same if you have a good plan in effect	1
Less discipline problems because there are two teachers in the classroom	5
Two teachers need to get along and agree with each other for inclusion to work	5

From the results of this survey question, the conclusion drawn is that classroom management is different in an inclusive classroom. Nine out of ten teachers stated that the management issues they have in their inclusive classrooms are different. The teacher who said it does not affect the classroom felt that if a good management plan is in place, it does not matter which type of child is in her classroom. The students will behave and follow the rules of the classroom as a result. Of the nine that stated it was different, five felt that having two teachers in the classroom cuts down on discipline problems. In addition, five out of the nine teachers stated that the two teachers needed to agree for co-teaching to be beneficial. In conclusion, the research indicates that in an inclusive classroom with co-teachers, behavioral problems are decreased in the classroom.

Question 4:

When do you think inclusion is either beneficial or not beneficial for all students (both general and special education students)?

All of the teachers who responded to this question (9 out of 10) stated that inclusion was beneficial most of the time. These are the times when they did not feel it was beneficial:

- **There are significant delays in their learning**
- **Their needs are too severe for a general education classroom**
- **Students need 1-1 attention that they can not receive in the general education classroom**
- **They are struggling with basic skills**
- **When co-teaching, the two teachers do not get along with each other**
- **When there is not an appropriate time for them to plan their lessons or not enough materials are provided to them**

Teachers are concerned that not every student is ready to be taught in a general educational setting. When there are significant learning delays or behavior problems, they may disrupt every student in the classroom. In addition, these teachers were concerned that they do not have enough planning time to get their lesson plans individualized for every student. Teachers stated that they need this extra time to create plans that include every student. If there is not enough planning time during the day, they cannot make these necessary adjustments. This may not be the case in every inclusive classroom.

Discussion:

From the survey answers, the conclusion that can be drawn is that inclusion is beneficial in the general education classroom. The common concern that educators had was how much planning time they are allowed and whether or not the special education students are prepared to be in a general education setting. Many of the answers stated

that educators were worried students with significant learning delays will struggle in an inclusive setting. The general education classroom goes at a faster pace than the special education classroom. In addition, there are more students in a mainstreamed classroom, so teachers do not have as much one-on-one time with their students. Students with special needs are used to having these extra resources. There are circumstances when it takes certain students longer to process information than it would others. Educators are concerned that students with disabilities are not getting the extra time they need in an inclusive classroom setting.

The majority of the educators also felt that when involved in co-taught classes, management problems are lowered. This is the result of having two adults to control problematic students compared to only one. “Two eyes were better than one” was their feelings. Students are less likely to get away with bad behavior in their classrooms as a result. As stated before, many of the teachers who answered the surveys co-teach, so it was not specified whether or not it is more difficult in a single-teacher inclusive classroom.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, there are mixed feelings on whether or not inclusion is beneficial in the general education classroom. This research focused on the opinions of the people involved with inclusion to decide if it is a positive learning environment for students. The literature review discussed the opinions of school personnel, parents and students involved in inclusive education. Both the positive and negative opinions on inclusion are included in the research. The research-based portion of the paper examines only at the

teacher's perspectives, not students or parents. Surveys were handed out in the greater Rochester area. The questions asked different teachers to state their opinions on different aspects of inclusion. After comparing the literary review and the survey questions, similarities and differences were found.

From the results of the literary review, the conclusion that can be drawn is that students and parents both have the same concerns. They are afraid the general educational students will not accept them socially. "Willingness to interact occurs only within the realm of school-related activities and does not generalize to activities outside of school" (Siperstein et al. 2007, p.452). Parents want their children to be accepted socially, as well as academically. Since they are not being accepted, they worry it will create them to either shut down or act out in the classroom. On the contrary, supporters feel that it does teach children to work with and interact with other students. In addition, they do not think it is fair to keep them segregated from the general public in the school building. Supporters feel that they have the right to learn with every child in school.

The results of the literature review showed that the school personnel had both positive and negative things to say about inclusive education. Supporters of inclusion felt that it benefits special education students to learn with their peers. They believed that it is both academically and socially beneficial for all students involved. In addition, they do not think it is right to keep students separated from their peers for the majority of the school day. If a student is able to emotionally handle the general education classroom, they should not be segregated. "A meaningful change will require educators to reinvent schools to be more accommodating to all dimensions of human diversity" (McLesky & Waldron, 2007, p.166). This means, for inclusion to work, changes need to occur inside

the classroom. McLesky and Waldron (2007) state that putting more resources in the classroom such as “adding a special education teacher, providing the classroom teacher with an instructional assistant, or by reducing class size (p.163)” might help teachers maximize teaching abilities.

Those who oppose inclusion do not feel that a student with special needs benefits in the general education classroom. Teachers do not feel prepared to teach these students. “Practicing teachers have reported a lack of competence and the need for more training in planning and making adaptations for including students with disabilities” (Cameron et al., 2007, p.354). A concern is that general education teachers do not have the knowledge to include such students. Also, some educators are worried that students may fall behind because the workload is larger and lessons go faster in a mainstream setting. They are fearful that these students receive the extra help that they need. In addition, they will not get the one-on-one attention that they would in a special educational setting. As a result, they will not learning the concepts being taught.

The surveys administered by the researcher resulted in similar conclusions. All ten of the educators surveyed were supporters of inclusion. They felt that it was beneficial in their classroom and should be implemented in every school district. “Regular educators, however, spend significantly more nonacademic time attending to the educational needs of students with learning or behavioral difficulties” (Johnson & Fullwood, 2006, p.20). In these cases, they felt that students should be placed in a separate setting. In addition, when co-teaching, they strongly felt that teachers must get along with each other in order for inclusion to be beneficial. There were more positive comments given than negative ones. This was the main difference between the surveys

taken by the researcher and the published research. In addition, the surveys were more in support of an inclusive classroom. There was not one teacher who was not a supporter of inclusion. Grade level and geographical setting did not affect any responses. Teachers felt that inclusive education is a positive concept.

There were similarities between the published research and the surveys conducted. Both research methods concluded that more planning time must be available for teachers. "In mainstream classes, regular educators will require additional time, effort, and resources to deal with such students" (Johnson et al., 2006, p.20). In a co-taught setting, having two teachers in a classroom can decrease the problems that may arise from placing emotionally disturbed students in the general education setting. In addition, both research methods showed teachers are concerned with student with severe emotional and educational needs being mainstreamed. They both felt that there are situations when it is best for students to be placed in a separate location.

In conclusion, there were more similarities than differences in the two research methods. A conclusion can be drawn that inclusion is a positive concept, but it may not be beneficial for every student with special needs. What is best for a child should always be the number one priority. Every child has his or her own individual needs. Before change can occur, school personnel must make sure that the general educational setting is what is best for a student. Parents, student and teachers all have their own concerns with inclusion. It is important for these people to all work together to find the best placement for a student.

References

- Cameron, D.L., Cook, B.G. (2007). Attitudes of Preservice Teachers Enrolled in an Infusion Preparation Program regarding Planning and Accommodations for Included Students with Mental Retardation. *Education and Training Development Disabilities*, 3, 353-363.
- Certo, N., Haring, N., & York, R. (1984). *Public School Integration of Severely Handicapped Students*. Baltimore, Maryland: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Chow, P., Blais, L., Hemingway, J. (1999). An outsider looking in: total inclusion and the concept of equifinality. *Education*, 3, 459-465.
- Cook, B.G., Semmel, M.I., Gerber, M.M. (1999). Attitudes of principals and special education teachers toward the inclusion students with mild disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 4, 199-207.
- Cook, B.G., Semmel, M.I., Gerber, M.M. (1999). Peer acceptance of included students with disabilities as a function of severity of disability and classroom composition. *The Journal of Special Education*, 1, 50-61.
- Gallagher, P.A., Floyd, J.H., Stafford, A.M., Taber, T.A., Brozovic, S.A., Alberto, P.A. (2000). Inclusion of students with moderate or severe disabilities in educational and community settings: perspectives from parents and siblings. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 35, 135-147.
- Hansen, L.L., Boody, R.M. (1998). Special education students' perceptions of their mainstreamed classes. *Education*, 4, 610-615.
- Hardman, M.L., Drew, C.J., & Egan, M.W. (2006). *Human exceptionality; school, community, and family*. Boston; Allyn and Bacon.

Heiman, T., Malka, M. (1998). Loneliness, depression, and social skills among students with mild mental retardation in different educational settings. *Journal of Special Education, 3, 154-164.*

Johnson, H.L., Fullwood, H.L. (2006). Disturbing Behaviors in the Secondary Classroom: How Do General Educators Perceive Problem Behaviors? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33, 20-39.*

Lamar-Dukes, P., Dukes, C. (2005). Consider the roles and responsibilities of the inclusion support teacher. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 1, 55-61.*

Palmer, D.S., Fuller, K., Arora, T., Nelson, M. (2001). Taking sides: parent views on inclusion for their children with severe disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 4, 467-484.*

Mastropieri, M.A., Scruggs, T.E. (2001). Promoting inclusion in secondary classrooms. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24, 265-274.*

McLeskey, J., Waldron, N.L. (2007). Making Differences Ordinary in Inclusive Classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 3, 162-168.*

The New York State Department of Education

<http://www.vesid.nysed.gov>

Pavri, S., Luftig, R. (2000). The social face of inclusive education. are students with learning disabilities really included in the classroom? *Preventing School Failure, 1, 8-15.*

Sailor, W., Roger, B. (2005). Rethinking inclusion: school wide applications. *Phi Delta Kappan, March, 503-509.*

Scruggs, T.E., Mastropieri, M.A. (1996). Teacher perceptions of

- mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958-1995: a research synthesis. *Exceptional Children*, 1, 59-75.
- Scruggs, T.E., Mastropieri, M.A., McDuffie, K.A. (2007). Co-Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms: A Metasynthesis of Qualitative Research. *Exceptional Children*, 4, 392-416.
- Siperstein, G.N., Parker, R.C., Bardon, J.N., Winaman, K.F. (2007). A National Study of Youth Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Students with Intellectual Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 435-455.
- Smoot, S.L., (2004). An outcome measure for social goals of inclusion. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 3, 15-23.
- Stein, J.U. (1994). Total inclusion or least restrictive environment? *Joperd*, November-December, 21-25.
- Tichenor, M.S., Heins, B., Piechura-Couture, K. (2000). Parent perceptions of a co-taught inclusive classroom. *Education*, 3, 569-574.
- Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S., Meyers, H., Nevin, A. (1996). Teacher and administrator perceptions of heterogeneous education. *Exceptional Children*, 1, 29-46.
- Wesley, P.W., Buysse, V., Tyndall, S. (1997). Family and professional perspectives on early intervention: an exploration using focus groups. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 4, 435-455.

Appendix

Survey Handouts

Stephanie Schubmehl
2042 Five Mile Line Road
Penfield, NY 14526

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Stephanie Schubmehl and I am a graduate student at St. John Fisher College. I am receiving my Master's degree in Special Education 7-12, and will be graduating in May of 2008. I am writing my capstone paper on inclusive education. This concept is when a student with special needs is not separated from his or her peers, but educated with in the general education classroom. It is becoming very common in today's schools.

The first part of my capstone will consist of a literature review, discussing the positive and negative opinions of different people involved in the inclusion process. I will take the literature that already exists to see how school personnel, parents and students feel about this issue. The second part of my capstone will consist of research, which will be conducted with actual people. I will use different methods to obtain information outside of what is already documented. This part of my capstone will be my own research that I find within the Rochester area. The focus of my research will only be educators. From this data, I will see what how you feel on this topic. In doing so, I will try to negate any bias that may form. I will take into consideration the different circumstances when inclusion may be implemented.

I would like it if you would participate in my study. Following this letter, I have questions for you to answer. Please answer them as honest as possible. Your response will never be seen by the general public.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your answers will greatly help the research for my capstone paper.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Schubmehl

5.) Are you given extra planning time to create lesson plans that include every student in your classroom?

6.) How do your students interact in your inclusive classrooms?

7.) When do you think inclusion is either beneficial or not beneficial for all students (both general and special education students)?

8.) Is making a lesson plan different in an inclusive setting? If so, how?

St. John Fisher College
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of study: Is Inclusion Beneficial in the General Education Classroom?

Name(s) of researcher(s): Stephanie Schubmehl

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Susan Schulz
585-385-7296

Phone for further information:

Purpose of study:

- To determine whether inclusion is beneficial to the general education population by gathering the opinions of those involved with the program.

Approval of study: This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Place of study: Rochester, NY
September 2007 until May 2008

Length of participation:

Risks and benefits: *The expected risks and benefits of participation in this study are explained below:*

- There is no risk involved in this study except for the questions may make you think at a deeper level about inclusion.

Method for protecting confidentiality/privacy:

- A signed confidentiality letter by both participant and researcher ensuring no one will know the identity of the person being interviewed.

Your rights: *As a research participant, you have the right to:*

1. Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose to participate.
2. Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.
3. Refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.
4. Be informed of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to you.

5. Be informed of the results of the study.

I have read the above, received a copy of this form, and I agree to participate in the above-named study.

Print name (Participant)

Signature

Date

Print name (Investigator)

Signature

Date

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher listed above. If you experience emotional or physical discomfort due to participation in this study, please contact the Office of Academic Affairs at 385-8034 or the Wellness Center at 385-8280 for appropriate referrals.