

Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education

Volume 1
Number 2 *Electronic Journal for Inclusive
Education Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 1999)*

Article 5

Fall 1999

Inclusion and Its Effects on Students

Kay E. Walker
Wright State University - Main Campus

June A. Ovington Ph.D.
Wright State University - Main Campus, june.ovington@wright.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/ejie>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), [Special Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Walker, K. E., & Ovington, J. A. (1999). Inclusion and Its Effects on Students, *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, 1 (2).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education* by an authorized editor of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Inclusion and Its Effects on Students

Kay E. Walker

June A. Ovington

September 6, 1998

Inclusion is being implemented in schools across the nation (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994). Schools are restructuring their general and special education programs because performance in our nation's schools has been poor. Inclusion advocates believe that the inclusion philosophy will improve education for both the general and special education student (An Inclusion Talkback, 1996). However, there is much disagreement on the effects of inclusion on various categories of students and much confusion about what inclusion really means (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994).

The conclusions made from research on the topic of inclusion depends upon the population being considered. In preschool aged children, [inclusion shows positive than negative results] (Freund, 1995). Research with severely disabled students shows more positive effects for the special and general education student. The research on inclusion involving mildly disabled students shows mixed results (Cook, 1995) perhaps there have been more studies on this population as they have been in general education classrooms since 1975. Professional associations have varying views, too. The National Education Association "supports and encourages appropriate inclusion" (The NCERI Bulletin: v3, 1996, p.31) which includes those programs that have placement options, professional development programs, time for teacher collaboration and planning, adequate support services, and appropriate class sizes. The Learning Disabilities Association of America does not support full inclusion as "decisions regarding educational placement of students with disabilities must be based on the needs of each individual student rather than administrative convenience or budgetary considerations". (The NCERI Bulletin: v3, 1996, p.30)

"Inclusion is a civil and educational right" (Inclusive Education: A Sense of Issue Papers, 1994) in this country. The issue of inclusion and how it effects students is important because our schools must provide the best education possible for all its students. The way that schools are structured, the way that they deliver their services, should be based on competent research on how students learn. (Freagon, 1993) This is not only a special education issue because the inclusion of students in the general classroom involves teachers, administrators, and all students.

Statement of the Problem

The question under review is what is inclusion and what effect does inclusion have on students. Some educational experts believe that inclusion improves education for special and general education students while many fear that inclusion is an administrative policy designed to save money on alternate programs and special services designated for special education services (An Inclusion Talkback Critics' Concerns and Advocates' Responses, 1995).

Operational Definition of Terms

Inclusion is a philosophy, not a legal term (Inos, 1995). Inclusion involves the education of all students, not just special education students. Inclusion assumes that all students should be educated in a general classroom in their neighborhood school and with peers their age. "Inclusion places the burden of proof on the school to justify removal rather than on the child to justify why he or she should be allowed to return to regular education environments." (Illinois Coalition on School Inclusion, 1994, p.4). Inclusion education for all students should utilize the best teaching techniques, and any necessary support services and supplementary aids available to make the process of learning a success. Services are brought to the students instead of students being removed from the general classroom to receive the services. Students are removed from the general education classroom only after the school proves that a different setting would benefit the education of that student or the student's peers. Inclusion is a policy that permits the proportions of disabled to non-disabled students in the general classroom to reflect society. The requirements of inclusion involve changes in the school's organization and curriculum, as well as modifications in instruction and assessment. Inclusion is an educational philosophy that challenges the traditionally accepted delivery methods of special and general education services (Freagon, 1993). There is much confusion about what inclusion really means. Some believe that inclusion means the elimination of all other special education programming, that all needs of the special education student must be met in the general classroom. This is called "full inclusion". Inclusion has also been equated with the term "least restrictive environment" (RE) which is taken from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). LRE means that disabled students are educated in general education classes unless "education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." (The NCERI Bulletin- v3, 1996, p.12) The National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion defines inclusion as

Providing to all students, including those with severe handicaps, equitable opportunities to receive effective educational services, with the needed supplementary aids and support services, in age-appropriate classes in their neighborhood schools, in order to prepare students for productive lives as full members of the society. (City Univ. of New York, NY. National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, 1994, p.5)

Inclusion is not "mainstreaming" or "integration". Mainstreaming and integration require that two separate educational systems be in place and that the student spend only part of the time in the general education classroom, most often in non-academic classes. Further, the special education student must prove that they are capable of doing the work in a general classroom setting (Freagon, 1993).

Review of the Literature

Legal History of Special Education

There is a long-standing precedent in the United States that all citizens are guaranteed an equal opportunity to education. The fourteenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution has been applied by the Supreme Court to education in many instances. One of the best known cases is *Brown vs. the Board of Education*, 1954, when the court held that segregated education was inherently unequal. There are "three federal laws that protect individuals with disabilities and ensure their rights to educational opportunities with nondisabled peers". (Inos and Quigley, 1995, p.1) The first one is Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This law requires that each school educate the disabled students in their jurisdiction unless the school can prove that the child's needs cannot be met in the general classroom. Federal funding is tied to the school's adherence to this law. A recipient shall place a handicapped person in the regular educational environment operated by the recipient unless it is demonstrated by

the recipient that the education of the person in the regular environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (Rogers, 1993, p.2)

The second federal law, P.L. 94-142, is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B (IDEA). In 1975, IDEA introduced the legal concepts of the "Individualized Education Plan" (IEP) and least restrictive environment. (Inos, 1995) This law guaranteed that disabled students needs will be identified and met in the classroom, or if this is not possible, provided as near to the student's home and in the least restrictive environment possible. Yearly reviews of the IEP are required to insure that the school is meeting the disabled child's needs. The third federal law, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), states that no one can be "denied the benefits of the services, programs or activities of a public entity" (Armbrister, 1998, p.146), an example of which would be the public school. The enforcement of the ADA insures that not only our schools, but the American public will be dealing with people of diversity every day.

Recent Federal Cases Supporting Inclusion

There are four recent federal court cases that specifically support inclusion. In *Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education*, 1989, the Fifth Circuit "developed a standard for determining when placement full time in a general education class with supplementary aids and services is appropriate and when removal to a special education class is educationally justified." (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p. 8) The standards specify that the school must attempt to meet the student's needs in the general education classroom, that the student must benefit from the education the school provides, and that the student's benefit may be academic or purely social. But for the first time, guidelines about the needs of the general education student and of the educational organization are addressed. This court case states that the effects of a particular disabled student on the general education students may be considered (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994). Also, the general education teacher is not required to devote all or most of her or his time to the child with a disability and the general education program need not be modified beyond recognition." (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p.8). In *Greer v. Rome City School* a 1991 case, the 11th Circuit gave parameters on LRE. If the costs of supplementary aids and support services significantly impact upon the education of other children in the district," (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p.9) a general educational classroom could be denied to the disabled student. In *Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District*, 1993, the 3rd circuit supported inclusion by stating that there were "reciprocal benefits of inclusion to the nondisabled students in the class" and that "inclusion is a right, not a privilege for a select few." (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p. 10) The court further indicated that appropriate planning, teaching methods, and support services should enable the general education teacher to solve any behavior problems caused by having the disabled student in the classroom. *Sacramento City Unified School District v. Rachel Holland*, 1994, reiterated the precedents set in the previous cases. Schools were mandated to provide the appropriate services to make the disabled student's placement successful, either academically or socially. "In none of the four 'full inclusion' circuit court decisions did the courts find that there were harmful effects for the general education students' education." (City Univ. of New York, NY, National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, 1996, p.1)

Why Schools are Moving Towards Inclusion

As the history of inclusion illustrates, much of the movement towards inclusion is legally motivated. However, there are other reasons for the desire to restructure the public schools. Many believe that the public schools have failed to provide an adequate education and that our student population is becoming increasingly diverse and in need of a more individualized Curriculum if they are to be successful. (Rogers, 1993)

A Nation At Risk, written in 1983, sounded an alarm. (A National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994) Public schools were not producing students that were prepared for continuing education or employment. Because of the perceived failure, the public schools are attempting to reorganize or restructure the way that they deliver services to both the special and the general education student. The legislature has responded to this crisis in education by writing national educational goals called "Goals 2000". The legislature has appointed groups to assess whether national educational goals have been met. (National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994) These goals use the words "all students" and "The legislation makes clear that in the use of the words "all", the "goals" are to apply to students, including those with disabilities." (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p.3) Among the goals are high school graduation rates of 90 percent and for every American to be literate.

Inclusion is a response to this restructuring. Inclusion demands more local control and less bureaucracy, a focus on collaboration and a teaming of experts. In the past, schools have not always addressed the issues of the varied learning styles of children, but focused on a one-size fits all curriculum. (An Inclusion Talkback: Critics' Concerns and Advocates' Responses, 1996) The philosophy of inclusion, on the other hand, celebrates diversity and has the philosophy of addressing the individualized needs of all students. Inclusion implements many teaching strategies that are proven to be effective in education, such as cooperative learning, constructivist activities, and problem solving. (Freagon, 1993)

Another reason that schools are restructuring is because a separate special education department has also not produced positive outcomes. (National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994) dropout rates are high, in excess of 20 percent, and "persons with disabilities have the highest unemployment rate of any population subgroup". (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p. 6) Under mainstreaming, services are not being delivered. In 1993, in a report called

Traversing the Mainstream: Regular Education and Students with Disabilities in Secondary Schools, many complaints about the current special education system were cited. They were: failures for students with disabilities in both general and special education settings; the lack of appropriate services, e.g. fewer than half of the students in general education classes had their performance monitored by a special education teacher; only one in ten received modified tests; and only 7 percent received the benefit of an aide in the classroom; the absence of linkage between special and general education services or providers; placement of students in general education settings for reasons other than their educational needs, the absence of needed supplementary aids and support services for those students served in general education settings. (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994)

Finally, student populations are becoming increasingly diverse. As diversity in the American population increase, so does the diversity of the students that compose our schools. To meet this diverse population's needs, the schools must respond with varied services for all its students. As diversity among the student population increases, it seems that more students have more needs that the schools must meet to insure their educational and social success. The inclusion movement promises, through innovative teaching techniques and the collaboration of many experts, to provide learning experiences in which all students have an opportunity to be successful. (Freagon, 1993)

"More emphasis is being placed on teaching the child, not the text." (National Study on Inclusion: Overview and Summary Report, 1995, p. 4)

Research on Inclusion

Amount and Quality of Research

The National Study of Inclusive Education conducted in 1994 shows that the practice of inclusion is spreading in the United States. One would expect volumes of quality research on inclusion, but this is not so. Perhaps it is because inclusion is so relatively new that "comprehensive program evaluations of inclusion are limited. Evaluations are often anecdotal and focus on the special education students alone." (National Study of Inclusive Education, 1994, p. 27) The research that is available on inclusion shows mixed results. Research is often anecdotal and sample sizes are often small. (Hunt, Goetz, 1997) To further confuse the results, there is no common vocabulary between inclusionary programs; however, most inclusion policies and procedures do "include reference to IDEA, IEP's, and LRE" (Top, 1996, p.13). Perhaps the very nature of inclusion contributes to these mixed results. Inclusion requires that a sense of community and common purpose be developed. This means that students, parents, teachers, and administrators must develop an inclusion program that will meet their particular building's needs. (Freund, 1993) Therefore, no two inclusion programs look alike.

Claims of Advocates and Critics

Advantages of inclusion

Advocates claim many benefits for the special education student. Special education students benefit academically and from daily interaction with general education students. A more diverse curriculum is likely to be offered in a general educational setting. In an inclusionary setting, special education students learn social skills and independence. They observe that all students have strengths and weaknesses, and that all students can be taught how to deal with them. In addition, the disabled child's schooling is not separate from siblings, permitting a more normal life for all family members and eventually more normalized functioning as an adult in the community. (An Inclusive Talkback: Critics Concerns and Advocates' Responses, 1996)

Benefits of inclusion for the general education student include: a curriculum that is more flexible and responsive to individualized needs, the presence of support services and technology, the collaboration of additional teaching experts in the classroom, and improved teacher training and teaching techniques. (Freagon, 1993) "The research of Goodlad and Lovitt (1993) and Oakes and Lipton (1990) and others have clearly demonstrated that all students learn best" when cooperative learning, problem solving, active participation of the students, and an accommodation of individual learning styles are utilized in the public schools. These teaching strategies are required in an inclusionary school because they encourage students to work hard and take risks. Students are more likely to take risks because inclusion fosters an environment that requires" a sense of community among faculty and students, a shared mission, and the ability to successfully collaborate with others." (Lyman, 1993, p.1) Another benefit that advocates cite is that, as adults, Americans will be more responsible and understanding of people with disabilities because of their experiences with special education students in the classroom. (Inclusion and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1996)

Disadvantages of Inclusion

Critics claim that the inclusion movement is an economically motivated alternative to the continuum of special education services that are provided by the separate special education system. (An Inclusion Talkback: Critics' Concerns and Advocates' Responses, 1996) Currently, support services and funds for training are provided but, with the passage of time, critics fear that services necessary to meet the IEP's of students be reduced or discontinued. There are concerns that the education teacher may not receive the training and the supports needed to provide for the disabled student's needs. (Top, 1996) Other fears include: the time required to meet the needs of the special education student will take away from instructional time for general education students, that students will have to help the teacher instruct the included students, that specialists will not be able to spend enough time with the student who needs their services (Irmsher, 1996), and that federal special education funding may be lost as it is linked to the identification of students and the type of services and supports they receive. (National Study on Inclusion: Overview Summary Report, 1995)

Studies

The characteristics of the researched population appears to be a contributing factor in determining inclusion's effects on students. Different results for the special education student and the general education student have been obtained from the research involving the preschool population, the mildly disabled population, and the severely disabled population.

Preschool population

The Community Integration Project (CIP) was a three year inclusion program conducted between September of 1991 and June of 1994 dealing with six early childhood programs offered at nine sights in Virginia. Twenty-eight disabled children were served in the three years of the program. This study focused on the organization and training of the staff, on parents' perceptions of inclusion, and on the progress of children with disabilities. (Freund, Wald, 1995)

The planning and training process of the staff of approximately 320 was intensive and had the goal of creating unity and educating teachers on the best practices in early childhood education. The staff shared in the decision making processes, worked in teams to develop an inclusion program that fit their needs and their site, and were involved in many training workshops. The staff sought "ways to work in concert with each other and with professionals from other disciplines. No single discipline can adequately meet all the needs of children with disabilities in an inclusive setting". (Freund and Wald, 1995, p.2) Inservice training focused on informing teachers, aids, and specialists to recognize problems and develop plans to address them. Administrators were trained on how to "nurture and develop administrative leadership in support of inclusion. This process included (1) consensus building, (2) shared responsibility; and (3) transfer of ownership." (Freund, Wald, 1995, p. 5) Evaluation of the training was conducted prior to training, after training, and one year after the inclusion program was underway. Respondents ranked statements and rated them as essential, often important, occasionally important, or not important. Areas of evaluation were classroom practices, professional collaborations, organizational factors, and staff development. The teachers ranked having high interest multilevel toys such as trucks and dolls and offering less structured activities as essential in promoting social interactions between disabled and nondisabled children and in promoting skills for disabled children. The staff reports the following issues as essential to successful inclusion: teachers committed to the idea of inclusion that were willing to try new things work collaboratively, and share responsibility for all

children were essential to successful inclusion. Essential procedures insuring the success of inclusion programs such as frequent monitoring and adjustment of programs and having a system for setting goals for children; having preschool general and special education staff attend same staff meetings; having inclusion as part of the school mission; having administrators deal with administrative obstacles for teachers; and the most effective ratio of general education students to disabled students was 12:4.

Parents perceptions of benefits and concerns are attached. Parents of the disabled believed that their child was learning more, but they were concerned that their child was being left out and was like less likely to receive services. "The results suggest that from the perspective of parents, inclusion seems to be working well for children and families." and that "parents of children with and without disabilities rated the benefits of inclusion as outweighing their concerns by a ratio of better than two to one." (Freund, Wald, 1995, p.6)

The developmental progress of the disabled children was measured by mastery of IEP goals and the Batelle developmental Inventory (BDI) given in the third year of the project. Overall, the children with disabilities in DIP mastered 69% of their goals with two-year-olds accomplishing 63%, three-year-olds accomplishing 68% and four-year-olds accomplishing 70%.¹ (Fruend; Wald, 1995, p.44) The BDI findings were:

All children with disabilities achieved a positive change in growth in at least one area of development. Averaged subtest scores for 12 out of 13 or 92% of the participating children met or exceeded their predicted gains on the BDI. 100% of the students met or exceeded their expected gains in personal-social skills. (Fruend; Wald, 1995, p.6)

One problem of this research is that the disabled population in the schools was small which could skew results. Also, parent evaluations were anonymous and pre-tests and post-tests respondents were not necessarily the same respondents and may not be comparable. The evaluations by staff were not required and; therefore, the data is not representative of the entire staff. However, this research is significant because it illustrates the importance of planning the inclusion program and the necessity of training the staff in the appropriate delivery of services in order to achieve successful educational results. (Fruend, Wald, 1995)

Mildly Disabled Population

There is more research available on mildly disabled students because this sector of the population has been in the general classroom since IDEA made LRE mandatory in 1975. However, the results of the research on this population are conflicted. Our research suggests that some students do well in inclusive settings and others of miserable, despite thoughtful and heroic efforts by their general and special educators" (Hunt; Goetz. 1997, p. 33) state Zigmond, Jenkins, Fuchs, Deno, and Fuchs in 1995.

The National Study on Inclusion makes many statements based on research about the positive effects on all students. It cites positive changes in student behavior, improved academic and affective development of learning disabled students, and that general education students "appeared not to be adversely affected by the presence of SLD students as classroom peers" (National Study on Inclusion: Overview and Summary Report, 1995, p.6). Salisbury, another supporter, stated in 1993, "Findings from federally funded research projects indicate that (1) achievement test performance among students who were classmates of students with significant disabilities were equivalent or better than a comparison

group." (NCERI Bulletin: v3, 1996, p. 13) Another source states that researchers in four states (Minnesota, Colorado, New York and Michigan) have looked at the impact on achievement scores of students without labels when students with disabilities are included in their classroom. To date, no negative impacts on achievements have been reported. (Freagon, Sharon; And Others, 1993, p.30)

Further benefits of inclusion for all students is the 'assessing academic skill levels, identifying social and behavioral needs, and organizing teams around individualized plans'. (NCERI Bulletin: v3, 1996,p.6)

There is no information in the above report on how the data was collected for the research. "The National Study on Inclusion: Overview and Summary Report" was published by the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion which may indicate a potential for a biased view on inclusion. The report appears thorough, but no raw data was published within the report, limiting its value.

Research raises concerns about inclusion, too. A study conducted by the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Special Education of Indiana University in 1993 separated the costs of inclusion into the four categories of instruction, administration, transportation, and staff development. "Staff Development may be the critical point of inclusive special education services; more important than Instruction and Administration concerns." (Roahrig, 1993, p. 7) Bryan Cook and others provide a negative view of inclusion based on the tolerance theory in the paper "Are Recent Reforms Effective for All Students?". The tolerance theory, proposed by Gerber and Semmel in 1995, states that teachers and schools cannot provide optimal learning conditions for each individual given limited instructional resources and students with varied instructional needs. Teachers can effectively reach students within a restricted span of variance through homogeneous instruction. However, students who fall outside this 'tolerance' will be relatively underachieving under the same instructional conditions. (Cook, 1995, p.6)

This research was conducted in fifty-six southern California schools that had begun the process of restructuring their organization and delivery services and implemented inclusionary practices. "The purpose of the present investigation was to determine the predictive efficacy of tolerance theory on the relative academic performance of students with mild disabilities at the school level, given the recent context mainstreaming and effective schools reforms." (Cook, 1995, p.8) Results of the research found: 1. there was an inverse relationship in within-school changes in general and special education achievement in the elementary schools, but not a statistically significant relationship in Junior high schools. The general student's scores increases while the disabled student's scores decreased.

A total of 38 of the 56 sample schools produced achievement gains in some students while simultaneously effecting a decrease in achievement outcomes of students with different learning traits. General and special education achievement progressed in similar directions in only 18 sample schools. Achievement gains or losses in these schools were typically of a small magnitude. Tolerance theory would posit that those schools that experienced achievement increases for both groups of students (11 schools) likely benefited from an atypical increase in resources or used present resources more efficiently. Similarly, those schools in which both groups of students decreased in achievement (7 schools) may have lost resources or used them less efficiently than in the previous year. (Cook, 1995, p. 19)

A conclusion of this study states that it is impossible to improve achievement of general and mildly disabled special education students merely by "implementing variables associated with exceptional schools and high mean achievement" (Cook, 1995, p. 21) such as improved teaching techniques. According to this research, restructuring without and increase in resources will result in a decrease of

achievement for the mildly disabled student. The effective practices such as "cohesion, problem solving interactions, instructional monitoring and feedback, parental support, and academic emphasis and expectations" (Cook, 1995, p. 11) in and of itself, will not increase achievement of general and special education students alike.

This research was sound. The sample size of this study was adequate. Seventy-five percent of the teachers of two hundred fifty-four schools participated in the teacher survey. The second phase of the project involved special education student testing. Thirty-three elementary schools and twenty-four junior high schools comprised this sample. A total of two hundred seventy-nine students were tested in the first year, and one hundred eighty-six students were tested in the second year. Scores were obtained for the general education students from the California Assessment Program, a state-wide testing system. Analysis for statistical significance was conducted.

Severely Disabled Population

Sharon Vaughn of the University of Miami, in response to the Hunt, Goetz article, states that "when it comes to issues of inclusion, there are, however, very significant differences between students identified as having severe disabilities and those identified as having LD." (Hunt; Goetz, 1997, p. 32) Results of nineteen studies conducted on small samples of severely disabled students and their classmates show that: (1) most special education parents felt that their severely disabled child was accepted by the general education students; (2) the staff and its training was a factor in successful inclusion, teachers reported personal benefits such as increased ownership of special education students; (3) increased reflection on teaching strategies and their role in the classroom; (4) a sense of pride and confidence in teaching abilities; (5) that there were no significant behavioral or academic change in performance levels of the general education students when a severely disabled student was included in their classroom; (6) IEP's of special education students placed full time in the general education classroom were of better quality; and (7) there is a significant increase of IEP objectives for the special education students. (Hunt, Goetz, 1997)

The external validity of this study is limited because of the small numbers of severely disabled students in the sample; however, much observation data was collected in the nineteen studies that will provide a springboard for future quantitative research in the area of the severely disabled in the general education classroom. (Hunt, Goetz, 1995)

Summary

Inclusion has an extensive legal history in the United States. All citizens are guaranteed an education. IDEA specifies that accommodations must be made, if possible, in the general education classroom for the education of the disabled. If it is not possible, then the appropriate services in the appropriate setting must be made available. Recent court cases, since 1989, specifically support inclusionary practices and state that inclusion offers benefits for all students.

Research on inclusion appears to be somewhat dependent on the population studied. Inclusion in the preschool is mostly positive; research with the mildly disabled is mixed, and research on inclusion with the severely disabled is mostly positive. In general, successful inclusionary programs include: intensive planning and training before and during inclusion, an array of support services and aids, and developing

and maintaining a collaborative working environment that includes administration, teachers, parents, and students.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Whether the researcher supports or criticizes inclusion, there is the desire for all students to receive the best education possible. LRE is a civil right of special education students and legal precedent requires that placement in the general classroom should be the first consideration of educators when planning instruction for special education students. Whether in the special or general education classroom, research has shown that certain teaching strategies, such as cooperative learning, problem solving, constructivist lessons, and mastery learning improve the learning of all students. Inclusion schools support these teaching strategies. However, we cannot forget that teaching strategies alone cannot effect positive changes for all students. Other support services, aids, and technology must be available. The tolerance theory when applied to inclusion, argues that reliance on effective teaching practices alone will not make effective schools. Support services and supplementary aids must be present for the student, as well as the teachers if the majority of students are to be successful. "Educational reform will do well in the future to overcome the simplistic notion that significantly increased achievement for all can be attained without additional resources and/or powerful new instructional technologies." (Cook and others, 1995, p. 22) Research on the costs of inclusion with the proper supports shows that it is little, if any, less expensive than previous special education programs. Since the reality is that educational funds are limited, educators must protect the rights of special education students by insuring that individual needs are met by maintaining a continuum of services. Successful inclusion practice involves developing a common mission thorough training of teachers and administrators, team work including teaching models that merge specialists' knowledge, reciprocal ownership of all the students, and planning time to collaborate, plan lessons, and adjust individualized programs. See the included inclusion checklist (Bard, 1995, p. A-269) "When general education and special education teachers are placed in a situations where they can work together, they have more to offer the students and each other." (Inos, 1995, p. 4)

Further recommendations would include: a national definition and vocabulary (Top, 1996), and basic requirements for inclusion practices (See B-I); continued efforts to restructure schools to provide a quality education for all, and conduct further research based on quantifiable characteristics of inclusion in all student populations.

References

Armbrister, T. (1998, May). A good law gone bad. Reader's Digest.

Bard, J.F. (1995). Placement of special education students. Inclusion Policy, Basic Education Circulars, 2-95.

Burnette, J. (1996). Inclusion. Washington, DC: Office of Educational

Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403 874).

Cook, B. G., and Others. (1995). Are recent reforms effective for all students? Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Excerpts from policies and position statements on inclusive schools. (1992). National School Boards Association (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED372 525).

Freagon, Sharon, and Others. (1993). Some answers for implementers to the most commonly asked questions regarding the inclusion of children with disabilities in general education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.

Freund, M., & Wald, P. J. (1995). Community Integration Project: Project CIP. An early education program for children with disabilities. Final report Washington, DC: Department of Teacher Preparation and Special Education.

Goetz, L., & Hunt, P. (1997). Research on inclusive educational programs, practices, and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. The Journal of Special Education Vol. 31/No. 1.

Inclusion and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (1996). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 372 525).

An inclusion talkback: critics' concerns and advocates responses. (1996). New York, NY: National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion. NCERI Bulletin: Vol. 3.

Inclusive education: a series of issue papers. (1994). Springfield, IL: Illinois Coalition on School Inclusion.

Inos, R.H., and Quigley, M.A. (1995). Research review for inclusive practice. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Region Educational Lab.

Irmsher, K. (1996). Inclusive education in practice. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 525).

Lyman, L. (1993). Group building for successful inclusion programs. Washington, DC: Flint Hills Educational Research Development Association Special Education Inclusion Conference.

National Study of Inclusive Education. (1994). New York, NY: National Center on Education Restructuring and Inclusion.

National study on inclusion: overview and summary report. (1995). New York, NY: National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion.

National survey on inclusive education. (1994). New York, NY: National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion.

Roahrig, P.L. (1993). Special Education Inclusion. Fiscal Analysis of Clark County Schools Inclusion Site Grant. Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Special Education.

Stussman, B. (1996). Inclusion: it's not all academic. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 525).

Top, B. (1996). Status of policies, procedures, and practices; State Directors of Special Education perceptions regarding implementation of Inclusion. Orange City, IA: Northwestern College, Department of Education.