

Fall 2002


What Are Teachers Doing to Accommodate for Special Needs Students in the Classroom?

Brenda Stevens

Caroline Everington
everingtonc@winthrop.edu

Stacy Kozar-Kocsis
kozar-kocsis.stacy@rrcs.org

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

Stevens, B., Everington, C., & Kozar-Kocsis, S. (2002). What Are Teachers Doing to Accommodate for Special Needs Students in the Classroom?, *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, 1 (6).

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 corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

What Are Teachers Doing to Accommodate for Special Needs Students in the Classroom?

Brenda Stevens, Caroline Everington and Stacy Kozar-Kocsis

Abstract:

Elementary teachers (N=42) from a district implementing inclusive practice were surveyed to determine: a) if the frequency of curricular modifications made differ by type of student disability, b) if there is a difference in the frequency of curricular modifications made for special and typical students, and c) if a relationship exists between modifications made for special needs students and for typical students. Results indicate the frequency of teachers' curricular modifications does not differ by type of disability; that they make significantly more frequent modifications for special needs students; and that there is a significant relationship between the frequency of modifications made for special and for typical students. That is, teachers who are making modifications for special needs students are also making modifications for typical students. This research is unique because few inclusion studies explore the actual classroom practices of teachers in inclusive settings. Implications for future research and practice are given.

Introduction

As special education has grown since its inception in 1975, it has evolved into a second system complete with its own teachers, administrators, credentialing process, programs, and budgets (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). Essays on the failure of special education began to proliferate almost from its' inception (Zigmond et al., 1995). Many contend that the current system is dysfunctional, ineffective, excessively costly, and often segregates and stigmatizes students who could effectively be served in traditional educational settings (Hocutt, Martin, & McKinney, 1990).

In 1986, in order to correct the perceived deficiencies of special education, the Assistant Secretary of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Madeline Will, suggested a delivery approach that became known as the Regular Education Initiative (REI), a major reorganization of educational services that would emphasize the regular classroom (Kubicek, 1994). This national movement provided an opportunity to restructure the relationship between regular, special, remedial, and compensatory education programs (Salend, 1994) and sought to include all students in a unified system (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Jenkins, Pious, & Jewell, 1990).

REI supporters tried to restructure the special and general education relationship in a number of ways. The principle means of realizing a merger was to seek waivers from state and federal rules and regulations, thus granting school districts increased flexibility to use special education resources in different and presumably more imaginative and adaptive ways (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

The current programmatic thrust for the organization and delivery of education to students with disabilities is toward what is increasingly coming to be called "full inclusion" (Sailor, Gerry, & Wilson, 1990). The term inclusion is used to refer to "the commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate, in the school and classroom he/she would otherwise attend (Rogers, 1993, p. 1)." It involves bringing the support services to the child, rather than moving the child to the services, and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class, rather than having to keep up with the other students (Rogers, 1993). Proponents of an inclusive system of educating students believe that this change has the potential to provide

a more effective education for all students and a stronger educational system (Friend & Cook, 1993; Pearman et al., 1992; Salend, 1994).

As inclusion has proceeded, regular classroom teachers have begun to address the very real problems of how to adapt group lessons, supplement textbook presentations, modify homework and standardize grades to accommodate students with disabilities (Smith, 1998). For the regular teacher, this means additional meetings with special education personnel, additional inservice sessions, additional planning, and more students. While regular education teachers cannot be expected to remedy all the academic limitations of students with disabilities or to redesign their entire curriculum for one student, many modifications can be made for these students. In order to accommodate students with disabilities, regular classroom teachers can plan appropriate instructional programs, modify existing curriculum materials, evaluate student progress, and make use of special education personnel when needed (Lipsky & Gartner, 1996, Smith 1998).

While there is a recent proliferation of text books designed to assist teachers in implementation of inclusion programs (Blenk & Fine, 1995; Falvey, 1995; Stainback & Stainback, 1996; Wang, 1993; Wood, 1998), few studies have addressed the extent to which teachers are implementing these adaptations for children with disabilities included into the regular classroom. Two studies conducted on this topic in the 1980's appeared to indicate that many regular education teachers were not actively involved in addressing the needs of the mainstreamed students.

One study (Ammer, 1984) examined teacher's level of participation and preferred degree of participation in the special education planning, programming, and placement process. Approximately 29% of the respondents stated that they had no knowledge of special students in their class. Nearly 85% of all educators surveyed indicated that they provided almost no specific accommodations for the special students in their classes. Of the accommodations made, two of the most frequently mentioned were socially including the students and individualizing lessons or materials.

In another study, Schultz (1982) surveyed a number of regular elementary teachers regarding their concerns about educating children with disabilities in the regular classroom. The results indicated that teachers felt a lack of expertise in planning for individual differences as related to curriculum and instruction and were confused as to their role and responsibilities toward the child with the disability in their classroom. However, to date, few studies have measured what regular education teachers are actually doing with children in the present inclusion programs, including how frequently they actually interact with them and what adaptations have been made. One study conducted by Rainforth (1992) found that teachers who have implemented inclusion models use more creative approaches and are more flexible in their teaching. However, additional information on the types of modifications and accommodations is needed. As teachers will be the primary service deliverers of whatever inclusion practices are adopted, we must have information on adaptations they are willing to make if we are to anticipate possible difficulties and prepare for successful inclusive practices (Vaughn et al., 1994).

Further, while numerous authors have looked at the effects of mainstreaming or inclusion on teachers attitudes (Green, 1983; Jamieson, 1984; Larrivee & Cook, 1979), few studies deal specifically with how various labels accorded children with disabilities affect regular education teacher's willingness to make modifications and the frequency of modifications made for children of differing abilities. A National Study of Inclusive Education (1995) found that no single category lends itself to the success of inclusion more than others. However, national practice indicates that few schools are including students with severe disabilities in the general classroom (Lipsky & Gartner, 1996). This suggests that teachers may perceive students with severe disabilities as being more difficult to include in their classroom.

Purpose

In light of these issues, the present study investigated the following research questions: a) Does the frequency of curricular modifications that regular education teachers make in the classroom for included students differ according to the type of disability of the students? b) Is there a difference in the frequency of curricular modifications made by regular education teachers for special and typical students included in their classrooms? c) What is the relationship between the frequency of curricular modifications made for special needs children included in the regular classroom and the frequency of curricular modifications made for typical children in the regular classroom?

Method

In order to ascertain what teachers are actually doing in their classrooms to meet the inclusion needs of all of their students, an informal study was conducted using elementary school teachers, kindergarten to sixth grade, from one suburban school district that had been implementing inclusion for five years. A survey research method was used to examine the frequency of curricular modifications made for regular and special needs students included in the classroom.

Description of the Sample Community

District Demographics

The data for this study were obtained from a sample of regular education classroom teachers, working with students in grades kindergarten through six, serving a single school district. Geographically, this school district is located in a midwestern state; it serves a large and diverse community. The community itself is considered cosmopolitan with a mix of agricultural, professional, and industrial workers. The socioeconomic status of the community is mostly middle to upper middle class.

Fourteen buildings comprise the district. Ten of the 14 buildings are elementary schools, two are junior high schools, one is a freshman school, and the remaining one is a high school. Growth has characterized the school district, with student enrollment increasing from 1,500 to 13,214 over the past 37 years. Average class size is 23 pupils and their ethnic composition is 94.7% Caucasian and 5.3% minority.

Throughout the years, the district has achieved state and local recognition for academics, fine arts, athletics, and other extracurricular activities. Two elementary schools and the high school have been recognized nationally as Blue Ribbon Schools of excellence. The students have scored well overall on state and national standardized tests.

Special Education Programs

This school district is also known for its' comprehensive special education programs which currently serve over 950 students. An inclusion pilot program was organized in 1989-90 and implementation began during the 1991-92 school year and has continued until the present. Categorical services are not provided in this district but, rather, educational support services are provided based on individual need. Such specification may often result in services in more than one placement option for a given student. Placement options include: a) indirect individual assistance; b) individual- or small-group instruction (1-3 students per instructional period); c) team teaching in regular classroom; and/or d) resource center involvement (maximum of 8-16 students with or without disabilities).

Procedure

The director of special education for the district assisted in distribution of the questionnaires. Packets with questionnaires were delivered to the 10 elementary schools by their Local Educational Agency (LEA) union representatives. Along with each questionnaire was a letter addressed to the building administrators from the director of special education which briefly explained the questionnaire and requested their staff's participation. An additional letter addressed to the participant was also included which explained the purpose of the research and the questionnaire. The staff members were then asked to complete and return their questionnaires. In addition, several follow-up attempts were made at the district level to increase the teacher response rate.

Instrument

The questionnaire, adapted from the work of Dover (1994), was developed by the researchers to survey the range of curricular options made for students. The questionnaire contained 81 questions: questions 1-8 addressed demographics, 9-19 experience and training, 20-29 collaboration and planning, 30-81 specific modifications. There were 25 different modifications listed on the questionnaire. Each of the respondents rated the frequency of each modification for typical and regular students separately. Beginning with question 20, the responses were made along a four point likert-type scale ranging from Daily (As part of all lessons I teach) to Hardly Ever (As part of no lessons I teach).

To control for possible response bias of self report data, (Sprinthall, Schmutte, & Sirois, 1991), all subjects were informed that there was no penalty or benefit resulting from their responses, the responses were confidential and anonymous, and the respondents were urged to be honest. Prior to distribution, the questionnaire was piloted on a small group of regular education teachers working in inclusive settings. They completed the questionnaire and made comments and provided feedback. The majority of changes suggested were incorporated.

The State Department of Education special education guidelines define the terms used in the questionnaire: Severe Learning Disability (SLD), Severe Behavior Handicapped (SBH), Developmentally Handicapped (DH), Multiply Handicapped (MH)¹ (Ohio Department of Education, 1982). In this state, SLD and DH are generally referred to as mild handicaps while SBH and MH are considered to be severe disabilities.

Results

Respondents and their Experience

The subjects for this study came from seven of the ten elementary schools in a suburban Midwestern school district. Repeated follow-ups with the director of special education resulted in 42 responses to the questionnaire, a return rate of 19%. Of the demographic information gathered on this sample - - gender (95.2%female) and average years of teaching experience (11.4) - - it appears that this group is representative of the elementary teachers of this school district. Table 1 reports the number, percentage, and grade level of the respondents. (See Table 1)

Surveying respondents' previous experience and training with special needs people was an important focus of this questionnaire. The results indicated that 66% of respondents had some experience with special needs people outside of the classroom. With reference to formal training concerning special needs students, 79% of

the teachers had some in-service training, 66% had some college course work, 48% had some exposure through workshops, and 66% had some other type of training. Regarding their previous experience with an included special needs student in their classroom, 2% of the teachers reported no experience, 12% had less than one year of experience, 38% had one to three years of experience, and 48% had at least four years of experience. Class size for more than 95% of the teachers was reported as being greater than 21 students. Over 88% of the respondents had one or more special needs students included in their classroom this year. The following represents the frequencies: 24% 1-2 students; 38% 3-4 students; 24% 5-6 students; 2% 7+ students. No district wide data was available on these dimensions so comparisons of the sample with the district data could not be made.

Over the past two years, respondents reported they had experienced the inclusion of the following types of students in their classrooms: 93% reported having students with mild disabilities (SLD &/or DH), 39% percent reported having students with Severe Behavior Handicaps (SBH), and 32% reported having students with Multiple Handicaps (MH).

There were four questions on the questionnaire addressing collaboration. When asked how often they planned lessons for special needs students with a special education staff member, they indicated the following: 41%, never do; 35% sometimes throughout the month; 3% daily. Forty-nine percent indicated that they do not teach in the same room with a special educator. When asked how often they were given instructionally relevant information on students which assisted them in adapting and modifying classroom instruction, 41% indicated never, while 39% indicated that they sometime during the month they were given relevant information. Of those subjects who were given information, 95% indicated that the information was provided to them by a special educator.

Seventy-five percent responded that students with special needs are able to participate in regular class activities on a daily or weekly basis because of appropriate supports. When asked how often they took time to work individually with students, the majority (76%) of teachers indicated that they worked either daily or weekly with both special needs and regular students (See Table 2). When asked how often they taught to their individual student's learning styles, 50% said they did so daily for special students and 45% said they did so daily for typical students.

When asked to rate the degree of success they felt in meeting the instructional needs of the special needs students included in their classrooms, no respondents perceived themselves to be very unsuccessful, 10% perceived themselves to be pretty unsuccessful, 69% perceived themselves to be somewhat successful, and 21% perceived themselves to be very successful.

Curriculum Modifications for Special and Typical Students

It is notable that most teachers indicated that they create and provide daily curriculum modifications in their classroom for identified special needs students without assistance from another professional. Table 2 presents the responses of the teachers and their frequency of use of the 25 different modifications for both special and typical students. Responses are categorized as daily, weekly, monthly, or rarely for both special needs and regular students. As the Table displays, over half of the teachers are making most of the listed modifications for special needs students. More than half of the teachers indicated that either daily or frequently throughout the week they perform the following: alter room arrangements, provide individualized instruction and resources, accommodate to student learning styles, record directions, change the length and difficulty level of assignments, and give prompts for the special needs student. When giving tests for the special needs child, they frequently increase the test time, shorten the test, or give the items orally. In the

area of peer interaction, the majority of the teachers indicated that they daily or several times a week use the following strategies: peer tutoring, teach specific social skills, provide social opportunities, use cooperative learning groups, and provide special reinforcement for special students.

More than half of the teachers indicated that from several times a month to several times a week they are able to make similar curriculum accommodations in their class for typical students. However, they reported hardly ever providing accommodations to typical students in the areas of testing, modification of assignments, and usage of special equipment. Data comparing the frequency of curricular modifications made for special and typical students for each item can be seen in Table 3.

Analyses

The following hypotheses were tested: a) Does the frequency of curricular modifications that general education teachers make in the classroom for included students differ according to the type of disability of the students? b) Is there a difference in the frequency of curricular modifications made by regular education teachers for special and typical students included in their classrooms? c) What is the relationship between the frequency of curricular modifications made for typical children and the frequency of curricular modifications made for special needs children included in the regular classroom?

To test the first hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was done to see if the frequency of curricular modifications made differ according to the disability of the students served in the classroom. This hypothesis was tested using only the questions on the questionnaire that specifically addressed modifications made for special needs students. There was no significant difference among the groups ($F(2,31)=.32$) mild disabilities (SLD or DH, $M=1.13$, severe behavior handicapped (SBH) $M=1.12$, multiple handicapped (MH) $M=1.26$). This indicates that there was no difference in the frequency of modifications made for each different type of special needs student.

To test the second hypothesis, a t-test was done to see if there is a difference in the frequency of curriculum modifications made by regular education teachers for special and typical students included in their classrooms. Means and standard deviations of the frequency of curricular modifications made by regular education teachers for special and typical students included in their classrooms were computed. The result indicated that there was a significant difference in the frequency of curricular modifications made by the teachers for the special needs students when compared to the frequency of curricular modifications made for typical students ($t=6.47$, $df=41$, $p<.001$).

To test the third hypothesis, a Pearson product moment correlation was done to see if a relationship exists between the frequency of curricular modifications made for special needs students and the frequency of curricular modifications made for regular education students. A significant correlation was found $r(42) = .51$, $p <.05$) between the frequency of curricular modifications made for the two different populations. There was a positive relationship between the frequency of curricular modifications made for the special and typical children.

Discussion

Implications

The teachers who responded to the questionnaire, in general, were experienced (averaging seven or more years of teaching experience) and had experience with special needs children inside as well as outside of their classroom. Over half of the respondents had been given at least some training, inservice or other, on inclusion. Most of the teachers (88%) had experience in an inclusionary setting for one or more years.

However, this experience appears to be limited to persons with mild handicaps (92%). Only one-third had worked with children who had multiple handicaps and/or severe behavior handicaps. The school district where this study was done had implemented an inclusion program for several years at the time of this study. From this information, it can be concluded that this is not a group of novice teachers.

Possibly the most important and interesting finding concerns the type of modifications and the frequency of their use by these teachers. It appears that the teachers are teaching to each individual student's learning style, whether special or typical. With regard to their special needs students, these teachers are providing significantly more frequent modifications for these students. Of the 25 modifications listed, in most cases, over 50% of the respondents are making that particular modification in their classroom daily or a few times a week. Modifications for testing were given more frequently for students with special needs. Other modifications used more frequently for special students included: moving the room arrangement, individualizing instruction; changing the difficulty level of the assignments, using a specialized curriculum, and providing special equipment.

These findings are very encouraging as they indicate that, in this district, teachers appear to be following the "spirit" of the inclusion initiative. That is, these teachers appear to be providing needed supports for the special needs students. This is contrary to the somewhat dismal findings of the earlier studies on mainstreaming (Ammer, 1984; Schultz, 1982).

Of further interest, is the finding that there is a positive relationship between the frequency of the modifications teachers make for students with special needs and the frequency they make modifications for typical students. Some of the specific modifications made for all students (both special and typical students) were: providing resources (i.e., study guides, highlighted text, outlines, using peer tutoring, structuring activities to create opportunities for special interaction, using cooperative learning groups, and providing behavioral intervention). These are practices that are typically used in inclusive models (Blenk & Fine, 1995; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997; Stainback & Stainback, 1996).

This is a very encouraging outcome which may suggest that inclusion is benefitting both typical and special children as well as helping to improve teaching. The teacher who adapts instruction and assignments to all children is assumed to be a better teacher than one who teaches all children the same. In addition, as more modifications are being made for all children in the classroom, the number of special education referrals may drop and the number of at-risk children who often fall through the cracks is likely to also decrease, making school a more successful place for all children. This finding lends some empirical support for inclusionary practices. However, caution is noted as this school district is known for instructional excellence, therefore this finding may be unique to this setting and not be generalizable to other settings.

While these teachers appear to be "doing the right thing" with regard to inclusive practice, they appear to be getting little support from their special education colleagues. It appears that regular education teachers are not planning with special education teachers on a regular basis in this district nor are they team teaching. The data also indicated many of the teachers have never been given instructionally relevant information on inclusion and making curricular modifications. Best practice indicates that for inclusion to be effective, this form of collaboration should be taking place (Friend & Cook, 1993; Lipsky & Gartner, 1996).

Although the district used for this study is known for excellence and has been implementing inclusive practices for several years, most of the respondents perceived themselves to be only somewhat successful in meeting the instructional needs of the student with special needs included in their classroom. This again may be related to the apparent low level of support from other professionals.

With regard to the frequency of modifications made for children with different types of special needs, it appears that no significant difference existed. This result is counterintuitive to popular belief which assumes that teachers will have to make more modifications to their teaching style and curriculum when working with students who have severe disabilities. We assume that teachers do not want to take children with complex needs because having to make more modifications will demand more time and effort on the part of the teacher, thus taking time away from the other children in their class (Williams & Algozzine, 1979; Moore & Fine, 1978; Wagner et al., 1983).

This finding can be viewed in several ways. First, it can be assumed that the teachers are currently making modifications for individual children based on their needs and do not view the severity of a child's disability as significantly affecting the frequency of modifications they currently make. This conclusion would be optimistic for children who have severe disabilities. If their presence does not require significantly more modifications than teachers may already be making, their inclusion in a regular education setting may be more welcome. A second interpretation may suggest that the teachers are not meeting the instructional needs of this population by making appropriate modifications, which is a distressing thought.

Limitations

There are a number of obvious limitations which may influence the generalizability of this research such as the small number of subjects and the always present concern about socially desirable responses with survey-type research. However, the authors believe that the importance of this data, the lack of previously reported data in this area, and the practical information this research provides for current practitioners override these limitations.

One limitation of this study is the number of subjects who completed the questionnaire, 42. Small sample sizes automatically raise the question of generalizeability. However, despite this, the authors believe that the demographics collected for the respondents are representative of the overall demographics for elementary teachers in the district. It is believed that there may be a number of reasons for this low response rate: the timing of the questionnaire and its' likely lack of relevance to some teachers. Each of these will be briefly discussed.

Regarding the timing of this study, this survey was distributed in the Spring of the school year when revision of annual educational plans (IEPs) are written for all students in the district. This process requires numerous meetings and extensive planning time from the teachers who work with special needs students. This questionnaire represented optional time-consuming paperwork. However, the authors believed this situation was unavoidable as they wanted to capture this data after the teachers had a full year of experience with their students.

In addition, judging from past research (Ammer, 1984), discussions with district level personnel, and knowing the number of special education students in the district, it is appropriate to state that approximately 25% of the eligible respondents have not had a special education student placed in their classroom. It is likely that this questionnaire held little relevance for this 25%. It is important to note that the respondent sample was comprised of teachers (98%) having had some experience with a special education students in their classroom, with 88% of respondents having some experience with special education students during this school year.

A second limitation is one of all questionnaire research. Social desirability may influence responses. Based on the results of the questionnaire, we really do not know if the teachers are doing what they said they are doing. However, all teachers were urged to be honest, informed that there was no possible benefit or penalty to their responses, and that responses would be kept confidential and honest.

A broader study which includes more subjects across districts as well as observations and/or interviews with teachers in the classroom would verify this study's findings. While this questionnaire was given to teachers who were experienced with this model, another suggestion would be to follow the same teachers over several years to determine if the frequency of modifications used changes with experience.

Conclusions

In summary, this study found that teachers, who had worked in a school district with an inclusion model in place for several years, were making on a regular basis many modifications for students with special needs. The type of modifications made has implications for teacher training and staff development. Further, it was found that as teachers make modifications for special needs students, they are also making modifications for typical students. This research provides some additional empirical support for inclusionary practices in a field where that information is lacking. It is further one of the few studies to explore the classroom practices which make inclusion effective.

References

- Ammer, J.J. (1984). *The mechanics of mainstreaming: Considering the regular educators' perspective*. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5 (6), 15-20.
- Blenk, K., & Fine, D.L. (1995). *Making school inclusion work: A guide to everyday practices*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Dover, W. (1994). *The inclusion facilitator*. Manhattan, KS: The MASTER Teacher, Inc.
- Falvey, (1995). *Inclusive and heterogeneous schooling: Assessment, curriculum, and instruction*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1993). *Inclusion*. *Instructor*, 103, 52-56.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L.S. (1994). *Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform*. *Exceptional Children*, 60, 294-309.
- Green, C.S. (1993 March). *Attitudes of regular teachers and administrators toward mainstreaming (Inclusion)*. In C.J. Liberton (Ed). *And Others. A system of care for children's mental health: Expanding the research base*. (pp. 241-246) *Annual Research Conference Proceedings, Tampa, FL*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 372 524).
- Hocutt, A.M., Martin, E.W., & McKinney, J. D. (1990). *Historical and legal context of mainstreaming*. In J.W. Lloyd, N.N. Singh & A.C. Repp (Eds.). *The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues & models* (pp. 17-28). Sycamore, IL. Sycamore Publishing Co.
- Jamieson, J.D. (1984). *Attitudes of educators toward the handicapped*. In R.L. Jones (Ed). *Attitudes and attitude*

change in special education: Theory and practice. (pp. 206-222). (Report No. EC 170 495). ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Reston, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 249 694).

Jenkins, J.R., Pious, C.G., & Jewell, M. (1990 Apr.). Special education and the regular education initiative: Basic assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56, 479-91.

Kubicek, F.C. (1994). Special education reform in light of select state and federal court decisions. Journal of Special Education, 28, 27-42.

Larrivee, B., & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude. The Journal of Special Education, 13, 315-324.

Lipsky, D. K. & Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusion, school restructuring, and remaking of American society. Harvard Educational Review, 66, 762-796.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

Moore, J., & Fine, M.J. (1978). Regular and special class teachers' perceptions of normal and exceptional children and their attitudes toward mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 253-259.

Ohio Department of Education (1982). Rules for the education of handicapped Children. Columbus, OH: Author.

Pearman, E.L., Barnhart, M.W., Huang, A.M., & Mellblom, C. (1992). Educating all students in school: Attitudes and beliefs about inclusion. Educating and Training in Mental Retardation, 27 (2), 176-82.

Rainforth, B. (1992). The effects of full inclusion on regular education teachers: Final Report. San Francisco, California Research Institute, San Francisco State University.

Rogers, J. (1993). The inclusion revolution. Phi-Delta-Kappa-Research Bulletin, 11, 1-6.

Sailor, W., Gerry, M., & Wilson, W.C. (1990). Policy implications of emergent full inclusion models for the education of students with severe disabilities (Report No. EC 302 673). San Francisco State University, CA. California Research Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 048).

Salend, S.J. (1994). Effective mainstreaming: Creating inclusive classrooms. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Schloss, P.J. (1992). Mainstreaming revisited. Elementary School Journal, 92 (3), 233-44.

Schultz, L.R. (1982). Educating the special needs student in the regular classroom. Exceptional children: Special education and pediatrics: A New Relationship, 48 (4), 366-68.

Smith, J. D. (1998). Inclusion: Schools for all students. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Sprinthall, R.C., Schmutte, G.T., & Sirois, L. (1991). Understanding educational research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1996). Inclusion: A guide for educators. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

Vaughn, T., (1994). Can inclusion succeed? Equity and Excellence in Education, 27(1), 68-69.

Wang, M. (1992). Adaptive education strategies: Building on diversity. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

Warger, C.L., Aldinger, L.E., & Okun, K.A. (1983). Mainstreaming in the secondary school: The role of the regular teacher. (pp. 5-35). (Report No. SP 022 205). Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, IND. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 355).

Will, M. (1986). Educating students with learning problems - A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-415.

Williams, R.J., & Algozzine, B. (1979). Teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. The Elementary School Journal, 80 (2), 63-67.

Wood, J. W. (1998). Adapting instruction to accommodate students in inclusive settings. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Zigmond, N., Jenkins, J., Fuchs, L., Deno, S., Fuchs, D., Baker, J., Jenkins, L. & Couthino, M. (1995, March). Special education in restructured schools: Findings from three multi-year studies. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 531-540.

Footnotes

1. Severe Learning Disability (SLD) - A disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write spell, or do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia and developmental aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance or of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage (p. 13).

2. Developmentally Handicapped (DH) - also referred to as Mental Retardation - Significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affects a child's educational performance (p. 5).

3. Severe Behavior Handicapped (SBH) - A condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance: (a) an inability to learn, which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors; (b) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; (c) inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; (d) a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or (e) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. The term does not include children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they are severe behavior handicapped (p. 11).

4. Multihandicapped (MH) - Having more than one handicapping condition causing severe educational

problems which make it impossible to accommodate the needs of the child in any program but a program for multihandicapped children. This may include deaf-blind, autistic and moderately, severely or profoundly developmentally handicapped children (p. 8).

Table 1

Table 1
Number, Percentage, and Grade Level of K-6 Teachers

Grade	n	percentage
N=42		
K	3	7.3
1	8	19.5
2	5	12.2
3	7	17.1
4	12	29.3
5	4	9.8
6	2	4.9

Note. One subject was omitted as they teach in a multi-age 2nd/3rd grade classroom.

Table 2

Table 2. Frequency of Use of Curriculum Modifications Percentage of Respondents

Question Number and Curricular Modification	Percentage of Respondents			
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Rarely
N=42				
20. How often do you plan lessons for special needs students with a member of your special education staff?	3	21	36	41
21. How often are you teaching in the same room with a special educator?	18	21	13	49
22. How often are you given instructionally relevant information on students that assists you in adapting and modifying classroom instruction and activities?	3	18	39	41
29. How often are students with special needs able to participate in regular class activities because appropriate supports have been identified and put into place?	40	35	20	5
How often do you take time to work individually				
30. with each identified child in your room?	52	24	17	7
31. with each typical student in your room?	26	60	12	2

How often do you take time to work <u>individually</u>					
30. with each identified child in your room?	52	24	17	7	
31. with each typical student in your room?		26	60	12	2
How often do you alter the physical room <u>arrangement</u> (i.e. seating) to accommodate for different learning needs					
32. for special students?		31	31	29	10
33. for typical students?		14	31	48	7
How often do you teach to the individual <u>student's</u> <u>learning</u> styles (i.e. visual, tactile, auditory, model)					
34. for special students?		50	29	19	2
35. for typical students?		45	33	21	0
How often do you individualize instruction and/or <u>lessons</u>					
36. for special students?		39	37	24	0
37. for typical students?		14	45	36	5
How often do you utilize specialized curriculum					
38. for special students?		18	39	33	10
39. for typical students?		0	26	46	28
<hr/>					
<u>Question Number and Curricular Modification</u>		<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>			
N=42		<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Rarely</u>
<hr/>					
How often do you <u>provide</u> resources (i.e. study guides, <u>highlighted</u> text, outlines)					
40. for special students?		15	39	42	5
41. for typical students?		5	37	44	15
How often do you provide <u>special</u> <u>equipment</u>					
42. for special students?		18	15	28	40
43. for typical students?		0	15	28	58
How often do you lower the <u>difficulty</u> level of <u>assignments</u>					
44. for special students?		43	38	17	2
45. for typical students?		5	29	38	29
How often do you shorten <u>assignments</u>					
46. for special students?		46	37	5	12
47. for typical students?		8	30	35	28
How often do you read or tape record directions					
48. for special students?		50	15	3	33
49. for typical students?		32	22	10	37

How often do you give extra cues or prompts				
50. to special students?	64	24	7	5
51. to typical students?	36	41	17	7
How often do you allow extra time for the completion of assignments				
52. for special students?	45	31	19	5
53. for typical students?	21	36	29	14
How often do you administer tests orally				
54. for special students?	24	39	20	17
55. for typical students?	10	24	29	37
How often do you read tests				
56. for special students?	28	35	20	18
57. for typical students?	8	30	23	40
How often do you have your tests administered by resource persons				
58. for special students?	23	18	23	38

<u>Question Number and Curricular Modification</u>	<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>			
	<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Rarely</u>
<u>N=42</u>				
59. for typical students?	0	8	18	75
How often do you change the test format				
60. for special students?	13	33	30	25
61. for typical students?	3	18	23	58
How often do you shorten tests				
62. for special students?	30	30	15	25
63. for typical students?	0	20	13	68
How often do you provide alternative tests				
64. for special students?	13	34	26	26
65. for typical students?	5	11	16	68
How often do you use peer tutoring				
66. for special students?	45	21	21	12
67. for typical students?	31	29	24	17

How often do you structure activities to <u>create opportunities for social interaction</u>				
68. for special students?	52	41	7	0
69. for typical students?	55	36	10	0
How often do you use <u>cooperative learning groups</u>				
70. for special students?	24	45	31	0
71. for typical students?	19	52	29	0
How often do you teach <u>friendship skills/sharing/negotiation</u>				
72. for special students?	45	21	26	7
73. for typical students?	45	17	29	10
How often do you provide <u>special reinforcement or behavioral intervention</u>				
74. for special students?	55	26	10	10
75. for typical students?	45	26	19	10
How often do you use <u>computer-assisted programs</u>				
76. for special students?	2	41	26	31
77. for typical students?	0	27	27	33

<u>Question Number and Curricular Modification</u>	<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>			
<u>N=42</u>	<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Rarely</u>
How often do you provide <u>alternative assignments/projects</u>				
78. for special students?	10	38	29	24
79. for typical students?	0	21	38	41
80. How often do you implement IEP objectives	48	33	18	3