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ABSTRACT

NECESSARY SUPPORTS FOR EFFECTIVE HIGH SCHOOL INCLUSION CLASSROOMS: PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATION, GENERAL EDUCATION TEACHERS, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

BY

ANDREA DAUNARUMMO

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the general education teacher, and the special education teacher in a public high school in New Jersey as to the components necessary for the successful implementation of inclusion at the high school level. The following research questions guided this study: what is necessary for effective inclusion according to the public school principal; what supports do public school teachers need in order for inclusion to be effective according to public school principals, general education teachers, and special education teachers; what supports are being provided according to public school administrators, general education teachers, and special education teachers; and what is the relationship between the supports public school teachers are receiving verses the supports they think they should be receiving? Data were collected by conducting two separate focus group interviews, one with the general education teachers and one with the special education teachers; and an individual interview with the principal. Although variations occurred amongst the participant groups as to the components they identified as necessary for the successful implementation of inclusion classrooms, the participant groups agreed on some of the necessary components for successful implementation of inclusion.
Nonetheless, this study revealed that differences existed as to what teachers are receiving verses what they think they should be receiving.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

Education is in a state of constant flux with a continued focus on improvements to the educational system. These efforts to improve education often are seen in the various educational trends and educational reform movements. One of the educational trends that have come to the forefront in education is the concept and subsequent implementation of inclusion. Inclusion is defined as educating students with disabilities in the general education classrooms alongside their age appropriate peers without disabilities. The concept of inclusion is not new; it has been around for quite some time. According to the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) enacted in 1975 and reauthorized and renamed Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) in 2004, to the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities are to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) alongside their peers without disabilities in their neighborhood schools (Baker, Wang, & Walberg 1994/1995; Rizzo & Lavay, 2000).

Regardless of the type of student in a district, the public schools are responsible for the education of all students. With the execution of the No-Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) school districts are not only responsible for holding the general education student population to higher educational standards, they are also held accountable for having these same standards for their special education student population. In addition, school districts are responsible for assessing all students’ knowledge according to grade level proficiency standards set forth by this legislation (Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; US Department of Education, 2008).
In order to comply with IDEIA regulations, public schools are including students with disabilities in the general education classes usually with some type of educational supports. At the secondary school level, a majority of these classes are taught by appropriately content certified teachers. The inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes helps ensure that all the students in these classes are exposed to teachers with the appropriate academic content certifications, therefore, providing students with and without disabilities access to the same academic content. Including students with disabilities in these classes assists in providing a higher quality education for all students so that they have a better opportunity to meet the proficiency level on state assessments (Itkonen, 2007). The supports that the students with disabilities receive are designated by each student's individualized education program (IEP) (Finn, Heath, Petrakos, & McLean-Heywood, 2002; Fuchs & Fuchs 1994; Hasazi, Johnston, Schattman, & Liggett, 1994).

Overall public schools are moving away from educating students with disabilities in self-contained and resource room settings and moving toward servicing these students alongside their non-disabled peers in the general education classrooms. During the 1995-1996 school year, 45.3% of students with disabilities ages 6-21 served by IDEA spent 80% or more of their school day in general education classes and 21.6% spent less than 40% of their day is general education classes. In the 2004-2005 school year the percentage of students that spent 80% of their school day in general education classes rose to 52.1% and those students who spent less than 40% of their school day in general education classes declined to 17.5% (US Department of Education, 2007).

The inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom has expanded the responsibility of the general education teachers and has changed the role of the
special education teachers. These students with disabilities have been identified as having specific learning challenges. Including students with disabilities in the general education classes makes both the general education teacher and special education teacher responsible for meeting these students' specific needs. The general education teacher and special education teacher must be able to successfully work together to educate all the students in that classroom (Hines, 2008; Keefe & Moore, 2004).

In order for inclusion to be effective, certain supports for teachers in inclusion classrooms are required. School administrators with their decision making authority have the ability to positively influence the success of inclusion classrooms. School administrators can choose to use their power to help eliminate barriers and make available the supports necessary for inclusion classrooms to be successful (Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000).

First, a compatible working relationship with adequate planning time between the general education teacher and special education teacher are necessary components for successful inclusion classrooms. An effective working relationship between the general education teacher and special education teacher is one in which both understand and agree with their roles in the classroom. According to Gately and Gately (2001), this specific relationship progresses through three specific stages of growth: the beginning stage, the compromising stage, and the collaborative stage. This relationship takes time to nurture and the amount of time needed varies according to the individuals involved. As this collaborative relationship successfully progresses through the various developmental stages, the teachers working in the inclusion classroom become more effective, thus creating a more successful inclusion classroom (Gately & Gately, 2001).
School building principals are ultimately responsible for teachers' schedules and they have the ability to provide opportunities for the inclusion teachers to collaborate by arranging common planning time. School principals also have the ability to choose the teachers involved in an inclusion classroom. They can match general education teachers and special education teachers that have had successful inclusion classrooms in the past. They can also schedule teachers in an inclusion classroom that would like to work together (Gately & Gately, 2001).

Additionally, school principals can help expedite teachers' progression through the stages of collaboration in inclusion classrooms by including them in the planning process (Hines, 2008). When teachers are included prior to the implementation of inclusion classrooms they gain a sense of empowerment. When teachers are empowered and included in the decisions that affect them, they are more likely to hold positive attitudes toward the changes they are required to implement thus leading to more successful inclusion classrooms (Ainscow & Kaplan, 2005; Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Conrad & Whitaker, 1997; Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Guzman, 1997; Rizzo & Lavay, 2000; Worrell, 2008).

Secondly, the general education teacher must have an understanding of the effective teaching strategies to meet the educational needs of the disabled students in that class (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Carpenter, & Dyal, 2007; Hines, 2008; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Schumaker & Deshler, 1994/1995). The research has shown that general education teachers feel inadequately trained to teach children with disabilities. This feeling of inadequacy is particularly prominent of teachers at the secondary grade level where general education teachers are more focused on content knowledge and use more whole-class
instruction and less differentiated instructional techniques (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003). Emphasis on high stakes testing and limited flexibility in scheduling are believed to be factors that contribute to secondary general education teachers’ focus on academic content and their lack of focus on varied teaching strategies (Keefe & Moore, 2004).

A third difficulty teachers in an inclusion class must overcome is the special education teachers’ lack of content knowledge. At the secondary level, both general education teachers and special education teachers believe that special education teachers lack adequate content knowledge therefore hindering the success of an inclusion classroom. The special education teacher must possess enough content knowledge to address the questions and concerns of all the students in an inclusion classroom (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007).

A factor that research has shown improves the success of inclusion is when teachers are provided with on-going professional development opportunities that focus on varied instructional approaches (Idol, 2006). When teachers have the ability to use varied instructional approaches in the classroom the research has supported that all the students in the inclusion class benefit (Ellet, 1993). School principals have the capability to effectively address these feelings of inadequacy by providing both educators opportunities for professional development in their areas of perceived deficiencies. On-going professional development of specific content knowledge can help boost the confidence of both the general education teacher and special education teacher in inclusion classrooms (Worrell, 2008).

A fourth component necessary for successful inclusion is a positive attitude toward inclusion. As knowledge of special education terminology, issues, and laws increase,
teachers confidences in their abilities to properly service included students increase thus promoting a more positive attitude toward inclusion (Worrell, 2008). Research has shown that the attitudes of special education teachers, general education teachers, and school principals are important factors in the success of inclusion implementation. When special education and general education teachers working together in an inclusive classroom have positive attitudes the inclusion model is more successful (Mason, Wallace, & Barholomay, 2000).

School building principals are responsible for the promotion of a positive school climate and culture. They are the key to institute positive school change. When school principals hold more positive attitudes toward inclusion they have a tendency to provide the teachers with more supports thus perpetuating the positive attitude amongst the stakeholders involved with inclusion (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000).

A fifth component for successful inclusion classrooms is the provision of proper materials and resources for inclusion classroom teachers. These materials and resources vary from class to class based upon the inclusion teachers’ and students’ needs. These may include but are not limited to teacher’s editions to classroom textbooks, the physical arrangement of the inclusion classroom, or even class size (Hines, 2008; Idol, 2006).

School building principals play an essential role in promoting successful inclusion classrooms because they have the power to provide the inclusion teacher with the proper materials and resources necessary for successful inclusion. They are responsible for ensuring that inclusion teachers have the supports necessary to meet the educational needs of all their students. School principals can perform a needs assessment for the teachers involved in
inclusion classrooms, and then they can follow-up with those teachers to evaluate whether or not they are being provided with the necessary supports for successful inclusion classrooms (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Conrad & Whitaker, 1997; Hines, 2008).

This movement to include more students in the general education classroom changes the climate and culture of schools and the dynamics of classrooms thus requiring the support of school principals (Dyal, Flynt, & Bennett-Walker, 1996; Hasazi, Johnston, Schattman, & Liggett, 1994; Mason, Wallace, & Barholomay, 2000). As educational leaders, school principals are responsible for promoting the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth (Council of Chief State School Officers “Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standard 2,” 2008). In addition, school principals as educational leaders are expected to promote the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment (Council of Chief State School Officers “Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standard 3,” 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Several barriers exist in implementing inclusion classrooms particularly at the high school level. General education teachers have expressed feelings of inadequacy toward meeting the needs of students with disabilities in inclusion classrooms (Dyal, Flynt, & Bennett-Walker, 1996; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Schumaker & Deshler, 1994/1995; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003). Many special education teachers lack the appropriate content knowledge to be effective in inclusion classrooms (Keefe & Moore, 2004). School building principals
need to provide both general education and special education teachers in inclusion classrooms with the specific supports necessary for successful implementation (Ainscow & Kaplan, 2005; Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Conrad & Whitaker, 1997; Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Guzman 1997; Mason, Wallace, & Barholomay, 2000; Rizzo & Lavay, 2000; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007). The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the general education teacher, and the special education teacher in a public school in New Jersey as to the components necessary at the public high school level for the successful implementation of inclusion.

Research Questions

The research was guided by questions focused on perceptions of effective inclusion, the necessary supports for successful inclusion, and the actual supports provided for inclusion. These questions focused on principal’s perceptions, general education teachers’ perceptions, and special education teachers’ perceptions.

Effective Inclusion

1. What is necessary for effective inclusion according to public school principals?

Necessary Supports

2. What supports do public school teachers need in order for inclusion to be effective according to principals?

3. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to public school general education teachers?

4. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to public school special education teachers?
Provided Supports

5. What supports are teachers being provided with according to public school administrators?

6. What supports are teachers being provided with according to public school general education teachers?

7. What supports are teachers being provided with according to public school special education teachers?

Supports Needed and Received

8. What is the relationship between the supports public school teachers are receiving versus the supports they think they should be receiving?

Research Design

These research questions were addressed in a descriptive, qualitative case study of one public school. The components necessary for effective inclusion were identified through individual and focus group interviews with special education teachers, general education teachers, and the school principal. The school principal was interviewed individually. The special education teachers and general education teachers were interviewed separately in small focus groups. The special education teachers and general education teachers must have meet the criterion of having taught in an English or mathematics inclusion classroom in the school within the last 5 years or having been currently assigned to teach in at least one of these classes the 2009-2010 school year. After each interview was transcribed verbatim, categories, themes, and trends were identified. These were broken down into sub-categories and developed into narrative passages to describe the findings of the study.
Importance of Study

Principals and teachers need to work together to improve the quality of education for all students. If principals know what general education and special education teachers need in order to be successful in inclusion classrooms, principals will be better able to provide these teachers with these necessary supports. If general education and special education teachers are provided with the necessary supports for successful inclusion, these teachers will be able to improve the quality of education in inclusion classrooms. These two groups can work together to improve the success of inclusion classes. Ultimately the teachers in inclusion classrooms will be more effective in educating all students in those classes whether they have been identified as having a disability or not.

Additionally, by improving inclusion classrooms, schools will be better equipped to help students meet New Jersey state assessment requirements and ultimately save money. Public school leaders will be able to more efficiently, effectively, and prudently manage school resources. By providing the supports for successful inclusion classrooms, all stakeholders benefit. It will generate more positive attitudes of general education teachers and special education teachers toward inclusion in turn, creating a more positive school culture and climate.

Limitations of Study

The teacher focus groups specifically identified the members of the child study team and other administrators, such as the department head and the supervisor of special education; a position assumed by the vice principal, as essential personnel who provided necessary supports for effective inclusion classrooms. Based upon these findings and their professional responsibilities, specifically with regard to the education of students with disabilities,
including the perceptions of these groups of people in this study could have provided an even deeper understanding of the specific supports which they provided which resulted in them being identified as essential personnel for effective inclusion classrooms at Lyden High School.

Definition of Terms

*Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)*: Refers to the minimal yearly acceptable level of academic achievement for New Jersey public school students' from grades 3 through high school level in the areas of mathematics and reading/language arts literacy as determined by students test scores on New Jersey statewide mandated tests. Both students in schools as a whole and as specific subgroups must meet AYP. According to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), public schools who utilize Title I funds must achieve 100% student proficiency in these areas by the spring of 2014. Both sanctions and rewards for school districts are determined based on attainment of AYP.

*District Factor Group (DFG)*: Refers to a classification system of New Jersey school districts based on the socioeconomic status (SES) of the community in which the school is located. District factor grouping is used to identify demographically similar school districts. The district factor grouping classification system for regular public schools includes eight main groups: A, B, CD, DE, FG, GH, I, or J. The DFG of an “A”, represents the lowest SES status and “J”, represents the highest SES status. Special DFG’s such as O, R, and V are used to denote other educational environments respectively; correctional and juvenile facilities, charter schools, and career and technical schools.

*General Education Students*: Students that have not been identified or classified as having a disability.
**General Education Teachers**: Teachers appropriately certified by the State of New Jersey to teach grades 9 through 12.

**High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)**: Refers to the state exam administered to New Jersey high school students in their junior year to assess their proficiencies in mathematics and language arts literacy.

**Inclusion**: Educating students with disabilities in general education classes which consist of one general education teacher and one special education teacher.

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**: Formerly called the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) of 1975, this act identifies specific categories of disabilities and specifies educational entitlements for people with disabilities.

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA or P.L. 108-446)**: Formerly called the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, this act identifies changes to the procedures for evaluation, the development of Individual Education Plans (IEP), parental rights, and special education teacher qualifications.

**Individual Education Program (IEP)**: An educational program designed for students with disabilities developed according to the New Jersey Administrative Code 6A:14-3:7

**Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)**: According to New Jersey Administrative Code 6A: 14-4.2, "...to the maximum extent appropriate, a student with a disability is educated with children who are not disabled...in the school he or she would attend if not a student with a disability...".

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)**: Legislation that requires all districts and schools receiving Title 1 funds to meet state specified annual educational goals.

**Secondary Education**: High schools encompassing grades nine through twelve.
*Special Education Teachers:* Teachers appropriately certified by the state of New Jersey to teach children with disabilities.

*Students with Disabilities:* Refers to students that have been identified and classified as having a disability and require special education services according to their individual education program.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Special Education: 1975 to No Child Left Behind and beyond

The public school's role of providing equitable educational opportunities for all students has a history of policy changes as different student populations are identified and their needs are addressed. Table 1 illustrates key federal legislation, court cases, and a brief summary of how these significantly impacted the education of students with disabilities. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, one student population that gained national attention was special education, or students with disabilities.

At that time, students with disabilities were either excluded from receiving a public education at all or received an inadequate education due to undiagnosed and non-serviced disabilities. It was not the public school's responsibility to educate these students; the educational needs of students with disabilities were the sole responsibility of their parents and families. Services to assist students with hidden disabilities who did attend school did not exist, ultimately leaving these students to figure it out on their own. The exclusion of students with disabilities or the sink or swim mentality, toward students with undiagnosed disabilities provided neither a free nor appropriate education for this population (Itkonen, 2007).
Table 1

**Key Federal Legislation and Court Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Federal Legislation and Court Cases</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td><em>Brown v the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas</em></td>
<td>Illegal for schools to segregate based on race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)</td>
<td>Provided states with grant support for the education of students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Bilingual Education Act (Public Law 90-247)</td>
<td>Guidelines for bilingual education funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td><em>PARC (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children) v. Pennsylvania</em></td>
<td>Provided parents of mentally handicapped children with due process rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided mentally handicapped students the right to be educated in public school or public school equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td><em>Mills v. Board of Education</em></td>
<td>Provided due process for all handicapped children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools not allowed to discriminate based on students’ handicapping condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Led to PL 94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972</td>
<td>Prohibited gender discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112) Section 504</td>
<td>Identifies specifications use of federal funds for persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outlined due process procedural safeguards for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA, Public Law 94-142)</td>
<td>Federal mandate to states that all children ages 5-21 with disabilities be provided a free and appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required all special education students to have Individualized Educational Plans (IEP’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided funding to states to educate children with disabilities in the LRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Public Law 98-199 amendment to EHA</td>
<td>Supported transition services from high school to adult living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Key Federal Legislation and Court Cases</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Regular Education Initiative (REI)</td>
<td>Initiated as result of increasing students receiving special education services. Annual report of the status of special education. Encouraged general and special education teachers to work together to educate all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Public Law 99-457 amended the Education for the Handicapped Act (EHA)</td>
<td>Mandated states to provide school services for children with disabilities beginning at age three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>EHA reauthorized and renamed Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, Public Law 101-476)</td>
<td>Added transition planning for students over 15 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Reauthorization of IDEA (Public Law 105-17)</td>
<td>Student with disability to be educated as much as possible in the general education setting. Transition planning begins at age 14. Schools report disabled student’s progress to parents as frequently as non-disabled student’s progress is reported to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act reauthorization of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td>Accountability measures which requires states to provide proof of all students reaching adequate yearly progress according to specified state standards. Emphasis on highly qualified teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>New Reauthorization of IDEA renamed IDEIA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act-Public Law 108-446)</td>
<td>Immediate emphasis on highly qualified special education teachers. Changes to evaluation and IEP (Individual Education Plan) procedures and parental rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1975, education for students with disabilities underwent dramatic changes with the passage of PL 94-142. Through the implementation of PL 94-142, also known as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the responsibility of educating students with disabilities shifted solely from the parents to a shared responsibility with society. This legislation attempted to deal with educational accessibility issues for students with disabilities. Although students with disabilities were provided with an education, this population was often educated separately from the general education student population, therefore, special education students received a separate but not equal education as students who were not disabled (Baker, Wang, & Walberg, 1995).

As time progressed, other legislative acts such as Goals 2000, the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994, the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Act in 2004, and the No Child Left-Behind Act of 2007 were enacted and amended to more appropriately address the needs of students with disabilities. These acts shifted the focus of the education of students with disabilities from educational accessibility to educational outcomes, quality, accountability and eventually educational equity (Baker, Wang, & Walberg, 1995; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Itkonen, 2007).

The way students with disabilities are educated has also undergone some drastic changes. This population, which was once provided an education apart from students without disabilities, is increasingly educated alongside their age-appropriate peers in general education classrooms. Educating students with disabilities alongside their age-appropriate peers in the general education classroom, often referred to as inclusion, has several different models. Although various models exist, the goals of inclusion remain
consistent: to provide a quality and equitable education for students with disabilities equivalent to those without disabilities.

Currently, equality in education is still a pertinent issue. Although educating students with disabilities is still undergoing reform, some students with disabilities are still being educated separately in specialized schools, self-contained classrooms, and resource classrooms. Nevertheless, the number of students with disabilities who are educated separately from students without disabilities is declining and the number of students with disabilities being educated in the general education classroom on a part-time and full-time basis is increasing.

Since the inception on PL 94-192 in 1975, the number of students with disabilities receiving services under IDEA has grown dramatically to over 5 million (Bullock & Gable, 2007). A 10-year analysis of these numbers provided by the Department of Education illustrates this growth from 1995-2005. According to the Department of Education IES Education Statistics (2008), during the 1995-1996 school year 45.3% of students with disabilities who were serviced under IDEA spent 80% or more of the school day in general education classrooms and 21.6% spent less than 40% of the school day in general education classrooms (Department of Education, 2008). During the 1999-2000 school year 46.0% of students with disabilities who were serviced under IDEA spent 80% or more of the school day in general education classrooms and 20.3% spent less than 40% of the school day in general education classrooms (Department of Education, 2008). During 2003-2004, 49.9% of students with disabilities who were serviced under IDEA spent 80% or more of the school day in general education classrooms and 18.5% spent less than 40% of the school day in
general education classrooms (Department of Education, 2008). By 2004-2005, 52.1% of students with disabilities who were serviced under IDEA spent 80% or more of the school day in general education classrooms and 17.5% spent less than 40% of the day in general education classrooms (Department of Education, 2008).

Educating students with disabilities alongside their age-appropriate peers without disabilities in their neighborhood schools, often referred to as inclusion, has been a growing reform movement. Because of the growing trend of including more students with disabilities in the general education classrooms, the various facets of inclusion are under continuous evaluation.

Although previous research has been done in the area of inclusion, with the continuing increasing population of inclusion students in conjunction with the increasing demands of accountability of academic performance, the components of successful inclusion need to be constantly reevaluated and the research in this area needs to be on-going. Just as other educational reform movements have to undergo continuous re-evaluation to determine effectiveness and possible methods of improvement, the inclusion education reform movement also needs to undergo re-evaluation to determine ways to improve the process (Baker, Wang, & Walberg, 1994/1995; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Schumaker & Deshler, 1994/1995; Weiss & Lloyd, 2002).

One way to re-evaluate inclusion is to continue the various forms of research on the diverse components of inclusion. Because the vast research on the area of inclusion has shown that both provision of teacher supports and administrative support are critical components that contribute to the success of inclusion, this research will evaluate the
interconnectedness of these components. To provide a basis for this research, this
literature review will discuss previous research conducted on barriers, supports, teacher
and administrative viewpoints, and governmental accountability criteria for effective
inclusion at the secondary level.

Inclusion Barriers

In the past, general education classrooms consisted of one general education
teacher who was responsible for the education of the general education students.
Students with disabilities were educated by one special education teacher in classrooms
separate from the general education students. There has been an educational trend to
include more students with disabilities in the same classrooms as the general education
students. These inclusion classrooms are often comprised of a general education
teacher as well as a special education teacher who are jointly responsible for the
education of all students in the classroom. These inclusion classrooms have changed
classroom dynamics and expanded the role of these classroom teachers.

Although the practice illustrated above has been in existence for some time,
including students with disabilities in the general education classrooms is not without its
difficulties. The research done thus far on this area suggests that several barriers,
particularly at the secondary level, must be overcome to enhance the effectiveness of
inclusion. There are three categories of barriers: logistical, pedagogical, and
organizational. As will be discussed further in this review, logistical barriers are
usually scheduling conflicts, poor collaboration skills, and limited texts and materials.
Pedagogical barriers can emanate from teachers’ training at the university, and usually
take the form of inadequate training for general education teachers and special
education teachers and limited knowledge and use of diverse teaching methodologies. Organizational barriers can be fostered by the principal or organizational climate of the district, and appear as negative school climate and culture including negative attitudes toward inclusion from various stakeholders and lack of principals' support (Avramidis, Bayliss & Burden, 2000; Bullock & Gable, 2006; Burnstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Downing, Eichinger, & Williams, 1997; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; Worrell, 2008).

In a study of co-teaching in inclusive classrooms conducted by Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007), which synthesized 32 qualitative research investigations on co-teaching across primary and secondary grade levels using a meta-synthesis approach, the research revealed that barriers to effective inclusion were lack of adequate planning time, poor co-teacher compatibility, inadequate teacher training, and lack of administrative support. Specifically at the high school level, the study revealed that high school teachers used less differentiated instructional techniques and less individualized instruction and more whole-class instruction.

The research conducted by Keefe and Moore (2004), which used semi-structured interviews of general education and special education teachers in a suburban high school in southwestern United States, revealed that challenges in co-teaching revolved around several concerns: the specific roles and compatibility of the teachers involved, the content knowledge of the special education teacher, the understanding and knowledge of the general education teacher about disabilities and modifications, the importance of the relationship between the special and general education teacher, large class sizes, adequate planning time, and appropriate modifications that should be
utilized particularly in the area of grading. The researchers also recommended additional studies on co-teaching. Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, and Spagna’s (2004) study on inclusion also revealed the following barriers: the general education teachers’ and special education teachers’ feelings of inadequate preparation, lack of time for collaboration, inadequate training, materials, large class sizes, and most importantly, lack of administrative support.

Soto, Muller, Hunt, and Goets (2001) used focus groups to conduct a study of inclusion students in the San Francisco Bay area. Their study participants included inclusion specialists, general education teachers, instructional assistants, parents, and speech-language pathologists. Once again, inadequate training, lack of collaboration time, poor attitudes, and lack of administrative support were identified as barriers to successful inclusion. Austin (2001) interviewed middle and high school teachers involved in co-teaching classrooms. This study revealed the importance of administrators to provide resources, schedule adequate planning time, and allocate human and material resources, and adequate pre-service training.

Logistical problems can damage students’ outcome in many forms. According to Rieck and Wadsworth (2000) and Weiss and Lloyd (2002), the rigidity of teachers schedules and rigorous academic curriculum requirements at the high school level do not provide the general education teachers and special education teachers in inclusion classrooms adequate collaboration time. Rieck and Wadsworth (2000) recommended that inclusion classrooms undergo continuous administrative assessment and evaluation throughout the school year and that teachers of inclusion classes receive more than one common preparation time. Carpenter and Dyal (2007) suggest several options to
provide teachers of inclusion classes with adequate pre-planning time. Some recommendations are to provide substitute coverage for these teachers, have these teachers meet before or after school, and/or to use a rotating planning period for special education teachers throughout the week.

Other researchers recommended block scheduling as a way to provide students with maximum instructional time (Shortt & Thayer, 2000). Eisenberger, Bertrando, and Conti-D’Antonio (2000) also supported the use of block scheduling to enhance instructional time; however, they also suggested providing teachers of inclusion classrooms shared control over the master schedule to assist with scheduling the necessary time they need to plan appropriately.

In addition, some general education teachers and special education teachers in inclusion classes possess poor collaboration skills and require training in collaboration methods (Gately & Gately, 2001; Hines, 2008; Keefe & Moore, 2004). Gately and Gately (2001) described three phases collaborating teachers must grow through to achieve a successful co-teaching environment: the beginning stage, compromising stage, and collaborative stage.

Additionally, personality conflicts between the general education teacher and special education teacher contributed to the difficulty in defining their responsibilities in inclusion classrooms. In Keefe and Moore’s (2004) study which used semi-structured interviews of general education teachers and special education teachers in high school co-teaching environments emphasized the importance of compatibility between teachers in co-taught classrooms. Some participants felt that compatibility was even more important than content knowledge. Hines (2008) also supported the idea that
collaboration between general education teachers and special education teachers in inclusion classrooms is essential.

Pedagogical barriers also can prevent teachers, especially at the secondary level, from providing an equitable education for all students. Due to the increased educational demands that have been placed on all students at the high school level, teachers must be appropriately content certified. That is, the special education teacher should be highly qualified in the academic content class to which he is assigned; however, this is not always the case (Itkonen, 2007). In practice, although the academic content teacher has content certification, the special education teacher assigned to that class may not.

The training of general and special education teachers often differs. In general, secondary regular education teachers’ training has been focused on academic content and less on pedagogy. In contrast, special education teachers training has been focused more on pedagogy and less on academic content. This difference of educational training may result in a puzzling dichotomy: general education teachers are knowledgeable about subject content; however, they may experience difficulty in how to convey that knowledge to students with various disabilities and special education teachers may be knowledgeable about how to convey information to students with disabilities; however, they are likely to be less knowledgeable about the academic subject (Austin, 2001; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; Worrell, 2008)

Studies across various grade levels revealed that a common concern of general education teachers was that they did not feel qualified or properly trained to educate students with disabilities in the general education classrooms (Burstein, Sears,
Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Gately & Gately, 2001; Keefe & Moore, 2004). In conjunction with their concern with their ability to teach special education students, general education teachers felt that special education teachers in inclusion classrooms lacked adequate content knowledge to be effective in inclusion classrooms (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Gately & Gately, 2001; Janney, Snell, Beers, & Raynes, 1995).

However, when general education teachers had more positive interactions with special education inclusion teachers and more exposure to students with disabilities in classrooms, their attitudes toward inclusion became more positive (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004). The research also revealed that role identification of the general education teachers and special education teachers took time to develop and was pertinent for success in inclusion classrooms. Some general education teachers were not able to adapt to having shared responsibility with the special education teacher and visa versa.

On the other hand, the research revealed that special education teachers in inclusion classrooms felt that they were not welcomed in these classrooms by the general education teachers. The special education teachers did not feel like they had ownership in inclusion classrooms, they felt more like outsiders (Weiss & Lloyd, 2002). Special education teachers also felt that they lacked adequate content knowledge to be effective in inclusion classrooms; particularly at the high school level (Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; Worrell, 2008). However, attainment of adequate content knowledge for secondary level special education teachers is particularly difficult when they are expected to service students with disabilities across an array of academic disciplines.
Including students with disabilities in the regular education classrooms requires a change for both the regular education teachers and the special education teachers assigned to those inclusion classrooms. Despite the differences in training, these two teachers must be able to work successfully together for the educational benefit of all the students in the inclusion classroom.

These pedagogical and logistical barriers are difficult to overcome; in addition, they potentially engender a negative environment, or school culture. School culture and its climate are typically administrative concerns and can be addressed by the building principal (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Hollingsworth (2001) recommended that administration devote part of the school day to professional development, various study groups, and small group dialogues to provide all teachers involved in inclusion classes opportunities to communicate about effective techniques and methods of collaboration in inclusion classes. Van Reusen, ShoHo, and Barker (2000-01) suggested ways in which administrators can improve teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion by providing more appropriate training, resources, and materials for teachers of inclusion classes.

School principals and the teachers in inclusion classrooms must come to a consensus on the components needed for effective inclusion. Consequently, it is important to identify what each party believes are those necessary components. Daane, Beirne-Smith, and Latham (2000) found that administrators, general education teachers, and special education teachers varied in their perceptions of collaborative efforts of inclusion; however, they did discover that one crucial component for successful inclusion includes administrators’ perceptions and support of inclusion.
Idol (2006) evaluated inclusion practices at the elementary, middle, and high school levels and also revealed that principals and teachers varied as to their views on inclusion. Idol (2006) recommended that in order to improve inclusion, principals should ask teachers what teachers need to make inclusion more successful. Due to the increasing special education student population in the general education classes and the increasing educational expectations of these students to pass the HSPA, more research is needed to help evaluate and perhaps enhance the quality of education for all students including the students identified as special needs, particularly at the secondary level.

Inclusion Supports

To create a more effective inclusion environment it is important to identify the necessary components of inclusion according to the individuals most responsible for the education of these included students. The school personnel most responsible for the education of these students are the school principal, the general education teacher, and the special education teacher of inclusion classrooms. To best serve the students in an inclusion classroom, the teachers in that classroom need to have the appropriate supports. The school principal, also referred to as the instructional leader of the building, holds the overall responsibility for the education of all the students in that building; therefore it is the responsibility of this individual to provide the teachers in inclusion classes the appropriate supports for effective inclusion.

According to Barnett and Monda-Amaya (1988), principals set the school vision and are major players in the change process of schools. It is their responsibility to set the tone of support and caring in the school community. They also play a significant
role in restructuring education practices within a school. Principals are the key figures in providing appropriate supports and education to teachers.

The research also proposes that various components are necessary for the proper implementation of inclusion. For inclusion to be successful, the barriers mentioned earlier need to be eliminated and the adequate supports need to be provided for the general education teachers and special education teachers (Ainscow & Kaplan, 2005; Bouchamma, 2006; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Conrad & Whitaker, 1997; Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000; Dyal, Flynt, & Bennett-Walker, 1996; Finn, Heath, Petrakos, & McLean-Heywood, 2002; Gately & Gately, 2001; Guzman, 1997; Hasazi, Johnston, Schattman, & Liggett, 1994; Hehir, 2002; Idol, 2006; Janney, Snell, Beers, & Raynes, 1995; Leyser & Tappendorf, 2001; Mason, Wallace, & Barholomay, 2000; Paterson, 2007; Rizzo & Lavay, 2000).

Keefe and Moore (2004) used semi-structured interviews of general education teachers and special education teachers who had either in the past or currently participated in inclusion classrooms to evaluate co-teaching challenges at the secondary level. They indicated that general education teachers in inclusion classrooms believed that greater knowledge about disabilities and modifications would benefit them. Furthermore, special education teachers in inclusion classrooms felt that they should have more content knowledge to be more effective.

Consequently, both general education teachers and special education teachers felt that the most essential component for successful inclusion was the compatibility between the general education teacher and special education teacher in the inclusion classrooms. Specifically, the ability to communicate effectively with each other and a
clear definition of each others’ roles in the inclusion classroom was essential for the success of the inclusion classroom (Keefe & Moore, 2004). All of these components are considered necessary for inclusion to be successful.

In a metasynthesis of 32 qualitative investigations on co-teaching in inclusive classrooms across all grade levels and geographic regions which included the perspectives of administrators, co-teachers, parents, students and support personnel, Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007) revealed of particular importance was the compatibility of the inclusion teachers and administrative support.

According to the research on inclusion, general education and special education teachers often vary in their opinions as to the necessary components for successful inclusion. They also differ in ranking these components in order of importance. In the survey study of secondary regular education teachers in San Diego County conducted by Ellet (1993), general education teachers identified and ranked various instructional strategies they were willing to use in class to accommodate students with disabilities such as tutoring, clarifying behavioral expectations, ignoring inappropriate behavior, collecting data on students, and grading. The teachers differed as to which strategies they were willing to use and they also differed as to the importance of each strategy.

Some teachers in inclusion classrooms believe that administrative support is the most crucial component to successful inclusion classrooms (Ainscow & Kaplan, 2005; Austin, 2001; Barnett & Monda-Amaya, 1988; Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, Spagna, 2004; Carpenter & Dyal, 2007; Conrad & Whitaker, 1997; Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000; Dyal, Flynt, & Bennett-Walker, 1996; Eisenberger, Bertrand, & Conti-D’Antonio, 2000; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Glanz,

Inclusion Viewpoints

Much research has shown specific challenges exist to successfully implementing inclusion at the high school level. Although increasing numbers of students with disabilities are being placed in general education classrooms, this does not necessarily mean that inclusion teachers are being provided with the appropriate support systems required for proper implementation. To adequately address the needs of students with disabilities principals need to ensure that the general education teachers and special education teachers involved in the inclusion classrooms are provided with the necessary supports for successful inclusion.

The research has shown that principals vary according to what they think general education teachers and special education teachers need for effective inclusion. According to Daane, Beirne-Smith, and Latham (2000), elementary principals, general
education teachers, and special education teachers agreed that administrative support is critical for successful inclusion, however, regular education teachers and special education teachers perceive inclusion classes as exhibiting more management problems. Administrators disagreed with this perception. Additionally, regular education teachers, special education teachers, and administrators also disagreed with the notion that inclusion increased academic achievement of students with disabilities. Although these three groups expressed different concerns regarding all students in the inclusion class, these professionals all agreed that both the general education and special education students in inclusion classes grew socially (Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000).

A survey conducted by Barnett and Monda-Amaya (1988) revealed that elementary, middle, and high school principals have little knowledge of special education, they have an unclear definition of inclusion, and their vision does not provide a supportive inclusion environment. Although these principals may think they know what general education teachers and special education teachers need, the research shows that these teachers are not always provided with the necessary resources. Reick and Wadsworth (2000) recommend that administrators use focus groups throughout the year to assess needs and evaluate the effectiveness of inclusion programs. In a survey study of elementary school principals by Praisner (2003), the study revealed that principals vary as to their attitudes toward inclusion classrooms. Praisner’s (2003) results indicate principals need more specific training in effective inclusion strategies and practices.
Inclusion Accountability

According to the No-Child Left Behind legislation, high school students are expected to demonstrate educational proficiency as ascertained by their performance on a standardized test. In New Jersey, students demonstrate this by obtaining passing scores on the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) examination. This test, administered to the students for the first time in early March of junior year, focuses on students’ ability in mathematics and language arts literacy. To help students with disabilities pass the HSPA, many districts have chosen to place this population in general education classrooms with appropriate educational supports. Therefore, a greater number of students with disabilities continue to be placed in general education classrooms and are expected to succeed in these general education classrooms as measured by state assessments.

Karger and Boundy (2008), suggest the reason for the increase of special education students included in general education class is due in part to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which has been reauthorized and amended as NCLB 2001. All students are eligible to be taught by highly qualified teachers, to be included in state-wide assessments, and required to meet Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in specific subgroups and on an individual basis. According to NCLB, by the year 2014 all high school students, with very minimum exceptions, must be 100 percent proficient in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics. If schools fail to meet AYP the state may impose penalties. Penalties may include required professional development, school restructuring, or other corrective actions which aim to provide students of failing school opportunities to attain a better quality education. These failing
schools are required to use funds from their Title I allocation to remedy these issues.

Consequently the penalties to schools for not meeting AYP have a detrimental effect on the financial status of schools.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the
general education teacher, and the special education teacher in a public school in New
Jersey as to the components necessary at the public high school level for the successful
implementation of inclusion. In order to accomplish this, the study was designed as a
descriptive, qualitative case study of one school. It incorporated interviews of three
kinds of participants at the school: special education inclusion teachers, regular
education teachers, and the school principal.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions.

*Effective Inclusion*

1. What is necessary for effective inclusion according to the principal?

*Necessary Supports*

2. What supports do teachers need in order for inclusion to be effective
according to the principal?

3. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to general
education teachers?

4. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to special
education inclusion teachers?

*Provided Supports*

5. What supports are teachers being provided with according to administrators?
6. What supports are teachers being provided with according to general education teachers?

7. What supports are teachers being provided with according to special education inclusion teachers?

Supports Needed and Received

8. What is the relationship between the supports teachers are receiving versus the supports they think they should be receiving?

To better understand the components necessary for effective inclusion classrooms at the high school level, this study was designed to elicit the perspectives of general education teachers, special education inclusion teachers, and administrators at one high school. Through individual and focus group interviews, the components necessary for effective inclusion were identified.

The majority of previous research on inclusion is quantitative in measure. Most studies relied on surveys. There was sparse qualitative research to study inclusion at the secondary educational level: therefore, I chose to extend the knowledge about inclusion by using single and focus group interviews. The interviews consisted of specific open-ended questions which allowed the participants the opportunity to offer detailed explanations for the answers they provided.

Site

I conducted this study at Lyden High School (pseudonym), a Central New Jersey suburban, public high school located in the United States which had an ethnically and economically mixed student population and a district factor grouping of DE. A district factor grouping of DE indicates a middle income socioeconomic school district
status. According to the information obtained on the New Jersey School Report Card 2007-2008, Lyden High School had a total student population of 1,733 and serviced students from grades 9-12 and special education (ungraded).

Table 2

*Student Population Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education (Ungraded)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Student Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student population with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) was 10.6% (New Jersey School Report Card 2007-2008).

This high school employed special education inclusion teachers in all academic subjects across grades 9 through 12: mathematics, English, history, science, and foreign languages. The special education inclusion teachers varied in years of educational experience and training. Some of the special education inclusion teachers were more seasoned and have taught at Lyden High School prior to the implementation of inclusion classrooms. These teachers have experienced different inclusion training programs throughout their teaching careers and have also witnessed the changes to
inclusionary practices at Lyden High School. Other special education inclusion
teachers have taught at Lyden High School for a shorter period of time and have not
gone through these same experiences. The academic scores of the New Jersey School
Report Card and the NCLB Report focused on mathematics and English HSPA test
scores. The state of New Jersey only reported the results of each school’s test scores in
these two academic areas. Each school’s results were compared to the state average test
scores, therefore, this study only focused on classes with special education inclusion
teachers in the academic areas of mathematics and English across grades nine through
twelve.

One of the reasons this research site was chosen was because the inclusion
classrooms in Lyden High School appeared to be successful for special education
students according to the results of students with disabilities category on the High
School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) as reported on the 2007 and 2008 NCLB
Reports. Students with disabilities were successful in outperforming the state averages
on both the Mathematics and Language Arts Literacy sections of the HSPA. For
example, in the area of mathematics, the percentage of Lyden High School students
with disabilities scored higher than the New Jersey state average at the proficiency and
advanced levels during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years. The percentage of
students with disabilities at Lyden High School that scored at the proficiency and
advanced levels in the area of Mathematics during the 2006-2007 school year was
35.6% and 20% respectively while the state average in this same category that scored
proficient and advanced was 29.1% and 5.2% respectively (2007 State of NJ NCLB
Report). During the 2007-2008 school year the percentage of students with disabilities
that scored at the proficiency and advanced levels in the area of Mathematics was 35.6% and 20% respectively while the state average in this same category that scored proficient and advanced was 33.2% and 5.2% respectively (2008 State of NJ NCLB Report).

Although in the area of Language Arts Literacy the percentage of Lyden High School students with disabilities scored lower than the New Jersey state average at the proficiency level during the 2006-2007 and the 2007-2008 school years, they scored better than the state average at the advanced level both years, thus outperforming the state average when combining the scores of the proficiency and advanced levels. The percentage of Lyden High School students with disabilities that scored at the proficient and advanced levels during the 2006-2007 school year was 36.4% and 20.5% respectively, while the state average in this same category was 47.8% and 4.6% respectively (2007 State of NJ NCLB Report). During the 2007-2008 school years students with disabilities at Lyden High School that scored at the proficient and advanced levels were 40% and 20% respectively, while the state average in this same category was 51.2% and 4.6% respectively (2008 State of NJ NCLB Report).

Another reason for choosing this site was that Lyden High School utilized block scheduling which research has shown enhanced the opportunities to maximize the benefits of inclusionary practices (Eisenberger, Bertrando, Conti-D’Antonio, 2000; Shortt, Thayer, 2000). So, in essence, the school was comparatively progressive in terms of providing research-based practices to enhance instruction for all students.
Data Collection

In the summer of 2009, I formally contacted the superintendent of schools with a letter asking him for permission to conduct a research study in one of his district’s high schools. The details of the study were outlined in the letter. After I received permission from the superintendent to conduct the research study, I contacted the high school principal with a letter asking him if he would be a willing participant in a study that related to his personal views on inclusion and his teachers’ views on inclusion. The letter asked him for permission to conduct research interviews of willing participants of inclusion mathematics and English classrooms. A letter which detailed the specifics of the study was also attached. After permission was granted, I sent a letter to the regular education and special education teachers of these inclusion classrooms asking them if they would be willing participants in a study that related to their personal views on inclusion. A letter which detailed the criteria for participation and the specifics of the study were attached.

Sampling

In addition to the principal, the other study participants were purposefully selected from the general education teacher respondents and the special education inclusion teacher respondents. The study participants needed to meet the criterion of having taught in an inclusion mathematics or an inclusion English class in Lyden High School within the last 5 years or having been currently assigned to an inclusion mathematics or an inclusion English class the 2009-2010 school year. Each study participant was assigned a participant number as their pseudonym name to ensure their confidentiality.
When approval was granted, I conducted an interview with the principal and obtained his perception of the necessary components of a successful inclusion classroom and determined his perceptions of the supports he provided for successful inclusion. As a direct result of the number of participant volunteers, I conducted two separate focus group interviews. The general education teachers and special education inclusion teachers were interviewed separately to obtain their perceptions of the necessary components for successful inclusion and their views on administrative supports provided. The first focus group interview consisted of three special education inclusion teachers. The second focus group interview consisted of four general education teachers. These interviews took place during the first half of the school year so that the study participants would benefit from the results prior to the end of the school year.

I was the chief researcher for this study. As a high school special education inclusion teacher for more than 10 years, I was knowledgeable about the topic under investigation. Through previous work experience, research, and coursework completion, I had experience with interview techniques and methods and was able to keep the focus group conversation flowing and redirect the group when necessary. As sole researcher it was my responsibility to handle the environmental setting, refreshments, appropriate seating, and any other logistical issues concerning the interviews. I digitally recorded all interview sessions and took notes during the interviews. Throughout each interview I summarized the participants’ responses and asked them for verification of accuracy of these summaries. At the conclusion of each
interview I summarized the key points and asked the participants for validation of the summary. These summaries helped ensure the validity of the study.

The principal, general education teachers, and special education inclusion teachers were the three different categories of participants. To effectively compare and contrast the views of the different participants, I interviewed each category separate from each other, in a space free of distraction (Krueger & Casey, 2000). The rationale for using focus groups was supported from the research of Krueger and Casey (2000); they were appropriate for this study because they were designed to “find a range of opinions of people across several groups in a more natural environment than that of an individual interview because participants were influencing and influenced by others-just as they were in life” (p. 11). Additionally, focus groups must not consist of people who have varying levels of power, thus interviewing the principal separately was essential (Krueger & Casey, 2000).

The interview with the principal was conducted during a mutually agreed upon time to eliminate any distractions. The focus group interviews with the teachers were conducted at a time and a location chosen by the principal to eliminate any distractions.

When the study participants of the focus groups arrived, I greeted them. The atmosphere that I set was critical to the success of the focus group interviews. The first few moments were the most crucial as it set the tone for the rest of the interview time (Krueger & Casey, 2000). I used an interview protocol recommended by Krueger and Casey (2000). First, I welcomed and thanked the participants for their participation, and then the researcher introduced herself to the group and provided the participants with an overview of the topic reminding them that all views were encouraged. I reminded the
participants that the interviews would be digitally recorded, however the participants’ confidentiality would be kept.

I then explained the ground rules for discussion. Each participant was provided with a blank piece of paper and a pen to jot down any questions they may have during the interview, a copy of the interview questions, and a previously numbered tent card containing their actual name and pseudonym name. The pseudonym name was the previously assigned study participant number. In order to ensure the participant’s confidentiality only the participant’s number was used during the interview and in the transcription of the data. Throughout the interview and in the data transcription, the study participants were referred to as participant number 1, 2, 3, and 4. The participants asked to hold their questions until the end of the discussion. After the ground rules were discussed I proceeded with the first question.

The interview began with simple opening questions to break the ice and initiate the discussion, such as “How many years have you been teaching?” The discussion moved from simple questions to open-ended introductory questions which assisted the participants in making connections to the discussion topic, such as “What is your definition of inclusion?” Transition questions were used to help link the participant to the topic and set up the key questions for discussion such as “In your experience is inclusion effective? What would make it more effective?” I concluded the discussion with the use of ending questions which allowed an opportunity for the participants to include any information I may have overlooked, such as “Is there anything you’d like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked” (Krueger & Casey, 2000)?
At the conclusion of the interview I briefly summarized the main points of the discussion and asked the group to validate the accuracy of the summary by offering any comments. I gave each participant a 10 dollar gift card to Dunkin Donuts as a token of appreciation for their participation. Although the interviews were digitally recorded, I also recorded notes on the margins of the questions throughout the interviews. I transcribed each interview recording and all interview notes verbatim.

The validity and reliability of the interview questions were tested by a jury of experts. The jury of experts included high school general education and special education teachers in a northern New Jersey suburban school district who had experience with inclusion classrooms, a previous high school principal of a northern New Jersey suburban school district, and doctoral candidates who had successfully completed research methodology courses. The jury of experts was provided with a copy of the research questions and asked to review the questions and provide me with necessary feedback. I used the feedback to make any necessary adjustments to the interview questions and validated the changes with the same jury of experts.

Participants

The study group participants varied in years of teaching experience. In the first participant group, the special education inclusion teachers, three teachers volunteered to participate in the study. They ranged in teaching experience from 7 to 34 years.

The second focus group consisted of four general education participants. Three of the general education teachers had experience teaching in an inclusion classroom with a special education inclusion teacher. One general education teacher participant did not have any experience working with a special education inclusion teacher,
however voiced concern that he had special education students in his classroom and
would most likely benefit from having a special education inclusion teacher in the
classroom with him. The general education teachers that had worked in inclusion
classrooms with a special education inclusion teacher ranged from 9 to 27 years of
teaching experience. The general education teacher participant that never worked with
a special education inclusion teacher had four years of teaching experience.

The principal of Lyden High School had 13 years of classroom teaching
experience as a history teacher at the middle and high school levels. He had been an
administrator at the elementary, middle, and high school levels in the district for the
past 20 years. He had spent the last 13 of those 20 years as the principal of Lyden High
School.

Data Analysis

I transcribed the digital recording of each participant group verbatim. I read
each transcription and identified specific categories and themes such as process to
determine placement of inclusion teachers, amount and type of teacher training and
preparation for inclusion classrooms, academic materials provided to the teachers,
planning time provided for collaboration of inclusion teachers, confidence level to teach
in inclusion classes, effective inclusion classroom practices, model of inclusion being
used, and other types of support services provided to inclusion teachers; in the margins
of my transcriptions. I also looked for trends of similarities among principal, general
education teachers', and special education inclusion teachers' responses. I color coded
each transcription in order to identify from which group each comment originated.
Each focus group question was created as a heading and I cut the transcriptions and
matched the participants' comments with each of these focus group question headings. I read each focus group question and participants' comments and created a descriptive summary for the responses to each focus group question. I read these summaries and identified specific themes.

I created a master chart to help identify which focus group question for each participant group pertained to each specific research question. I reorganized the data according to the master chart and matched the focus group questions to the research questions. I read through the responses which aligned to each research question and developed summaries for the responses to each research question. I read through these summaries and identified main themes and categories. I created charts for the following categories of research questions: needed supports, provided supports, and needed and provided supports. Each chart included the participant group name and the theme identified from their narrative summary. I color coded similar comments from each group which assisted in developing sub-categories. I used these themes and sub-categories and developed narrative passages and further described the findings of the study.

Timeline

The study took approximately 5 months to complete. In the month of August 2009, I sent a letter requesting permission from the superintendent to conduct a research study outlining the details. Once permission was granted, I then sent a letter requesting permission from the principal to conduct a research study outlining the details. I also sent a letter to the high school teachers requesting participant volunteers. This letter
included the criteria for participation and information concerning the details of the study. The study participants were interviewed in October.

The interview with the principal took place at a specific time requested by him to eliminate any possible distractions. The interviews with the teachers took place one day at a time designated by the supervisor of special education to eliminate any distractions. The transcription of the interviews took place in October and November. The final interpretations were done by December. At the end of January, I shared the results with the interested participants.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the
general education teacher, and the special education teacher in a public high school in
New Jersey as to the components necessary at the public high school level for the
successful implementation of inclusion. The research was qualitative in nature and was
guided by research questions which focused on participants' perceptions of effective
inclusion, the necessary supports for successful inclusion, and the actual supports
provided for inclusion.

This chapter provides an analysis of each research question according to the
perceptions of the principal, the general education teachers, and the special education
teachers. The analysis of each research question began by matching the research
question to the appropriate question route response for each study group participant.
The analysis for each research question incorporates excerpts from each interview
which relate to each research question. The data were further analyzed with interpretive
comments from the researcher.

Analysis of Discussions

Research Question 1

What is necessary for effective inclusion according to the principal? The responses
from 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (see Appendix A) from the question route for the
principal pertain to research question 1.
**Attitude.** The principal felt that believing “all students can learn” was the most important component for effective inclusion classrooms. The principal also remarked that district support was essential for effective inclusion. He explained that if he determined he needed something to enhance the inclusion program and expressed that need to the district that the district would provide the principal with whatever was necessary because not only does Lyden High School believe in inclusion, the district “believes in it.” He remarked that Lyden High School offered inclusion courses in the core subject areas such as; “math, English, art, physical education, and health.” He also expressed offering inclusion across other academic disciplines as necessary for effective inclusion. He explained that he would like to see inclusion classes also offered in academic elective classes.

**Teacher responsibility.** The principal also articulated that both teachers in the inclusion classroom should have “dual responsibility” for instruction for the benefit of all the students in the classroom, not specifically for the special education students. He said he should be able to walk into an inclusion classroom and see both the special education inclusion teacher and the general education teacher assisting all students simultaneously.

**Training.** He communicated that for inclusion to be effective, on-going inclusion professional development for the collaborative teaching teams of inclusion classrooms was both needed and provided. The principal said that the district “has a lot of professional development” for the teachers of inclusion classes “at least twice a year, fall and spring.” He conveyed that both the special education and general education
collaborative inclusion team teachers attended this professional development training together. He suggested that this type and duration of professional development training was sufficient to meet the needs of both the general education teacher and special education teacher in inclusion classrooms. However, he thought the best training for teachers of inclusion classrooms was on the job experience.

Brief summary. He explained that he felt the best way for inclusion to be effective was simply by immersing inclusion teachers in inclusion classrooms. The principal also expressed extreme confidence in his special education teachers of inclusion classrooms in their abilities to assist the general education teachers of inclusion classrooms. The principal also stated that “supplemental materials” were necessary for effective inclusion and at times “teachers’ aides.”

Research Question 2

What supports do teachers need in order for inclusion to be effective according to principals? The responses from 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 from the principal question route pertain to research question 2.

Belief. Once again, according to the principal, the most important component that teachers need for inclusion to be effective is teachers’ belief. The principal expressed this belief as a true positive belief in the students’ ability to succeed. The principal conveyed that this belief begins at the district level and trickles down to the principal, teachers, and ultimately the students. At the district level, this belief begins by making inclusion classrooms available across the curriculum and providing inclusion classrooms with supports such as “supplemental materials” and “teachers’ aides.” The principal expressed that this district belief is extended to the teachers by providing on-
going professional development for the general education and special education
inclusion team of teachers. He said, “Sometimes the professional development is state
run, sometimes it is district run.” He also stated that the inclusion team teachers attend
these workshops together.

*Attitude.* At the school level, this belief begins with the positive attitude of the principal
and is often expressed by his actions when he, as “the instructional leader” demonstrates
model teaching lessons “at least once or twice a week” and lets the special education
students know that “Hey man! You can do it! You can be successful!” According to
the principal, this belief is expressed by the special education inclusion teachers who
“have the right attitude” and who are “always brainstorming to see what they can do.”
These teachers “do whatever they have to do to maximize” student learning. The
special education teachers also express this belief when they exhibit nurturing behaviors
and positive attitudes that “no matter what we initiate (referring to the district) when it
came to those kids they would try it. They wouldn’t say, ‘It can’t be done.’ They don’t
ever say you know ‘This can’t happen.’ They’ll do it and they’ll do it with earnest.
They’ll do it earnestly.” Eventually, this belief “just trickles down to the kids” because
“kids know whether or not you care. I mean you can’t fool kids. You can’t fool kids.”

*District responsibilities.* Additionally, teachers need support from the district in the
form of continuous professional development, the proper supplemental materials, and
sometimes the provision of teachers’ aides.

*Teacher collaboration.* Teachers also need the support from each other as a
collaborative team. The principal expressed that the teachers involved in inclusion
classrooms need to be able to “work together, collaborate together...so they can feed off
each other.” The principal expressed the importance of the special education teachers' ability to “work together with the general education teacher as a team” to help “all students.”

Research Question 3

What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to general education teachers? The responses from 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (see Appendix B) on the question route for teachers pertain to research question 3.

Essential school personnel. When asked this question of the general education teacher focus group, majority of the group agreed that the most important supports they needed were special education teachers who were knowledgeable about how to effectively work in inclusion classrooms. The group agreed that the “biggest support” personnel person was the special education inclusion teacher in the classroom. One teacher remarked, “More or less yeah the teachers are pretty much the kinda support that we have.”

Consistency, competency, and compatibility. All the participants in the general education teacher focus group felt that working consistently with the same special education inclusion teacher who was competent with the subject matter would make inclusion classrooms more effective. This group explained that due to block scheduling they have worked with different special education inclusion teachers throughout the school year. One participant added “I think that something that would make it more effective, would be to have the same in-class support teacher with the regular teacher on a consistent basis and kinda match them up so that there are people that work together well.” This respondent further explained this response by stating a situation when they
had to work with various in-class support teachers and it was not successful. She remarked, "It doesn't work. You can't do that and really know what you're doing."

Another participant emphatically agreed with her statement and added, "I would agree! Also having that special ed inclusion teacher having their strength be in that particular subject." Another participant agreed with this comment and interjected, "Yeah, that'd be awesome!" The other participant continued, "I think if special education teachers feel more comfortable in the subject area and have more command of the knowledge it'd be more effective." Another participant supported this by adding that the special education inclusion teacher should be placed in an inclusion classroom "where their concentration is."

Success stories. Participants in this group went on to explain various instances when they did work with the same in-class support teacher who was knowledgeable about the subject content and the inclusion classroom was effective. One participant explained an instance when she worked with the same in-class support teacher for several years and they developed a terrific collaborative teaching relationship where they "knew each other" and "after a short period of time it just clicked. We both knew what each other wanted to do." Another participant explained a positive effective inclusion classroom experience when he worked with a special education inclusion teacher and they each were able to benefit from each others strengths and weaknesses. He stated, "She knew right where my limit was as the classroom disciplinary person I knew where her limit was, very professional."

Common planning. The general education teachers also felt that common planning would improve the effectiveness of inclusion classes. This group felt that common
planning time would provide the in-class support teacher with the opportunity to plan ahead to assist the special education students more effectively.

**Responsibilities.** This group also felt that inclusion classrooms would be more effective if both the general education and special education inclusion teachers had knowledge in advance of the special education students' needs prior to conducting class. The general education teachers felt they should receive the modifications sheets for each special education student in their classes prior to beginning the school year so they could ensure they were in compliance with the legal mandates regarding the proper modifications for the special education students. One teacher expressed, “If possible, I'd like to know a week ahead of time before I start class what I'm gonna need to do for these kids.” He referred to a situation in his class when he found out after the school year had begun that he was not following the student’s modifications. He went on to explain that he was “legally mandated to sit this child in the first desk in the first row and I got them sitting back by the window.”

**Student comfort level.** All the participants in the general education focus group agreed that it was important for steps to be taken to make sure the special education students in inclusion classrooms were not singled out. One participant remarked, “There shouldn’t be any attention at all in regards to anyone knowing besides the teachers in there as to what’s going on so I think that’s very important.”

**Training.** All the general education teachers expressed the need for professional development specifically on inclusion preferably from outside agencies. One teacher remarked, “I think an important part that they can play in all of this is setting up professional development. “Just find a workshop or two and send us out there,” one
participant remarked. When asked if the professional development should be conducted by people from within the district or outside the district the participant indicated that it would be best if the training was conducted from an out of district source. He commented, "I think it would be better served by having you know something that someone out of district coming in."

Research Question 4

What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to special education inclusion teachers? The responses to 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 on the question route for teachers pertain to research question 4.

Essential school personnel. When asked what supports were provided for inclusion classrooms, the special education inclusion teachers answers focused on personnel support such as, the child study team, the guidance department, the special education supervisor, and the department head. When asked to elaborate on this, the group explained that these people were receptive to the special education teacher's input on student placement. When asked to explain that comment the participant replied, "Just if we feel a kid is improperly placed they hear what we have to say about it." The group went on to explain that although their suggestions regarding student placement may not always be followed, they still were permitted to offer their input.

They also expressed that the special education supervisor and department head were good supports as a last resort in possible conflict resolution situations that may arise between the general education and special education inclusion teachers if they "as teacher to teacher can't" resolve the issue. One participant explained this further by saying, "sometimes there's a teacher that doesn't necessarily want us and they say
things like 'this is my room' and 'this is my way' and they're extremely territorial, then they (referring to the department head and special education supervisor), help in that type of situation.”

Class composition. The special education inclusion teacher focus group identified student composition of classes as another kind of support necessary for effective inclusion. The group expressed that currently the inclusion classrooms seemed to be comprised of “the lowest of the regular ed with the highest of the special ed.” The special education teacher group expressed that this composition often resulted in the special education inclusion teacher helping the regular education students more than they helped the special education students. This group felt that inclusion classes would be more productive if they were comprised of high functioning special education students and higher achieving regular education students. Perhaps these teachers felt this recommended class composition would provide the special education inclusion teacher adequate time to effectively assist all students in that inclusion classroom because the higher achieving general education students would require less teacher assistance. The teachers agreed that although they believed in inclusion, sometimes it was better not to have a special education student in the general education class if that student was not able to perform successfully in that inclusion classroom. These teachers agreed that sometimes it was unfair to place special education students with significant cognitive deficiencies in academic classes in which these students were not able to comprehend the material. They expressed that sometimes it was better for a special education student to be in a smaller classroom setting where the special education teacher was able to provide the student with more individualized attention.
**Confidence and compatibility.** In order for inclusion to be effective, the special education inclusion teachers agreed that they should be confident in teaching the academic content and they should be compatible with the general education teacher of their assigned inclusion classroom. When the inclusion classroom included these components, confidence and compatibility, the majority of the special education teachers expressed that they could and, at times they have, taken over the responsibility of teaching all students in those classes. One special education inclusion teacher gave an example when she stated, “I had two examples last year where I had two teachers both out on maternity leave. I was able to conduct the class because I knew the subject matter and I knew that I could do it.” That same teacher commented that she had not worked with a particular general education teacher for 2 years; however if she were required to teach that class tomorrow she would be able to walk in and teach that class as if she had been there the whole time. She went on to explain that she would be able to do this because she and that general education teacher had built a working relationship together and she would be extremely comfortable with the subject matter. She declared, “we had our system and you know it was team teaching which is what it should be.”

Another special education inclusion teacher agreed that in order for inclusion to be effective it would be important for the special education inclusion teacher to have knowledge of the academic subject. This particular special education inclusion teacher expressed the importance of the special education inclusion teachers’ knowledge of the subject matter. She provided examples of how she was able to bring the academic knowledge she gained from teaching special education resource room classes of the
same academic content into the inclusion classes and how she was able to bring academic content knowledge to her special education resource room classes she gained from her inclusion classes. She expressed that this sort of “interplay” was important. This same teacher relayed a story of a time when although she worked well with a “fabulous” general education teacher the inclusion class was not effective for the students because she, as the in-class support teacher, was unfamiliar with the academic content. Another participant went on to explain that “situations where you’re happy and comfortable makes for a happy and comfortable classroom...for the two teachers as well as the kids.”

**Novice teachers.** The special education teachers all agreed first year teachers should not be a part of inclusion classes. These teachers explained why they felt this way. They explained that they had situations where they have worked with first year teachers and found that inclusion was not effective because first year teachers were, “trying to find their own ground in the classroom.” This group expressed that first year teachers’ time was spent by trying to cope with other aspects of teaching, such as classroom management and lesson interruptions, and that adding another teacher in the room can sometimes be perceived as an added pressure as opposed to support. One teacher referred to the general education teacher as feeling “intimidated” by having another teacher in the classroom.

**Teacher comfort level.** Another concern that special education inclusion teachers attributed to the effectiveness of inclusion classes was the general education teacher’s comfort level teaching in the same class with a special education inclusion teacher. According to the special education inclusion teachers, effectiveness of inclusion classes
also depended on the attitudes of the general education teachers. One participant stated, “Maybe what we’re saying is inclusion should be something that the teacher, regular ed teacher, wants.” Another participant interjected and continued the thought, “and is comfortable with.” Another participant continued, “There are teachers that we all have worked with that you know I mean we can finish their sentences when they’re up at the board and it’s a wonderful rapport.” These teachers explained that inclusion was more effective when they worked with the same general education teacher in the same academic classroom over a period of time. Additionally they explained that the general education teacher was extremely comfortable working in an inclusion class with that particular special education inclusion teacher. They went on to explain that these two teachers had developed such a wonderful working relationship that they felt synchronized in their thinking when teaching class.

Resistance. Sometimes the special education inclusion teachers have experienced different forms of resistance to inclusion from the general education teachers. One of the special education inclusion teachers expressed this resistance by stating, “There are definitely certain teachers who clash and others who work wonderful together.” The special education inclusion teachers had also faced resistance from students in inclusion classes by hearing remarks such as, “Are you the sub?” or “Oh, are you student teaching?” or simply “Why are you here?” According to the special education inclusion teachers, these student remarks mostly occurred in inclusion classroom situations where either the two teachers did not appear compatible and/or in inclusion classroom situations where the special education inclusion teacher was not comfortable with the academic content of the class.
Common planning. According to the special education inclusion teachers, having common planning time with the general education teacher helped make inclusion more effective. One participant explained an instance when she “accidentally” had common planning time with the general education teacher and “it was really nice.” Another participant supported the need for common planning time when she said, “Special ed we’re running all over the building so just to have another extra couple of moments to talk to the teacher that you’re with to discuss how that day’s lesson went it’s nice to have those extra couple of moments.”

Research Question 5

What supports are teachers being provided with according to administrators? The responses to 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 on the question route for principals pertain to research question 5.

District responsibilities. When asked this question, the principal’s first responses were “supplemental material” and “teacher’s aides.” He continued by stating that the district would provide him with whatever supports he needed.

Training and essential personnel. The principal continued to explain that both the general education teachers and special education inclusion teacher were provided with on-going professional development training “at least twice a year.” The principal explained that he also considered the special education inclusion teacher a support for the general education teacher in inclusion classrooms.

Leadership attitude. Lastly, the principal shared that he supported his teachers with a leading by example attitude by personally modeling lessons “once or twice a week” in various academic disciplines.
Research Question 6

What supports are teachers being provided with according to general education teachers? The responses to 4, 5, 6 and 9 on the question route for teachers pertain to research question 6.

Training. When asked what type of training they had on inclusion, the general education teachers paused to think for a moment and the first person responded “none that we know.” When prodded, “Nothing at all?” The participant responded, “No.” A different respondent was thinking the question through when he said, “Minimal. I believe maybe we’ve had one workshop in my 9 years.” Another respondent continued, “In one word I would say my training has been informal.” He went on to explain that he received his training from the special education inclusion teacher that was assigned to his classroom.

Essential school personnel. This participant group all agreed that the most important support that they received was the special education inclusion teacher they were assigned to work with in the inclusion classroom. They also said that they considered other teachers in the special education department another source of support for inclusion.

Legal documents. This group also agreed that although they did not receive them in a timely fashion, the students’ Individualized Education Plan (IEP) modifications forms were another form of support they received. The general education teacher participants in this group explained that they used these modification forms to make the necessary individual educational adjustments for each special education student in their inclusion classrooms. These forms notified the general education teacher about what type of
accommodations special education students required in an inclusion classroom such as, the need to be seated in the front row of the classroom or additional time needed to complete assignments.

Research Question 7

What supports are teachers being provided with according to special education inclusion teachers? The responses to 4, 5, 6, and 9 on the question route for teachers pertain to research question 7.

*Training.* The special education inclusion teacher group was asked what type of training they had on inclusion. The group participant that had been teaching a longer period of time expressed that when inclusion was first instituted they really did not have much training. One participant expressed that when inclusion first began at Lyden High School she felt the need to seek out training on inclusion so she attended a full day out of district workshop that she willingly paid for with her own money. This group explained that as time progressed and inclusion became more prevalent in Lyden High School, they were provided with various professional development training on inclusion.

*Essential school personnel.* The special education inclusion group considered personnel as important supports they received for inclusion. They named the child study team, the guidance department, special education supervisor, and the department head as “a big help.” (Please refer to the response to research question number four for a detailed explanation).
Research Question 8

What is the relationship between the supports teachers are receiving versus the supports they think they should be receiving? The responses to 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 on the question route for teachers and the responses to 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 on the question route for principals pertain to research question 8.

Principal viewpoints. Although the three participant groups had the same goal of making inclusion classrooms effective some discrepancies existed among the groups as to how best to achieve that goal. The principal viewed inclusion as a collaborative team effort from both the general education teacher and special education inclusion teacher to meet the needs of all students in inclusion classrooms. He believed that a positive attitude existed and was essential for effective inclusion classrooms. He believed this attitude began at the district level and penetrated down to the student level. He also believed that professional development for the collaborative team teachers of inclusion classrooms was important for inclusion effectiveness. The principal believed that both the general education teachers and special education teachers of inclusion classrooms received professional development training as a team. He also stated that teachers were provided with all the necessary supports for effective inclusion classrooms.

Teachers’ viewpoints. Both the general education and special education inclusion teacher groups would like to work in effective inclusion classrooms where they were able to successfully work together to educate the students in those classrooms. The teacher groups interviewed agreed that several scheduling issues should be considered when creating effective inclusion classrooms. The teachers groups came to these conclusions based upon previous inclusion classroom teaching assignments. They
stated the following components were important: establishing a good rapport with their cooperating teacher; their cooperating teacher should have a command of the subject content in the inclusion classrooms; both teachers should have some consistency with the teacher they work with; and they needed common planning time with their cooperating teacher. Both teacher groups agreed that these things were necessary for effective inclusion classrooms; however they occurred only by chance.

The teacher groups agreed that having the special education students' modification documentation was beneficial. Although both the general education teacher and the special education teacher were provided with these documents, they would prefer to obtain this information prior to the beginning of the school year so it could be helpful to avoid singling out the special education students in the inclusion classrooms.

*Essential school personnel differences.* All three groups agreed that school personnel were necessary sources of support for inclusion classrooms. The principal and the general education teacher groups felt that the special education inclusion teacher was their best personnel support. The special education inclusion teacher felt that the child study team, guidance department, special education supervisor, and department head were their best source of personnel support for inclusion classrooms.

*Training.* The special education teachers agreed that they needed and received professional development training on inclusion. Although the principal expressed that the teachers of inclusion classrooms attend professional development training together at least twice a year, the general education teachers stated that they would like training on inclusion but have not really received it. The general education teachers explained that the district provided them with only one full in-service day per year and offered
other opportunities for professional development after school throughout the course of
the school year. They explained that these workshops usually took place after school
and focused on subject area or technology and that they have not received any formal
training on inclusion.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the general education teacher, and the special education teacher in a public high school as to the components necessary at the high school level for the successful implementation of inclusion. This study specifically explored the perceptions of effective inclusion, the actual supports provided to teachers of inclusion classrooms, and further investigated what supports would be necessary for successful inclusion classrooms. This study used focus group interviews with general education teachers, special education inclusion teachers, and an individual interview with the principal to determine what effective inclusion looked like and if the teachers of inclusion classrooms actually received the supports necessary for effective inclusion classrooms. We should know if differences existed among the perceptions of the principal, the general education teachers, and the special education inclusion teachers with regard to the definition of effective inclusion, the supports provided for inclusion classrooms and the supports that were necessary for effective inclusion classrooms. This information can be used to provide the general education teachers and special education teachers of inclusion classrooms the supports they need and, in essence, improve the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms. If discrepancies existed among these three groups, inclusion classrooms may have been less effective simply because these teachers may not have received what they needed.
Summary of the Study

This was a qualitative case study of one public high school which used focus group interviews of the general education teachers, special education inclusion teachers and an individual interview with the principal to determine their perceptions of the necessary components for effective inclusion classroom practices specifically at the high school level. Each participant group was interviewed separately and a detailed analysis of the data was conducted. The responses pertaining to each individual research question and interpretive comments were addressed in Chapter IV. This chapter further described these research findings by examining both similarities and differences in perceptions among the three participant groups as they related to the research on inclusion. Underlying issues regarding the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms were unearthed by delving deeper into the research findings and exposing gaps in the information revealed by the study participants. This chapter concluded with recommendations for policy, practice, and future research on inclusion.

The three participant groups agreed with the definition of inclusion, however; they differed significantly in what they perceived was necessary to attain effective inclusion classrooms. All participant groups agreed that it was essential for those involved in inclusion classrooms to have a positive attitude toward the concept of inclusion, toward the students in those classes, and toward each other. These findings were consistent with those of Mason, Wallace, and Barholomay (2000) which concluded that the attitudes of special education teachers, general education teachers, and principals were important factors to determine the successfulness of inclusion implementation. They found that the inclusion model was more successful when the
special education and general education teacher working together in an inclusive classroom had positive attitudes. In fact, according to the research, some teachers believed a positive attitude toward inclusion was the most essential component for effective inclusion classrooms (Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Downing, Eichinger, & Williams, 1997; Hampton, & Xiao, 2007; Leyser & Tappendorf, 2001; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; Van Reusen, Shoho, & Barker, 2000-2001).

The principal assumed that the way to instill a positive attitude among these constituents was to lead by example. He felt that the district had a positive attitude toward inclusion by providing all the schools in the district, including Lyden High School, with supplemental learning materials, classroom aides, and on-going professional development training for teachers in inclusion classrooms. Once again these findings were consistent with the research. Hines (2008) and Idol's (2006) research revealed the necessity for providing the required materials and resources to teachers of inclusion classrooms for these classrooms to be effective. The principal believed he personally set the example of a positive attitude by teaching model lessons a few times a week. These findings coincided with the research which supported the belief that principals were responsible for the promotion of a positive school climate and culture. According to Barnett and Monda-Amaya (1988), it was the responsibility of the principal to set the right tone in the school community.

All participant groups felt that for inclusion to be effective, the team teaching relationship in those classrooms must consist of teachers who had established a good rapport with each other. These findings were confirmed by the research of Hines.
(2008) and Keefe and Moore (2004) which highlighted the importance of compatibility between the general education and special education inclusion teachers. According to research by Gately and Gately (2001), the collaborative relationship between the general education teacher and special education inclusion teacher was found to be very important. They explained that this relationship progressed through developmental stages and took time to nurture and grow. Other research findings confirmed that some teachers believed that the compatibility of these teachers was the most important component for successful inclusion classrooms (Fischer & Frey, 2001; Gately & Gately, 2001; Hollingsworth, 2001; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Weiss & Lloyd, 2002).

Both teacher groups agreed that it was extremely important that the special education inclusion teacher should be assigned to inclusion classes where they had a command of the academic content. This finding is heavily supported by the research conducted on barriers and supports necessary for successful inclusion classrooms (Austin, 2001; Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Gately & Gately, 2001; Hines, 2008; Itkonen, 2007; Janney, Snell, Beers, & Raynes, 1995; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Soto, Muller, Hunt, & Goetz, 2001; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; Worrell, 2008). The research of Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007) and Keefe and Moore (2004) specifically identified the need for academic competence of the special education inclusion teacher particularly at the secondary level.

Many researchers have identified poor teacher compatibility, special education teachers’ lack of content knowledge, lack of adequate planning time, and inadequate training as barriers to successful inclusion classrooms (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen,
Other research done with regard to necessary supports of effective inclusion classrooms have discovered that these same components should be provided to the teachers involved in inclusion classrooms (Hines, 2008; Itkonen, 2007; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Scruggs, Mastropieri & McDuffie, 2007). The study participant teacher groups expressed these same concerns and offered solutions to address these issues such as placing special education inclusion teachers in classes with general education teachers who have had success in the past and were willing to work together, keeping the pair of inclusion team teachers together on a more consistent basis, and putting special education inclusion teachers in a classroom where they were familiar with the academic content, providing common planning when possible, and providing professional development on inclusion.

Additionally, all three groups felt that adequate professional development should be provided; however, discrepancies existed among the groups as to what constituted adequate professional development for inclusion and what training had been provided. These findings were also consistent with the research of Idol (2006) and Worrell (2008) which supported the need for on-going professional development opportunities for teachers of inclusion classrooms.

The principal felt that adequate professional development for the inclusion team of teachers was provided; however, the teaching teams of inclusion classrooms did not concur with this conclusion. The principal explained that the team of teachers in inclusion classrooms attended professional development workshops on inclusion.
together twice a year, once in the fall and again in the spring. He identified this training as “on-going professional development.” This finding was incongruent with the comments from the general education teachers who expressed that the only training they really had on inclusion was that which they received from the special education inclusion teacher with whom they worked. They commented that they believed they may have attended one workshop on inclusion but they were not really sure. They explained that the district only provided them with a one day in-service for the year which focused on academic content. They further explained that other professional development training opportunities were available after school throughout the school year; however, these trainings focused only on academic content or technology and no training on inclusion was offered to the general education teachers. This group expressed that they did not have any formal training on inclusion.

The principal’s definition of what constituted effective professional development contradicted the research on effective professional development conducted by Desimone (2009), which explained that one of the components necessary for effective professional development according to scholars was that it was spread out over time and included a minimum of 20 hours of contact time. Moreover, Lyden High School utilized block scheduling which meant that the teachers and students did not have the same classes in the fall as they did in the spring. Some teachers may not have taught in inclusion classrooms in the fall and may have been assigned to inclusion classes in the spring. In essence it was like beginning a new school year and the inclusion team of teachers that taught together in the fall may not necessarily teach together in the spring. Therefore, the teachers who received professional development
on inclusion in the fall may be different than those who received or required it in the spring.

Both teachers groups agreed that the teachers of inclusion classrooms should have common planning time. This finding was also supported by the research which maintained the need for adequate planning time for inclusion classrooms to be effective (Austin, 2001; Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; Eisenberger, Bertrand, & Conti-D’Antonio, 2000; Hollingsworth, 2001; Keefe & Moore, 2004; Rieck & Wadsworth, 2000; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007).

The principal was under the assumption that the components necessary for effective inclusion classrooms were already in place. He assumed that the teachers of inclusion classrooms had a positive attitude about the concept of inclusion, the belief that all students can learn, and that they had a positive rapport with the other teacher of the inclusion classroom. He also assumed that teachers received all the necessary support services needed for effective inclusion classrooms. The principal did not mention the need for conflict resolution between the general education and special education inclusion teachers. This oversight may be due to the fact that neither the general education teachers nor the special education inclusion teachers mentioned support from the principal as necessary for effective inclusion. The general education inclusion teachers looked to the special education teachers as their main support system for inclusion classrooms, and the special education inclusion teachers looked to other school personnel such as; the child study team members, the guidance department, the supervisor of special education, and the department head as their main support systems.
The special education inclusion teachers mentioned that conflict resolution situations were handled by either the supervisor of special education or their department chair. The principal may have delegated the responsibility for the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms to the supervisor of special education and the department chair. Therefore, he may have been under the impression that these individuals had successfully handled any issues that pertained to the needs of effective inclusion classrooms. While the principal did not offer any specific suggestions to improve the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms he expressed that if his faculty had a need, the district would be sure to address it. On the other hand, both the general education teachers and special education inclusion teachers offered suggestions for specific actions to be taken to help improve the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms at Lyden High School. Perhaps interviews with the supervisor of special education and the department chair would shed further light on the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms.

One of the most interesting findings were the attitudes from the participants of each group which indicated that they believed it was their professional responsibility to find ways to best educate all students in inclusion classrooms. The focus group participants indicated that the responsibility of accountability to educate students in inclusion classrooms was theirs and they never mentioned the students' responsibility for their own education. The responses from the principal were also congruent with this conclusion.

Only the special education inclusion teacher group mentioned that sometimes the teachers of inclusion classrooms were not able to meet the academic needs of the special education students in inclusion classrooms. These teachers attributed this deficit
to the low cognitive abilities of some special education students. The special education teachers recommended educating these particular students in smaller classrooms where teachers would be able to provide more individualized attention to address the academic needs of these particular students. The special education teacher group also suggested restructuring the inclusion classroom so they would be comprised of higher academic functioning special education students with higher functioning general education students. They expressed a feeling of being overwhelmed and less efficient when inclusion classrooms were comprised of lower academically functioning general education students who demanded more attention from the special education inclusion teachers. Another interesting finding was that none of the study participant groups mentioned parental/guardian support as necessary for the successfulness of inclusion classrooms. Once again the responsibility of education for the students in inclusion classes was deemed the sole responsibility of the educators in Lyden High School.

Although organizational barriers were not a major concern of any of the study participant groups, the teacher groups identified that logistical and pedagogical barriers for implementation of effective inclusion classrooms were present at Lyden High School. The teacher groups voiced logistical concerns such as: scheduling issues which resulted in the lack of common planning time for teachers of inclusion classrooms and inconsistencies with keeping successful inclusion teaching teams together for long periods of time. These scheduling issues also contributed to some pedagogical barriers such as; assigning special education inclusion teachers to teach in classes where they were not comfortable with the academic content. The main concerns of teachers revolved around specific pedagogical barriers such as; inadequate teacher training,
particularly for the general education teacher; limited academic content knowledge of the special education inclusion teacher, and general education teachers' feelings of inadequacy to meet the needs of special education inclusion students.

Recommendations for Practice at Lyden High School

According to the results of this study, it is important for the leadership of Lyden High School to address the current logistical and pedagogical barriers to enhance the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms. It is recommended that whenever possible special education inclusion teachers are scheduled to teach in academic content classrooms with which they are competent and that these teaching teams remain together over time. It is also recommended that these teams of teachers are provided with common planning time and attend adequate on-going professional development training on inclusion together at a minimum of 20 hours throughout the school year.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this research, additional areas for study are recommended:

Research of the same nature should be conducted in the other high schools within this school district. It would be interesting to determine if the findings of this research are consistent across the other high schools in this school district.

Research should be done in high schools where the teachers of inclusion classes were provided with the identified necessary supports to determine if they consider these inclusion classrooms effective.

Research should be done on principals of high schools to determine if they have similar definitions of inclusion. This research should indicate if there is a correlation
between the supports they provide to the teachers of inclusion classrooms and the perception of inclusion effectiveness according to the principals, general education teachers, and special education inclusion teachers.

Research should be conducted with general education teachers at the high school level who have received training on inclusion to determine if a correlation exists between the degree of teacher training and inclusion effectiveness.

Research should be done with special education inclusion teachers at the high school level who have been working in an inclusion class consistently with the same general education teacher to determine if there is any correlation between working consistently with the same general education teacher and the perceptions of inclusion effectiveness.

Research should be done with novice teachers of inclusion classrooms to determine their perceptions of necessary supports for effective inclusion classrooms.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the principal, the general education teacher, and the special education teacher as to the components necessary at the high school level for the successful implementation of inclusion. This study was aimed at gathering information through individual and focus group interviews to better understand the needed supports for teachers in inclusion classrooms. Despite the lack of necessary supports provided for inclusion classrooms identified by the general education and special education teachers at Lyden High School, this school seemed to have a successful inclusion program according to the results of students with disabilities category on the HSPA as reported on the 2007 and 2008 NCLB Reports (NJ
Department of Education, 2007, 2008). It was apparent that the principal, the general education teachers, and the special education inclusion teachers at Lyden High School wanted the students in inclusion classrooms to be successful. This principal and these teachers should be commended for their efforts in attempting to provide students in inclusion classrooms with the best possible education they can. These teachers searched for opportunities to improve the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms. It would be interesting to research the perceptions of inclusion program effectiveness if these teachers were provided with all the supports they feel they needed. It would also be interesting to research the perceptions of inclusion program effectiveness if there was a shared perception of accountability regarding students' education amongst the educators, students, and parents/guardians.

It is evident that the faculty of Lyden High School possesses the talent and skills necessary to conduct effective inclusion classrooms. Lyden High School has a positive instructional leader in its principal who understands the importance of providing teachers with the necessary tools to effectively perform their duties as teachers. Lyden High School also has a willing and able faculty who voluntarily explore ways to enhance their effectiveness as teachers in inclusion classrooms. Lyden High School could benefit by capitalizing on the strengths of its exceptional faculty.

The principal of Lyden High School could positively utilize his faculty's motivation and desire to improve the effectiveness of inclusion classrooms. The principal can ensure that the teams of teachers in inclusion classrooms are provided with the necessary on-going professional development on inclusion. He can do this by either delegating this responsibility to the department heads and the supervisor of
special education or by assuming this responsibility himself. One way this can be done is by identifying talented and skilled staff members who have been trained on inclusion and using a turn-key method of instruction where these staff members can conduct training sessions for the general education and special education inclusion teachers. Another option is to provide staff professional development opportunities utilizing outside agencies. The principal can also request that the teachers who attend these sessions earn professional development hours. The principal of Lyden High School can request a policy which permits for professional development for the inclusion team of teachers to be built into the school year.

Another practice that the principal can currently benefit from is by identifying the academic areas in which the special education inclusion teachers have preference in teaching. This can be done by simply distributing an e-mail to the special education staff asking them. The special education teachers can rank the classes from their first preference to their last. The inclusion team of teachers that prefer to work together can also be identified simply by sending an email to the staff and asking them. When possible the administration can schedule these teachers accordingly.

Lyden High School can also adopt the policy that teachers of inclusion classrooms are to be provided with student modification documents prior to the start of the school year.
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Appendix A
Question Route For Principals
Question Route for the Principal

1. How many years have you been principal?

2. What was your position before you were principal?

3. Have you ever taught special education students? If yes, please elaborate.

4. How do you define inclusion? If you were to walk into a classroom, how would you know if it's being done correctly?

5. What kind of training have you had on inclusion? Please elaborate.

6. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms? Please elaborate.

7. How effective do you think your inclusion program is in this building? What would make it more effective?

8. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?

9. Do you feel that the district is able to provide you with all the materials necessary for effective inclusion practices?

10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion? Are they receiving it? Are they using it properly?

11. What do the special education teachers need for effective inclusion? Are they receiving it? Are they using it properly?

12. What can you do to support effective inclusion practice classrooms?

13. Is there anything you'd like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?
Appendix B

Question Route For General Education and Special Education Teachers
Question Route for the General Education and Special Education Teachers

1. How many years have you been teaching?

2. What is your definition of inclusion?

3. How many years have you been teaching in an inclusion classroom at the high school level?

4. What type of training have you had on inclusion? Please elaborate

5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?

6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?

7. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?

8. How can administration help improve inclusion?

9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom?

10. How does your current classroom differ from your ideal classroom?

11. Is there anything you’d like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?
Appendix C
Data Analysis Chart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What is necessary for effective inclusion according to principals?            | 6. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms? Please Elaborate.  
7. How effective do you think your inclusion program is in this building? What would make it more effective?  
8. What is necessary for effective inclusion practices?  
9. Do you feel that the district is able to provide you with all the materials necessary for effective inclusion practices?  
10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly?  
11. What do the special education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly?  
12. What can you do to support effective inclusion practice classrooms?  
13. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked? | NA                                                                       | NA                         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What supports do teachers need for inclusion to be effective?</td>
<td>4. How do you define inclusion? 6. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms? 7. How effective do you think your inclusion program is in this building? What would make it more effective? 8. What is necessary for effective inclusion practices? 9. Do you feel that the district is able to provide you with all the materials necessary for effective inclusion practices? 10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly? 11. What do the special education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly? 12. What can you do to support effective inclusion practice classrooms? 13. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Principal Question</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to general education teachers?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. How can administration help improve inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Principal Question</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What supports should exist for inclusion to be effective according to special education inclusion teachers?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. How can administration help improve inclusion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Is there anything I may have overlooked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What supports are teachers being provided with, according to administrators?</td>
<td>6. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms? Please Elaborate. 7. How effective do you think your inclusion program is in this building? What would make it more effective? 8. What is necessary for effective inclusion practices? 9. Do you feel that the district is able to provide you with all the materials necessary for effective inclusion practices? 10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly? 11. What do the special education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly? 12. What can you do to support effective inclusion practice classrooms? 13. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. What supports are teachers being provided with, according to general education teachers?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4. What type of training have you had on inclusion? Please elaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What supports are teachers being provided with, according to special education inclusion teachers?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4. What type of training have you had on inclusion? Please elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Principal Question</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>What is the relationship between the supports teachers are receiving versus the supports they think they should be receiving?</strong></td>
<td>6. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms? Please Elaborate.</td>
<td>4. What type of training have you had on inclusion? Please Elaborate.</td>
<td>4. What type of training have you had on inclusion? Please Elaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How effective do you think your inclusion program is in this building? What would make it more effective?</td>
<td>8. What is necessary for effective inclusion practices?</td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
<td>5. What supports are provided for inclusion classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you feel that the district is able to provide you with all the materials necessary for effective inclusion practices?</td>
<td>10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly?</td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
<td>6. How effective do you think your inclusion program is? What would make it more effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What do the special education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly?</td>
<td>13. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?</td>
<td>7. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?</td>
<td>7. What is necessary for effective classroom inclusion practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What do the general education teachers need for effective inclusion; are they receiving it; are they using it properly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. How can administration help improve inclusion?</td>
<td>8. How can administration help improve inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is there anything you would like to add to our discussion that I may have overlooked?</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
<td>9. Please describe your ideal inclusion classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Is there anything you would like to add that I may have overlooked?</td>
<td>10. Is there anything you would like to add that I may have overlooked?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>