Identified Teacher Supports for Inclusive Practice

Phyllis E. Horne, Vianne Timmons, and Rosalyn Adamowycz
University of Prince Edward Island

Abstract

This study investigated inclusive practices in Prince Edward Island (PEI) elementary schools in terms of the supports teachers consider as important for inclusion. Twenty teachers were randomly selected to complete a survey, and 5 teachers were randomly selected to participate in an interview about inclusion supports. The survey in this study adapted The School and the Education of All Students Scale. Participants identified and ranked several supports that they deemed important for successful inclusion. The results indicated that elementary teachers in PEI consider certain supports as important when planning an inclusive classroom, such as class size, curriculum and planning time, training, and other incentives. In light of PEI's continued transition in Special Education services, such results provided insight into specific recommendations. The identified teacher supports necessitate acknowledgement and understanding by teachers, parents, school boards, government, and teacher-training programs to ensure inclusive practices are implemented effectively in the PEI school system.

Over the last 5 years, inclusionary practices have been integrated into the public school system in the province of Prince Edward Island (PEI) with various supports in place. Inclusion, in its broadest sense, is defined as serving students with a full range of abilities and disabilities in the general education classroom with appropriate in-class support (Crawford, 1994; LoVette, 1996; Rea, McLaughlin, & Walther-Thomas, 2002; Salend, 2001). The PEI Minister's Directive on Special Education (Minister's Directive, 2001) defined inclusionary practice as:

...the value system which holds that all students are entitled to equitable access to learning, achievement, and the pursuit of excellence in their education. The practice of inclusion transcends the idea of physical location, and incorporates basic values that promote participation, friendship and belonging.

Research suggests mixed practices and outcomes within the inclusion movement, with positive aspects of inclusion emphasized by some researchers and concerns expressed by others.

In a study examining perceptions of students and general education teachers, Fox and Ysseldyke (1997) stated that positive effects on the social development of all students can emerge in an inclusive classroom. Similarly, other research suggests that peer interaction through modeling and the simple physical proximity within an integrated classroom appeared to increase self-esteem and promote a sense of belonging in all students (Bunch & Finnegan, 2000; Bunch, Lupart & Brown, 1997). Some research findings have raised the concern that regular classroom teachers in an inclusive setting may lack the appropriate supports and assistance to adequately meet the needs of all their students (Bunch et al., 1997; Daniel & King, 1997). In situations where inclusion is implemented ineffectively, it is often the case that students with disabilities in a general education setting do not receive necessary support services (Moore, Gilbreath, & Mauri, 1998).

Much research has been conducted about the supports that teachers perceive as necessary in an inclusive classroom (Daniel & King, 1997; Lipsky & Gartner, 1998; Lupart, 1998). Bunch et al. (1997) conducted a national study on educators' attitudes towards inclusion, and within this survey a number of supports were raised as important, such as pupil-teacher ratio and having Educational Assistants. In this survey, a PEI sample was not included in the Atlantic regional statistics, likely due to the small population sample size. In terms of supports, other researchers have found that certain factors can influence the effectiveness of an inclusive classroom, such as lack of teacher training or in-service, inadequate teacher support, and poverty (Hammond, 2003). Additionally, Norrell (1997) suggested that an inclusive classroom requires prior and on-going training for teachers, additional planning time, limited number of special education students, provision for teacher aides, additional monetary resources, and support from principals and other staff.

According to Statistics Canada (Kohen, Uppal, Guevremont, & Cartwright, 2006), the proportion of children with disabilities in PEI is consistent with the national average: (a) The proportion of children with mild to moderate disability in PEI is approximately 2.4%; across Canada, the proportion is approximately 2.3% and (b) the proportion of children with severe to very severe disability in PEI is approximately 1.6%; across Canada, the proportion is approximately 1.7%.

All elementary schools across PEI are inclusive, meaning that all students are taught in the regular classroom with their peers. Nevertheless, classroom instructions, programs, and services are adapted or modified in terms of curriculum, materials, facilities (physical space), alternative methodologies, or additional support from staff (Minister's Directive, 2001). In PEI, for adaptation or modification to occur the student must have an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) created by referred professionals. Despite having directives in place, disconnect can still occur between available supports for inclusionary services and implementing the supports to practice inclusion.

Previous research on inclusionary supports led to this present study's examination of teacher supports in PEI. This research examined the supports that PEI teachers deem to be important to effectively implement inclusive practices. In PEI, special education policies continue to transition, and little research or evaluation has been conducted on current inclusive practices in the province. New policies have continually been developed based on the *MacKey Special Education Report*, an extensive review of special education services in PEI. The results of the present study provide input for the continued development of policies and practices in inclusionary practices in elementary schools in PEI, where special education is in a period of transition.

Methodology

The present study investigated the question: What supports do regular classroom teachers identify as necessary to meet the needs of all students in inclusive elementary classrooms in Prince Edward Island? Surveys and interviews were the primary methods of data collection. The purpose of the surveys was to gauge teachers' concerns about inclusion and the supports that they perceive as necessary for inclusion to be effective for all students. The interviews were intended to add depth and clarity to survey answers. The survey and interview were administered with minimal disruption or interference to the regular classroom teaching. The surveys were administered first and the interviews conducted afterwards; all data collection was completed within a 4-month period.

Site and Population Selection

The research sites were inclusive classrooms (grades 1 to 6) in English elementary classrooms in PEI. All English regular classroom teachers from elementary schools in PEI were invited to participate. Letters of information and permission were written to the two English school districts: the Eastern School District and the Western School Board. Teachers interested in participating contacted the researcher. In total, 20 elementary teachers from the Western School Board ($n = 13$) and Eastern School District ($n = 7$) volunteered to participate in the study and completed the survey. Participants included 1 male and 19 female teachers ranging in age from 26 to 53 years ($M = 42.1$ years) and teaching experience from 3 to 32 years ($M = 18.6$ years).

The Survey

An adaptation of The School and the Education of All Students Scale (SEAS) survey, developed in Colorado by Pearman, Huang, and Mellblom (1997), was utilized. The development of the SEAS survey evolved from discussions with district directors of special education, university graduate classes in administration and special education, university instructional personnel, building administrators, and regular and special education teachers. These discussions focused on the needs, hopes, and expectations of each respective group. The survey deals with three issues: (a) incentives (i.e., supports) which might be valuable in encouraging inclusion of all students, (b) attitudes and perceptions about educating all students, and (c) areas that may be causing concern for educators. Written permission to use this survey in this present study was obtained in advance. The survey's first section on teacher supports—also termed, *incentives*—deals directly with the purpose of this study and article. Table 1 provides the list of questions in the survey. In the last question on the survey, participants rank five incentives in order of importance. This final question was presented as follows:

From the list above, please choose the five items that would provide the most incentive to include all students in your school or school board. Place the numbers of the five items in the spaces below with 1 being the most important and 5 of lesser importance.

An instrument field test was conducted before the survey and interview questions were

implemented. One teacher with a child with special needs in a combined Grade 2/3 class and with resource/teacher assistant support less than 25% of the day, volunteered for a local field test with the survey and interview. She reported that the survey questions were comprehensive. Only one interview question was modified slightly after the field test to enhance clarification. The original interview question asked about training prior to having a student with special needs in the class. The revised question asked about training during the year with the student with special needs.

Procedure

With permission given, a letter of introduction was sent to the elementary principals in the two school districts explaining the research and asking for their assistance in identifying volunteer teachers. During the administration of the survey, the 20 teachers who volunteered were contacted and the purpose of the research was explained. The informed consent forms and self-addressed stamped envelopes were mailed to the participants. Upon receiving the signed consent forms, the surveys, and self-addressed stamped envelopes were mailed to the participants. Participating teachers were contacted by telephone a week later to ensure that the surveys had been received and to check for any questions or concerns, except in cases where the survey was returned before this time. In survey item 20, teachers were asked to choose and rank the five most important supports identified in the survey, with the first support listed as most important, and the fifth support listed as fifth most important. Point values of 5 to 1 were assigned to each incentive item in order of importance (e.g., first ranked incentive equaled 5 points). Table 2 provides the ranked results.

Interviews

Interviews provide an opportunity for participant descriptions to be explored, illuminated, and gently probed (Wimpenny & Gass, 2000). Interviews in this study were used to elicit detailed information about inclusion supports. The interviews also allowed the researcher to check for accurate understandings of the participants' meanings. As referred to previously, one interview question was changed from the original SEAS survey for clarification purposes.

Five of the 9 teachers who had indicated an interest to be interviewed at the end of the survey were randomly selected for interviews. Semi-structured interviews, with open-ended questions related to the research question, were conducted. Each interview was audio taped and took approximately 30 minutes to complete. A tape recorder was approved by participants to reduce the distractions of note-taking and also to ensure that the interview was captured in its entirety. The recordings were transcribed and the order and phrasing of the questions varied slightly in each interview as some respondents elaborated and directed the flow of the conversations. A continual check for accurate understandings of the participants' meanings occurred. Participants received transcripts of the interview and were asked to contact the researcher if they had any questions, concerns, or additional feedback. Participants were engaged in active feedback and corroborated the transcription data.

Questions were structured to enable participants to share their personal experiences and their opinions regarding the inclusion of children with disabilities in the regular classroom. Inter-

view questions included (1) Can you give me a sketch of your life as a teacher? (Include such things as years of experience, grades and subjects taught, educational background.); (2) What training/professional development did you receive prior to and during having a special needs child in your class? (3) Could you tell me about the needs of the special needs child/children in your class? (4) What supports (time, personnel, and materials) did you receive from the special education/resource teacher? Were there any negative effects from having this support? Were there any positive effects from this support? (Please elaborate.); (5) What supports did you receive from the administration? (6) What supports did you receive from the other staff? (7) Did you receive support from a teacher assistant? If so, how much and what type of support was provided? Were there any positive effects from this support? Were there any negative effects? and (8) Were there any supports that would have made your teaching more effective for the whole class?

Analysis

Upon receipt of completed surveys, data were immediately analyzed and coded. Data of the 20 teachers were compiled and 20 frequency graphs were developed for each question to portray results. Table 1 depicts the percentages of response data to the survey questions. Table 2 depicts how teachers ranked supports.

Immediately after the interview, notes and observer comments were transcribed verbatim. The data from the interviews were coded and categories generated. A search for common vocabulary during the initial reading of the transcripts was conducted; preliminary categories were developed during the second reading of the transcripts based on findings in the literature review as well as survey questions. Categories were added, dropped, or refined as necessary during subsequent readings of the transcripts and data analysis in relation to the research question. To consolidate the findings common similarities were integrated from the survey data and interviews. The consolidation of findings created three main groupings that represented what supports teachers appeared to deem as most important for inclusive practice.

Results

This section summarizes the main findings from the survey regarding what teachers deemed as pertinent supports for inclusion. As with the original SEAS survey, there were 19 supports for the teachers to rate, with item number 20 asking respondents to prioritize 5 of the 19 incentives. Table 1 reports the main findings from the survey, and Table 2 summarizes the supports that teachers prioritized as most important.

As can be seen in Table 2, reduction in class size was considered as being most important with an assigned value of 51; the next two most important incentives were assistance with adapting curriculum and additional support for students with special needs. Other incentives of high ranking were training in individualization of instruction, training in the consultation/collaboration model of education, and additional planning time. Only three incentives were not ranked by teachers: the ability to provide teachers with incentives/supports, financial rewards to schools, and financial rewards to teachers.

Table 1
Teacher Supports Considered Important (n = 20)

Survey Topic: Supports	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
1. Financial rewards to teachers are important to effectively include all students (one participant did not rate)	5%		25%	65%
2. Financial rewards to schools are important to effectively include all students (one participant did not rate)	5%	5%	45%	40%
3. Ability to provide teachers with incentives to include all students was important (two participants did not rate)	15%	30%	30%	15%
4. Training in consultation/collaboration model for all staff	55%	40%	5%	
5. Increased provincial funding as recognition for effective inclusion (one participant did not rate)	50%	35%	5%	5%
6. Incentives for staff to further education	40%	55%	5%	
7. Additional planning time for teachers	60%	40%		
8. Additional in-service or credits toward inclusion certification	55%	40%	10%	
9. Reduced paperwork (one participant did not rate)	25%	50%	20%	
10. Reduced 'duty time' to effectively include all students	20%	30%	35%	15%
11. Additional teacher assistant time for staff who effectively include all students	65%	25%	5%	5%
12. Increased teaching staff	65%	30%	5%	
13. Assistance with adapting curriculum	75%	25%		
14. Training teacher assistants to work with all students	80%	20%		
15. Training for all staff in individualized instruction for all students	60%	35%	5%	
16. Evaluating the effectiveness of inclusion	45%	55%		
17. Reduced class size/student-teacher ratios	80%	20%		
18. Team teaching with special education staff	50%	45%	5%	
19. Additional support for students with special needs	95%	5%		

Table 2
Teacher Ranked Supports for Inclusion (n = 20)

Supports for inclusion	Total Points	No. of Teachers
1. Reduction in class size	51	14
2. Assistance with adapting curriculum	33	12
3. Additional support for special needs students	32	10
4. Additional teacher assistant time	28	8
5. Increased teaching staff	27	8
6. Training in individualization of instruction	25	9
7. Training in a consultation/collaboration model	24	6
8. Additional planning time	24	7
9. Training for teacher assistant staff	14	6
10. Team teaching with special education staff	9	4
11. Reduction in paper work	8	2
12. Increased provincial funding	7	3
13. Reduction of duty time	5	2
14. Additional credits towards certification	5	3
15. Assistance in evaluating effectiveness of inclusion for all students	4	3
16. Staff incentives to further education	2	1
17. Ability to provide teachers with incentives	0	0
18. Financial rewards to schools	0	0
19. Financial rewards to teachers	0	0

Note: Maximum score for ranked support is 100 points.

Interview Data

Comments from the interviews elaborated on the survey results and included (a) curriculum adaptations, “Finding material that would reach [the student who has a disability] level...to provide them with something that makes them feel good and successful. That’s the hardest part...,” “This little boy can’t function at the grade three level in any area. The math program, I’ve developed myself. I’ve taken math material from any source I can get,” and “It shouldn’t be up to these teachers to go and find help because you don’t have to for the 20 some other students

that you have...;” (b) additional support for students, “We had to work hard at getting the support” and “I needed a teacher assistant because, many times, this little boy had to be physically removed from the classroom. He would throw chairs, tables, books, or whatever;” and (c) additional teacher assistant time, “This little guy should have someone the whole day, from early morning to home time. I don’t believe in a policy that gets TAs for behaviour problems and not for children with learning problems.” One teacher stated a positive aspect about having a teacher assistant:

...just peace of mind that there was someone else there—an extra set of adult eyes and hands in the school. One little boy won’t talk because people can not understand him. He actually vomited one day, and, rather than telling the teacher, he sat and worked in his own vomit until she noticed.

Summary of Results

For the purpose of examining teacher supports, commonalities from the survey questions were grouped together to allow for similar themes to emerge. The main thematic groupings were substantiated by the interview comments. The three main groupings that emerged were numbers in class size/staff, curriculum adaptation, and training. The ranked survey items dealing with manageable numbers to enhance teaching included reduced class size, additional teaching staff, additional teacher assistant time, and team teaching. Ranked survey items dealing with curriculum involved curriculum adaptation and additional planning time. Ranked survey items dealing with training included additional supports for students, training in individualized instruction, training in collaboration model, and training for teacher assistant staff. Therefore, the three clusters of supports that appear to be of most relevance to participants are referred to as teacher–student ratio, curriculum adaptation, and training.

Discussion

This research explored the supports elementary teachers identified as necessary to meet the needs of all students in their inclusive classrooms. The results are discussed in terms of the identified top three groupings—teacher–student ratio, curriculum adaptation, and training—with links made to previous findings from literature.

In this PEI study, a reduction in class size or a change in pupil–teacher ratio was ranked as most important for inclusion and rated as important by 20% and very important by 80% of the teachers surveyed. A related result showed the support of increased teaching staff was rated as important by 30% of the teachers surveyed and as very important by 65% of the participants. Increased teaching staff was ranked as the fifth most important incentive for inclusion by the teachers surveyed. These ranking results are consistent with other researchers. A study by Werts, Wolery, Synder, Caldwell, and Salisbury (1996) indicated that 81.8% of surveyed teachers (with students with special needs) reported the need to have a reduced class size. Likewise, Pearman et al. (1997) found that 98% of teachers surveyed indicated a reduction in class size or a change in pupil/teacher ratio as an important or very important factor, and 96% of respondents indicated that increased teaching staff was important or very important.

In the present study, teachers indicated that reduced class size, additional teachers, and additional time with teaching assistants would serve as strong incentives for inclusive practice.

Through interview comments and survey rankings it appears that the teachers found the task of meeting the needs of all students in large numbers to be challenging. Most students with special needs require additional adjustment during the teaching period, and this adjustment can take time away from meeting curriculum outcomes. In considering the support of pupil–teacher ratios, policymakers may want to refer to Norrell’s study (1997) where it was suggested that the number of special education students be limited to three per class. The highly ranked support for team teaching may also be a method to aid in classroom ratios. Balancing the number of students, teachers, and teaching assistants in a way that provides the most effective inclusive practices appears to be a support that requires consideration in inclusionary practices in this province.

The second grouping of supports concerns the issue of curriculum adaptation and planning time. For effective inclusion practices to occur, it is helpful when the determination of curriculum adaptation, modification, or simple supports is clarified for the teacher. In this PEI study, assistance with adapting curriculum for students with special needs was ranked as important by 25% and very important by 75% of the teachers. Further, support for planning time was rated as important or very important by 90–95 % of the teachers surveyed. Effective curriculum planning takes time—time to meet with the parents and professionals to create an appropriate program. As one interviewed teacher stated,

Time is a big factor. We try to run in during the morning before school, but are just rushed...there’s not a lot of time for sitting down and getting together to share ideas, but it is really helpful if opportunity allows.

Previous studies indicated the same concern. A study by Pearman et al. (1997) reported that 92% of teacher respondents were concerned or very concerned about enough planning time for curriculum. Similarly, Lipsky and Gartner (1998) concluded that school staff must have time to work together to plan effectively. The PEI interviews corroborate the above findings, in that adequate planning time is needed to effectively implement the supports available. As quoted previously, interviewed teachers expressed concern over the need to adapt curriculum as well as lacking resources and time to provide a consistent effort in this process. The PEI survey suggests that regular classroom teachers may not have the time or expertise to provide adequate curriculum adaptation, and therefore more support is required in this area.

Training was the third issue identified as a needed teacher support. The ranked importance for more support in training was broad, ranging from teacher training in inclusion to training for teacher assistants to individualized instruction training. This study indicated that training in the consultation/collaboration model, individualized instruction, certification for staff, and additional in-service training were rated as important or very important by 90% of the teachers surveyed. Other studies concluded similar findings. Pearman et al. (1997) found that 91% of the respondents in their study indicated that additional paraprofessional time was important or very important. Further, Synder (1999) found that 87.5% of elementary teachers in the study had received no in-service (i.e., teacher training) in working with students with special needs, while Singh (2002) stressed the need to have knowledge development programs for effective inclusive classrooms. A study by Turner (2003) revealed that teachers require additional training in methods of instruction to meet the needs of all students effectively. These include specialized training in specific disabilities and training in areas of challenge represented by students in their classes. Turner also noted that in many other professions, training is provided at no expense during regular working hours, yet, all too often teachers are expected to pay for their own training on their own time. In this study, PEI teachers voiced a need for support in various training areas

to teach in the inclusive classroom.

Elementary teachers in inclusive classrooms in PEI require supports similar to teachers across the continent. The main supports voiced by teachers include a manageable class size, assistance with curriculum adaptations, and additional avenues for training. In order for effective inclusion to occur, certain supports need to be implemented for teachers and staff, as well as the students in the elementary education system.

Conclusion

This study reveals that elementary teachers in PEI consider certain supports as a requisite when planning an inclusive classroom: class size, curriculum and planning time, training, and other incentives. The supports raised by PEI teachers coincide with research conducted elsewhere. Concerns for teacher supports need to be addressed by various stakeholders, including teachers, parents, school boards, the Department of Education, and teacher-training programs. It is through research, discussion, and legislation that specific concerns about inclusion in the classroom might be addressed (Howard 2004). Various recommendations may be considered: (1) limiting the total number of students with special needs in an inclusive classroom; (2) implementing a team teaching approach; (3) educating the community at large about the benefits of inclusion to secure necessary supports from government funding and acknowledging the principles of inclusion; and (4) providing further training and/or orientation, team teaching, and other teaching methods. Policy makers may consider these recommendations. In addition, policy makers may formulate ways to establish policies that ensure available materials and human resources are indeed implemented. This may come in the form of routine reviews and evaluations about teacher supports for inclusive practices.

The supports identified in this study, such as training, manageable class size, teacher assistant support, and planning time, are necessary to create effective learning environments for all students and teachers in PEI. These supports not only need to be in place, but also reviewed and evaluated for effectiveness. In light of PEI's continued transition in Special Education services, such localized studies provide insight into specific activities and actions. Teachers, parents, school boards, government, and teacher-training programs require continued collaboration and discussion to ensure inclusion is successful for all students.

References

- Bunch, G., & Finnegan, K. (2000). *Values teachers find in inclusive education*. Proceedings, Fifth International Special Education Conference. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Bunch, G., Lupart, J., & Brown, M. (1997). Resistance and acceptance: Educator attitudes to inclusion of students with disabilities. Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410713).
- Crawford, D. (1994). *Full inclusion: One reason for opposition*. Retrieved January 2007, from <http://my.exccpc.com/~presswis/inclus.html>.
- Daniel, L., & King, D. (1997). Impact of inclusion education on academic achievement, student behavior and self-esteem, and parental attitudes. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 9(2), 67-80.
- Fox, N., & Ysseldyke, J. (1997). Implementing inclusion at the Middle school level: Lessons from a negative example. *Exceptional Children*, 64(1), 81-98.

- Hammond, H. (2003). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion: Survey results from elementary school teachers in three southwestern rural school districts. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 22(2), 24-30. Retrieved January 2007, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4052/is_200304/ai_n9201600
- Howard, P. (Apr 2004). Least Restrictive Environment: How to tell? *Journal of Law and Education*. Retrieved November 2006, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3994/is_200404/ai_n9352210
- Kohen, D., Uppal, S., Guevremont, A., & Cartwright, F. (2006). Children with disabilities and the educational system – a provincial perspective (Report No. 81-004-XIE). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada. Retrieved June 2007, from <http://www.statcan.ca>
- Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A. (1998). Taking inclusion into the future. *Educational Leadership*, 56(2), 78-81.
- LoVette, O. (1996, November). *Inclusion: Who wins? Who loses?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Tuscaloosa: Mid-South Educational Research Association.
- Lupart, J. (1998). Setting right the delusion of inclusion: Implications for Canadian schools. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 23(3), 251-264.
- Minister's Directive (2001). *Minister's directive on special education (No. MD 2001-08)*. Charlottetown, PE: Department of Education. Available from: www.gov.pe.ca/educ/index.php3?number=76715
- Moore, C., Gilbreath, D., & Mauiri, F. (1998). *Educating students with disabilities in general education classrooms: A summary of the research*. Retrieved November 2006, from Western Regional Resource Center Web site: http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/15/75/44.pdf
- Norrell, L. (1997). A case for responsible inclusion. *Teaching PreK-8*, 28, 17.
- Pearman, E., Huang, A., & Mellblom C. (1997). The inclusion of all students: Concerns and incentives of educators. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 32, 11-20.
- Rea, P. J., McLaughlin, V. L., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children*, 68(2), 203-222.
- Salend, S. J. (2001). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practice*. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Singh, D. K. (2002). Regular educators and students with physical disabilities. [Electronic version]. *Education*, 123(1). Available from: <http://www.questia.com>
- Snyder, R. (1999). Inclusion: A qualitative study of inservice general education teachers' attitudes and concerns. *Education*, 120(1), 173-182. Available from: <http://www.questia.com>.
- Turner, N. D. (2003). Preparing preservice teachers for inclusion in secondary classrooms. *Education*. Retrieved January 2007, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200304/ai_n9190339
- Werts, M., Wolery, M., Snyder, E., Caldwell, C., & Salisbury, C. (1996). Supports and resources associated with inclusive schooling: Perceptions of elementary school teachers about need and availability. *Journal of Special Education*, 30(2), 187-203.
- Wimpenny, P., & Gass, J. (2000). Interviewing in phenomenology and grounded theory: Is there a difference? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31(6), 1485-1492.

Authors' Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Phyllis Horne, President, Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation, P. O. Box 6000, Charlottetown, PEI, C1A 8B4.
E-mail: pehorne@peitf.com.

Appendix

SEAS Inclusion Survey

What do you think would provide an incentive for you, your school, or school board to effectively include all special needs students in the classroom? Please indicate your perception of the importance of each item by circling the appropriate response.

- 4 – very important
- 3 – important
- 2 – not very important
- 1 – not at all important

1. Financial rewards to teachers for effectively including all students
2. Financial rewards to schools for effectively including all students
3. Ability to provide teachers with incentives to include all students
4. Training for all school staff to work in a consultation/collaboration model
5. Increased provincial funding as recognition for effective inclusion of students
6. Incentives for staff to further their education
7. Additional planning time for cooperative teaching staff
8. Additional inservice or credits towards certification
9. Reduction in paper work
10. Reduction of duty time for staff effectively including all students
11. Additional teacher assistant time for staff who effectively include all students
12. Increased teaching staff
13. Assistance with adapting curriculum for special needs students
14. Training for teacher assistant staff to work with all students
15. Training for all school staff in the individualization of instruction for all students
16. Assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of inclusion for all students
17. Reduction in class size or change in pupil/teacher ratios
18. Team teaching with special education staff
19. Additional support for special needs students

20. From the list above, please choose the five items that would provide the most incentive to include all students in your school or school board. Place the numbers of the five items in the spaces below with 1 being the most important and 5 of lesser importance. (example 1. 10 2. 3 3. 17 etc.)

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____

The following questions ask about your attitudes and opinions concerning the inclusion of all students into the regular classroom in your school. There are no right or wrong answers—only your attitudes, beliefs, and opinions which are very important. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the response that corresponds with your beliefs.

- 4 – strongly agree
- 3 – agree
- 2 – disagree
- 1 – strongly disagree

1. I believe that inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of all students
2. Inclusion of most special needs students can cause more problems than it can solve
3. Parents of students in my school are willing to accept the philosophy of including all students
4. My school board supports efforts at including all students into the classroom
5. Regular education staff in this school want special needs students to fully belong in the regular classroom
6. Diversity within the classroom enriches the learning environment
7. The leadership of the principal is necessary for inclusion of special needs students to work well

8. Principals enable regular and special education staff to communicate and cooperate with each other
9. There is support for inclusion from the Department of Education
10. Inclusion of special needs students into the regular classroom has created tension in my school
11. Staff at my school are resisting including special needs students in the regular classroom
12. Special education staff in this school want their students to be fully included in the regular classroom
13. My principal provides the support needed by regular education staff in including special needs students
14. I feel that I need training to assist in including special needs students in this school effectively
15. I believe that inclusion of special needs students will work well within this school
16. School staff are adequately prepared to meet the needs of special needs students and all students
17. Inclusion of special needs students is dependent entirely upon the teachers or staff involved
18. The inclusion of special needs students is detrimental to the education of other students
19. Students in this school accept special needs in their classroom
20. I feel that including special needs students in the regular classroom creates too much additional work for the staff
21. As a result of inclusion, parents will be more satisfied with their child's education
22. Regular and special education staff are provided time to cooperatively plan instruction

The move towards inclusion of all students into the regular classroom may create worries or concerns on the part of all staff. Please circle the level of concern about the following items.

- 4 – very concerned
3 – concerned
2 – not very concerned
1 – not at all concerned

1. That there will not be enough time to meet the educational needs of all students
2. About instructing a variety of students in one class
3. Class standards will change with a variety of students in the class
4. Staff have not been trained to work with a variety of students in the classroom
5. All students will not be adequately challenged
6. That maintaining discipline will be difficult
7. Staff have not been trained to manage a class of diverse
8. Staff will not be able to individualize instruction for a diverse classroom population
9. About evaluating the work of diverse students in the classroom
10. About being able to work cooperatively with others
11. That there will not be enough planning time
12. That there will not be ongoing training and assistance for staff
13. Additional paper work
14. Student attitudes about inclusion of all students
15. The ability to evaluate inclusion programs and measure
16. Staff ownership of students
17. Additional meeting time (parents, IEP, etc.)
18. Parents will not understand the reasons for inclusion
19. All students will not be accepting of special needs students

20. The primary motivating force behind the inclusion of all students in this school is:

(Please rank order all that apply in their order of importance with 1 being the most important.)

_____ Parents	_____ Board philosophy
_____ Federal and Provincial law	_____ Teacher willingness to include students
_____ Student needs	_____ School philosophy
_____ Being on the cutting edge of education	
_____ Other (Please specify)	