

Bethel University

Spark

---

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

---

2020

## The Effects of Inclusion for Teachers, Special Education, and General Education Students in General Education Classrooms

Rachel O'Neill  
*Bethel University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

O'Neill, R. (2020). *The Effects of Inclusion for Teachers, Special Education, and General Education Students in General Education Classrooms* [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/476>

This Master's thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark.

THE EFFECTS OF INCLUSION FOR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION, AND GENERAL  
EDUCATION STUDENTS IN GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

A MASTER'S THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY  
OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY  
RACHEL O'NEILL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION  
MAY 2020

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

THE EFFECTS OF INCLUSION FOR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION, AND GENERAL  
EDUCATION STUDENTS IN GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

RACHEL O'NEILL

MAY 2020

APPROVED

Thesis Advisor: Lisa Silmser, Ed. D.

Program Director: Katie Bonawitz, Ed. D.

## Abstract

With the current special education policies in place in the United States, solutions must be found in order to equitably meet the academic, social and emotional needs for all types of students found in a classroom. One of the most practiced solutions found in schools today, is the inclusion of special education students in mainstream classrooms. Inclusion can provide many benefits to teachers, general education and special education students when executed properly. When not executed properly, inclusion can cause undue stress to both teachers and students. This literature review will examine the effects of inclusion on teachers, special education, and general education students in general education classrooms. The research examined within the literature review focuses on the benefits, disadvantages, professional development, and beliefs regarding inclusion. All age groups and levels of school were examined within the research. Ultimately the research proves that teachers require more purposeful professional development in inclusion in order to execute it properly within their classrooms.

## Table of Contents

Signature Page.....	2
Abstract.....	3
Table of Contents .....	4
Chapter I: Introduction .....	5
Historical Context.....	5
Guiding Questions .....	7
Definitions.....	8
Summary .....	9
Chapter II: Literature Review .....	10
Literature Search Procedures .....	10
Benefits of Inclusive Classrooms .....	10
Disadvantages .....	15
Professional Development.....	20
Beliefs .....	28
Chapter III: Discussion and Conclusion.....	33
Summary of Literature .....	33
Limitations of the Research.....	39
Implications for Future Research.....	41
Implications for Professional Application .....	42
Conclusion .....	44
References.....	45

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

### Historical Context

Education is an ever-evolving field, with expectations and laws changing for administrators, teachers and students over the years. Creating successful students not only includes general education students, but also special education students. In 1975, the law required students with disabilities to be educated inclusively with their general education peers (Kilanowski-Press et al., 2010). Educating diverse students with diverse needs leads to different challenges that educators need to overcome within their schools.

Arguably the most significant law that was passed in regards to students with disabilities was The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1997. IDEA requires schools to provide students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs (Schultz et al., 2016). Along with FAPE being tailored to the student's individual needs, the law also includes that schools are required to provide access to the general curriculum to meet the challenging expectations established for all children. This means that all students with disabilities need to have access to the best education plan that will meet their unique needs. Also, due to IDEA, all special education students have the right to the least restrictive environment in their education (Kilanowski-Press et al., 2010). This means that each student with a disability will have their team review their strengths, weaknesses, and needs, and consider the best, and least restrictive placement in any particular educational setting. A solution to this need of educating in the least restrictive

environment is children with disabilities participating in mainstream or general education classes. Educating general and special education students together will likely include an inclusive classroom where all students, general and special education, are welcomed and taught together.

Today, inclusion may include two teachers working together in one classroom. This generally consists of one general education teacher and one special education teacher. These two teachers working collaboratively together in one classroom can vary greatly from classroom to classroom. Teaching styles, techniques, strategies, and student engagement make look different in every classroom and may vary from day to day. This collaborative work environment has led to various co-teaching models that inclusive classrooms can use.

There are six co-teachings models that are generally in practice in inclusive classrooms that are noted by Friend and Cook (2017). One co-teaching model is one teach, one observes. This is where one of the teachers teaches the lesson and the other observes the students for various reasons. The second co-teaching model is one teach, one assist. This model has one teacher teaching again, while the second teachers unobtrusively assists the students during the lesson. The third co-teaching model is parallel teaching. This is where the teachers divide their classes into two groups and teach the same lesson at the same time. The fourth co-teaching model is station teaching. This model divides the classroom up into multiple groups where the students travel to different stations. A station might have a teacher providing a lesson or having the students work independently. The fifth co-teaching model is alternative teaching.

This is where one teacher takes responsibility for a large group, and the other teacher takes responsibility for a smaller group. The last co-teaching model is team teaching. This is where both teachers are teaching the same content to the same group (Friend & Cook, 2017).

Although laws and teaching practices have changed in order to promote inclusivity of children with disabilities there is still a question to the effectiveness of inclusive classrooms. Many questions regarding the benefits for both general and special education students still remain unanswered. Prejudices and outdated belief systems still exist within the modern-day educational system, and these prejudices and beliefs can hinder our inclusive classrooms. Educators have developed various inclusion strategies and co-teaching models in order to meet these prejudices and beliefs head on, along with addressing the needs of their diverse students. These inclusion strategies and co-teaching models are not only relevant to those involved in education, but can be vital to policymakers and community members as well.

### **Guiding Questions**

Educational laws have determined the level of inclusivity of children with disabilities in general education classrooms. These laws not only affect special education students, but also their teachers and peers. For this reason, this literature review sought to find the effects of inclusion. What are the effects of inclusion for teachers, special education and general education students in general education classrooms?



What benefits can inclusive classrooms have? When inclusive classrooms are executed correctly, they can have many benefits for teachers, special education students, and general education students. Benefits for teachers include collaborating with other teachers and broadening their beliefs and techniques. Benefits for special education students include increased social interaction, access to more curriculum, increased friendships and a less restrictive environment. Benefits for general education students include increased friendships and social interaction, and broadening their beliefs about disabilities.

What disadvantages can inclusive classrooms have? When inclusive classrooms are not executed correctly, they can academically, emotionally and socially hinder both general and special education students. Working with diverse student needs, along with other colleagues can cause stress and hinder teacher performance. Due to all of the individuals involved in inclusive classrooms, it is important to gather and analyze information regarding their effectiveness.

### **Definitions**

It is necessary to define the following terms so that the reader will understand the information presented in chapter two. While some of these terms are very common, it is important to have a common definition.

**Co-teaching** is when the general education teacher and a special education teacher are educating students in the same classroom. There are six co-teaching models; one teach, one observe, one teach, one assist, parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching.

**Collaboration** is the act of working together with another teacher to produce or create something. In inclusive classrooms, this is teachers attempting to successfully integrate all students academically and socially within their classrooms.

**Inclusion** is individuals with disabilities learning alongside their non-disabled peers. Students in special education are taught within in general education classrooms.

**Inclusive Classrooms** is a model where special needs students spend their time with non-special needs students. This generally takes place within one classroom.

**Special Education** is learning provided to students with exceptional needs. These exceptional needs include learning disabilities or mental challenges. These students are provided individualized services.

**Disability** is a condition that physically or mentally limits a person's movements, learning capabilities or general activities. A student must have a recognized disability in order to receive special education services through their school.

### **Summary**

If we are to determine the effects of inclusion for teachers, special education and general education students in general education classrooms we must consider all aspects of inclusive classrooms. The next chapter in this thesis will be a literature review. Within the literature review, the benefits, disadvantages, professional development and belief systems will all be examined to determine how they all effect inclusion. The literature will be summarized in chapter three. Along with the summary, chapter three will address the limitations of the research, implications for future research and professional application.

## **CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Literature Search Procedures**

In order to locate the literature for thesis, searches Education Journals, ERIC, Academic Search Premier, and EBSCO Mega FILE were conducted for publications from 1980-2019. This list was narrowed by reviewing published empirical studies from peer-reviewed journals that focused on inclusion and collaboration in general education classrooms, found in journals that addressed the guiding topics. The key words that were used in these searches included “collaboration,” “inclusion,” “co-teaching,” “social inclusion,” and “inclusive classrooms.” The structure of this chapter is to review the literature on the benefits, disadvantages, professional development and beliefs of having inclusive classrooms for teachers, special education and general education students.

### **Benefits of Inclusive Classrooms**

Inclusive classrooms, when executed correctly, can have many benefits for teachers, special education students, and general education students. Benefits for teachers include collaborating with other teachers, getting to know their students and families better, and broadening their teaching beliefs and techniques through purposeful professional development. Special education students can benefit from access to more curriculum, increased friendships and social acceptance, academic performance, and a less restrictive academic environment. Benefits for general education students include increased social interaction, and broadening their beliefs about disabilities. If inclusive classrooms are not executed correctly, it can hinder

general education students academically, decrease self-esteem for students, and increase the risk of bullying within the classroom. Powers, Bierman, and Coffman (2016) compared the restrictive educational placements in both the elementary and secondary setting. Powers et al. (2016) followed participants from kindergarten through high school completion. Through home and teacher interviews and school records, the authors found that students in restrictive educational placements were not affected in elementary school. However, it did find that there was increased risk of high school non-completion and the severity of adolescent conduct in secondary settings. Powers et al. (2016) believe that there needs to be an alternative setting or solution because restrictive education placement was harmful to students in a secondary school setting. Placing these students into less restrictive, inclusive secondary classrooms can benefit these students, including increasing their rate high school completion.

Borders, Barnett, and Bauer (2010) observed and compared normal hearing to the hard of hearing students with mild to moderate deafness in an inclusive classroom. Graduate students observed each inclusive classrooms and measured students' response to practice and prompt opportunities, differences in levels of prompting and engagement. Borders et al. (2010) found that the hard of hearing students fell within the typical range of all students within the categories that were observed. Borders et al. (2010) concluded that based on their results, inclusive classrooms seem to be successful.

Inclusion benefits special education students' education in early childhood. Justice, Logan, Tzu-Jung Lin, and Kaderavek (2014) showed that the average spring

language scores of early childhood special education students were strongly affected by peer effects in their classroom. Justice et al. (2014) studied 670 pre-school aged student participants with about 55% of the students on an IEP. Data was collected on the students' language skills in order to determine how much peer effects had on them. The children's teacher filled out a questionnaire on language skills for each student in the fall and the spring. Justice et al. (2014) calculated the average language skill level of each classroom in the fall, then used peer skills to predict the children's language development. The results showed that students were significantly affected by peers in their classroom, especially students with disabilities. For example, if a student with low language skills had classmates with higher language skills, they were more likely to have higher language skills in the spring. The same was found to be true when the scenario was reversed. Justice et al. (2014) proves that inclusive classrooms can academically benefit students, especially special education students.

Dessementet, Bless, and Morin (2012) also found that there were academic benefits to inclusion. Dessementet et al. (2012) used a total of 68 participants in the study between the ages of seven and eight, diagnosed with an intellectual disability, had an IQ between 40 and 75. The participants were evenly put into an inclusive classroom and a special needs classroom that was located at a special needs school. Dessementet et al. (2012) measured academic gains along with adaptive behavior gains. The results showed that special education students in inclusive classroom made more gains in their literacy skills than their peers at special needs schools.

Along with academic benefits, inclusive classrooms can have social benefits for students as well. Morrison and Burgman (2009) found that classroom environment affects the friendship experiences that students with disabilities experience. There was a total of ten children with some type of disability, who ranged in age between eight and ten years old that participated in the study. The data was collected through student interviews conducted over several sessions in their family homes. Students with disabilities varied from classroom to classroom, but generally all wanted to have meaningful friendships and to be able to fit in. Some students with disabilities recognized that they are different from others, but also saw that everyone is different from one another. Others did not see their differences and viewed themselves as the same as their peers. Morrison and Burgman (2009) found that if a classroom is more inclusive and shows children with disabilities in a positive light, then the students with disabilities are able to make more meaningful friendships. This shows that the classroom environment shapes the friendships that students with disabilities experience and this makes inclusive classrooms an important part of education.

Gasser, Grütter, and Torchetti (2018) found that inclusive classrooms can predict children's sympathy and their intended inclusion toward their hyperactive classmates. Gasser et al. (2018) used 1209 Swiss children from 61 school classes to explore their attitudes toward hyperactive disabled children in school. Students were given an assessment during their 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade years. In the assessment, students were given a hypothetical story with hyperactive behavior, and were asked to rate three questions regarding their intentions on whether to include the hypothetical student into

social activities. Students were also asked to assess their classmates' reactions to three hypothetical situations of exclusion of hyperactive students. Lastly, students were asked to nominate an unlimited number of classmates who they liked best in order to determine peer acceptance. Gasser et al. (2018) found a significant positive effect of students' individual perceptions of their classmates. This helps prove that inclusive classrooms can have an effect on students' acceptance of other classmates, including hyperactive disabled students.

Inclusive classrooms are important for peer acceptance and teachers need to continue to improve the inclusivity of their classrooms. A way to improve inclusivity could be through a cooperative learning approach. For this reason, Jacques, Wilton, Townsend, and Wilton, K. (1998) attempted to determine the effects of the participation of non-disabled children in a cooperative learning program on their social acceptance of classmates with mild intellectual disability. Jacques et al. (1998) used 21 participants with mild intellectual disabilities who were chosen based off their IQ and, ranged in age from 9-11. These students were either kept in their classroom as a control group or put into cooperative learning groups. The cooperative learning groups were small groups of four to six students, with one child being mild intellectually disabled. The students in the group worked as a part of a jigsaw group to complete a project together. After the student were done with cooperative learning group, they were immediately given a social acceptance measure. Jacques et al. (1998) found that the students in the cooperative learning group had an increase in social acceptance from their peers, compared to the control group. The results were the same using the

measure five weeks after the initial results. This proves that using the correct approach in inclusive classrooms can increase social acceptance of special education students.

Another way to improve inclusivity could be through a collaboration model in inclusive classrooms. Collins, Branson, Hall, and Rankin (2001) showed that students with disabilities can be taught to perform a related task within the collaborative instructional model. The students in the study were asked to write letters in a collaborative English classroom. The English teacher, two special education teachers, and a university investigator measured four components of students writing. They measured the date, greeting, body and closing components of the students' letters. Students were given a baseline writing and the number of correct components were recorded at the beginning of the study. There was a minimum of three, one-on-one intervention sessions to improve the students writing. At the end of the study, each student showed growth in their writing. Collins et al. (2001) shows that students with disabilities can be taught to perform a related task within the collaborative instructional model, proving that the collaborative instructional model is academically effective.

### **Disadvantages**

Although there are a lot of benefits to inclusive classrooms for students and teachers, there are some disadvantages to be addressed as well. Brown and Babo (2017) examined the influence of an inclusive classroom setting on the academic performance of general education secondary students on the language arts literacy section of the 2013 New Jersey High School Proficiency Assessment (NJ HSPA). Brown and Babo (2017) used 214 eleventh grade, non-disabled general education students



who went to school in New Jersey in the study. Students were assigned to either a College Prep I or II level English course based on standardized test data, teacher recommendations and parent input. The College Prep II courses were the inclusion classes where two certified teachers (one context expert and one special education teacher) taught the College Prep II class. The study measured how inclusive classrooms influenced non-disabled general education students by comparing their performance on the 2010 and 2013 NJ HSPA Language Arts Literacy section. Brown and Babo (2017) found that placement in the inclusive classroom was an indicator of performance. Students who were placed in a non-inclusive classroom setting performed higher on the 2013 NJ HSPA than general education students who were placed in an inclusive classroom. According to this study, the placement in inclusive classrooms can hinder the academic performance of the general education students if not executed properly.

Inclusive classrooms can hinder general education students' academics, but it can also hinder all students' self-esteem. Daniel and King (1997) attempted to determine the effects of students' placement versus nonplacement in an inclusion classroom on dependent variables, including parent concerns about their children's school program, teacher and parent reported instances of students' problem behaviors, student's academic performance, and students' self-reported self-esteem. A second purpose was to determine whether student placement in three different types of inclusion programs would result in differences in the dependent variables. There were 207 third through fifth grade students who participated in the study. They were divided into three groups of students: group one – 68 students from four non-inclusion

classrooms. Group two – 34 students from two clustered inclusion classrooms. Group three – 105 students from six random inclusion classrooms. The parents of the students answered a 22-item attitudinal questionnaire designed to measure their levels of programming concern. Teachers' and parents' perceptions were collected using the scores on internalizing and externalizing their children's adaptive functioning or problems subscales of the Child Behavior Checklist. Gains in students' standardized achievement test scores in reading, mathematic language, and spelling were collected by subtracting their previous years score with this year's score. Students' scores on familial acceptance, academic competence, peer popularity, and personal security were measured by using subscales of the Self-Esteem Index. The results of the study indicate that the effects of inclusion programs are somewhat mixed. There does not seem to be a discernable pattern in achievement differences. Even though there doesn't seem to be an achievement pattern, there is a higher instance of behavior problems among students in inclusion classrooms. This implies that the inclusion teacher may devote more time to discipline problems and possibly diminishing time spent on instruction. The behavior problems could have had a negative effect on students' self-esteem. Daniel and King (1997) found that students placed in inclusion classrooms have lower self-esteem than students in non-inclusion classrooms. This means that contrary to the inclusionary assumption, inclusion programs may not necessarily help to raise students' self-esteem.

Daniel and King (1997) found that although there was no negative impact on attitudes towards special education students, students can suffer from decreased self-

esteem in inclusive classrooms. In line with previous studies, Zablotsky, Bradshaw, Anderson, and Law (2014) attempted to identify the child-level and school-level risk factors associated with bullying with children diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder. The authors studied a total of 1,221 families. Zablotsky et al. (2014) collected data through a questionnaire that the families filled out on their child. The questionnaire asked the families about school demographics, child demographics, clinical characteristics, comorbidity and involvement with bullying. Families answered questions about the frequency of perpetrations and the victimization of bullying in order to answer what was specifically happening to the child. Zablotsky et al. (2014) found that students with Autism Spectrum Disorder are more vulnerable to bullying at schools. It was more typically seen in children that were in fully inclusive classes all of the time or nearly all of the time. The study recommends that schools provide more professional development on bullying and inclusion, specifically for this population of students.

Staff need continued professional development to build relationships in inclusive classroom and bullying, especially for more vulnerable special education students. A particularly vulnerable student population who teachers can use additional relationship building professional development on are students who use augmentative and alternative communication. Chung, Carter, and Sisco (2012) explored the social interactions with students with disabilities who use augmentative and alternative communication in general education classrooms. Chung et al. (2012) observed 14 participants, nine elementary students and seven middle school students. The students

all had an educational diagnosis of intellectual disability (ID) and were being serviced with IEP's. Ten students were supported with electronic communication devices and six students were supported with nonelectronic systems. The researchers observed each student in a general education, inclusive classroom, and collected information through a combination of interval and event recordings. They also measured social interactions specifically length, mode of communication and initiation. The study found that the students being observed rarely initiated communication especially with their peers. A majority of communication the students participated in, was with their assigned adult. Being in an inclusive classroom did not help these students build peer relationships. More professional development can be focused on building relationships and peer interactions so that special education students are not at any disadvantage in inclusive classrooms.

There are also social benefits for both general and special education students in inclusive classrooms. Vaughn, Elbaum, Schumm, and Hughes (1998) investigated if there was a positive social outcome of learning-disabled elementary students who were placed in inclusive general education classes. There were 185 total participants that ranged in age from third through sixth grade. There were 59 students with LD, 72 low to average achieving students, and 54 high achieving students. Vaughn et al. (1998) used two different teaching models in the classrooms that these special education students were in. The first model was a co-teaching classroom where the general education teacher and a special education teacher co-taught in the same classroom for the entire school day. The second model was a consultation/collaboration classroom where the

general education teacher had a part-time teaching assistant for four hours per day and special education teacher for one to two hours per day. The general education teacher and the special education teacher co-planned the lessons. The data showed a positive correlation in the peer acceptance and friendship quality of the students in the consultation/collaborative classroom. In the co-teaching classrooms, there were no statistically significant differences over time in either peer acceptance, or friendship quality. Vaugh et al. (1998) also found a positive correlation in reciprocal friendships between the classes. In the co-teaching setting, the percentage of students with LD and low- to average achieving students who had at least one reciprocal friend increased slightly through the school year. In the consultation/collaboration setting, the percentage of LD and low- to average-achieving students with at least one reciprocal friend slightly increased through the school year.

### **Professional Development**

Inclusive classrooms can be beneficial to general education students and special education students, but their classroom teachers need purposeful and informational professional development in order to execute successful inclusive classrooms.

Professional development can be used to improve a teacher's performance, use of pedagogies, and broadening their techniques in their classrooms. Duchaine, Jolivete and Fredrick (2011) examined the effect teacher teaching using written performance feedback, had on the frequency of teacher's behavior-specific praise statements (BSPS) in a high school classroom. Duchaine et al. (2011) used three suburban high schools with two general education teachers and one special education teacher. Observations

occurred at the same time each day when the class met, provided the teachers were present in class. Duchaine et al. (2011) determined a baseline using five observations. Once the baseline was established, the teachers began training in BSPS. BSPS were defined as statements of approval provided to a student or students by a teacher that included a description of the behavior being reinforced. The results are consistent with previous studies, which indicate that teacher training with performance feedback can have a direct impact on teachers' use of BSPS. Educating and training teachers in different techniques can be a tool that administrators can use to help foster more inclusive classrooms.

Wong (2008) attempted to determine the effects of mainstreaming disabled students, on the attitudes of non-disabled students, toward people with disabilities. In the study, there was a total of 406 student participants. The program had two different groups of students. One group had the five disabled students with their non-disabled peers and the second group was made up of all non-disabled students. The students were given a questionnaire at the beginning of the school year to determine their attitudes towards disabled students and then again at the end of the school year. The study found that the attitudes of non-disabled peers did not change very much over the course of the school year. If their attitudes did change, the non-disabled students attributed to the change to something else other than being in classes with disabled students. Wong (2008) attributed the attitudes of the non-disabled students not changing because there was no support to foster relationships in classes. Teachers did not work on cooperative work between the two types of students. If this would have

been more supported, more relationships could have been built, and attitudes might have changed more. Wong (2008) found that the general education students' attitudes did not change about their disabled peers. Although, the attitudes did not change, they also didn't begin to feel negatively towards their disabled peers. Wong (2008) also pointed out that teachers could have used more training to foster relationships between students.

Pülschen and Pülschen (2015) found that it is important to devote time to training teachers to become collaborative team players and internalize a set of values that accompanies an inclusive framework. Teacher's that work toward a common goal may decrease their stress and become more successful inclusive teachers. Pülschen and Pülschen (2015) used 33 students enrolled in 'Counseling, Collaboration, and Conflict Handling' within a Master's program in special education, as the intervention group. 35 other students enrolled in other classes within a master's program in special education were in the control group. The data was based on questionnaires and role plays that assessed the collaborative competence and subjective tension. The subjects watched and ranked conflict situations for conducting self-assessment in the area of collaboration. The subjects were asked to provide information about their practical experience in inclusive classrooms and their level of identification with the concept of inclusion. This was the measurement for the base level. The measurement for the base level was followed by the Acceptance and Commitment (ACT) training which lasted three months. The second measurement was carried out after the ACT training, along with questions about the acceptance and evaluation of the ACT. The results show that

an Acceptance and Commitment Training enables participants to solve conflicts successfully while reducing the subjective tension of the participants. The more education and training that teachers can receive regarding collaboration, the more likely they will be solving conflicts and reducing tension. The training in this study proves that it is important to devote time to having teachers become team players, internalizing a new set of values that accompany an inclusive framework. Teachers that work toward a common goal may decrease their stress and become more successful inclusive teachers.

Brendle, Lock, and Piazza (2017) examined information from teachers in co-taught classrooms to document method of implementation and to gain insight into participants' knowledge and perceptions of co-teaching. Brendle et al. (2017) found that the teachers reported an awareness of the research-based models for co-teaching but, they lack the expertise in implementing the various models in their classrooms. All of the teachers reported that they need further training in order to successfully implement the research-based co-teaching models. Secondly, Brendle et al. (2017) found that the teachers did not consistently function as a collaborative partnership. The teachers inconsistently co-planned, co-instructed and co-assessed in their classrooms. The reason for this being that the teachers reported the need for more professional development in co-teaching. Brendle et al. (2017) found the results through a rating scale that consisted of nine categories related to roles of co-teachers, planning, instruction and administrative supports. Each teacher was also asked a 23 question semi-structured interview with two open-ended questions post interview. Brendle et al.



(2017) also conducted classroom observations during the spring semester. The observations documented teacher instructional roles and identified the co-teach models utilized during instruction. Brendle et al. (2017) were able to determine that teachers need more education and training in order to execute proper co-teaching models.

There is a general need for professional development that focuses specifically on co-teaching and student engagement. Shoulders and Krei (2016) compared the differences in secondary special and general education teachers' perceptions of their efficacy in teaching students in an inclusive classroom. Shoulders and Krei (2016) used a total of 180 teachers; about 80% of the teachers were general education teachers and about 17% were special education teachers. The teachers were sent the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy scale (TSES). This was used to measure the teachers' efficacy in student engagement. The study found that there was a significant difference between special and general education teachers' perceptions of their efficacy in student engagement. Special education teachers thought they had significant influence on student engagement, where general education teachers thought they only had some influence on student engagement. The study also found that gender, level of education, years of teaching experience, and number of college courses in special education did not predict teacher efficacy in student engagement. However, the amount of professional development on teaching students with special needs in an inclusive setting did predict student engagement. This means that the number of hours spent in professional development in co-teaching is directly correlated to teacher efficacy in student engagement.

Professional development can also focus on broadening different teaching techniques. Chang, Shih, and Kasari (2016) examined the friendship in preschool children with Autism, and attempted to determine the extent to which teachers used strategies to facilitate friendship development. There was a total of 31 mainstreamed preschool aged children with Autism in the study. Chang et al. (2016) examined the children's friendships by having their parents and teacher fill out a questionnaire about the child's friends. Chang et al. (2016) also examined what strategies the teacher used in the classroom by using timed interval observations. The results showed that parents and teacher's ratings of their children's friendship were high than the observer's ratings. The results also found that only one-fifth of the study's participants made friendships. The observations determined that teachers did not use many strategies to help the children with Autism make friends. The teachers mainly used behavioral strategies when interacting with the students who were misbehaving. This led the authors to conclude that teachers need to be taught more strategies on how to foster more friendships with children with Autism in their classroom (Chang et al., 2016).

Bain and Parkes (2006) attempted to establish whether or not the use of tools by teachers covaried with actual improvement in their classroom practice. 20 teachers participated in the study with a total of 350 students. Twenty five percent of the participating students had a diagnosed learning disability. Data was collected through observations where department heads and administrators used protocols for the observations. The protocols addressed direct explicit teaching, cooperative learning, team accelerated instruction, peer tutoring and classroom engagement. These

protocols were derived from practices commonly associated with inclusive classrooms.

Bain and Parkes (2006) found that teachers were implementing the common classroom pedagogies. The teachers who routinely implemented these pedagogies were more successful than their peers who made less use of the pedagogies. This means that teachers need to be taught and use explicit teaching, cooperative learning, team accelerated instruction, peer tutoring and classroom engagement to have more successful inclusive classrooms.

Another support that can help teachers foster an inclusive classroom is using Positive Behavior Interventions. Jones, Weber, and McLaughlin (2013) investigated the effects of a school token system on on-task behaviors by two seventh grade boys with ASD or ADHD within an inclusive classroom. Jones et al. (2013) observed the two students in their inclusive classrooms and measured their on-task behavior and talk-outs. After the initial observations, a token economy was implemented in the classroom and students were observed again. The authors then took the token economy away and observed the students again. 'Erik' was being serviced for Autism Spectrum Disorder and 'Scott' was being serviced for ADHD. Jones et al. (2013) found that Erik displayed higher rates of on-task behavior after receiving the drawing reward rather than after receiving the opportunity to read a new magazine. This led the authors to believe that with a revised and extended contingency contract using the token economy, Erik on-task behaviors might have been generalized (Jones et al., 2013). Jones et al. (2013) believe that if Scott's teachers followed a consistent data-based behavioral plan designed in consideration of behaviorist principles rather than just removing Scott when

he was disruptive, along with the token economy, his decreasing of talk-outs could have been sustained. Overall, both students seemed to have benefited from using Positive Behavioral Interventions. This is another technique that teachers can learn about to have more inclusive classrooms.

Along with behavioral trainings, teachers can also learn about different ways to measure student's success in the classroom. Lowrey, Hollingshead, and Howery (2017) examined the language teachers used to discuss inclusion, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and learners with intellectual disability (ID). Lowrey et al. (2017) examined the language used to discuss the three in order to better understand how teachers describe the relationship between them. Lowrey et al. (2017) found that teachers should allow multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression in the classroom. UDL can support teachers to identify the different ways of measuring success. This means using UDL can help all children find the best way they can demonstrate their learning, which could lead to gaining confidence and feeling more included. The same study also found that teachers can continue to improve how they choose to talk about the students with ID. Teachers can continue to intentionally build a sense of membership and providing instruction accessible to all students. This may start with the language teachers used about all of their students. Teachers can use professional development to focus on support in UDL and language surround the special education students in their classrooms.

Another support that teachers can use for inclusive classrooms is collaborative teaching. Kilanowski-Press, Foote, and Rinaldo (2010) investigated the current state of

inclusion practices in general education classrooms. Kilanowski-Press et al. (2010) surveyed a total of 71 inclusion teachers that taught in rural, suburban, and urban schools at elementary, middle, and high schools. Each teacher was given and completed a survey, and mailed it back to the authors. The most significant finding of the study was that team teaching was the least employed inclusive approach. This means that according to the study, the instructional approach that may most clearly exemplify inclusive practices, due to the shared core instruction, is least utilized. Further studies can investigate why this is the case. Kilanowski-Press et al. (2010) also found that one student support was the most prevalent type of support provided in inclusive classrooms. This is not a recognized co-teaching model and could be argued as the least inclusive form of support for special education children. One-to-one support excludes special education students from the larger instructional group and should be closely monitored. Teachers need to continue to receive professional development on the best teaching practices for inclusive classrooms.

### **Beliefs**

Changing teachers and society's beliefs regarding people with disabilities to be more positive and accepting can begin in inclusive classrooms. Inclusive classroom teachers need to know their students' needs and differentiate, in order to make their inclusive classroom welcoming to all students. Paterson (2007) explored teacher's knowledge about classroom context (knowledge of individual students in the class) and the thinking of teachers as they taught heterogeneous secondary classrooms. The study observed and interviewed five junior high teachers. These teachers taught in inclusive

classrooms, which meant they had at least one permanent student with a learning disability. Patterson (2007) recorded and observed each inclusive classroom. They also interviewed the teachers and recorded teachers' meaning they placed on their experiences and what principles had guided their choices. Patterson (2007) also asked teachers to make retrospective reports of their thinking while watching their videotaped lessons. Patterson (2007) found that the teachers had individual knowledge of all of their students, with or without disabilities. They used this knowledge to guide their teaching. These results mean that the teachers are not paying the most attention to the whole class, rather the teachers are paying attention to individual needs and adjusting their lessons accordingly. The belief that knowing the individual student is important and should be executed in class, needs to continue in order to address the diverse needs found in all classrooms.

Teacher's thinking about individual students helps support differentiation within inclusive classrooms. It is important have teachers think about students individually and also positively. This will increase students' needs being met. Roose, Vantieghem, Vanderlinde, and Van Avermaet (2019) investigated if teacher's beliefs are associated with how they view inclusive classrooms. Roose et al. (2019) used surveys and video-based comparative judgement from teachers in 23 schools to collect data. In the video-based comparative judgement, teachers were asked to compare two short videoclips and pick which one was best regarding PTSI (Positive Teacher-Student Interactions) and DI (Differentiated Instruction). The teachers' choices regarding their picks were compared to an expert benchmark and see how they matched. Roose et al. (2019)

found that teachers' professional beliefs were able to predict the noticing of PTISI and DI in the video clips. The teachers who had more positive beliefs regarding diverse groups of students, and the more open they were to integrate student needs into curriculum, the more likely they were to notice it in the video clips. These results indicate that teachers' beliefs are important when noticing PTISI and DI. Having more teachers noticing PTISI and DI could lead to more implementation in their classrooms. Having more positive beliefs about diverse groups of students and being open to integrate student needs into curriculum can be important in meeting students' needs and changing society's beliefs about people with disabilities.

Increasing positive beliefs about diverse groups of students and being open to integrate student needs into curriculum are important to inclusive classrooms. Another important factor to inclusive classrooms is parent teacher collaboration. Schultz, Able, Sreckovic, and White (2016) attempted to gain understanding of teachers' perceptions of helpful parental involvement and advocacy strategies for ensuring students with Autism Spectrum Disorder success in inclusive school settings. Shultz et al. (2016) selected 34 teachers to participate in the focus groups. Teachers were put into two focus groups at each school level (elementary, middle, and high school). There were four to eight participants in each focus group that met twice for an hour over the course of one year. Participants were given a case study that described a fictional student with ASD tendencies that fit each school level. The case study was accompanied with a list of questions to discuss at the focus group. The questions were: How is the student similar to or different from the students you work with? What are your biggest concerns

related to students such as the student in the story? What would be most helpful to you in helping students like the student in the story? The study found that the teachers had a wide range of experiences involving parent-teacher collaboration that ranged from parents who were overinvolved to under-involved with their child's schooling. Teachers discussed that it is important for parents to be advocates for their children and provided many examples of successful parent advocacy. Some examples were information sharing, Circle of Friends networks and IEP information to assist the teachers in understanding their students with ASD. Regardless of the different perceptions of all of the parents, from the overinvolved to the under-involved, all teachers recognized how important home and school collaboration is for successful students with ASD. Parent information and advocacy was viewed as essential for teachers and peers to understand and accept ASD students. Future studies can research to find if these results can be translated to other disabilities, outside of just ASD.

Along with increasing positive beliefs with teachers and parents, we need to increase positive beliefs about all disabilities in society, including Autism. Dillenburger, McKerr, Jordan, Devine, and Keenan (2015) examined public attitudes towards individuals with autism. Dillenburger et al. (2015) focused on visibility and social interaction, needs and interventions, and rights and resources. There were 1204 adults from private households participated in the study. The research team conducted interviews with selected participants and asked participants questions regarding Autism. The study found that the public had overall positive attitudes regarding children and adults with Autism. Over 75% of respondents said that they would be comfortable if a



family with a child or an adult with autism moved next door to them. About 80% of respondents said they would feel comfortable with an adult with autism married a close relative or was a work colleague. Changing teacher's and society's beliefs about people with disabilities can start in inclusive classrooms.

## CHAPTER III: DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

### Summary of Literature

Inclusive classrooms can have many benefits for parents, teachers, special education students, and general education students. Benefits for teachers include collaborating with other teachers and broadening their beliefs and techniques. Benefits for special education students include increased social interaction, access to more curriculum, increased friendships and a less restrictive environment. Benefits for general education students include increased friendships and social interaction, and broadening their beliefs about disabilities. Powers, Bierman, and Coffman (2016) found that restrictive education placement was harmful to students in a secondary school setting. Placing these students into inclusive secondary can lead to benefits, including increasing their rate high school completion. Borders, Barnett, and Bauer (2010) observed five children with mild to moderate deafness in an inclusive classroom, and concluded that inclusive classrooms seem to be successful for deaf students. Justice, Logan, Tzu-Jung Lin, and Kaderavek (2014) showed that the average spring language scores of early childhood special education students were strongly affected by peer effects in their classroom, and early childhood students with disabilities were even more likely to be impacted by peer effect in their classroom. Justice et al. (2014) found that if a student with low language skills had classmates with higher language skills, they were more likely to have higher language skills in the spring. The same was found to be true when the scenario was reversed. Dessemontet, Bless, and Morin (2012) measured both academic and adaptive behavior gains, and found that special education students in

inclusive classroom made more gains in their literacy skills than their peers that solely attended special needs schools.

Along with academic benefits, inclusive classrooms can have social benefits for students as well. Morrison and Burgman (2009) found that classroom environment affects the friendship experiences that students with disabilities experiences. Morrison and Burgman (2009) found that if a classroom was more inclusive and shows children with disabilities in a positive light, then the students with disabilities can make more meaningful friendships. Gasser, Grütter, and Torchetti (2018) found that inclusive classrooms can predict children's sympathy and their intended inclusion toward their hyperactive classmates. Gasser et al. (2018) found a significant positive effect of students' individual perceptions of their classmates in their inclusive classroom and helped prove that teachers should be trained to improve the inclusivity of all the children in their classroom, including hyperactive disabled students. This shows that inclusive classrooms with the right environment are an important part of education.

Inclusive classrooms are important for peer acceptance and teachers need to continue to improve the inclusivity of their classrooms. A way to improve inclusivity could be through cooperative learning. For this reason, Jacques, Wilton, Townsend, and Wilton, K. (1998) found that the students in a cooperative learning group had an increase in social acceptance from their peers, compared to the control group. Another way to improve inclusivity could be through a collaboration model. Collins, Branson, Hall, and Rankin (2001) showed that students with disabilities can be taught to perform a related task within the collaborative instructional model. Each student in the study

grew in their writing which proved that students with disabilities can be taught to perform a related task within the collaborative instructional model.

Inclusive classrooms can be beneficial to general education students and special education students, but their classroom teachers need the right educating and training in order to execute a successful inclusive classroom. Chang, Shih, and Kasari (2016) determined that teachers did not use many strategies to help the children with autism facilitate friendship development. This led the authors to conclude that teachers need to be taught more strategies on how to foster more friendships with autistic children in their classroom. Bain and Parkes (2006) found that teachers who routinely implemented common classroom pedagogies were more successful than their peers who made less use of pedagogies. This means that teachers need to be taught and use explicit teaching, cooperative learning, team accelerated instruction, peer tutoring and classroom engagement to have successful inclusive classrooms.

Coaching can improve a teacher's performance in their classrooms. Duchaine, Jolivete and Fredrick (2011) found that teacher coaching with performance feedback can have a direct impact on teachers' use of BSPS. Coaching teachers can be another tool that administrators can use to help foster more inclusive classrooms by coaching their teachers' specific inclusive strategies. Pülschen and Pülschen (2015) found that it is important to devote time to having teachers become collaborative team players and work toward a common goal. This can lead to decreased stress and becoming more successful inclusive classroom teachers. A support that can help teachers foster an inclusive classroom is using Positive Behavior Interventions. Jones, Weber, and

McLaughlin (2013) investigated the effects of a school token system on on-task behaviors by two seventh grade boys with ASD or ADHD within an inclusive classroom. Both students seemed to have benefited from using Positive Behavioral Interventions. This is another professional development topic that teachers can learn about to have more inclusive classrooms.

Along with behavioral trainings, teachers can also learn about more and different ways to measure student's success in the classroom. Lowrey, Hollingshead, and Howery (2017) found that Universal Design for Learning (UDL) can support teachers to identify different ways of measuring success for all children. The same study also found that teachers can continue to improve how they choose to talk about the students with ID, and should continue to intentionally build a sense of membership and provide instruction accessible to all students. Teachers can use professional development to focus on support in UDL and language surround the special education students in their classrooms. More professional development is important in order to properly implement collaborative inclusive classrooms. Shoulders and Krei (2016) found that the number of hours in professional development in collaborative work predicted efficacy in student engagement. Kilanowski-Press, Foote, and Rinaldo (2010) found that team teaching was the least employed inclusive approach employed in classrooms. Team teaching is the instructional approach that may most clearly exemplify inclusive practices, due to the shared core instruction, is least utilized. Kilanowski-Press et al. (2010) also found that one-to-one student support was the most prevalent type of support provided in inclusive classrooms. This could be argued as the least inclusive

form of support it excludes special education students from the larger instructional group. Brendle, Lock, and Piazza (2017) found that the teachers reported an awareness of the research-based models for co-teaching, but they lack the expertise in implementing the various models in their classrooms. All of the teachers reported that they need further training in order to successfully implement the research-based co-teaching methods.

Although there are plenty of benefits to inclusive classrooms for students and teachers, there are some disadvantages to be addressed as well. Brown and Babo (2017) found that students who were placed in a non-inclusive classroom setting performed higher on the 2013 NJ HSPA than general education students who were placed in an inclusive classroom. Along with inclusive classrooms hindering academic performance of general education students, inclusive classrooms can have an impact on students' attitudes. Wong (2008) found that the attitudes of non-disabled peers toward people with disabilities did not change significantly over the course of the school year. Wong (2008) attributed the attitudes on the non-disabled students not changing because there was no support to foster relationships in classes. Daniel and King (1997) found the effects of students' placement versus nonplacement in an inclusion classroom on dependent variables, including parent concerns about their children's school program, teacher and parent reported instances of students' problem behaviors, student's academic performance, and students' self-reported self-esteem were mixed. Daniel and King (1997) found that students placed in inclusion classrooms had a higher instance of behavior problems and lower self-esteem than students in non-inclusion

classrooms. This means that contrary to the inclusionary assumption, inclusion programs may not necessarily help to raise students' self-esteem. In line with these previous studies, Zablotzky, Bradshaw, Anderson, and Law (2014) found that students with Autism Spectrum Disorder are more vulnerable to bullying at schools. It was more typically seen in children that were in fully inclusive classes all of the time or nearly all of the time.

Education staff needs continued education and training to build relationships in inclusive classroom and bullying. A particularly vulnerable student population who teachers can use additional relationship building professional development on are, students who use augmentative and alternative communication. Chung, Carter, and Sisco (2012) found that this population of students rarely initiated communication especially with their peers. A majority of communication the students participated in, was with their assigned adult. More professional development needs to be focused on building relationships and peer interactions so that special education students are not at any disadvantage in inclusive classrooms. There are also social benefits for both general and special education students in inclusive classrooms. Vaughn, Elbaum, Schumm, and Hughes (1998) found a positive correlation in the peer acceptance and friendship quality of the students in a collaborative classroom setting. In collaborative settings, the percentage of students with LD and low- to average achieving students who had at least one reciprocal friend increased slightly through the school year.

Changing teachers and society's beliefs regarding people with disabilities to be more positive and accepting can start in inclusive classrooms. Inclusive classroom

teachers need to know their students' needs and differentiate, in order to make their inclusive classroom welcoming to all students. Paterson (2007) found that teachers had individual knowledge of all of their students, with or without disabilities in their classrooms. The teachers in the study used this knowledge to guide their teaching. These results mean that the teachers are not paying the most attention to the whole class, rather the teachers are paying attention to individual needs and adjusting their lessons accordingly. Teachers' thinking about individual students helps support differentiation within inclusive classrooms. Roose, Vantieghem, Vanderlinde, and Van Avermaet (2019) investigated if teachers' beliefs are associated with how they view inclusive classrooms. Roose et al. (2019) found that teachers who had more positive beliefs regarding diverse groups of students, and the more open they were to integrate student needs into curriculum, the more likely they were to notice PTSI (Positive Teacher-Student Interactions) and DI (Differentiated Instruction) in the video clips. Having more teachers noticing PTSI and DI could lead to more implementation in their classrooms. Along with increasing positive beliefs with teachers and parents, we need to increase positive beliefs about all disabilities in society, including Autism. Dillenburger, McKerr, Jordan, Devine, and Keenan (2015) found that the public had overall positive attitudes regarding children and adults with Autism. Changing beliefs regarding people with disabilities can begin in inclusive classrooms.

### **Limitations of the Research**

The literature for this thesis was found through searches in Education Journals, ERIC, and EBSCO Mega FILE. The literature used was found through searching key words



included “collaboration,” “inclusion,” “co-teaching,” “social inclusion,” and “inclusive classrooms.” These key words were used to find literature on the benefits of inclusion for special education and general education students in general education classrooms. The databases used and specific keywords, limited the scope of literature that was found and used in this review.

Another limitation to this review was the vast sample size. Due to the limited search procedures, the author was unable to find enough literature for just high school students in the United States. Instead, the literature found, used various countries and used various ages. Schools around the world differ in their procedures, time spent with students, classroom structure, and other factors. These many variations could have affected the conclusions drawn from all of the various studies. The conclusions drawn are also not incredibly specific due to the use of various schools around the world and various ages.

A final limitation of this review was the time. The author was unable to find enough literature that specifically covered the benefits of inclusion for special education and general education students in general education classrooms from the last ten years. The literature that the author was able to find varied greatly in time. The oldest study was from 1998, and the most recent study in the review was from 2018. Education can change greatly from year to year, especially from decade to decade. New research and information changes and informs new practices within schools. This change was not taken into account in this review and the conclusions drawn from it.

### **Implications for Future Research**

A limitation for this literature review was the vast sample size due to the limited search procedures and lack of literature to choose from. Future researchers can explore researching specific age groups and the benefits of inclusion for general and special education students. For example, researchers can specifically focus on high school aged students or elementary aged students. Classroom procedures and expectations can vary greatly between an elementary student and a high school student. Separating each age group for research could be very informative.

Another limitation for this review was the large time period between all of the studies used. Laws, data and societal expectations can change greatly over twenty years and research should reflect this. Future research can continue to address the benefits of inclusion for both general and special education in an ever-changing educational world.

Future research can continue to gather more data from student's perspective. For this review, there was studies from teachers, parents, and society's perspective, but little from student's perspective. Future research can address both general and special education students' perspectives on the benefits of inclusive classrooms. Researchers can focus on academic positive or negative gains for both sets of students. Along with an academic focus, researchers can also focus on social positive or negative gains for both sets of students. Future studies can also focus on both academic and social positive or negative gains from students' perspectives while they are in school and post-graduation.

### **Implications for Professional Application**

The data from this literature review reveals several relevant applications that can be applied to the real world of teaching. The biggest application being teachers need to attend more thoughtful and purposeful professional development on inclusive classrooms. According to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), all special education students have the right to the least restrictive environment in their education. The least restrictive environment will most likely include at least one inclusive classroom. Special education students being in an inclusive classroom effects the teachers, general education students and the special education students themselves. The large number of individuals affected by inclusive classrooms leads to the need for more purposeful professional development in order to execute them correctly.

Purposeful professional development can include educating teachers about different types of collaborative teaching models such as; one teach, one observe, one teach, one assist, parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching. Brendle et al. (2017) found that the teachers reported an awareness of the research-based models for co-teaching but, they lack the expertise in implementing the various models in their classrooms. Kilanowski-Press et al. (2010) found that team teaching was the least employed approach that was employed which could be argued as the most inclusive approach. Kilanowski-Press et al. (2010) also found that one-to-one student support was the most prevalent type of support provided in inclusive classrooms. This is not a research-based co-teaching model and could be argued as the

least inclusive form of support. More purposeful professional development can educate teachers on their options which can lead to more effective inclusive classrooms.

Teachers can be trained on specific classroom techniques that can support the diverse needs of the students in their classrooms. One way to support the diverse students is through differentiation and modifications. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) allows content accessible to all students. Lowrey et al. (2017) found that teachers should allow multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression in the classroom. UDL can help incorporate modifications in a classroom and support teachers identify the different ways of measuring success in their classrooms. Purposeful professional development can help all students demonstrate their learning, which could lead to gaining confidence and feeling more included and therefore be more successful.

Professional development can also focus on addressing the diverse social and emotional needs within classrooms. Teachers can continue to expand their knowledge in promoting friendships within classrooms. Daniel and King (1997) found that students placed in inclusion classrooms have lower self-esteem than students in non-inclusion classrooms. Along with lower self-esteem, Zablotzky et al. (2014) found that students with Autism are more vulnerable to bullying. Chang et al. (2016) determined that teachers mainly used behavioral strategies when interacting with the students, and did not use many strategies to help the students with Autism in their classroom make friends. Purposeful professional development can help all teachers have more strategies on how to foster high self-esteem and more friendships. General and special education students who have higher self-esteem and more friendships can lead to all

students feeling safe and welcome, and part of an inclusive classroom community.

Students who feel safe can thrive socially, behaviorally, and academically and this can start with more purposeful professional development for teachers.

### **Conclusion**

The effects of inclusion for special education and general education students in general education classrooms can have a positive or a negative effect on teachers and students. An inclusive classroom that is executed correctly can increase teacher collaboration, student friendships, social acceptance, and academic performance. An inclusive classroom that is poorly executed can leave teacher's feeling overwhelmed, decrease student self-esteem and academic performance, and increase bullying. The determination of whether an inclusive classroom is successful or not, begins with purposeful professional development for teachers. When all educators support inclusive classrooms, they can be successful, and all teachers and students can benefit tremendously.

## References

- Bain, A., & Parkes, R. J. (2006). Curriculum authoring tools and inclusive classroom teaching practice: a longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(2), 177–189. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2005.00527.x>
- Borders, C. M., Barnett, D., & Bauer, A. M. (2010). How are they really doing? observation of inclusionary classroom participation for children with mild-to-moderate deafness. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 15(4), 348–357. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ910445&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Brendle, J., Lock, R., & Piazza, K. (2017). A study of co-teaching identifying effective implementation strategies. *International Journal of Special Education*, 32(3), 538–550. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1184155&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Brown, J. E., & Babo, G. (2017). The influence of placement in an inclusive classroom on the academic performance of non-disabled eleventh grade students in a suburban New Jersey school district. *Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research*, 5, 1–15. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ115194&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Chang, Y.-C., Shih, W., & Kasari, C. (2016). Friendships in preschool children with autism spectrum disorder: what holds them back, child characteristics or teacher

behavior? *Autism: The International Journal of Research and Practice*, 20(1), 65–74. Retrieved from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1085535&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Chung, Y.-C., Carter, E. W., & Sisco, L. G. (2012). Social interactions of students with disabilities who use augmentative and alternative communication in inclusive classrooms. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 117(5), 349–367. Retrieved from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ983527&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Collins, B. C., Branson, T. A., Hall, M., & Rankin, S. W. (2001). Teaching secondary students with moderate disabilities in an inclusive academic classroom setting. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 13(1), 41–59. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1023/A:1026557316417>

Daniel, L. G., & King, D. A. (1997). Impact of inclusion education on academic achievement, student behavior and self-esteem, and parental attitudes. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91(2), 67–80. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1080/00220679709597524>

Dessementet, R. S., Bless, G., & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 56(6), 579–587. Retrieved from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ965124&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- Dillenburger, K., McKerr, L., Jordan, J. A., Devine, P., & Keenan, M. (2015). Creating an inclusive society... how close are we in relation to autism spectrum disorder? A general population survey. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* 28(4), 330–340. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1111/jar.12144>
- Duchaine, E. L., Jolivete, K., & Fredrick, L. D. (2011). The effect of teacher coaching with performance feedback on behavior-specific praise in inclusion classrooms. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 34(2), 209–227. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1353/etc.2011.0009>
- Friend, M. & Cook, L. "Six approaches to co-teaching." *State Education Resource Center*, Retrieved from [ctserc.org/component/k2/item/50-six-approaches-to-co-teaching](http://ctserc.org/component/k2/item/50-six-approaches-to-co-teaching).
- Gasser, L., Grütter, J., & Torchetti, L. (2018). Inclusive classroom norms, children's sympathy, and intended inclusion toward students with hyperactive behavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 71, 72–84. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.10.005>
- Jacques, N. Townsend, M. & Wilton, K. (1998). Cooperative learning and social acceptance of children with mild intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 42(1), 29–36. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost.com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=keh&AN=5428239&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Jones, M. N., Weber, K. P., & McLaughlin, T. F. (2013). No teacher left behind:



educating students with ASD and ADHD in the inclusion classroom. *Journal of Special Education Apprenticeship*, 2(2). Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1127784&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Justice, L. M., Logan, J. A. R., Tzu-Jung Lin, & Kaderavek, J. N. (2014). Peer effects in early childhood education: testing the assumptions of special-education inclusion. *Psychological Science (0956-7976)*, 25(9), 1722–1729. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1177/0956797614538978>

Kilanowski-Press, L., Foote, C. J., & Rinaldo, V. J. (2010). Inclusion classrooms and teachers: a survey of current practices. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25 (3), 43–56. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ909035&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Lowrey, K. A., Hollingshead, A., & Howery, K. (2017). A closer look: examining teachers' language around UDL, inclusive classrooms, and intellectual disability. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 55(1), 15–24. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1130335&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Morrison, R., & Burgman, I. (2009). Friendship experiences among children with disabilities who attend mainstream Australian schools. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy.Revue Canadienne D'Ergotherapie*, 76(3), 145-152.  
[doi:10.1177/000841740907600303](https://doi.org/10.1177/000841740907600303) [doi]

- Paterson, D. (2007). Teachers' in-flight thinking in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40* (5), 427–435. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ775535&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Powers, C. J., Bierman, K. L., & Coffman, D. L. (2016). Restrictive educational placements increase adolescent risks for students with early- starting conduct problems. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 57*(8), 899–908. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1111/jcpp.12487>
- Pülschen, S., & Pülschen, D. (2015). Preparation for teacher collaboration in inclusive classrooms – stress reduction for special education students via acceptance and commitment training: A controlled study. *Journal of Molecular Psychiatry, 3*(1), 1-13. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1186/s40303-015-0015-3>
- Roose, I., Vantieghem, W., Vanderlinde, R., & Van Avermaet, P. (2019). Beliefs as filters for comparing inclusive classroom situations connecting teachers' beliefs about teaching diverse learners to their noticing of inclusive classroom characteristics in videoclips. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 56*, 140–151. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.01.002>
- Schultz, T. R., Able, H., Sreckovic, M. A., & White, T. (2016). Parent-teacher collaboration: teacher perceptions of what is needed to support students with ASD in the inclusive classroom. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 51*(4), 344–354. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ112>

0351&site=ehost-live&scope=site

- Shoulders, T. L., & Krei, M. S. (2016). Rural secondary educators' perceptions of their efficacy in the inclusive Classroom. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 35(1), 23–30. Retrieved from <https://search-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1147432&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Vaughn, S., Elbaum, B. E., Schumm, J. S., & Hughes, M. T. (1998). Social outcomes for students with and without learning disabilities in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31(5), 428-436. doi:10.1177/002221949803100502 [doi]
- Wong, D. K. (2008). Do contacts make a difference? The effects of mainstreaming on student attitudes toward people with disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 29(1), 70-82. doi:S0891-4222(06)00108-9 [pii]
- Zablotsky, B., Bradshaw, C. P., Anderson, C. M., & Law, P. (2014). Risk factors for bullying children with autism spectrum disorders. *Autism: The International Journal of Research and Practice*, 18(4), 419–427. Retrieved from <https://search-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1023360&site=ehost-live&scope=site>