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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and its amendments made it clear that schools have the responsibility to educate children with disabilities in general education classrooms (Burke & Sutherland, 2004). The promotion of inclusive education has been based on two concepts: (a) the right of children with disabilities to have access to general education, and (b) the idea that inclusive education is more effective compared to segregated education (Lindsay, 2007). For teachers who work with students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD), however, inclusion presents an exceptional challenge because of the wide range of problems displayed by these students (Gunter, Coutinho, & Cade, 2002; Young, 2005).

Students with E/BD are characterized as having severe deficits in their social competence and academic performance. These students are also characterized by their maladjusted or antisocial behavior (Robbins-Etlen, 2007). In the United States, more than 470,000 students are identified as having E/BD. An increase is evident in the percentage of secondary students with E/BD served under IDEA (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

The success of an inclusion program depends on those who work closely with the students (Burke & Sutherland, 2004; Hastings & Oakford, 2003). The competence and perceptions of individual teachers are important factors in determining how well the goal of inclusive education will be achieved (Jerwood, 2002). On the assumption that successful implementation of any inclusive policy generally relies on educators being positive about it, much research has sought to examine teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Researchers intend to resolve issues encountered in order to help people
involved in the process not only to stay informed, but also to maintain the same vision, insight, and confidence about where the hard work for inclusion is heading.

Research on teacher perceptions of inclusion for students with E/BD may help to design professional development activities (Al Khatib, 2007; Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005), guide collaboration among stakeholders (Carter & Hughes, 2006; Ernst & Rogers, 2009; Etscheidt, 2006; Lindsay, 2007; Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006), and thus improve the quality of special education for students with E/BD (Kessler, 1993). I aimed to examine whether significant differences exist between the perceptions of educators regarding the inclusionary practices for students with E/BD in general education settings. The present study also analyzed characteristics of the participants, as noted in the demographic information accrued from the survey, in order to determine the impact of teacher-related variables on teacher perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

Statement of the Problem

The growth rate of placing students with E/BD in general education classrooms has been increasing over the past few years (Danforth & Morris, 2006). Although the success of inclusion depends much on the collaboration between general and special education teachers, few studies have been conducted to examine the perceptions of both general and special educators about the inclusion of students with E/BD (Shemesh, 2009).

Purpose of Study

Research on teacher perceptions of inclusion for students with E/BD may help to design professional development activities (Al Khatib, 2007; Avramidis et al., 2000; Shippen et al., 2005), guide collaboration among stakeholders (Carter & Hughes, 2006; Ernst & Rogers, 2009; Etscheidt, 2006; Lindsay, 2007; Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006), and, thus, improve the quality of special education for students with E/BD (Kessler, 1993). I aimed to
examine whether significant differences exist in the perceptions of teachers regarding the inclusionary practices for students with E/BD in three areas: inclusion of students with E/BD, behaviors of students with E/BD, and teacher efficacy. The present study also analyzed characteristics of the participants, as noted in the demographic information accrued from the survey, in order to determine the impact of teacher-related variables on teacher perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

Research Questions

Literature shows teacher perceptions of inclusion affect the implementation of inclusionary practices (Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000; Gavish & Shimoni, 2011; MacCarthy, 2010; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Perceptions held by teachers are tied to their sense of ability to effectively meet the needs of their students (Bandura, 1977; Gavish & Shimoni, 2011). Findings of studies, however, are not consistent regarding how different variables affect teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices (Gavish & Shimoni, 2011; MacCarthy, 2010; Robbins-Etlen, 2007). To help understand teachers’ self-efficacy and, therefore, improve the success of students with E/BD in their inclusionary settings, the present study examined how factors related to student, teacher, and environment correlate with teachers’ perceptions of including students with E/BD in their classrooms. As collaboration among teachers is critical for successful inclusion (Robbins-Etlen, 2007), the present study particularly intended to identify whether differences exist between special education teachers and general education teachers. The following research questions guided the present study:

Research Question 1: In what ways do teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD across different teaching settings?

Research Question 2: In what ways does teaching experience correlate with perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?
Research Question 3: In what ways does previous training in special education for general education teachers correlate with teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?

Significance

Successful implementation of an inclusion program depends on the perceptions of those who work most closely with the students involved (Burke & Sutherland, 2004; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Lepelstat, 1984), particularly general and special education teachers. The present study, therefore, explored whether variations exist between general and special education teachers’ attitudes toward the inclusion of students with E/BD. Educators may apply the findings of the study to guide the development of professional training, design effective inclusion programs, and build effective collaborative systems.

Limitations

The participants in the present study were limited to the current database in one of the education service centers (ESC) located in north central Texas. The findings, therefore, may not generalize to other states or districts. Because I depended on a second party to transmit information to projected subjects, I did not have direct access to the participants. Moreover, I assumed that the use of the web-based survey was adequate to collect data needed to examine the teachers’ perceptions toward the inclusion of students with E/BD. I, however, could not manipulate the participants' honesty in their responses to the survey questions. While the application of the web-based instrument was efficient, the use of Internet and computer technology might intimidate those who do not feel comfortable with this method.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and acronyms used in the present study were defined and clarified in order to help the reader understand their meanings in the context of special education.
• Accountability system: the system that requires states to establish performance goals and indicators for all students, including students with disabilities (Hardman & Mulder, 2004).

• Emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD): the term used to describe students with emotional disturbance as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 2004 (Council for Children with Behavior Disorders, 2000; Forness & Knitzer, 1992; Merrell & Walker, 2004; Young, 2005).

• Inclusion: the physical placement of students with disabilities in general education classrooms (Cook, 2001).

• Least restrictive environment (LRE): one of the fundamental requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) that students with disabilities should be educated in general education classrooms with peers without disabilities to the maximum extent possible (Wright & Wright, 2009).

• Mainstreaming: inclusive education (Lindsay, 2007); selective placement of students with special needs in general education classes (MacCarthy, 2010).

• No Child Left Behind (NCLB): a legal statue ensuring all students will have an equal opportunity to receive a high quality education by well-prepared teachers in order to achieve important learning goals (U.S. Department of Education, 2008).

• Perception: a process by which people select, organize, and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment. Individuals first perceive, learn from perception(s), and then form attitudes. Meanwhile, attitudes influence the way people process information (Robbins & Judge, 2011). The present study uses the terms perception and attitude interchangeably.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to provide a comprehensive understanding of inclusive education for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD), Chapter 2 reviews the inclusion movement in the United States. It includes a compilation of research findings and suggestions regarding appropriate education for students with E/BD. Meanwhile, Chapter 2 discusses the placement of students with E/BD as well as issues related to personnel preparation. Most importantly, Chapter 2 examines research on perceptions toward the inclusion of students with E/BD into general education classrooms. Literature dating from 1928 to 2011 was explored using the database of ERIC, ERIC via EBSCOhost, and PQDT (ProQuest Dissertations and Theses), along with references of books, monographs, mini-library series, and resources gleaned from the originally identified sources.

Inclusion Movement in the United States

The education system in the United States advocates inclusion of all students in age-appropriate general education classrooms (Bradley, 2001). However, the use and meaning of the term “inclusion” varies widely depending on the user, the context, and the purposes involved. This confusion has caused many controversies regarding the practice of special education (Byrnes, 2008). Thus, an exploration of how the concept of inclusion has evolved over time and how this concept may affect the development of special education and its application to students with E/BD is crucial to effective implementation of current legislation, policy, and practice.

The widespread use of the term “inclusion” is a fairly recent development in the long history of special education in the United States. However, discussions and debates regarding the idea of inclusive education have always been topics of concern in the field of education
The integration of previously excluded students into the mainstream of the education system is not a new concept as a continuous integration of more students into the mainstream has been observed throughout history. In 1779 Thomas Jefferson proposed to include students from poor families in the education system. This was the first endeavor to consider greater inclusion of students in the public schools. Approximately 100 years later public education finally allowed students into schools regardless of their ability to pay (Stainback, 2000). In the early 1900s, girls were provided public educational opportunities, followed by students from racial minorities in the 1950s, and by students with disabilities in the 1970s (Smith, Polloway, Patton, & Dowdy, 2011). In 1975, Congress passed the landmark Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA), which in 1997 was reauthorized as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), a law which specified all children — including those with disabilities formerly excluded from school — were entitled to a free, appropriate public education (FAPE). To achieve this goal, students with disabilities must have an individual education program (IEP) that defines their special learning need(s) and mandates appropriate services. Moreover, appropriate funding needs to be allocated in order for students with disabilities to be educated in the least restrictive environment with their peers without disabilities (Bradley, 2001; Turnbull, Huerta, & Stowe, 2006).

According to Bartlett, Weisenstein, and Etscheidt (2002), a national philosophical change has moved toward integration and normalization of individuals’ lives since World War II. This profound and rapid change partly resulted from the fact that wounded war veterans were unwilling to accept a segregated, unproductive life. Although earlier education reformers had argued for segregated schools as the most humane and receptive environment for educating students with disabilities, many forces and developments had collectively led to a legalized commitment to educate all the U.S. young people with disabilities in the most typical school setting possible. Two of the most important social elements that occurred were the Civil Rights
Movement of the 1950s and 1960s and the development of organizations for parents and supporters of students with disabilities. In addition, several other factors contributed to the advancement of special education (Bartlett et al., 2002): (a) the education system supports the use of standardized intelligence tests and other types of reliable educational assessment; (b) new professional fields such as psychiatry, speech pathology, and educational psychology have started to develop; (c) medical understanding and treatment of diseases considered to be mysterious in the past have been improved; and (d) technological advances in critical areas (e.g., public transportation, artificial limbs and braces, electronic communication aids) help to address related issues.

As the discussions and debates about appropriate education for students with disabilities continued, terms used to describe choices about including or excluding students with disabilities evolved (Osgood, 2005; Winzer & Mazurek, 2000). While reflecting on the reforms in special education, Osgood (2005) provided an overview of the terms that have been used in special education over an extended period of American history. The terms “integration” and “segregation” were used from the early 1900s into the 1960s. During the 1970s, the term “zero reject” was used to explore the idea of including exceptional students. By 1974, the term “mainstreaming” had become prevalent for those involved in research, advocacy, policy development, professional training, and classroom practice to describe efforts to more fully integrate students with disabilities in schools. As special education entered the 1980s, the term “full mainstreaming” or “complete mainstreaming” began to be used. The idea of progressive inclusion had appeared by the mid-1980s. The terms “inclusion” and “full inclusion,” however, did not supersede “mainstreaming” as preferred terminology until the early 1990s.

Although the term “inclusion” lacks an agreed-upon definition, the primary legal
educational issues involved with inclusion are “who” decides “where” and “how” to educate students with special needs (Bartlett et al., 2002). In the 1980s and 1990s, students with disabilities were increasingly placed in general education classes as the Regular Education Initiative (REI) encouraged all students to be taught in general education classrooms and the responsibility of teaching these students to be shared by general and special education teachers (Winzer & Mazurek, 2000; Young, 2005). Meanwhile, two working forums conducted by the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD) noted one emerging theme about inclusion, the idea that “inclusion should be more than a placement issue: It should be a focus on best practices and on ways they can be delivered effectively” (Lewis, 1994, p.16). An additional theme within the best practice literature on inclusive schools is that the local district or school building must take ownership of students’ learning and develop its own definition as well as a set of working objectives in order to be successful. With the combined forces mentioned earlier, the inclusion movement in special education has continuously grown as more and more jurisdictions break through traditional barriers and create a strong support for the inclusion of all students (Winzer & Mazurek, 2000).

Since the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1975, Congress has amended the law on several occasions, most recently in 2004 as P.L. 108-446, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (Turnbull et al., 2006). In addition to this education law, two important Civil Rights laws that prohibit discrimination against students with disabilities are Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, enacted in 1973 (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 1973) and the Americans with Disabilities Act, enacted in 1990 (Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990). All three federal statutes require children with disabilities must be educated to the maximum extent appropriate with children who do not have disabilities — the concept known as the least restrictive environment (LRE; Bartlett et al., 2002). Least restrictive environment is one of IDEA’s six principles, which presumes that the
student’s education will take place in a typical setting and with students without disabilities (Turnbull et al., 2006). Only when regular placements are not appropriate due to disruption of the environment or lack of educational benefit to the student with disabilities may the student be placed in special education settings. Therefore, educators must consider the use of supplementary aids and services as well as accommodations and modifications in establishing a placement environment where the student with disabilities will benefit and will not be disruptive to other students (Bartlett et al., 2002).

Inclusion of Students with E/BD

Students with E/BD are characterized by having behavioral or emotional responses in school programs sufficiently different from appropriate age, cultural, or ethnic norms that these problems adversely affect educational performance of the students themselves and others (Forness & Knitzer, 1992). Students with schizophrenic disorders, affective disorders, anxiety disorders, or other sustained disturbances of conduct or adjustment are also included in this category. Interventions applied in general education classrooms usually would not be sufficient to help this group of students (Merrell & Walker, 2004).

Regardless of the pressure to conform to the requirements of the least restrictive environment (LRE), professionals have identified a number of obstacles that may be encountered when moving students with E/BD toward more inclusive services in general education. Students with E/BD are usually the last to be considered for inclusion because they typically present significant problems for teachers in general education settings (Gunter et al., 2002). Their behavior frequently affects not only their own learning but also the learning of others (Smith et al., 2011). Even in progressive school districts committed to inclusive education, students with E/BD are often the last disability group considered because a behavioral disability is less tolerated among general educators. The lack of tolerance further breeds a lack of acceptance of responsibility — a recognized key to quality inclusion. Also,
educators’ fear of potential violence from students with E/BD probably contributes most to the intolerance (White, 1994).

Throughout history, many obstacles and inhibitors have to be overcome in order to move toward ideal educational placements for students with E/BD. Many children exhibiting emotional and behavioral problems were denied access to education and other services prior to the 1960s. At that time, emotional and behavioral problems were considered to be a medical or psychological problem rather than an educational problem (Bradley, 2001). Terms such as “lunacy,” “insanity,” and “idiocy” were once used to label children with E/BD from the 19th through the beginning of the 20th century (Kauffman, 1976). Education for students with E/BD did not become a field of specialization until the middle of the 20th century (Kauffman, 2005).

The growing understanding of individuals with emotional and behavioral problems has improved the attitudes of the general public toward this population of students. However, many challenges still remain. The 1964 study by Morse, Cutler, and Fink on the status of classrooms for students with E/BD and the later study by Knitzer, Steinberg, and Fleisch in 1990 are two well-recognized studies.

In the 1960s, public school classes for students with E/BD were a fairly new development. Morse and colleagues (1964) received sponsorship from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) to conduct a large-scale study of public school classes for students with E/BD (labeled “emotionally handicapped” at that time). They reported the research findings from a mail survey of 117 programs and site visits to 54 programs across the United States. The findings showed the staffing and operation of the special classes often left much to be desired, although these programs seemed typically to be organized out of good intentions and with a defensible rationale. In addition, a high percentage of teachers had little or no special training. The teachers often worked individually with little support from anyone other than their building principals. Programs tended to be poorly coordinated with mental health
and other services. The curriculum and instructional methods were similar to those used in general education. The approaches used during the time of the study were more intuitive instead of systematic.

Another major national study by Knitzer et al. (1990) once again examined whether the education system appropriately served children with E/BD. The overall findings of the study were disappointing. Some disturbing findings include the pervading boredom and apathy of students during the school day, teachers’ use of ineffective instructional strategies, the curriculum of control, and the lack of support for teachers. Findings from the study revealed significant gaps in educational services for students with E/BD (Smith et al., 2011): (a) over 80% of students with E/BD are educated in general education schools; (b) approximately 50% of students with E/BD are educated for at least a portion of each school day in general education classrooms by general education teachers; (c) limited or no mental health services exist in most special education programs for students with E/BD; (d) students with E/BD receive inadequate transition services; (e) parents of students with E/BD often encounter great difficulties in securing appropriate educational programs for their children; and (f) nearly no schools provide social skills training.

Some trends can be recognized in the comparison of the 1964 and the 1990 studies. For example, in 1964, curriculum was remedial in its emphasis, whereas in 1990 it was defined largely by worksheet and seatwork. In 1964, management of children’s inappropriate behaviors included life-space interventions, self-control lessons, high expectations for performance, and positive consequences for meeting academic and social goals. On the other hand, behavior management in 1990 focused on classroom silence instead of student learning. Although many of the findings in both studies were negative, the 1990 study suggested some improvements were being made in many school districts by providing appropriate services to
students with E/BD. One important improvement was the increase of school-based mental health services (Whelan & Kauffman, 1999).

Moreover, the federal government has intended to maintain a balanced definition so that students with emotional or behavioral problems that interfere with their educational progress may receive appropriate services under the requirements of IDEA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (Bradley, 2001). Current efforts represent a significant improvement in the approaches to serving children with E/BD. Among those improvements is the fact that the U.S. Congress removed the word “serious” from the previous classification of serious emotional disturbance in response to the professional concern that the term stigmatizes individuals with emotional and behavioral problems. Congress also sought to focus attention on appropriate interventions and services that maximize outcome benefits for students (Bradley, 2001).

On the other hand, not everyone is excited about bringing students with E/BD into the general education classrooms because of several concerns. First, many classroom teachers do not have the training, resources, and other supports necessary to accommodate students who have diverse learning and behavioral needs. When classes are overcrowded, students will not be getting appropriate, specialized attention and care. Further, other students’ education will be often disrupted (Tornillo, 1994).

Moreover, inclusion seems to become a burden on educators when the federal reforms and the public at large develop higher academic standards and mandate schools to improve all students’ academic achievement. The passage of the NCLB Act in 2000 (U.S. Department of Education, 2006), for example, began to include the academic progress measures of students with disabilities. With the requirements of this statute, school district officials have the responsibility to ensure all students reach 100% student proficiency levels within 12 years on assessments that evaluate students’ ability to obtain important learning goals (Wright, Wright,
& Heath, 2004). To increase students’ achievements on competency exams, regardless of their
differences, school staff may focus constrained time and energy mainly on those who have
potential to reach grade-level expectations for performance (Lieberman, 1992; Tornillo, 1994).

Some critics suspect school administrators move toward more inclusive approaches
because of financial concerns rather than out of a concern for what is really best for students. If
schools can serve students with disabilities in general education classrooms, then schools can
reduce the expensive special education service costs due to additional personnel, equipment,
materials, and classrooms (Leo, 1994, Tornillo, 1994). Even some special educators and
parents of students with disabilities hesitate to support inclusive education. They are afraid
services and resources will be diluted when schools disperse students with special needs across
the school campus and district. They also argue students with disabilities may not have special
education teachers to advocate for them as their education responsibility shifts to general
education teachers.

The debate on the inclusion of students with disabilities may continue as many other
concerns are addressed. Placement in general classrooms, however, has always been a stated
goal of special education for students with E/BD (Guetzloe, 1994). Special education
professionals understand general education classrooms may not always be appropriate for all
students and a continuum of educational options must be maintained — as required by federal
laws. Therefore, educators’ main concern is to determine the conditions under which students
with E/BD can achieve success in the general education classrooms. Meanwhile, critical issues
of inclusion should continue to be addressed in order to improve educational placements for
students with E/BD.

Issues of Inclusion for Students with E/BD

The arguments surrounding inclusion of students with E/BD involve at least two
factors that professionals in special education must consider: placement and teacher
preparation (Landrum & Tankersley, 2000). As the field of special education for students with E/BD continues to grow and evolve, these two issues demand educators’ attention.

**Placement**

The controversy over the educational placement of students with E/BD is surely the most divisive aspect of the inclusion debate and includes attention to two elements of the settings in question. First, do inclusive settings more appropriately meet the unique needs of the students? Second, do inclusive settings offer more in terms of prosocial peer models and support of appropriate social skills than do segregated settings (Landrum & Tankersley, 2000)? According to Kauffman and Hallahan (1997), the choices of general classroom settings or special classroom settings are merely two points along a continuum of placement options that includes such arrangements as intermittent help from itinerant teachers, resource help for parts of the day, and consultative or collaborative teaching. Professionals who serve students with E/BD, after identifying and evaluating the special needs of the students, should drive efforts to place students along the continuum toward less restrictive settings rather than make a simple choice between the segregated and integrated classrooms.

In an analysis of the placement and exit patterns of students with E/BD, Landrum, Katsiyannis, and Archwamety (2004) found student data from the U. S. Department of Education indicate an increasing trend in educating students with E/BD in general education classrooms. This placement trend also mirrors a similar increase for all students with disabilities. Although the overall rate of general class placement remains lower for students with E/BD than for students with other disabilities, the rate from 1998 to 2005 increased from 27% to about 34.7% (U.S. Department of Education, 2001, 2010).

Regardless of placement for students with E/BD, the decision for placement is dependent on the benefit to the students with E/BD. If general educational classroom teachers are not prepared to work effectively with the students with E/BD, the increasing trend of
placing students with E/BD in the general education classrooms should raise educators’ concerns. Current literature shows the general education system is usually unprepared to provide appropriate services for many students with E/BD (Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Landrum & Tankersley, 2000; Robbins-Etlen, 2007). On the other hand, the body of literature on special class placement seems to offer little guidance or support for practice despite the controversy it has generated (Landrum & Tankersley, 2000; Nolte, 2010).

In reality, inclusion of students with E/BD is labor intensive. It requires rigorous effort and great levels of support for both teachers and students. Schools need to provide the support and assistance necessary to ensure students will benefit from their educational programs. Most importantly, the services students receive should be based on a comprehensive, appropriate assessment of multiple factors. This comprehensive evaluation may include the students’ specific needs, strengths, and weaknesses regarding their behavioral, cognitive, and social functioning and the influences of the family and other social systems (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2000). In addition, students should be placed, according to the decision of an interdisciplinary team, in the least restrictive environment in which those services can be delivered.

Teacher Preparation

Whether in special or general education classrooms, teachers are the professionals who continually plan and adjust curriculum as well as instruction in response to the needs of the student with E/BD. Quality teachers, therefore, will definitely increase the gains of the student no matter the setting in which the student is placed. Consequently, the attention should be directed to the training and preparation of teachers who will work with students with E/BD who not only display challenging behavior but also exhibit academic deficits (Davis et al., 2004).

Currently, educators’ ability to serve students with E/BD is disappointing even when students with E/BD are served in special education programs (Landrum & Tankersley, 2000;
Robbins-Etlen, 2007). Trends in the federal education reform, however, have made it important to prepare quality teachers in both general and special education classrooms. First, an increasing number of students with disabilities have been placed in general classrooms. Second, students with disabilities have the right to access the general curricula. Third, the movement to standards-based education has called for both special and general educators to be responsible for helping students improve their academic performance (Hardman & Mulder, 2004). While the traditional training for general education teachers focuses on working with groups of students across content domains with little attention to individual learning and behavioral differences, general education teachers need to obtain adequate knowledge about special education and inclusion so they know how to collaborate with special education teachers (Nolte, 2010).

Even for teachers who work with students with E/BD, inclusion presents an exceptional challenge resulting from the wide range of behavioral and academic problems displayed by these students (Davis et al., 2004). Special education teachers especially need to be competent working with students in both academic performance and behavioral management areas with sufficient knowledge, proficient skills, and professional wisdom. The principle of “highly qualified” in the law of No Child Left Behind refers to the qualifications of special education teachers (Turnbull et al., 2006) and stresses that special education teachers should obtain “subject matter competency” in areas in which they are the primary instructors (Hardman & Mulder, 2004). In the IDEA law, the principle of “scientifically based intervention” (known as evidence-based intervention) also requires highly qualified teachers to use scientifically based methods in evaluating a student and then to provide an appropriate education to the student (Turnbull et al., 2006). Moreover, preparing special education teachers to work collaboratively with general education teachers is important for the inclusion of students with E/BD in a standards-driven system (Hardman & Mulder, 2004) as the federal laws have included
provisions requiring students with disabilities be fully included in the content and achievement standards, assessments, and accountability systems that are the foundation of education reforms (Kohl, McLaughlin, & Nagle, 2006).

Meanwhile, Whelan and Kauffman (1999) noted recruiting teachers into the field of special education has become more and more difficult because of the stresses associated with it and also because of onerous paperwork teachers must complete to comply with federal and state laws. Another issue is the tendency to use personnel other than teachers to spend all day with a student who presents serious emotional and behavioral problems. Such practice should raise concern about whether the interactions between the paraeducator and the student enhance the growth and development of the student.

To address the shortages of adequately prepared personnel who will serve students with E/BD, the alternative teacher certification movement has become popular (Van Acker, 2004). Van Acker defined alternative teacher certification as any significant departure from the traditional undergraduate route through a teacher education program. Today, alternative certification programs are offered by a wide array of agencies as well as many colleges and universities. However, the nature, requirements, and structures of these programs differ greatly. Rosenberg, Sindelar, and Hardman (2004) analyzed the design and features of current alternative certification programs and reported several positive findings. Data indicate partnerships exist among institutions of higher education, state departments of education, and local education agencies which make it possible for instruction to be delivered through a mix of university-based coursework, district staff development, and supervised fieldwork. However, Rosenberg (2004) argued that, regardless of some advantages of the alternative certification programs, too many programs have “limited selectivity that rush candidates into difficult teaching situations with little formal training and support. Such programs may actually have little long-term impact on the shortage of special education teachers” (p. 97). Other
research indicates high rates of teacher attrition have been linked to the practice of assigning uncertified teachers to high-demand classrooms, particularly those with students who consistently display discipline problems (Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999).

Alternative certification programs that incorporate professional standards, high-quality learning activities, mentorship, and evaluation allow the recruitment and preparation for critically needed personnel in creative ways (Hogan, 2010). However, as noted earlier, effective teachers of students with E/BD require a wide range of competencies (e.g., behavior management, social skills instruction, content enhancements). The design of any teacher development program should help teachers to be competent to meet the specific needs presented by this group of students. Meanwhile, improving retention is as important as increasing the supply of new teachers (Rosenberg et al., 2004).

Researchers today, with continuous endeavors, are able to adequately identify the characteristics of effective special programs for students with E/BD. Many resources and behavioral improvement programs for educating students with E/BD have also been in place and proven successful (Bullock & Gable, 2007). Thus, teacher pre-service and in-service preparation programs should include components that will help teachers understand and implement these research-based strategies.

Teachers’ Perceptions of Inclusion

People’s attitudes are the result of their perceptions – what they perceive reality to be, instead of reality itself (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Perceptions depend on a variety of factors. These factors may include “perceiver characteristics, stimulus characteristics, and the situation, context, or interaction within which these take place” (Garvar, 1989, p. 465). The perceiver’s prior experiences, language used, current motivation, values, needs, and goals for the future may influence attitudes toward a person, an object, or an event. A review of literature regarding mainstreaming shows teachers’ perceptions are a significant factor in the
implementation of inclusion. The perception educators hold about their roles toward students with disabilities may affect the way they classify and treat these children in their classes (Coats, 2002; Lepelstat, 1984; Robbins-Etlen, 2007; Wickman, 1928). Although research has not empirically demonstrated teachers’ perceptions of the concept of inclusion correspond with teacher-student interactions or student outcomes in inclusive environments (Cook, Semmel, & Gerber, 1999; Cook, Tankersley, Cook, & Landrum, 2000), a relation apparently exists between teachers’ perceptions of their students and type and quality of teacher-student interactions (Cook, 2001). Factors affecting teachers’ perceptions of inclusion may be categorized into variables related to child, teacher, and environment (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998).

Child-related Variables

The behavior of students is an important concern for teachers. Studies find general classroom teachers often demonstrate low tolerance for students’ maladaptive behavior and nonconformity. Educators consider behaviors related to social defiance and socialized delinquency to be most disturbing (Johnson & Fullwood, 2006). Specially, general education teachers report more negative perceptions of the inclusion for students with behavioral problems (Coats, 2002). As a result, general educators tend to resist the inclusion of students whose behavior is difficult to manage in their classrooms (Walker & Rankin, 1983; Gersten, Walker, & Darch, 1988). Students perceived to exhibit less ideal student behaviors are more likely to be rejected by teachers, without regard to learning disabilities (Siegel, 1992). Teachers are more agreeable to teach students whose disabilities do not interfere with their learning or the learning of other students (Skipper, 1996). Meanwhile, teachers respond most negatively toward students characterized as aggressive and least negatively toward students characterized as avoiding their peers (Coleman & Gilliam, 1983). The impact of the child
with emotional and behavioral problems on other children creates great concerns for many teachers (Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Robbins-Etlen, 2007).

The type of disabilities or disabling conditions, however, does matter in some cases. Research shows teachers tend to change their perceptions and expectations for students with disabilities depending on the severity or obviousness of students’ disabilities (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). For example, Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) found a smaller majority of teachers were willing to include students with disabilities in their own classes, but responses varied according to the disabling condition. Cook (2001) reported teachers are inclined to show indifference toward students with severe or obvious disabilities, whereas students with mild or hidden disabilities are more likely to experience teachers’ rejection. Jahnukainen and Korhonen (2003) found only a few teachers consider the best placement for children with severe and profound intellectual disabilities is in full-time general education classes. The majority of teachers (about 80%) believe full-time or part-time special classes located in mainstream schools would be the most appropriate for these students.

In addition to problematic behavior and the type of disabilities or disabling conditions, academic competence or performance of students also affects teachers’ perceptions of inclusion. Teachers seem to be more rejecting toward students with learning problems as compared to students without learning difficulties (Siegel, 1992). Lepelstat (1984) reports a significant relationship between class achievement and teacher perceptions — teachers of higher achieving classes are more negative and see more detrimental academic effects from placing students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms.

Teacher-related Variables

Some studies show female teachers are more receptive than male teachers to mainstreaming students with emotional disturbance and learning disabilities (Gerber, 1993). Other researchers report different results. For example, Ernst and Rogers (2009) suggest male
teachers report more favorable attitudes than do female teachers. McIntyre (1988) reported the special education referral rate among regular classroom teachers identified female teachers as more likely to refer students with high levels of disruptive and problematic behavior than their male teacher counterparts. However, when overt, acting-out behavior is not present, the referral rates do not differ between female and male teachers. The trend of female teachers being less tolerant to externalizing types of behaviors within regular classrooms is also reported by Ritter (1989).

Results of investigations on teachers’ training backgrounds (e.g., research results on how a teacher’s gender affects his or her perceptions of inclusion) do not all point in the same direction. Gerber (1993) found no significant differences between the groups of art teachers, special education teachers, and regular education teachers based on whether the teachers (a) have one or more 3-credit special education courses, (b) attend school district in-service training in special education, or (c) attend Special Education Resource Center (SERC) workshops. Several researchers, on the contrary, found little support for the effects of training background or previous experience on teachers’ perceptions of inclusion (Hastings & Oakford, 2003; MacCarthy, 2010). Vaughn, Schumm, Klinger, and Saumell (1995) found that lacking professional preparation and not being willing to teach students with special needs are barriers to inclusion. Similarly, Avramidis et al. (2000) discovered teachers who have been implementing inclusive programs or have active experience of inclusion hold more positive perceptions.

Research generally shows the importance of professional development in the formation of positive attitudes toward inclusion (Burke & Sutherland, 2004; Johnson & Cartwright, 1979). Teachers with university-based professional development particularly appear to have more positive attitudes and be more confident in meeting the IEP requirements of students with special education needs (Dupoux, Wolman, & Estrada, 2005; Ernst & Rogers,
2009; Van Reusen, Shoho, & Barker, 2001). Meanwhile, teachers’ attitudes toward and knowledge about mainstreaming are not significantly influenced by their area of specialization or academic achievements (Johnson & Cartwright, 1979). Such findings, however, may have changed since the late 1970s (Johnson & Fullwood, 2006).

While teaching experience is individually correlated with attitudes toward integration of students with disabilities, it is not a significant predictor when other variables are considered at the same time. For instance, the implicit obligations on teachers may affect their perceptions of inclusion. Although teachers may feel inclusion can provide some benefits, whether they have sufficient time, skills, training, or resources necessary for effective inclusion raises many issues to be resolved (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Meanwhile, teachers’ teaching subject areas (Ellins & Porter, 2005; Johnson & Fullwood, 2006) and highest degree earned (Johnson & Fullwood, 2006) also correlate with their perceptions of disturbing behaviors.

Interestingly, country of origin seems not to be an influential variable in determining teachers’ perceptions toward integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms. Although the teachers evaluate the inclusion process in different ways and tend to implement it differently, most teachers support inclusion (Heiman, 2004). This may be because the notion of “a culture of teaching” supersedes the influence of the different national cultures in which teaching takes place (Dupoux et al., 2005).

**Educational Environment-related Variables**

Bullock, Zagar, Donahue, and Pelton (1985) examined and compared the characteristics of students with behavioral disorders being educated in five settings: (a) resource rooms in public schools, (b) self-contained classrooms in public schools, (c) psychiatric hospitals, (d) residential treatment centers, and (e) state training schools for the adjudicated. The result showed teachers’ perceptions and ratings of the behavior of youth
with behavioral disorders varied across settings. Similar results can be found in the study by Muscott (1996). Teachers assigned to resource rooms expect more appropriate behavior from their students than do peers assigned to teach in separate, special schools and residential placements. Teachers assigned to special classes express more rigorous standards than their peers who teach in residential schools.

Rock (1990) tried to identify specific special program/teacher variables which predict the mainstreaming of children with serious emotional disturbance to less restrictive educational environments. His research results indicate mainstreaming orientation and demographic characteristics of restrictive programs, along with particular experiences/training of teachers, are significant predictors of the mainstreaming of children with serious emotional disturbance.

When having special education teachers serve as consultant teachers and mainstream teachers as collaborators, students with disabilities in regular education classes are more likely to gain acceptance from the teacher (Kessler, 1993). For both special and general educators, administrative support and collaboration are predictors of positive attitudes toward full inclusion (Ernst & Rogers, 2009; Robbins-Etlen, 2007; Villa, Thousand, Meyers, & Nevin, 1996). Teachers who have access to resources, such as curricular materials and the support of other professionals, are positively inclined to inclusion. Noting regular classroom teachers rate behavior as more problematic than do special education teachers, Safran and Safran (1987) conclude teacher judgments of problem behavior reflect more on the classroom context (disruptive vs. non-disruptive) instead of the classroom environment. Teachers generally identify students with problem behaviors as causal in a disruptive classroom due to their fears of behavioral contagion.

Conclusion

The LRE mandate of the IDEA sets forth a clear Congressional preference for
integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms. While students with E/BD possess unique characteristics and thus present challenges in various aspects, educators who work closely with these students need to make a commitment to improving services in order to increase the chances of students’ success not only in the inclusive classrooms but also in their communities (Aiello & Bullock, 1999). Teachers, playing a major role in the implementation of inclusion, should always understand how they form their perceptions and how their mindsets may affect their reactions to children’s behavior (Wickman, 1928).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research on teacher perceptions of inclusion for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD) may help to design professional development activities (Al Khatib, 2007; Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005), guide collaboration among stakeholders (Carter & Hughes, 2006; Ernst & Rogers, 2009; Etscheidt, 2006; Lindsay, 2007; Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006), and thus improve the special education quality for students with E/BD (Kessler, 1993). I examined the ways educators differed regarding the inclusionary practices for students with E/BD in general education settings. The present study also analyzed characteristics of the participants, as noted in the demographic information accrued from the survey, in order to determine the impact of teacher-related variables on the implementation of inclusion.

Research Questions

Literature shows teacher perceptions of inclusion affect the implementation of inclusionary practices (Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000; Gavish & Shimoni, 2011; MacCarthy, 2010; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Perceptions held by teachers are tied to their sense of ability to effectively meet the needs of their students (Bandura, 1977; Gavish & Shimoni, 2011). Findings of studies, however, are not consistent regarding how different variables affect teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices (Gavish & Shimoni, 2011; MacCarthy, 2010; Robbins-Etlen, 2007). To promote teachers’ self-efficacy and, therefore, improve the success of students with E/BD in their inclusionary settings, the present study examined how factors related to student, teacher, and environment correlated with teachers’ perceptions of including students with E/BD in their classrooms. As collaboration among teachers is critical for successful inclusion (Robbins-Etlen, 2007), the present study identified
differences between special education teachers and general education teachers. The following research questions guided the present study:

Research Question 1: In what ways do teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD across different teaching settings?

Research Question 2: In what ways does teaching experience correlate with perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?

Research Question 3: In what ways does previous training in special education for general education teachers correlate with teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?

Selection of Participants

Participants in the present study included teachers in the current database in one of the education service centers (ESC) in north central Texas which serves 66 school districts of widely varying sizes and located in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The administrative staff of the ESC assisted with the study by transmitting information provided by me to potential participants via e-mail. Teachers were invited to respond to the survey website embedded in the invitation to participate in the study.

Instrumentation

The present study applied the instrument adapted from Teacher Attitudes Inclusion Inventory modified by Alhamad (2006) from an attitudinal survey. To establish the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, Alhamad conducted two pilot studies. Pilot Study 1 updated the terminology used and directed the questions toward teachers’ perceptions of inclusion for students with E/BD. Responses from 133 special education and general education teachers were reviewed and analyzed. The results showed six of the subscales had good reliability: (a) Behavior, .70; (b) Class Placement, .74; (c) Self-concept, .81; (d) Time and Work, .70; (e) Other Students, .71; and (f) Teacher, .82. Based on the comments provided by the
participants and the data analysis, the questionnaire items were reduced from 47 to 33 questions. Pilot Study 2 was conducted with 338 special education and general education teachers to ensure the reliability and validity of the revised questionnaire. A factor analytic method was applied to assess the validity. The construct validity of the instrument was completed using principal component factor analysis. The results showed three factors with Eigen values above 1.0 were apparent: (a) Students with E/BD in the general classroom, 12.49; (b) Behavior of students with E/BD in the general classroom, 2.80; and (c) Teacher efficacy, 1.85. The Cronbach alpha reliability for these factors was .91, .85, and .86 respectively. The final version of the questionnaire contained 26 items.

I investigated the ways teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Moderate changes were made from the original design (e.g., format change, electronic form, update terminology, item order) of Alhamad (2006). The title of the questionnaire was changed to Survey on Teacher Perceptions of Inclusionary Practices for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (TPIP). Meanwhile, the modified instrument was submitted to five teachers who have taught general and/or special education. The teachers examined the survey to determine whether the content and clarity of the survey was appropriate and adequate to achieve the purpose of the proposed study. Analysis of the feedback resulted in minimal modifications.

Data Collection Procedures

After the modification of the survey, I contacted the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of North Texas with the proposed letter of invitation to participate (Appendix A) and the TPIP survey (Appendix B) in order to obtain official approval for the research. Once the approval from IRB was received, I sent the letter of invitation to participate in the survey to the contact person at the ESC where she identified the sample for the present study. The information on the survey, which was accessible by clicking a link
provided in the invitation e-mail, was sent to participants through the contact person at the designated time.

In the invitation e-mail, I asked participants to complete the TPIP survey, a Likert-type web-based survey with two sections. Section A included questions pertaining to the demographics information of the participants. Items in Section A were designed to determine variables that might affect teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Section B requires participants to check their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Items in Section B intended to obtain information regarding teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Participants responded to the survey questions by clicking the selection items that best describe them. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The consent of each participant to act as a subject in this research was implied by the return of the completed survey. To encourage teachers’ responses to this survey, an online random number generator was used to choose a winner for a $50 gift certificate. As participants responded to the survey any time during a 5-week time frame, I saved the submitted survey information in a database for later analysis. To increase the response rate, I had e-mails sent three times within this period of time reminding potential participants to complete the survey.

Sample Size

A G* Power 3.1.2 was conducted to determine the sample size required to conduct all planned analyses. Although the largest group (number of children in the classroom) has 7 levels, it was unlikely that I would have sufficient distribution across those 7 levels because the response rate was not as high as she had anticipated. Therefore, I collapsed across levels of that group and calculated the power analysis on a 3- subscale
survey with a 4-level categorical variable. As a result, the sample size required to detect a moderate effect size \((f = .30)\) in the MANOVA, an alpha = .05, and power = .80 was 88 teachers. Therefore, a sample size of 88 usable teachers’ responses would be adequate for all analyses to account for potential outlier data and missing data (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

Analysis of Results

Once the data were collected and entered into an electronic data file (SPSS 19.0), I conducted various analyses. Descriptive analyses were conducted on the demographic variables. Categorical demographic variables were analyzed with frequencies and percentages. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the items’ factor loadings (Child, 1990). A reliability analysis (e.g., Cronbach’s alpha) was also conducted to measure the consistency of the items (Carmines & Zeller, 1979).

Research Question 1 asked “In what ways do teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD across different teaching settings?” A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to determine differences between subscale scores (Bray & Maxwell, 1985; Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). Furthermore, separate MANOVAs were conducted to test the effects of different teaching settings. Multiple linear regressions were also conducted to determine if any of the demographic factors were predictive of teachers’ perceptions (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010).

Research Question 2 asked “In what ways does teaching experience correlate with perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?” A MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of teaching experience on perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. In addition, a multiple linear regression was conducted to predict teachers’ perceptions from teaching experiences (Cohen et al., 2003; Hair et al., 2010).
Research Question 3 asked “In what ways does previous training in special education for General education teachers correlate with teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?” To examine this third research question, a separate MANOVA was conducted to test if the effect of special education training for general education teachers affected their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. A linear regression was conducted to predict teachers’ perceptions about inclusionary practices for students with E/BD from special education training (Cohen et al., 2003; Hair et al., 2010).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of the present study was to examine the ways teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD) in three areas: inclusion of students with E/BD, behaviors of students with E/BD, and teacher efficacy. Chapter 4 presents the data tabulated with SPSS (Version 19.0), which includes several areas: (a) a sample description, (b) reliability and validity, and (c) results of the three research questions.

Sample Description

The original sample size was 172. The final sample size was 127. Reasons for removing 45 participants from the original sample included the following:

- 24 participants were removed because they did not complete Section A
- 21 participants were removed because they did not complete Section B

The sample size of 127 participants satisfied the least requirement of 88 participants according to the power analysis previously conducted. Meanwhile, because the numbers of invitations sent were not reported by administrators, the rate of response for the present study was unable to determine.

To ensure that the data were distributed evenly across the categories of responses, some of the demographic variables were combined as follows:

1. For highest degree earned, only 2 people had doctoral degrees. Masters and doctoral degrees were combined into a single category compared to bachelor's degree.

2. For years of teaching experience and years of teaching experience with students with E/BD, categories were combined into 0-3 years, 4-9 years, 10 or more years.

3. For student age levels, middle school and junior high school were combined. Also, for student age level, there were 10 participants who indicated "other" and their responses
varied ranging from elementary to high school. Therefore, those people were eliminated from the analyses, pertaining to that just that variable (not to actually remove the participants).

4. For number of students with E/BD, the categories were combined into none, 1-2, and 3 or more.

5. For number of special education courses taken, the categories were combined into: none, 1, and 2 or more.

Table 1 is the result of the descriptive analyses based on the demographic information (Section A) of the survey.

Reliability and Validity

In running the confirmatory and reliability analyses for the three perception subscales, all scores in the second subscale (i.e., behaviors of students with E/BD) were coded reversely. The Cronbach’s alpha for Perceptions of Inclusion of Students with E/BD (α = .860) and Perceptions of Behaviors of Students (α = .851) were above .80 and considered good. The reliability for Perceptions of Teacher Efficacy (α = .785) was acceptable as its Cronbach’s alpha lay between 0.8 and 0.7. I conducted the confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) to reassure the validity and reliability of the present study. The result of the confirmatory factory analysis showed that all the items in each subscale loaded on one component and the factor loadings of each question item were above .50, explaining at least half of the corresponding subscale (Table 2). Furthermore, CFAs in each of these subscales (i.e., Perceptions of Inclusion of Students with E/BD, Perceptions of Behaviors of Students with E/BD, Perceptions of Teacher Efficacy) respectively explained 51.7%, 48.9%, and 49.3% of teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.
Table 1

*Frequencies and Percentages for Categorical Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s or Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Teaching Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Age Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to Two</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Education Course Taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained Classroom for Students with E/BD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School for Students with E/BD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Teacher/Behavioral Specialist in School Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room to Support Students Special Needs Assigned to General Education Classrooms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Teacher to Support Students with E/BD Served in General Education Classroom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher in General Education Classroom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Frequencies not adding to 127 and percentages not summing to 100 reflect missing data.*
Table 2

**Factor Loadings of the Items within Three Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Question Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. A student with E/BD will develop a more positive self-concept as a result of being placed in a general education classroom</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. The inclusion of students with E/BD into a general education classroom setting represents an opportunity for a teacher to grow professionally and personally.</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD (8 items)</td>
<td>20. General education students will profit from contact with students from E/BD.</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. The assignment of a student with E/BD to a general education classroom is a wise administrative decision.</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. If I were a parent of a student with emotional/behavioral problems, I would want him/her to be in a general education classroom for most of the school day.</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. A student with E/BD who is assigned to a general education classroom is likely to develop a more positive attitude toward school.</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. The experience of being in a general education classroom will increase the likelihood of a student with E/BD attaining a productive and independent place in society.</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. A student with E/BD will likely form positive social relationships with other students in the general education classroom.</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD (9 items)</td>
<td>15. A student with E/BD is likely to be disruptive in a general education classroom.</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. If a student with E/BD is placed in a general education classroom, there will be an increase in management problems.</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. I believe that the inclusion of students with E/BD into the general education classroom will harm the educational achievement of normal achieving students due to their disruptive behavior.</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. If a teacher is to be successful in teaching students with E/BD, he/she should have fewer students in the classroom in order to meet the students' academic and behavioral needs.</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 *(continued)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Question Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD (9 items) <strong>(con’t.)</strong></td>
<td>22. Referrals to the school principal for disciplinary actions will likely occur more frequently for a student with E/BD than for other students in a general education classroom.</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. A student with E/BD assigned to a general education classroom will adversely affect other children's motivation to learn.</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. The disruptive behavior of students with E/BD in the general education classroom will likely increase the number of behavior problems of other students.</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. A student with behavioral needs in my classroom necessitates an excessive amount of time for curriculum planning.</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. There is insufficient time in a teacher's day to deal satisfactorily with the varied needs of both general education and students with E/BD.</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy (6 items):</td>
<td>12. I believe my work is more interesting when given the opportunity to work with students with E/BD.</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. I am concerned that I may not be able to work effectively with students with E/BD.</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. I am confident that I will be able to make students with E/BD feel comfortable in my classroom.</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. In general, I am not temperamentally suited to be successful with students with E/BD.</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Teaching students with E/BD increases my overall teaching competence.</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. In general, I look forward to the challenge of working with students with E/BD.</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked “In what ways do teachers differ in their perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD across different teaching settings?” A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to test the differences between the TPIP subscale scores. There was a main effect of the subscales, multivariate effect: $F (2, 125) = 73.97, p < .001, \eta^2 = .542$. Participants’ scores on the perceptions of inclusion of students with E/BD subscale...
were significantly higher than their scores on the perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD. Furthermore, participants’ scores on perceptions of teacher efficacy were significantly higher than their scores on the perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD (Table 3).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception Subscale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1. Multivariate effect: $F(2, 125) = 73.97, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .542$. 2. Means with different superscripts indicate significant difference, $p < .05$.

A MANOVA was conducted to test the effect of teaching settings on the TPIP subscale scores. There was an effect of teaching assignment on the TPIP subscale scores, multivariate effect: $F(3, 123) = 6.52, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .137$. Teaching settings had a significant effect on perceptions of teacher efficacy, multivariate effect: $F(1, 125) = 14.23, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .102$. Special education teachers had significantly higher scores on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy ($M = 3.92, \ SD = .63$) than general education teachers ($M = 3.48, \ SD = .64$). Teaching settings did not have a significant effect on the other two subscales, all $ps$ not significant (Table 4).

A series of multiple linear regressions were conducted to predict TPIP subscale scores from the demographic variables. The overall model predicting perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD from the demographic variables (i.e., gender, highest degree earned, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment) was not significant, regression model:
$F(10, 107) = 1.14, p = .338$, adjusted $R^2 = .012$. Furthermore, there were no individual significant predictors of perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD (Table 5).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception Subscale Scores by Principal Teaching Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Teaching Settings</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.92 b</td>
<td>.63 b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1. Multivariate effect: $F(3,123) = 6.52, p < .001, \eta^2 = .137$. 2. Means with different superscripts indicate significant difference, $p < .05$.

The overall model predicting perceptions about behaviors of students with E/BD from the demographic variables (i.e., gender, highest degree, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment) was significant, regression model: $F(10, 107) = 2.32, p = .016$, adjusted $R^2 = .101$. There were, however, no individual significant predictors of perceptions about behaviors of students with E/BD (Table 5).

The overall model predicting perceptions about teachers’ efficacy from the demographic variables (i.e., gender, highest degree, years of teaching experience, and teaching assignment) was significant, regression model: $F(10, 107) = 3.23, p = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .160$.

Furthermore, years of teaching experience was a significant predictor of perceptions of teacher efficacy, regression model: $F(10, 107) = 3.23, p = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .160$. Those who had 10 or more years of general education teaching experience, compared to those who had 0 to 3 years of general education teaching experience, were more likely to have lower scores on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy ($\beta = -.435$). Years of teaching
experience with students with E/BD was also a significant predictor of perceptions of teacher efficacy ($\beta = .341$).

Table 5

*Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Perceptions Subscale Scores from Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Behavior of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Teacher Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male vs. Female</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Earned</td>
<td>Master’s or Doctoral vs. Bachelor’s</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching General Education 4 to 9 Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching General Education 10 or more Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Students with E/BD</td>
<td>Teaching E/BD 4 to 9 Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching E/BD 10 or more Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assignment</td>
<td>Special Education vs. General Education</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Age Levels</td>
<td>Elementary vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School/Junior High vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* 1. Summary regression models of the subscales (i.e., Inclusion of Student with E/BD, Behavior of Students with E/BD, Teacher efficacy): $F (10, 107) = 1.14, p = .338$, adjusted $R^2 = .012; F (10, 107) = 2.32, p = .016$, adjusted $R^2 = .101; F (10, 107) = 3.23, p = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .160$. 2. $\beta$s with * indicate significant difference, $p < .01$.

Those who had 10 or more years of teaching experience with E/BD students, compared to those who had 0 to 3 years of general education teaching experience, were more likely to have higher scores on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy. Finally, teaching
assignment was a significant predictor of perceptions of teaching efficacy ($\beta = .242$). Those who had a special education teaching assignment were more likely to score higher on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy than those who had a general education teaching assignment (Table 5).

Results for Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked “In what ways do teaching experience correlate with perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?” A MANOVA was conducted to test the effect of years of teaching experience on the TPIP subscale scores. Results showed that years of teaching experience did not have a significant effect on overall TPIP subscale scores, multivariate effect: $F (6, 244) = 1.54, p = .166, \eta^2 = .036$. Furthermore, years of teaching experience did not have a significant effect on each individual TPIP subscale score (Table 6).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Multivariate effect: $F (6, 244) = 1.54, p = .166, \eta^2 = .036$.

Meanwhile, years of teaching experience with students with E/BD did not have a significant effect on overall TPIP subscale scores, multivariate effect: $F (6, 244) = .59, p$
Furthermore, years of teaching experience with students with E/BD did not have a significant effect on individual TPIP subscale scores (Table 7).

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception Subscale Scores by Years of Teaching Experience with Students with E/BD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate effect: $F(6, 244) = .59, p = .741, \eta^2 = .014$.

Finally, number of students with E/BD taught did not have a significant effect on overall TPIP subscale scores, multivariate effect: $F(6, 152) = 1.106, p = .362, \eta^2 = .042$.

Furthermore, number of E/BD students taught did not have a significant effect on individual TPIP subscale scores (Table 8).

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception Subscale Scores by Number of Students with E/BD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Number of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or Two</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or Two</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or Two</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate effect: $F(6, 152) = 1.106, p = .362, \eta^2 = .042$. 
A series of multiple linear regressions were conducted to predict TPIP subscale scores from the years of teaching experience, years of teaching experience with students with E/BD, number of EBD students, gender, and student age levels. The summary of the results is presented in Table 9.

The overall model predicting perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD was not significant, regression model: $F(10, 69) = 1.54, p = .144$, adjusted $R^2 = .064$ (Table 9). Teaching experience was, however, a significant predictor of perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD. Teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience were more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of the inclusion of students with E/BD than those who have 0 to 3 years of experience ($\beta = -.476, p = .026$).

The overall model predicting perceptions about behaviors of students with E/BD was significant, regression model: $F(10, 69) = 2.97, p = .004$, $R^2 = .199$. Furthermore, student age was a significant predictor of perceptions about behaviors of students with E/BD. Those who taught elementary age children were more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD than those who taught preschool and kindergarten students ($\beta = -.318, p = .030$).

Finally, the overall model predicting perceptions of teacher efficacy was not significant, regression model: $F(10, 69) = 1.46, p = .175$, adjusted $R^2 = .055$. Furthermore, there was no individual significant predictor of perceptions about teacher efficacy, all $p$s not statistically significant.
### Table 9

**Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Perception Subscale Scores from Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Teaching Experience with Students with E/BD, Number of Students with E/BD, and Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Behavior of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Teacher Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching General Education 4 to 9 Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching General Education 10 or more Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-.476*</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Teaching Students with E/BD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching E/BD 4 to 9 Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching E/BD 10 or more Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students with E/BD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 vs. None</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or More vs. None</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male vs. Female</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.318*</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1. Summary regression models: $F(10, 69) = 1.54, p = .144$, adjusted $R^2 = .064$; $F(10, 69) = 2.97, p = .004$, $R^2 = .199$; $F(10, 69) = 1.46, p = .175$, adjusted $R^2 = .055$. 2. $\beta$s with * indicate significant difference, $p < .05$. 3. $F$ ratios are for the full model.

#### Results for Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked “In what ways does previous training in special education for general education teachers correlate with teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?” It should be noted that these analyses were only used for general education teachers. A MANOVA was conducted to predict TPIP subscale scores from number of special education courses taken.
Results showed that number of special education courses taken did not have a significant effect on overall TPIP subscale scores, multivariate effect: $F(6, 144) = .678, p = .668, \eta^2 = .027$. Furthermore, number of special education courses taken did not have a significant effect on individual subscale scores (Table 10).

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception Subscale Scores by Number of Special Education Courses for Teachers with General Education Credentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Courses Taken</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors of Students with E/BD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate effect: $F(6, 144) = .678, p = .668, \eta^2 = .027$.

Finally, a series of multiple linear regressions were conducted to predict TPIP subscale scores from number of special education courses taken (with covariates). It should be noted that these regressions were conducted only with general education teachers’ scores. Summary of the results are shown in Table 11.

The overall model predicting perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD was not significant, regression model: $F(10, 66) = 1.67, p = .106$, adjusted $R^2 = .081$. Teaching experience was, however, a significant predictor of perceptions about inclusion of students with E/BD. Teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience were more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of inclusion of students with E/BD than those who have 0 to 3 years of experience ($\beta = -.488, p = .014$).
Table 11

**Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Perception Subscale Scores from Number of Special Education Courses and Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Inclusion of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Behavior of Students with E/BD</th>
<th>Teacher Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Education Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vs. None</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vs. None</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male vs. Female</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching General Education 4 to 9 vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching General Education 10 or more Years vs. 0 to 3 Years</td>
<td>-.488*</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 Students with E/BD vs. None</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or More Students with E/BD vs. None</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.398*</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School vs. Preschool to Kindergarten</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F Ratio = 1.67
F Ratio = 3.54
F Ratio = 1.29

Note: 1. Summary regression models: $F(10, 66) = 1.67, p = .106$, adjusted $R^2 = .081$; $F(10, 66) = 3.54, p = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .251$; $F(10, 66) = 1.29, p = .257$, adjusted $R^2 = .036$. 2. $\beta$s with * indicate significant difference, $p < .01$. 
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The overall model predicting perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD was significant, regression model: $F (10, 66) = 3.54, p = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .251$. Furthermore, student age was a significant predictor of perceptions about behaviors of students with E/BD. Those who taught elementary age children were significantly more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of behaviors of EBD students than those who taught preschool and kindergarten students ($\beta = -.398, p = .009$).

Finally, the overall model predicting perceptions of teacher efficacy was not significant, regression model: $F (10, 66) = 1.29, p = .257$, adjusted $R^2 = .036$. Furthermore, there was no individual significant predictor of perceptions about teacher efficacy, all $p$s non-significant.

Comments from Participants

Forty-four participants commented on issues of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD, with 22 general education teachers and 20 special education teachers reporting. Table 12 presents a brief summary of these comments.

Table 12

| Summary of Factors to Be Considered for Successful Inclusion for Students with E/BD |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| Factors                        | f (n = 44)      | Rank Order |
| Individual Situation of the Student with E/BD | 29              | 1      |
| Resources and Support          | 13              | 2      |
| Teacher’s Capability           | 12              | 3      |

Based on the comments from the participants, general education teachers and special education teachers both considered the individual profile of a student with E/BD to be important for successful inclusionary practices. “Every student is different. Each has his/her own unique circumstances and each requires a different approach” (Subject 115). The severity of a student’s disorder in terms of its manifestation and duration particularly needed
to be taken into account. As shared by one teacher, a student with E/BD had to be removed from the general education classroom after attacking the teachers on various occasions. The student finally “got a place in a ED room with a couple of students and 3 adults” (Subject 22).

Moreover, a student’s relationship with the classroom teacher and peers determined whether the inclusion would benefit the student with E/BD. For example, one teacher stated that her student was able to show self-control and slow down his impulsive reaction when the teacher discussed his choices and the consequence of his choices prior to an outburst. Another student, however, was disliked by his peers; no one wanted to work or sit with him. The student did not benefit from inclusion because of his negative relationship with his classroom peers.

The classroom teachers’ resources, support, and capability also received close considerations from the participants. Due to “the increase of budget cuts and oversized classes”, one teacher considered that “a student with any disability or disorder is at a greater risk to fail as are all children in the educational setting” (Subject 112). Another teacher agreed on problems of lacking resources saying that students with disabilities tended to be placed in “a room with little follow-up or assistance” (Subject 118). Difficulty of inclusion is “because of the system we have with the ever decreasing resources available,” stated another teacher (Subject 118). With regard to teachers’ ability to include students with E/BD in a general education classroom, one teacher felt that “adequate planning and successful classroom management strategies” would increase the chances of successful inclusion (Subject 25).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to investigate variables related to teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD). Teacher participants responded to an online survey in terms of their perceptions of inclusion of students of E/BD, behavior of students with E/BD, and teacher efficacy. Chapter 5 includes interpretation of the present study’s major findings supported or refuted by articles on inclusion issues. Limitations of the present study are addressed. Recommendations for future research are also provided.

Interpretations of Major Findings

This section presents major findings integrated from the results of the three research questions previously stated. I explain major findings for Research Questions 1 and 2 in the section on Teaching Experience, while results for Research Question 3 are discussed under Special Education Courses Taken. 

Teaching Experience

Research Questions 1 and 2 asked how teachers differ in terms of their teaching level and teaching experience regarding inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Findings of the present study showed teaching experience was a significant predictor of teacher’s perceptions regarding placement of students with E/BD in a general education classroom. Teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience were more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of inclusion of students with E/BD than those who have 0 to 3 years of teaching experience. For example, teachers with more years of teaching experience tended to disagree that a student with E/BD would likely form positive social relationships with other students in the general education classroom. Teachers may
develop such perceptions because teachers with more years of teaching experience possibly had more negative experience with current inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

In studying the effect of teaching experience on teachers’ perceptions of inclusion, Alhamad (2006) stated that special education teachers’ perceptions toward placement of students with E/BD in inclusive classrooms were associated with their negative teaching experience. One reason for these negative associations may be a limited staffing of inclusion teachers on campus. Moreover, factors such as time restraints, insufficient support, and inadequate skills may also affect work with students with E/BD. Studies have shown that high rates of teacher attrition have been linked to the practice of assigning uncertified teachers to high-demand classrooms, particularly teachers with students who consistently display discipline problems (Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999). Successful teaching experience, on the other hand, may help teachers develop positive perceptions toward inclusion. For example, Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden (2000) discovered that teachers who have been implementing inclusive programs or have active experience of inclusion held more positive perceptions.

Second, findings of the present study showed that student age was a significant predictor of teachers’ perceptions regarding behaviors of students with E/BD in a general education classroom. Teachers who taught elementary age children were significantly more likely to score lower on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD than teachers who taught preschool and kindergarten students. It should be noted that all the subscale scores and items in the present study needed to be conceptually in the same direction so that all of the subscale scores were in a positive direction, including the perceptions about behavior. Therefore, scores on the subscale of teachers’ perceptions regarding behaviors of students with E/BD were reversely coded. As a result, teachers who scored low on the perceptions regarding behaviors of students with E/BD were more likely to
agree on statements in this subscale. For example, teachers scored low in the subscale of perceptions regarding behaviors of students with E/BD would agree that “a student with E/BD is likely to be disruptive in a general education classroom” as stated in question item 15. Thus, why did elementary school teachers in the present study, compared to preschool and kindergarten teachers, have lower scores on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of behaviors of students with E/BD?

Elementary school teachers, compared to preschool and kindergarten teachers, start to face pressure from academic expectations. The No Child Left Behind Act may pressure teachers to believe that behaviors of students with E/BD would disturb other children’s learning (U.S. Department of Education, 2006; Tornillo, 1994). The pressure from academic expectations should be the same for teachers teaching students of older ages. In the present study, however, why did teachers teaching students at middle school/junior high and high school not express a lower degree of perceptions on the subscale that measures behaviors of students with E/BD when compared to teachers teaching preschool and kindergarten? One of the reasons may be students of older ages are emotionally and cognitively mature enough to manage problems resulting from behaviors of students with E/BD in the classroom so that teachers teaching students of older ages are less concerned about the impact of problems students with E/BD may create in the classroom. In fact, Alhamad (2006) indicated that student age did not have an effect on special education teachers’ perceptions of placement of students with E/BD in a general education classroom. For general education teachers, however, student age had an effect: Elementary and middle school teachers held more positive perceptions of placement of students with E/BD in a general education classroom. It is noted that findings of studies do not show consistent results regarding the impact of student age on teachers’ perceptions of placement of students with E/BD in a general education classroom.
Third, findings of the present study showed that special education teachers had significantly higher scores on the subscale that measures teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy than general education teachers. Compared to general education teachers, special education teachers are more likely to have a higher degree of perceptions on the subscale that measures their competence of teaching students with E/BD. The principle of “being highly qualified” in No Child Left Behind Act requires that special education teachers should obtain “subject matter competency” in areas in which they are the primary instructors (Hardman & Mulder, 2004). As a result of this mandate since 2000, special education teachers have been well equipped to serve students with E/BD in inclusionary settings. Other studies on inclusion, however, found that educators’ ability to serve students with E/BD was disappointing even when students with E/BD were served in special education programs (Landrum & Tankersley, 2000; Robbins-Etlen, 2007). Such results are contradictory to the present study and raise concerns that teachers’ perceptions about their ability to serve students with E/BD might not reflect program effectiveness due to limitations of the research that is based on responses from self-report questionnaires. Meanwhile, research continuously shows that general education teachers need to obtain adequate knowledge about special education so that they know how to collaborate with special education teachers (Nolte, 2010). Knowledge and skills needed to include students with E/BD in a general classroom even require more specific training in this regard.

In conclusion, teachers who have positive experience with inclusionary practices for students with E/BD are more likely to have a higher degree of positive perceptions about integrating students with E/BD in a general education classroom. When other variables are considered at the same time, however, teaching experience may not be a significant predictor for teachers’ perceptions of inclusion for students with E/BD. For instance, time, skills,
training, resources, and many other factors necessary for successful inclusion for students with E/BD continue to raise issues to be resolved.

**Special Education Courses Taken**

Research Question 3 asked how special education courses taken by general education teachers affected their perception of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Therefore, the analyses focused only on teachers with general education credentials. Findings of the present study showed that number of special education courses taken by general education teachers did not have a significant effect on overall or individual subscale scores. This result was consistent with research that training background had little support for the effects of training on teachers’ perceptions of inclusion (Hastings & Oakford, 2003; MacCarthy, 2010). For example, Gerber (1993) found no significant differences on perceptions of inclusion among teachers, whether teachers (a) had one or more three-credit special education courses, (b) attended school district in-service training in special education, or (c) attended special education resource center (SERC) workshops.

The result of the present study that special education courses taken did not significantly affect general education teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD contradicts results from other studies on the same issues. Research generally shows the importance of professional development in the formation of positive perceptions of inclusion (Burke & Sutherland, 2004; Johnson & Cartwright, 1979). Teachers with university-based professional development are more likely to develop more positive perceptions of inclusion and be confident in meeting the IEP requirements of students with special education needs (Dupoux, Wolman, & Estrada, 2005; Ernst & Rogers, 2009; Van Reusen, Shoho, & Barker, 2001). Ineffective teacher preparation programs or in-service training may explain why special education courses taken by general education teachers did
not make significant differences regarding their perceptions of inclusionary practices as found in the present study.

In studying the effect of special education courses taken by general education teachers regarding teachers’ perceptions of inclusion for students with E/BD, Alhamad (2006) found a significant positive, modest correlation between training and teachers’ perceptions. Alhamad’s finding of the positive correlation between training and teachers’ perceptions on inclusion for students with E/BD may be explained by the importance of effective training as it affects teachers’ perceptions. Vaughn, Schumm, Klinger, and Saumell (1995) found that lacking professional preparation and not being willing to teach students with special needs are barriers to inclusion. Many alternative teacher certification programs with “limited selectivity” probably rush candidates into difficult teaching situations with little formal training and support. Such programs may have little long-term impact on the successful inclusionary practices (Rosenberg, 2004).

Reflections

The findings of the present study need to be confined because of the following considerations:

1. The findings only represented responses from the sample used in the present study, which was the current database in one of the education service centers (ESC) in north central Texas.

2. Comments made from participants, requiring optional responses in the survey, merely provided a broad picture regarding what teachers considered to be critical in order to implement successful inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

3. The response rate of the survey was unable to be calculated as I had no information regarding how many invitations were sent by designated administrators.
4. Only variables identified in the present study were examined. Many other factors not included might also contribute to the success of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

5. The survey was conducted only one time without considering that teachers’ perceptions might change over time along with other factors regarding the inclusionary practices for students with E/BD.

6. The findings of the present study, due to its nature of quantitative research, could not provide insights for each individual campus regarding how to implement successful practices for the inclusion of students with E/BD.

Recommendations

**Implementation of Practices**

In order to facilitate inclusionary practices for students with E/BD, the following guidelines must be observed and tailored according to the condition of each individual campus:

1. Identify the individual needs of a student with E/BD.

2. Carefully match teachers and a student with E/BD.

3. Offer adequate support by:
   a. Providing sufficient training for teachers in areas not only specifically helpful to work with students with E/BD but also applicable to other students.
   b. Giving information of resources.
   c. Making classroom assistance available as needed.

4. Maintain collaboration and timely follow-ups among those involved in the process.

Researchers today have adequately identified the characteristics of effective special programs for students with E/BD. Many resources and behavioral improvement programs for
educating students with E/BD have also been in place and proven to be successful (Bullock & Gable, 2007). Thus, teacher pre-service and in-service programs should include components that will help teachers understand and implement these research-based strategies.

**Future Research Direction**

Future research may continue to investigate variables related to teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD, including other possible factors and testing in a larger population. On the other hand, future research may identify actionable factors that will improve current inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Instead of continuously exploring factors related to teachers’ perceptions, future research may provide in-depth understanding and make the research results applicable to practices implemented in each individual district or campus. I would suggest the use of qualitative research specifying areas such as the following:

1. What are three of the most challenging issues in current inclusionary practices for students with E/BD?
2. What are evidence-based practices currently implemented to help with the inclusion of students with E/BD?
3. How effective are these current practices?
4. What types of training are needed for educational personnel to enhance their effectiveness with students with E/BD?
5. What types of support are needed to enhance teacher effectiveness?
6. What types of resources are needed to facilitate appropriate learning opportunities?

In addition to teachers’ self-reports, observations from supervisors and administrators may help create a coherent picture of the issues investigated. Moreover, investigation over time would reflect updated changes and trends concerning the inclusionary practices for
students with E/BD. Results obtained from the research may help develop programs for in-service training and future teacher preparation.

Summary

The present study examined variables affecting teachers’ perceptions of inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. Factors identified would provide insights for decision-makers in terms of appropriately placing a student with E/BD in an inclusionary setting. Future researchers need to conduct in-depth examinations in order to develop training that would adequately equip teachers to serve students with E/BD in inclusionary settings.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE
Dear Colleague,

My name is Yu-Wen Grace Lee, a doctoral student in the Special Education program at the University of North Texas (UNT). I am conducting a research study titled “Perceptions of Inclusionary Practices for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. The result of the research will help improve the quality of education for students with E/BD.

I invite your assistance by completing a survey which will take approximately 15 minutes. Your consent is implied by completing the survey. After completing the survey, you have an opportunity to include your personal information in order to enter into a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift certificate. Please note that any personal information given will not be connected to your survey responses in any way. The winner will be contacted by e-mail no later than March 31.

I sincerely hope that you will access the survey and complete the information requested. If you have questions regarding the present study, please contact the investigator, Yu-Wen Grace Lee by e-mail at Yu-WenLee@my.unt.edu, or you may contact the faculty sponsor, Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock at 940-565-3583 or via email: Lyndal.Bullock@unt.edu.

If you are willing to participate in the present study, please do the following:

1. Click on the link http://web3.unt.edu/bullock/TPI
   (Note: If your email program does not accept HTML, type the web address in your browser.)

2. Respond to items on the survey.

Your assistance with the study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Yu-Wen Grace Lee
APPENDIX B

SURVEY ON TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF INCLUSIONARY PRACTICES FOR
STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS
The purpose of this survey is to accrue information that may help to examine the perceptions of general and special education teachers regarding the inclusionary practices for students with E/BD. The result of the research will help improve the quality of education for students with E/BD.

• Participation in this survey is voluntary. You have the right to withdrawal at any time with no penalty or loss of rights.
• The survey will take approximately 15 minutes.
• All data obtained will remain confidential. The confidentiality of your information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding the present study.
• There are no foreseeable risks for completing this survey.
• This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB may be contacted at 940-565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.
• For those who complete the survey, there is an opportunity to participate in a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift certificate. Any personal information given will not be connected to your survey responses in any way.
• You may print a copy of this notice for your records.

By clicking Continue you agree that you have read and understand the informed consent and are ready to proceed with the survey. If at any time you would like to withdraw from the survey, please close your browser.

If you have questions regarding the present study, please contact the investigator, Yu-Wen Grace Lee by e-mail at Yu-WenLee@my.unt.edu, or you may contact the faculty sponsor, Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock at 940-565-3583 or via email: Lyndal.Bullock@unt.edu.
Section A: Demographic Information (For the following items, please indicate the response which best describes you and your work.)

1. What is your gender?
   Female    Male

2. What is your highest degree earned?
   Bachelor’s Degree    Master’s Degree    Doctoral Degree

3. Altogether, how many years of teaching experience do you have?
   0–3    4 – 6    7–9    10–12    13–More

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have working with students who are diagnosed as E/BD?
   None    1– 3    4 – 6    7–9    10–12    13–More

5. Currently, what is your principal teaching assignment at the school where you work?
   General Education Teacher    Special Education Teacher

6. In general, which best describes the teaching credential you currently hold?
   General Education Credential    Special Education Credential

7. Which best describes the age level of students you teach?
   Preschool –K    Elementary    Middle School
   Junior High School    High School    Other (please state)

8. As a teacher in a general education classroom, how many students with E/BD have you had altogether in your class or classes? (Note: Special education teachers skip to item #10.)
   None    1-2    3-4    5-6    7-8    9-10    11 or more

9. As a general education teacher, how many courses in special education have you taken at the college/university level?
   None    One    Two    Three or More

10. As a special education teacher, which one best describes the framework in which you work: (Note: General education teachers skip this item.)
__Teacher in a self-contained classroom for students with E/BD.
__Teacher at a special school for students with E/BD.
__Serve as a crisis teacher or behavioral specialist in my school building.
__Resource room to support students with special needs who are assigned to general education classrooms.
__Inclusion teacher to support students with E/BD who are being served in a general education classroom.
__Teacher in a general education classroom.
__Other (please state)

Section B: (The following items are designed to solicit your perceptions about inclusionary practices.)

11. A student with E/BD will develop a more positive self-concept as a result of being placed in a general education classroom.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

12. I believe my work is more interesting when given the opportunity to work with students with E/BD.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

13. I am concerned that I may not be able to work effectively with students with E/BD.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

14. The inclusion of students with E/BD into a general education classroom setting represents an opportunity for a teacher to grow professionally and personally.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

15. A student with E/BD is likely to be disruptive in a general education classroom.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

16. If a student with E/BD is placed in a general education classroom, there will be an increase in management problems.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

17. I believe that the inclusion of students with E/BD into the general education classroom will harm the educational achievement of normal achieving students due to their disruptive behavior.
18. I am confident that I will be able to make students with E/BD feel comfortable in my classroom.

19. If a teacher is to be successful in teaching students with E/BD, he/she should have fewer students in the classroom in order to meet the students’ academic and behavioral needs.

20. General education students will profit from contact with students with E/BD.

21. In general, I am not temperamentally suited to be successful with students with E/BD.

22. Referrals to the school principal for disciplinary actions will likely occur more frequently for a student with E/BD than for other students in a general education classroom.

23. A student with E/BD assigned to a general education classroom will adversely affect other children’s motivation to learn.

24. The disruptive behavior of students with E/BD in the general education classroom will likely increase the number of behavior problems among other students.

25. The assignment of a student with E/BD to a general education classroom is a wise administrative decision.

26. Teaching students with E/BD increases my overall teaching competence.

27. If I were a parent of a student with emotional/behavioral problems, I would want him/her to be in a general education classroom for most of the school day.

28. In general, I look forward to the challenge of working with students with E/BD.
29. A student with behavioral needs in my classroom necessitates an excessive amount of time for curriculum planning.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

30. A student with E/BD who is assigned to a general education classroom is likely to develop a more positive attitude toward school.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

31. There is insufficient time in a teacher’s day to deal satisfactorily with the varied needs of both general education students and students with E/BD.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

32. The experience of being in a general education classroom will increase the likelihood of a student with E/BD attaining a productive and independent place in society.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

33. A student with E/BD will likely form positive social relationships with other students in the general education classroom.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

Please add any comments about inclusionary practices for students with E/BD that you may desire:

If you would like for your name to be entered into the drawing for a $50.00 Amazon gift certificate, please provide your name and e-mail address below. This information will in no way be connected to your survey responses.

Name________________________________________________________

E-Mail Address________________________________________________

Thank you again for your participation in this research survey.
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