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This study identified the expected knowledge/skills needed for working with children and youth with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) in general education classroom settings, as identified by general educators. A survey instrument containing 52 knowledge/skills statements, previously identified as critical for working with students with E/BD by special educators, was administered to 150 general elementary, intermediate, middle, and secondary teachers. Mann-Whitney U tests were calculated to determine the differences between general educators’ beliefs and special educators’ beliefs regarding necessary knowledge/skills for working with students with E/BD. Three areas were investigated for differences: (a) Importance, (b) Proficiency, and (c) Frequency of Use. Three open-ended, unstructured questions were also included in the survey and responses to these questions were summarized.

The findings indicated that general educators and special educators differ in all three areas (Importance, Proficiency, and Frequency of Use) regarding knowledge/skills necessary for working with students with E/BD. The findings also indicated that general educators possess ideas regarding successful indexes for inclusion of children and youth with E/BD into the general education classroom setting and possible barriers to inclusion of children and youth with E/BD into the general education classroom setting.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY


Integration

Before there was mention of inclusion for children and youth with disabilities, there were early integrative efforts which focused on individualized physical, functional, social, and societal integration of children and youth with disabilities. Physical integration refers to placement of students in maximally normalized settings. Functional integration refers to planned use of school facilities and resources to accomplish specified goals, and social integration refers to planned, ongoing social contact between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers. Societal integration focuses on preparing students to work, live, and recreate independently in their
School integration continues to be a process oriented to individual needs for the purpose of preparing students to live independently. However, as educators and parents seek to provide integrated school experiences for students who historically have been denied public school access, full-time general education placement for all students continues to be a goal (Sailor et al., 1989; Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989). Integration involves allowing the lesser system members (special education) to join the more favored (mainstreamed) system. Such mainstreaming is contingent upon demonstrating that participation will be in accordance with the standards of the dominant system. To be integrated successfully, the student must be ready to compete, in some fashion, within "normal" expectations of general education as it currently exists.

Inclusion in Comparison to Integration

Inclusion differs from integration in several ways (Simpson & Sasso, 1992):

1. Inclusion is advocated for every child. Thus, considerations of individual needs is secondary to maximum exposure to normalized environments and typical peers.

2. Variables related to societal integration are abandoned in favor of an integrated school experience.

3. Advocates for inclusion of all students choose to ignore empirically validated procedures in favor of a model that reflects not what we know to be true, but, instead, how we would like things to be.

In summary, inclusion implies the existence of one unified educational system from the beginning, encompassing all students equitably without regard to variations in their status. From such a perspective there is no need for integration because there is no initial separation. All degrees of variation in students' needs and performances will be accommodated.

Critics and Proponents of Inclusion

Inclusion clearly is based on and supported by an interest in doing the "right thing." Very few would disagree that professionals and parents are advocates for children and youth with disabilities.
In being advocates, these two groups strive to identify and implement programs and procedures that are in the best interest of the students and their families. The debate lies in just what is the "right thing" to do. Proponents of inclusion argue that there are problems associated with segregated educational programs for children and youth with disabilities, including instructional discontinuity (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986), curricular and experimental limitations (Stainback & Stainback, 1984), and restricted educational options (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989).

Critics of inclusion say that classroom modifications supportive of mainstreaming, such as reduced class size, teacher availability, increased teacher planning time, and support services, are needed for successful full-time general education integration of children and youth with disabilities (Myles & Simpson, 1989, 1990; Simpson & Myles, 1990). Other critics of inclusion address the problem that general education teachers should not be made responsible for students who follow nontraditional curricula (Jenkins et al., 1990).

Inclusion and Children and Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Regardless of the arguments, there is a trend toward inclusion is becoming a viable model in states across the nation. The trend involves including students with disabilities in the general classroom setting. As expected, many educators and parents have concerns regarding the inclusion efforts. Children and youth with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) are of particular concern to many special educators (Kauffman & Pullen, 1989; Kauffman & Wong, 1991; Muscott, 1988). The more severe the student's behavioral problems, the more difficult it is to carry out a successful program of instruction in an inclusive setting. Students with E/BD are referred most for special education placement by general education teachers (Hutton, 1985; Minner, 1989; Ritter, 1989). Once identified as E/BD, these students are among the least acceptable candidates for reintegration or inclusion (Braaten et al., 1988; Downing-Anderson, Simpson, & Smith-Myles, 1990; Gans, 1987; Janney & Meyer, 1990; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992; Safran & Lutz, 1984).

The perception held by general educators that students with E/BD are "disturbing" is linked to
the idea that these students are antisocial, inattentive, defiant of authority, and disruptive (Bullock, Zagar, Donahue, & Pelton, 1985). Several studies (Cullinan, Epstein, & Kauffman, 1984; Gersten, Walker, & Darch, 1988, Medway, 1979) suggest that the attributional assumptions many general educators hold regarding causality and stability of students' behavioral problems, as well as their view of the severity and manageability of the problems, contribute to the resistance of general educators to welcome these students back into their classrooms (Safran & Safran, 1987).

General education teachers also feel that they are incapable of managing the situations that arise with students with E/BD (Kauffinan & Wong, 1991; Landon & Mesinger, 1989; Landrum & Kauffman, 1992, Medway, 1979). Studies show that less than half of the general education teacher population received any coursework dealing with specialized instruction (Brown, Gable, Hendrickson, & Algozzine, in press). Considering these facts, it is no wonder that general educators feel insufficiently prepared to cope with the demands imposed upon them by students with E/BD.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to survey general education teachers regarding their beliefs concerning expected knowledge/skills needed to provide a successful instructional environment for students with E/BD within inclusive settings. Three areas of responses were examined: (a) Importance, (b) Proficiency, and (c) Frequency of Use. The survey instrument used in this investigation was developed in an earlier study (Bullock, Ellis, & Wilson, 1994) and modified to include only 52 of the original 201 knowledge/skills statements (see Appendix A). The results of this survey were compared to data from the Bullock et al., (1994) study, which examined teachers of students with E/BD regarding their beliefs concerning expected knowledge/skills needed to provide a successful instructional environment for students with E/BD.

Significance of the Study

With the trend toward the inclusion of children and youth with E/BD in the general classroom setting and with the most resistance occurring from general educators with this population, it is beneficial to identify what general educators believe to be the necessary skills for working with this
population. As states across the nation begin to adopt inclusive policies for their public education systems, there is a need to identify what knowledge/skills general education teachers need or already possess for teaching children and youth with E/BD. This study focuses on knowledge/skills needed to teach children and youth with E/BD.

Limitations of the Study

Identification of a representative sample of general education teachers can be a limitation to any educational study because of the difficulty of entry to school districts for research purposes. Utilizing only local school districts for research populations possibly made the research population selective. The researcher acknowledges that the sample used in this study was highly selective. Also, acknowledgement is made of the fact that the general education teachers surveyed may not have wanted the researcher to be knowledgeable of their deficits in proficiency regarding the inclusion of special populations in their classrooms.

Definitions of Terms

Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (E/BD): a categorical term used to refer to deviations in the normal course of psychosocial development that are related to impaired interactions between the individual and the environment (Bullock, 1992a). This term is used synonymously with the federal disability category "severely emotionally disturbed," as defined by Public Law 94-142:

(i) The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked extent, which adversely affects education performance.

(A) An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors;
(B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory relationships with peers or teachers;
(C) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances;
(D) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or
(E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

(ii) The term includes children who are schizophrenic. The term does not include children who
are socially maladjusted unless it is determined that they are seriously emotionally disturbed (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services [OSERS], 1977, p. 42).

Inclusion: physical and social participation in a general education program on a full-time basis (Bullock, 1992b).
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A thorough literature search was conducted in the following areas: (a) Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) documents; (b) Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI); (c) United States Department of Education Research Library, Washington, DC; and (d) PsychLit on-line catalog.

Preparing Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (E/BD) for the General Education Classroom

There is limited research concerning deliberate attempts to teach students who are returning to the general education classroom from special education settings to deal with the rigors of the general classroom. Graubard, Rosenberg, and Miller (1974) taught students to make eye contact with teachers, to request extra help, and to engage in reinforcing behavior such as sitting up straight and nodding in agreement with the teacher. Morgan, Young, and Goldstein (1983) taught students with E/BD to prompt teachers to assist them, to praise teachers for giving them help, and to prompt teachers to show approval of their academic and social performance. The problem lies in the fact that most students with E/BD are either unable to maintain skills after instruction is discontinued or they are unable to generalize these skills to non-instructional situations.

Preparing General Education Teachers to Teach Students with E/BD

With the apparent lack of training of general education teachers or preparation of students for re-entry into general education classrooms, the need to train and prepare general classroom teachers for inclusion of special populations into their classrooms becomes a priority (Johnston, 1990; Leyser

The focus of providing improved teacher preparation programs has found merit in that public schools want bright, intelligent teachers to provide services to students (Berry, Noblit, & Hare, 1985). However, quality teachers are often not the ones chosen to fill such positions. The assumption that every individual who possesses an education degree and a provisional teaching certificate is competent is a poor assumption.

Critical Competencies Needed for Inclusion of Students with E/BD

Special educators play a complex role in the provision of services for students with disabilities (Blasi, 1981; Kauffman & Wong, 1991; MacAulay, 1990; McManus & Kauffman, 1991; Reynolds, 1980; Wong, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1991). These teachers must be prepared to respond confidently and competently to a variety of situations. An inability to do so may result in either (a) inappropriate educational placement options, (b) violations of due process rights, (c) overall poor decisions involving the design of effective instructional and behavioral management procedures, or (d) all three.

Identifying competencies needed by teachers of children and youth who may be classified as E/BD has long been a concern of teacher educators (Bullock, Dykes, & Kelly, 1974; Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Cullinan, Epstein, & Schultz, 1986; Haring & Fargo, 1969; Hewett, 1966; Mackie, Kvaraceus, & Williams, 1957; Polsgrove & Reith, 1979; Ramsey, Algozzine, & Stephens, 1989). By cooperatively developing and stating training goals in terms of competencies, teacher educators can begin to standardize the goals and evaluate the effectiveness of their training programs through analyzing their students' abilities to meet the stated competencies.

History of Identification of Competencies Needed to Teach Students with E/BD

Historically, numerous studies have been done in the area of teacher competencies for teachers
who teach students with E/BD. Mackie et al. (1957) conducted one of the earliest studies related to identifying competencies needed by teachers who teach students with E/BD. At the time, it was one of the most comprehensive attempts to identify and evaluate teacher preparation. The study identified 88 competencies, which were defined by a special study group. These competencies were placed into eight categories, including (a) knowledge of the child, (b) curriculum, (c) materials and methods, (d) testing and test information, (e) guidance, (f) the teacher as a professional team worker, (g) parent and public relations, and (h) the teacher as a person. The list of competencies was sent to 147 teachers in randomly selected states. The respondents were selected as "superior" teachers working in a cross-section of situations: urban and rural centers, public and private schools, residential and day schools, and home and hospital programs. Of the 75 teachers who answered the questionnaire, 39 were classroom teachers. Respondents rated each competency along a four-point scale in terms of its importance for teaching children and youth classified as "socially maladjusted."

A total of 20 competencies identified as very important were related to a number of complex skills, such as (a) knowledge and ability for establishing and operating a stimulating, flexible, and tension-free classroom environment capable of meeting each child's individual needs; (b) ability to make accurate differential diagnoses and to interpret psychological tests, reports, and case histories; (c) ability to counsel students with regard to their attitudes and problems; (d) ability to manage a child's individual social behavior and develop self-control; (e) knowledge of the causes of behavior problems and of students' psychological needs, and (f) ability to work with other professional groups.

The Mackie et al. (1957) report reflected emphasis on many areas, and a picture of the ideal teacher of children and youth with E/BD emerged as one who should be (a) warm, accepting, stable, tolerant, and knowledgeable about personal and interfamilial dynamics involved in children and youth with E/BD, (b) able to function as a member of a treatment team involving other professionals and to understand and cooperate with the therapeutic orientation of psychiatrists and psychologists; (c) capable of developing individualized educational programs for teaching students according to their ability to learn and of translating research into effective teaching practices; and (d) capable of
providing counseling for students consistent with the therapeutic program supplied by other
treatment sources.

Rabinow (1960) described competencies and a related training program for preparing teachers
of students with E/BD to function as members of treatment teams that included representatives from
psychiatry, psychology, and sociology. These competencies were initiated out of the
Neuropsychiatric Institute (NPI), affiliated with the University of California at Los Angeles. These
competencies were not as extensive as the Mackie et al. (1957) study, but there was an intent to be
more specific concerning the skills needed for teachers.

Hewett (1966) identified a hierarchy of seven competencies of teachers of students with E/BD,
based on his experience in training teachers at the Neuropsychiatric Institute (NPI) (UCLA). He saw
the need for teachers of students with E/BD to be objective in assessing teacher outcomes and for
communicating these to others. Flexibility, defined as the capacity to alter programs and tactics to
meet the needs of a child with E/BD, was considered an essential skill because of the fluctuating
demands and tolerance levels of students with E/BD. Hewett (1967) also recognized the need for
teachers of E/BD to establish social and educational structure (limits) with regard to classroom rules
and academic expectations. In addition, teachers of E/BD had to be resourceful in creating a
motivating and appropriate curriculum for meeting individual children's educational needs.

Providing positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior was also seen as an indispensable skill for
teachers of E/BD, according to Hewett. He saw a major skill requirement for teachers of students
with E/BD in providing instruction (curriculum expertise) and a stimulating intellectual model.

The emphasis on accountability in special education was possibly first discussed by Haring and
Fargo (1969) when they observed that the true test of teaching competence was not measured in
terms of the coursework but in the effects teacher behavior produced on pupil behavior. They
identified eight teacher competencies essential for teaching students with E/BD: (a) observation and
behavioral analysis; (b) use of academic, verbal, social, physical, and behavior assessment
information for program planning; (c) selection of appropriate instructional materials and
identification of motivational requirements of the child; (d) use of contingency management procedures for establishing and maintaining learning activities; (e) continuous monitoring of data for evaluating student progress; and (f) application of teaching skills to individual and group teaching situations.

Early attempts to examine those knowledge/skills needed by teachers of E/BD have been the foundation for the research that began in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Bullock et al. (1974) approached teacher competencies for teachers of E/BD in a different format. They utilized a nine-heading cluster format. Cluster headings included (a) field experiences, (b) programming, (c) background overview, (d) assessment diagnosis, (e) administration, (f) utilization of personnel and resources, (g) management, (h) evaluation and research, and (i) theory and knowledge. Once major cluster areas were identified, competency goal statements were placed under these headings. Goal statements were behaviorally stated and eventually utilized in the teacher preparation program at the University of Florida.

Kerr, Salzberg, Shores, and Stowitschek (1979) identified a list of competencies for field-based training programs for E/BD teachers that included five competencies in the area of assessment and planning and seven competencies in the area of direct training and evaluation. They asked graduate teachers to identify from a list of behaviors provided by teachers competencies that were most useful in promoting changes in student behavior.

Field-based observations of the frequency of teacher use of the above skills revealed that task analysis was the most frequently used competency, followed closely by criterion-referenced testing, then instructional programming, concept analysis, and observation. Prompting, modeling, shaping, direction giving, and questioning were the major competencies employed by the teachers in applied situations.

Gable, Hendrickson, Young, and Shokoohi-Yekta (1992) conducted a survey to identify and compare the perceptions of teachers of students with E/BD and those of special teacher educators. One hundred and eleven teachers and 25 teacher trainers (a) estimated the number of hours teachers
spend weekly executing various responsibilities/competencies; (b) rated the importance of those competencies to teacher effectiveness; and (c) judged the adequacy with which teacher preparation programs are equipping teachers to carry out these responsibilities. Results revealed a general consistency between teachers and teacher educators along these three dimensions in relation to six competency areas: assessment, planning, instruction, behavior management, consulting, and administrative skills.

The rationale of teacher competency assumes that behaviors and attributes can be identified, taught, and objectively measured (Cullinan et al., 1986). Previously, competencies for teachers of students with E/BD were identified by experts in the field (e.g., Bullock, 1988; Fink & Janssen, 1993; Joyce & Weinke, 1989; Polsgrove & Reith, 1979). The total number of clusters range from six areas (Joyce & Weinke, 1989) to nine areas (Bullock, 1988). These studies are again broken by clusters into specific skill statements that range from 34 individual skills to 227 individual skills, respectively.

Current Focus on Teacher Competencies Needed for Teaching Students with E/BD

Bullock et al. (1994) utilized a list of competencies needed by teachers of students with E/BD (created after obtaining aggregate sets of teacher knowledge/skills for teaching students with E/BD from several university special education programs) in order to create a survey instrument pertaining to teacher competencies. After these sets of knowledge/skills statements were obtained, an extensive validation process was performed. The following steps were used to validate knowledge/skills statements:

1. All 1,341 statements were placed on 3 x 5 cards.
2. Statements were carefully reviewed by the authors; duplicates were eliminated, and some statements were combined into a single statement. After this extensive process of validation and cross-checking by the researchers, 209 knowledge/skills statements remained.
3. Nine categorical headings were established (per categorical data obtained in earlier studies by
the senior author [Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Bullock et al., 1974]), plus one labeled as other.

4. Ten graduate students with training in E/BD were asked to independently sort the statements into the established categories. Any statement that did not appropriately fit within one of the established categories was to be placed under the category other. The card sorts were recorded and reviewed, and decisions were made by the researchers as to what would be the best categorical placement for the items. Items placed under the category other were reviewed by the researchers, and decisions were made as to whether additional categories were needed, or if they could logically be placed under an existing category. Because two or more raters agreed on the categorical placement for most of the statements, the process was considered reliable, as assessed by inter-rater agreement (McMillan & Schumacher, 1984). Two categories were identified from the category other which appeared to stand apart from the nine previously identified categories. These categories were consultation/collaboration and parents. As a result, these two additional categories were added.

5. Once all items were placed in a category, four doctoral-level teacher trainers and experts in the field of E/BD were given an extensive research packet, which contained the 209 knowledge/skills statements and specific directions asking each researcher to carefully critique the list of statements and make recommendations as to (a) whether the items were accurate, clear, and readable; (b) whether they agreed with the categorical placement of the items; and (c) whether additional items were needed. When two or more of the same recommendations were made by the experts, these recommendations were incorporated into the final list of statements. The final list was comprised of 201 statements organized under 11 different categories.

6. In survey form, the final list, made up of 201 items, was then sent to a sample of special educators to assess the importance of each knowledge/skills statement, the perceived proficiency for each knowledge/skills statement, and the frequency of use for each knowledge/skills statement. This list of knowledge/skills statements had 11 categories and 201 knowledge/skills statements. The sample of special educators was obtained by first sending a letter to a geographic representative sample of members of the Council for Children with Behavior Disorders Division of the Council for
Exceptional Children. After agreeing to participate in the study, respondents were sent the survey package (consisting of survey instructions and a demographic data sheet) to complete and return to the researchers.

The following is a list of the 11 knowledge/skills areas with the number of knowledge/skills statements for each knowledge/skills area: (a) foundation information (22); (b) general knowledge (33); (c) theory and knowledge (10); (d) assessment/screening (24); (e) behavior management (31); (f) programming (37); (g) field experience/practice (13); (h) parents (16); (i) evaluation, research, & technology (7); (j) consultation and collaboration (4); (k) resources (4). An analysis was done to determine the weighted mean ratings on Importance, Proficiency, and Frequency of Use by category and then ranked by importance. The ranked 11 knowledge/skills categories (1st to 11th) are as follows: (a) behavior management; (b) consultation/collaboration; (c) assessment/screening; (d) programming; (e) resources; (f) parents; (g) evaluation, research & technology; (h) foundation information; (i) theory & knowledge; (j) field experience; and (k) general knowledge. Briefly, the 11 knowledge/skills categories were defined as follows: (a) foundation information--focuses on terminology, classification procedures, and historical development of E/BD systems; (b) general knowledge--focuses on unique applications of the Council for Exceptional Children Core of Knowledge/skills as related to E/BD specifically; (c) theory and knowledge--focuses on the examination of theories as they relate to the etiology of the disorder of E/BD, diagnosis, and the designing of intervention systems that would facilitate the emergence of a personal orientation and philosophy; (d) screening/assessment--focuses on the development of a knowledge base of appropriate screening/assessment practices as they relate specifically to the E/BD population; (e) behavior management--focuses on the examination of systems/procedures that may be applied/utilized to facilitate social/emotional growth of students with E/BD; (f) programming--focuses on the examination of classroom organization, instructional management, and individualized curricular applications designed to facilitate academic, social, and emotional growth of students with E/BD; (g) field experience/practice--focuses on opportunities for students-in-training to participate
in hands-on experiences, with students with E/BD (mild to severe) being served in a variety of placement options, ranging from the least restrictive to most restrictive; (h) parents--focuses on increasing the students'-in-training understanding of the needs of parents and how to effectively communicate with parents and assist them in becoming more facilitative advocates for their children; (i) evaluation, research, and technology--focuses on techniques and procedures available to classroom teachers to assist in student and program evaluation, student database management, and the use of Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) and Computer Managed Instruction (CMI); (j) consultation and collaboration--focuses on the consultative and/or collaborative role of the special educator in ensuring that appropriate educational services are provided to students with E/BD and in working with teachers and other direct service providers; and (k) resources--focuses on the techniques that teachers of E/BD can utilize in working with a wide variety of school and community-based professionals in order to facilitate delivery of appropriate services to students with E/BD.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to identify the expected skills needed for working with children and youth with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD), as identified by general educators. The following section describes the methodology for the present study. Organization for this section is as follows: (a) research questions; (b) sample selection; (c) setting; (d) experimental design; (e) data collection, and (f) data analysis.

Research Questions

As demonstrated in the review of literature, a considerable amount of investigation has been accomplished regarding identification of knowledge/skills needed by teachers who work with students with E/BD. As a result of this literature review, the following research questions directed the current investigation.

Research Question 1. Will general educators ascribe a greater degree of importance to the 52 knowledge/skills statements identified as critical by special educators in the Bullock et al. (1994) study than will special educators, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Research Question 2. Will general educators report a lesser degree of proficiency for knowledge/skills than will special educators, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Research Question 3. Will general educators report a lesser frequency of use for knowledge/skills than will special educators, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Sample Selection

The nature of the study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Texas, Denton. Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the director
of general education and by administrators in the research and evaluation departments in the school
districts selected for participation in this research study. General educators from selected school
districts, grade levels (K through 12), were delivered the 150 knowledge/skills surveys containing 52
survey items and 3 open-ended, unstructured items. The surveys were distributed to general
education teachers who had taught, were currently teaching, or were preparing to teach in a classroom
setting where students with E/BD were in attendance with their nondisabled peers.

Setting

Three school districts (four elementary schools, one intermediate school, one middle school, and
two secondary schools), located in North Central Texas were utilized for this study. School districts
previously identified as those which were considered to ascribe to an inclusive schools model and
which had in place or were moving toward the development of this model were utilized in this study.

Experimental Design

The knowledge/skills survey research package utilized in this investigation (see Appendix A)
was previously validated in a study by Bullock et al. (1994). The knowledge/skills survey is
composed of 11 defined knowledge/skills categories containing a total of 52 knowledge/skills
statements and three open-ended, unstructured items regarding inclusion practices. The three open-
ended, unstructured questions were related to inclusion of students with E/BD, but did not call upon
the respondent to indicate a response within an established range. The rationale for using open-
ended, unstructured questions was that research indicates that respondents seldom answer the way
they are expected to respond, if they are free to provide any answer they wish (Alreck & Settle,
1985). In this investigation, respondents were provided free rein in responding to questions
regarding possible successful indexes for inclusion or possible barriers to the success of inclusion.
Using the open-ended, unstructured questions, the researcher had an opportunity to make better
estimates of respondents' true intentions, beliefs, and attitudes regarding the inclusion of children and
youth with E/BD into general classroom settings. The survey package contained an introduction to
the survey with instructions for completion, a terminology section with definitions for all terminology
considered to be special-education specific in nature, and a demographic survey requesting information regarding each teacher's academic and teaching background.

Data Collection

Survey packages were hand delivered to the participating school districts. The researcher visited each of the school building principals. Each school principal was provided a research proposal (briefly outlining the research study), directions for distributing survey packages, and a date by which the researcher would return to collect the survey packages. On the designated pick-up date, the survey packages were gathered by the researcher. All survey data were collected from the school districts in March 1994.

Data Analysis

After survey packets were returned, data were subjected to two types of analysis. The first analysis involved summing the responses for Importance, Proficiency, and Frequency of Use across all knowledge/skills categories for each survey, thereby producing 33 mean responses for each survey case. To do this, the mean response for Importance, Proficiency, and Frequency of Use for each of the 52 knowledge/skills statements for each survey was computed.

In the second analysis, a comparison was made between the data from this study and the survey data from the study which surveyed special educators (Bullock et al., 1994). In an effort to determine the specific differences between the two groups (special educators and general educators) regarding their opinions on specific knowledge/skills, Mann-Whitney U test analyses were computed (Siegel, 1956). Mann-Whitney U test analyses were chosen because the data were ordinal (and as such did not fulfill the basic assumptions of analysis of variance). In addition, Mann-Whitney U test analyses allow for an examination of differences among sets of groups. The accepted level of significance for this study was established at the .05 significance level. These analyses assisted the researcher in answering the three research questions. An anecdotal discussion of data from the three open-ended, unstructured questions and a discussion of demographic data is provided in the discussion section.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to survey general education teachers regarding their beliefs concerning expected knowledge/skills needed to provide a successful instructional environment for students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) within inclusive settings. The survey instrument used in this investigation was developed in an earlier study (Bullock et al., 1994) and modified to include only 52 of the original 201 knowledge/skills statements (see Appendix A). The results of this survey were compared to data from the Bullock et al. (1994) study, which examined teachers of students with E/BD regarding their beliefs concerning expected knowledge/skills needed to provide a successful instructional environment for students with E/BD.

Survey forms were distributed to 150 general education elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers from three school districts located in the North Central Texas area. One hundred surveys were distributed (20 surveys to each school) to three elementary, one middle, and one intermediate schools. Of these surveys, 81 were utilized in the study. Nineteen surveys were not used because of incomplete information. Fifty surveys were distributed (25 surveys to each school) to two high schools. Of these surveys, 15 were utilized in the study. Thirty-five surveys were not utilized from this group because of incomplete or insufficient information. The total sample size utilized in this study was 96. Of these, 43 survey respondents were elementary teachers, and 53 respondents were middle/secondary teachers.

The demographic sheet used with the survey asked each participant to respond to 12 areas (see Appendix A). The complete demographic breakdown for all participants in this investigation can be found in Appendix B.
Research Questions

Three research questions were generated to guide the study. Each question is addressed individually in this section, along with the statistical procedures utilized, the results, and a brief discussion.

Research Question 1

Will general educators ascribe a greater degree of importance to the 52 knowledge/skills statements identified as critical by special educators in the Bullock et al. (1994) study than special educators, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Data from the Mann-Whitney U tests analyses on Importance are represented in Table 1. The response range for Importance was one to five, with 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest; therefore, a high mean rank score would represent a lesser degree of importance being ascribed. The data were analyzed by each of the 11 knowledge/skills categories. (Definitions of those 11 knowledge/skills categories can be found in Chapter 2.) In Table 1, data from the present study were represented by a (1) following its mean rank score, and data from the earlier research report (Bullock et al., 1994) are represented by a (2) following its mean rank score.

Table 1

Mann-Whitney U Test Analyses by Knowledge/Skills Category for Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>U-score</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Foundation information</td>
<td>115.91(1)</td>
<td>3033.0</td>
<td>-4.5078</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.64(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - General knowledge</td>
<td>123.90(1)</td>
<td>2265.5</td>
<td>-6.6242</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.88(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Theory and knowledge</td>
<td>104.27(1)</td>
<td>4150.5</td>
<td>-1.5341</td>
<td>.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.92(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U-score</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - Assessment/screening</td>
<td>120.65(1)</td>
<td>76.04(2)</td>
<td>2577.5</td>
<td>-5.7820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Behavior management</td>
<td>119.00(1)</td>
<td>77.64(2)</td>
<td>2736.0</td>
<td>-6.1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Programming</td>
<td>110.13(1)</td>
<td>86.24(2)</td>
<td>3588.0</td>
<td>-3.4185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Field experience/practice</td>
<td>116.36(1)</td>
<td>80.19(2)</td>
<td>2689.0</td>
<td>-5.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Parents</td>
<td>108.51(1)</td>
<td>87.81(2)</td>
<td>3743.5</td>
<td>-2.7767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Evaluation, research &amp; technology</td>
<td>107.65(1)</td>
<td>88.65(2)</td>
<td>3826.0</td>
<td>-2.3729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Consultation and collaboration</td>
<td>112.54(1)</td>
<td>83.90(2)</td>
<td>3356.5</td>
<td>-3.6415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Resources</td>
<td>110.28(1)</td>
<td>86.09(2)</td>
<td>3573.0</td>
<td>-3.0401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all knowledge/skills categories, general educators differed in the degree of importance they ascribed for each knowledge/skills category in comparison to the special educators. The difference in the degree of importance ascribed by general educators and special educators was significant at either the .05 or .001 significance level for all categories except Category 3. For example, in Category 5, the mean rank for general educators was 119.00, and the mean rank for special educators was 77.64; the difference reported was significant at the .001 significance level, as is represented by the 2-tailed p (p < .0001), which surpasses the significance level established for this study. For all knowledge/skills categories, general educators ascribed less importance to the sum total for that knowledge/skills category, as are represented by greater mean ranks than are the mean ranks for special educators.

Because there were significant differences in all categories except Category 3, it may interpreted that this difference could be attributed to two factors.
1. As described earlier in the demographic data, not many general educators serve students with E/BD in their classroom for more than one class period a day or one class subject, and possibly they have not spent enough time with students with E/BD to recognize the importance of many of these competencies. Historically, a student with emotional or behavioral problems was referred to special education fairly quickly without much prereferral intervention.

2. Possibly, the teachers involved in this study do not consider the competencies contained in these 10 knowledge/skills categories as important as special educators because the practice of these competencies is still relatively new with the advent of inclusion of students with E/BD into the general education classroom settings.

One knowledge/skills category in Table 1 depicted a difference between the two groups (general educators and special educators), but the difference was not significant at the .05 level (Category 3). This category contained competencies regarding theory and knowledge. This could be interpreted to mean that some agreement exists between general educators and special educators regarding competencies in the knowledge/skills category and that possibly, both general education and special education teacher preparation address these competencies.

**Research Question 2**

Will general educators report a lesser degree of proficiency for knowledge/skills than will special educators reported, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Data from the Mann-Whitney U tests analyses on Proficiency are represented in Table 2. The response range for proficiency was one to five, with 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest; therefore, a high mean rank score would represent a lesser degree of proficiency being ascribed. The data were analyzed by each of the 11 knowledge/skills categories. (Definitions of those 11 knowledge/skills categories can be found in Chapter 2.) In Table 2, data from the present study are represented by a (1) following its mean rank score, and data from the earlier research report (Bullock et al., 1994) are represented by a (2) following its mean rank score.
Table 2

Mann-Whitney U Test Analyses by Knowledge/Skills Category for Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>U-score</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Foundation information</td>
<td>127.21(1)</td>
<td>1947.5</td>
<td>-7.1548</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.67(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - General knowledge</td>
<td>133.27(1)</td>
<td>1366.5</td>
<td>-8.6761</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.80(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Theory and knowledge</td>
<td>111.20(1)</td>
<td>3484.5</td>
<td>-3.2274</td>
<td>.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.20(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Assessment/screening</td>
<td>130.56(1)</td>
<td>1626.0</td>
<td>-8.0055</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.42(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Behavior management</td>
<td>124.08(1)</td>
<td>2248.0</td>
<td>-4.6306</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.71(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Programming</td>
<td>116.70(1)</td>
<td>2957.0</td>
<td>-4.7881</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.87(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Field experience/practice</td>
<td>121.27(1)</td>
<td>2518.5</td>
<td>-5.8565</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.44(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Parents</td>
<td>109.83(1)</td>
<td>3616.5</td>
<td>-2.9378</td>
<td>.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.53(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Evaluation, research &amp; technology</td>
<td>115.44(1)</td>
<td>3078.0</td>
<td>-4.2655</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.09(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Consultation and collaboration</td>
<td>119.51(1)</td>
<td>2687.5</td>
<td>-5.2806</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.15(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Resources</td>
<td>120.02(1)</td>
<td>2638.5</td>
<td>-5.3885</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.65(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all knowledge/skills categories, general educators differed in the degree of proficiency they reported for each knowledge/skills category in comparison to the special educators. The difference in the degree of proficiency reported by general educators and special educators is significant at either the .05 or .001 significance level. For example, in Category 1, the mean rank for general educators was 127.21, and the mean rank for special educators was 69.67; the difference reported was significant at the .001 significance level, as is represented by the 2-tailed p (p < .0001), which surpasses the significance level established for this study. For all knowledge/skills categories,
general educators reported possessing a lesser degree of proficiency in the total for that knowledge/skills category, as represented by greater mean ranks for general educators than for special educators.

With general educators reporting the possession of significantly less proficiency for all competency items within the knowledge/skills categories as compared to special educators (see Table 2), it could possibly be interpreted that general educators in this study are validating what research already says about the insufficient amount of preservice training that general education teachers receive. General educators could also be proficient at competencies that they do not perceive to be related to working with students with E/BD, or perhaps they are unaware of the possibility that some competencies for working with students without disabilities are related to competencies for working with students with E/BD.

Research Question 3

Will general educators report a lesser frequency of use for knowledge/skills than will special educators, as measured by the knowledge/skills survey?

Data from the Mann-Whitney U tests analyses on Frequency of Use are represented in Table 3. The response range for frequency of use was one to five, with 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest; therefore, a high mean rank score would represent a lesser degree of frequency of use being reported. The data were analyzed by each of the 11 knowledge/skills categories. (Definitions of those 11 knowledge/skills categories can be found in Chapter 2.) In Table 3, data from the present study are represented by a (1) following its mean rank score, and data from the earlier research report (Bullock et al., 1994) are represented by a (2) following its mean rank score.
Table 3

Mann-Whitney U Test Analyses by Knowledge/Skills Category for Frequency of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>U-score</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Foundation information</td>
<td>119.40(1)</td>
<td>77.25(2)</td>
<td>2697.5</td>
<td>-5.2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - General knowledge</td>
<td>124.94(1)</td>
<td>71.87(2)</td>
<td>2165.5</td>
<td>-6.5804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Theory and knowledge</td>
<td>105.27(1)</td>
<td>90.95(2)</td>
<td>4054.5</td>
<td>-1.7738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Assessment/screening</td>
<td>113.36(1)</td>
<td>83.10(2)</td>
<td>3277.0</td>
<td>-3.7520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Behavior management</td>
<td>114.88(1)</td>
<td>81.64(2)</td>
<td>3132.0</td>
<td>-4.6306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Programming</td>
<td>103.44(1)</td>
<td>92.73(2)</td>
<td>4230.0</td>
<td>-1.4248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Field experience/practice</td>
<td>118.16(1)</td>
<td>78.45(2)</td>
<td>2817.0</td>
<td>-4.9760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Parents</td>
<td>101.03(1)</td>
<td>95.07(2)</td>
<td>4461.5</td>
<td>-0.7397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Evaluation, research &amp; technology</td>
<td>104.03(1)</td>
<td>92.16(2)</td>
<td>4173.5</td>
<td>-1.4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Consultation/collaboration</td>
<td>112.09(1)</td>
<td>84.33(2)</td>
<td>3399.0</td>
<td>-3.4439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Resources</td>
<td>107.73(1)</td>
<td>88.57(2)</td>
<td>3818.0</td>
<td>-2.3778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all knowledge/skills categories, general educators differed in the Frequency of Use competency items for each knowledge/skills category in comparison to the special educators. The difference in the frequency of use reported for competencies in seven of the knowledge/skills categories by general educators and special educators are significant at either the .05 or .001 significance level. For example, in Category 1, the mean rank for general educators was 119.40, and the mean rank for
special educators was 77.25; the difference reported was significant at the .001 significance level as is represented by the 2-tailed p (p < .0001), which surpasses the significance level established for this study. In knowledge/skills Categories 3, 6, 8, and 9, the difference between general educators and special educators was not significant at the .05 significance level. For all knowledge/skills categories, general educators reported a lesser frequency of use in the total for that knowledge/skills category, as represented by greater mean ranks for general educators than for special educators.

As can be seen in Table 3, for all knowledge/skills categories, general educators reported a lesser frequency of use in the total competency items for that knowledge/skills category, as represented by a greater mean rank for general educators than for special educators. This could indicate that general educators are not visualizing what their new role in an inclusive classroom will entail or that perhaps those already serving students with E/BD for a longer period of instructional time have yet to practice the competencies associated with working with students with E/BD for a period long enough to recognize the frequency or regularity of usage.

In knowledge/skills Categories 3, 6, 8, and 9, the difference between general educators and special educators regarding frequency of use was not a significant at the .05 level. Although not significant at the .05 significance level, the four knowledge/skills categories (theory and knowledge; programming; parents; and evaluation, research and technology) reported some measurement of difference. This could be indicate that general educators may indeed not use these competencies as often as special educators, yet general educators are already aware of the regularity of usage of these competencies in working with nondisabled students.

One other set of data collected in this study. There were three open-ended, unstructured questions at the end of the survey (see Appendix A). The questions were as follows:

53. Are there any other knowledge/skills, not mentioned in the first fifty-two questions, which you believe are important in teaching or preparing to teach students with E/BD in inclusive settings? (YES or NO) If YES, please state below.

54. In your opinion, what characteristics need to be in place in the school environment for inclusion of students with E/BD to be successful? Please state below.
55. Are these characteristics currently in place in your school or are preparations being made to operationalize these inclusive characteristics into your school? (YES or NO) If NO, please state, in your opinion, what is preventing this process?

After a compilation of all the comments regarding these three questions, it was found that, on question 53, only one suggestion was given by the 96 respondents for an additional set of competencies. The suggestion was that there should be a set of teacher competencies that address cross-cultural competencies. In regard to question 54, the respondents identified 17 items as successful indexes for inclusion of students with E/BD into general education classroom settings (see Table 4). In regards to question 55, the respondents identified nine barriers which they felt prevented successful inclusion of students with E/BD into general education classroom settings (see Table 4).

Not all of the 96 respondents answered the three open-ended, unstructured questions.

Table 4
Open-Ended Unstructured Question Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful indexes for inclusion of students with E/BD</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate training</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear expectations for all students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• resource personnel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• time for planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate funding</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher awareness regarding inclusion and successful inclusive practices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear expectations for teachers from school districts regarding district inclusive policies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collaboration between general education and special education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support from school administration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• considering each student on an individual basis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher flexibility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong behavior management system in place in the classroom</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• proper facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• small teacher-pupil ratio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• relaxed and receptive classroom environment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• parental support</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tracking of student behavior history</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to inclusion of students with E/BD</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• lack of knowledge regarding inclusive practices</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tables continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to inclusion of students with E/BD</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• large class sizes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• large teacher workload</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not enough time for planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not enough funding</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lack of cooperation between general education and special education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poor attitude toward E/BD population</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• frustration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to survey general education teachers regarding their beliefs concerning expected knowledge/skills needed to provide within inclusive settings a successful instructional environment for students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). The knowledge/skills survey research package utilized in this study was previously validated by Bullock et al., 1994. The knowledge/skills survey was composed of 11 defined knowledge/skills categories, containing a total of 52 knowledge/skills statements and three open-ended, unstructured items regarding inclusion practices. One hundred surveys were distributed (20 surveys to each school) to three elementary, one middle, and one intermediate schools. Of these surveys, 81 were utilized in the study; 19 surveys were not used because of incomplete information. Fifty surveys were distributed (25 surveys to each school) to two high schools. Of these surveys, 15 were utilized in the study; 35 surveys were not utilized from this group because of incomplete or insufficient information. The total sample size utilized in this study was 96. Of these, 43 survey respondents were elementary teachers, and 53 respondents were middle/secondary teachers.

There were 10 knowledge/skills categories in regard to the Importance responses in which a difference was found between the two groups (general educators and special educators), and the difference was significant at either the .05 or .001 significance level. These categories included (a) foundation information; (b) general knowledge; (c) assessment/screening; (d) behavior management; (e) programming; (f) field experience/practice; (g) parents; (h) evaluation, research, & technology; (i) consultation and collaboration; and (j) resources. There was one knowledge/skills category in regards to Importance in which a mean difference was found between the two groups (general
educators and special educators), however the difference was not significant at the .05 significance level. This category was theory and knowledge. For all knowledge/skills categories, general educators reported a lesser degree of importance in the total competency items for that knowledge/skills category, as represented by a greater mean rank for general educators than for special educators.

General educators reported a significant lesser degree of proficiency for all knowledge/skills categories as compared to special educators in the total competency items for that knowledge/skills category as represented by a greater mean rank for general educators than for special educators.

In regard to the Frequency of Use responses, general educators differed in the Frequency of Use competency items for seven of the knowledge/skills categories in comparison to the special educators. These categories included (a) foundation information; (b) general knowledge; (c) assessment/screening; (d) behavior management; (e) field experience/practice; (f) consultation and collaboration, and (g) resources. The difference in the frequency of use reported for knowledge/skills in these categories was significant at either the .05 or .001 significance level. In knowledge/skills Categories 3, 6, 8, and 9, the difference in the Frequency of Use was not significant between general educators and special educators at the .05 level. These categories included (a) theory and knowledge; (b) programming; (c) parents; and (d) evaluation, research and technology. For all knowledge/skills categories, general educators reported a lesser frequency of use in the total competency items for that knowledge/skills category, as represented by a greater mean rank for general educators than for special educators.

General educators did indeed differ from special educators in their beliefs about critical knowledge/skills for working with children and youth with E/BD. Table 4 indicates that general educators do, in fact, have ideas about what could bring about successful inclusion for students with E/BD. Perhaps, with collaboration between general educators and special educators, differences regarding critical knowledge/skills for working with children and youth with E/BD in the educational setting will at least be held to a minimum. The minimum differences left after collaboration will
perhaps be accounted for in their different teacher preparation programs and not by a lack of knowledge.

As recommendations for future research, seven ideas are offered:

1. Research could be conducted to obtain data on only general educators and to perform correlations between and across knowledge/skills categories. This could possibly shed light on some attributes of general educators as a whole.

2. Research needs to be conducted to address the overall resistance of general education teachers regarding students with E/BD.

3. Research needs to address what cross-cultural knowledge/skills are needed for working with students with E/BD. As the educational environment in our public schools becomes more diverse, cross-cultural knowledge/skills will become critical for all teachers.

4. Research needs to be done which addresses inclusion issues and general education settings, in particular inclusion issues that involve students with E/BD and their inclusion into general education classrooms.

5. Research needs to address the identification of appropriate training areas for general education teacher preparation program regarding inclusion of students with E/BD into general education classrooms.

6. Research needs to address the differences between elementary and secondary general educators regarding working with students with E/BD in general education classrooms.

7. Research needs to address the differences between rural, urban, suburban general educators regarding working with students with E/BD in general education classrooms.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY RESEARCH PACKAGE
SURVEY TO IDENTIFY
CRITICAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS NEEDED
TO TEACH STUDENTS WITH
EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS (E/BD)

This survey is designed to obtain your responses regarding the identification of critical knowledge/skills needed to teach children/youth with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD).

In order to gain a better understanding of current perspectives, we ask that you consider knowledge/skills from three perspectives: importance, proficiency, and frequency of use. We know that some knowledge/skills are absolutely essential to the teaching process, but may not be applied on a daily basis; in contrast, some acts routinely performed by teachers may not be very significant.

We recognize that looking at knowledge/skills from these three vantage points increases the time required to complete the survey, but we believe this will assist us in generating a more accurate picture than if we relied only on one or two sides of the knowledge/skills' question.

We sincerely appreciate you taking the time necessary to complete this survey. Once data have been analyzed, we believe it will make a significant contribution to programs preparing teachers to work with students with E/BD.

Directions

IMPORTANCE. In this column, circle the number which best describes how important it is that teachers of students with E/BD have the knowledge/skills stated. Use the following codes:

1 = Very Important
2 = Somewhat Important
3 = Undecided
4 = Somewhat Unimportant
5 = Very Unimportant

PROFICIENCY. In this column, circle the number which best describes how you rate your personal ability/proficiency in each of the items. Use the following codes:

1 = Very Proficient
2 = Somewhat Proficient
3 = Undecided
4 = Somewhat Unproficient
5 = Very Unproficient

FREQUENCY OF USE. In this column, circle the letter which best describes the frequency with which you use each of the items. Use the following codes:

D = At least Daily
W = At least Weekly
M = At least Monthly
A = At least Annually
N = Never

For your convenience, definitions of terms used in survey can be found on the back of this sheet.
Survey Terminology Definitions

community-based - occurs in real-life settings (e.g., Laundromats, restaurants, shopping malls).

correctional system - set of placements designed to rehabilitate or punish individuals who have been adjudicated (or have broken the law).

criterion-referenced test - evaluation based on specific behaviors demonstrated, where the expected behavior serves as the criterion. A type of assessment that measures an individual's standing with respect to a particular criterion.

deviant behavior - behavior which does not follow the normal sequence and is at variance with group demands or cultural conventions and expectations.

Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (E/BD) - categorical term used to refer to deviations in the normal course of psychosocial development that are related to impaired interactions between the individual and the environment.

Individual Education Plan (IEP) - a written plan of long- and short-term goals for a special education student agreed upon by the educational decision-making committee.

Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) - a written document that identifies and organizes resources to help families of infants and toddlers with disabilities meet goals they have set for themselves and their children.

Individual Transition Plan (ITP) - a written document that identifies and organizes school and community-based resources to help students with disabilities meet the goals they have set for themselves in preparation for exiting the public school setting.

occupational therapist - a medical professional who provides treatment from a physician's prescription that enhances daily living and personal care activity skills through the development of fine- and gross-motor activities relating to upper extremities.

proximity control - a process whereby a teacher intervenes in problem behaviors of a student by positioning themselves physically close to the student in order to calm the troubled student.

reintegration - a process whereby a special education student is allowed to rejoin the mainstream regular education environment.

screening practices - practices involving an assessment procedure used to detect students who may be at risk for developing various learning or behavior problems.

stress signals - a nonverbal technique that a teacher may use to interfere with unacceptable behaviors of students (e.g., eye contact, finger snapping, light flicking).
**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM**

**Instructions.** Please provide the information requested for all items listed below.

1. Your job title is ____________________________

2. Your age group is: (check one)
   - (1) 21-24
   - (2) 25-29
   - (3) 30-34
   - (4) 35-39
   - (5) 40-44
   - (6) 45-49
   - (7) 50-54
   - (8) 55-59
   - (9) 60 or over

3. You are (check one)
   - (10) Male
   - (11) Female

4. Ethnicity (check one)
   - (12) African American
   - (13) Asian Pacific
   - (14) Caucasian
   - (15) Hispanic
   - (16) Native American
   - (17) Other: (please state)

5. Location of School (check one)
   - (18) Suburbia
   - (19) Urban
   - (20) Rural

6. Subject Specialty (check one)
   - (21) Reading
   - (22) Mathematics
   - (23) History
   - (24) Science
   - (25) English
   - (26) Music
   - (27) Art
   - (28) Physical Education
   - (29) Other: (please state)

7. Grade Level (check one)
   - (30) Preschool
   - (31) Elementary
   - (32) Jr. High/Middle
   - (33) Secondary

8. Inclusion Preparation
   - (34) Preservice
   - (35) Inservice
   - (36) Other: (please state)

9. Highest Degree Completed (check one)
   - (37) Bachelors
   - (38) Masters
   - (39) Doctoral

10. Number of Years in Present Position (check one)
    - (40) less than 1 year
    - (41) 1-3 years
    - (42) 4-6 years
    - (43) 7-9 years
    - (44) 10-12 years
    - (45) 13-15 years
    - (46) > 15 years

11. Total Years in Teaching (check one)
    - (47) less than 1 year
    - (48) 1-5 years
    - (49) 6-10 years
    - (50) 11-15 years
    - (51) > 15 years

12. Amount of Time with Students with E/B/T (check period or class area)
    - (52) 1-2
    - (53) 3-4
    - (54) 5-6
    - (55) 7 or greater
**SURVEY TO IDENTIFY**
**CRITICAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS NEEDED**
**TO TEACH STUDENTS WITH**
**EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS (E/BD)**

**FOUNDATION INFORMATION**
focuses on terminology, classification, procedures and historical development of Emotional/Behavioral Disorder (E/BD) systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. ability to plan, organize, and implement an individual education plan (IEP) appropriate to the cognitive and affective needs of the student with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>2. ability to identify procedures related to the education of students with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>3. ability to identify early intervention strategies used with students with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>4. understanding of characteristics of E/BD and indications for education and treatment of populations with E/BD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5. understanding of cognitive development as it relates to emotional/behavioral development and behavior performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL KNOWLEDGE**
focuses on unique applications of the Council for Exceptional Children Core of Knowledge and Skills as related to E/BD specifically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. ability to develop an appropriate IEP, considering assessment analysis, input from other professionals, input from parents, and input from interagency sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>7. ability to exhibit skills needed for interdisciplinary communication and team functioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. ability to function as a member of a team to plan social and educational interventions for students

9. understanding of professional ethics in the field of special education

10. understanding of the relationship of special education to general education

THEORY & KNOWLEDGE
focuses on the examination of theories as they relate to the etiology of the disorder of E/BD diagnosis and designing intervention systems.

11. ability to describe and defend a personal orientation for dealing with children/youth and translate into educational practice

12. ability to model programs that have been effective in managing students with emotional/behavioral disorders

13. understanding of theories of delinquent behavior and the processes of the correctional system

14. understanding of theories, structure, and programming parameters of career/vocational education as they relate to students with affective/behavioral needs

15. ability to apply knowledge of teaching interventions based on traditional theories of psychopathology

ASSESSMENT/SCREENING
focuses on the development of a knowledge-base of appropriate assessment and screening practices as they relate specifically to the E/BD population.

16. understanding of the use of informal assessment (e.g., observation and conferences, teacher-made tests) in individualizing instruction for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>DWMAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. ability to determine the education performance level of a specific child by "pinpointing" deficits, weaknesses, and strengths

18. ability to interpret and use information from case records (e.g., reports from psychiatrist, psychologist, psychiatric social worker) for planning intervention strategies

19. ability to determine the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students

20. ability to translate assessment data into recommendations for educational programming

**BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT**

focuses on the examination of systems/procedures which may be applied/utilized to facilitate social/emotional growth of students with E/BD

21. ability to use a variety of nonaversive techniques (e.g., voice modulation, facial expressions, planned ignoring, proximity control, tension release)

22. ability to establish and maintain pupil attention, and present reinforcement and/or correct pupil responses

23. ability to develop and/or implement appropriate classroom rules and a means for enforcing these rules

24. understanding of behavioral principles for increasing and decreasing behaviors and implementation of individualized behavior management plans with rules and positive/negative consequences to modify deviant behaviors and increase appropriate behaviors of students with E/BD

25. ability to develop and/or implement a consistent classroom routine
PROGRAMMING
focuses on the examination of classroom organization, instructional management and individualized curricular applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. ability to establish a consistent classroom routine
27. ability to establish classroom rules as well as a means for enforcing these rules
28. ability to evaluate social/affective behavior in the classroom (e.g., identifying possible sources of conflict, stress signals, etc.)
29. ability to demonstrate appropriate management procedures when presented with a spontaneous management problem

FIELD EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE
focuses on opportunities for students in training to participate in hands-on experiences with students with E/BD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. ability to conduct class activities in a way that encourages appropriate interaction between students
31. ability to provide effective individual, small, and large group instruction
32. ability to work with groups of children and individuals within groups who have different educational needs
33. ability to teach academics that relate directly to a student's functional needs
34. ability to actively participate in teacher/parent conferences including multidisciplinary conferences, individualized educational (IEP) meetings, and placement conferences
PARENTS
focuses on increasing a student's understanding of parent's needs and how to effectively communicate with parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. ability to communicate effectively with other members on the IEP/IFSP/ITP planning team

36. ability to demonstrate a professional attitude that reflects school policy and standards

37. understanding of the need to adapt communication to the levels and needs of the listener (e.g., parents, parents with disabilities, non-English speaking parents, volunteers, paraprofessionals, professionals outside the field of special education)

38. understanding of issues and procedures involved in communicating and cooperating with regular classroom teachers

39. understanding of parent needs and ability to communicate and work with parents/guardians

EVALUATION, RESEARCH, & TECHNOLOGY
focuses on techniques and procedures available to classroom teachers to assist in student and program evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. ability to evaluate the effects of the program upon individual pupil performance and use the evaluation to determine total program effectiveness

41. ability to use the computer in instructional programs to special education students

42. understanding of current research, trends, and legal issues in the field of special education

43. understanding of current research on E/BD and appropriate ways to apply research findings in the classroom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. ability to describe the following evaluation procedures employed by the school: academic grading systems, standardized tests, and permanent records</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. understanding of the collaborative relationship of special education and regular education</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. understanding of collaborative and/or consultative role of special educator in reintegration of E/BD</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. understanding of principles and/or procedures for consulting with teachers and administrators about the special education program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. understanding of use of professionals (e.g., mental and physical health specialists) as consultants to the special education program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. understanding of functions of professional groups and referral agencies which provide services to children and youth with E/BD</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. understanding of ways of identifying and accessing resources relevant to persons with disabilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. ability to participate in the staff development of other personnel (e.g., able to identify, clarify, and report needs for staff development; able to plan staff development activity; able to use effective instructional techniques for implementation)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>D W M A N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. ability to explain the major responsibilities of ancillary personnel (e.g., school psychologist, school nurse, educational diagnostician, social worker, counselor, occupational therapist, adapted physical education specialist) and how their services might be utilized by special education teachers

Please answer the following questions in written format:

53. Are there any other knowledge/skills, not mentioned in the first fifty-two questions, which you believe are important in teaching or preparing to teach students with E/BD in inclusive settings? (YES or NO) If YES, please state below.

54. In your opinion, what characteristics need to be in place in the school environment for inclusion of students with E/BD to be successful? Please state below.

55. Are these characteristics currently in place in your school or are preparations being made to operationalize these inclusive characteristics into your school? (YES or NO) If NO, please state in your opinion, what is preventing this process?
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
### Demographic Characteristics of the Study's Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Area</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teachers</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No age reported</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbia</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Specialty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* - 28 were primary - all level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High/Middle</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Characteristics of the Study’s Participants continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Area</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* - none or through another resource)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Present Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years in Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Time With Students with E/BD*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or greater</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* - preparation stage of inclusion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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