

Best Practices for the Inclusion of Special Education Students:

A Meta-Synthesis

Christina Lindquist

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Education in Special
Education degree at the University of Alaska Southeast

RECOMMENDED: _____

Jill Burkert, Ph. D., Academic Advisor

APPROVED: _____

Heather Batchelder, Ph. D., Assistant professor Special Education

Date

Abstract

This meta-synthesis of literature explores how successful a variety of inclusive practices may be in educating students with special needs. The general and special education teachers' education and attitude related to inclusion greatly influences the success of the inclusive programs they design and employ for the students they teach. The inclusive program should include a variety of strategies for engaging the student and helping the student to have successful academic and behavioral outcomes.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Since the passing of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, educators and families of children with disabilities along with community service providers have worked to determine the best methods for children with disabilities to be educated with their peers. Inclusion has had a variety of definitions and implementations as this law has been modified and updated during the last four decades. Even today, best practices for inclusion continue to be debated and modified in classrooms, schools, and districts across the country, particularly in relation to the testing of students with special needs and how teachers are held accountable for their students' progress.

With the creation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2002, special and general education teachers feel greater pressure to appropriately serve their students with special needs. Most students with special needs are required to complete the same high stakes assessments as their non-disabled peers. There is some suspicion that, due to this requirement, some general education teachers do not want students with special needs included in their classroom. Their main concern is that if the student does poorly on these assessments that it will reflect poorly on their teaching. Since many districts are migrating to teacher evaluations based upon student performance, with a high percentage of the evaluation based solely upon the scores of the high stakes testing, teachers do not want to be put on an improvement program or risk losing their job

based on the presumably low performance which a student with special needs may demonstrate. On the other side of this concern, there is much confusion and speculation about how special education teachers will be evaluated with the new system when the general education teacher is frequently the teacher of record for the student. These concerns may place added pressure on the individualized education program (IEP) team as they strive make the most appropriate placement decisions for the students they are responsible for.

As the inclusion debate continues, it is important to look at the different ways which inclusion has been implemented and how these different methods have led to varying degrees of success. It should be considered that different methods of inclusion may work better for students with some types of disabilities while being significantly less successful for students with other types of disabilities. Teachers of students with disabilities should be aware of the different types of inclusion and the successes and limitations of them as they are determining which inclusion methods to use with their own students. While every child should have their own personally developed IEP, past studies and trials should inform the IEP team as they work together to make decisions about the education of each student.

1.2. Author's beliefs and experiences

Although I am only in my second year of teaching, I worked with students with special needs in the capacity of a paraprofessional for the last three years before becoming a teacher. During this period of time I have worked mainly in intensive programs in which the students receive the majority of their education in a self-contained classroom and experience inclusion during lunch, recess, and special area times. Until recently I felt that this worked very well for the students, and to some extent I still do. The students in these settings were typically reaching

their individualized education program (IEP) goals and had opportunities for interactions with their peers. These facts would indicate a successful inclusion program in the school.

Last school year, as I began my teaching career, our school staff reviewed the testing scores for the previous school year. It was celebrated that over 94% of our elementary students with IEPs who participated in standardized testing made adequate yearly progress. That night I was discussing the results with my husband who is a special education teacher at another elementary school. He was amazed at the results and we began discussing the differences between how the two schools handle inclusion.

In the elementary school where my husband serves as a special education teacher, students who have more intensive needs are included with their non-disabled peers in the manner previously described. Students with high incidence disabilities are typically served in a resource classroom for 45 minutes per day, per core subject they receive services for. The rest of the day they are in the general education setting without any additional supports in place. In the school where I teach there has been some resistance from the general education teachers to have students pulled out of the classroom by the special education teacher, especially during core instruction times. Since our school is small and is only set up for a resource program, many of the students with high incidence special needs receive some services in their general education classroom by the classroom teachers. They also receive instruction from the special education teacher or paraprofessional in a separate location, such as a special education classroom or small conference room, during non-core instruction times. Students with special needs are grouped with other students without IEPs who are in the response to intervention (RTI) process. These intervention groups are taught by special education teachers, the Title I teacher,

paraprofessionals, and school tutor/advisors. The special education teachers supervise the instruction the students on their caseload receive and monitor their progress. The other special education teacher who is full time and has 13 years of experience has found that when his students are in the general education classroom for the core instruction and then receive support in their qualifying areas during non- core instruction times they are able to more quickly close the gap between where they are and where they should be. It appears, based upon his personal data, that keeping special education students in the general education classroom not only benefits them from being exposed to the same curriculums as their peers, but also sets higher expectations from the teachers, and increases their social interactions with peers during group assignments.

Last school year I was hired as a half-time special education teacher due to the case load of the other special education teacher and the incoming students moving up from the special education preschool at our school. One student in particular has been diagnosed with Autism and is an intensive needs student. In most other schools in our district he would be placed in an intensive resource classroom with minimal academic inclusion opportunities. As our school does not have a separate intensive needs classroom, he is as fully integrated into the general education classroom as his behaviors will allow. We have determined the times of day when he has the most difficulty remaining in the classroom and have scheduled brief pull out sessions to coordinate with those times. At the time of this writing, he is receiving the same core curriculum instruction as his peers during these pull outs, although during these times he is receiving one on one instruction and support. He is able to verbalize correct responses to questions or information on worksheets but will not always write the correct answer due to refusal to write or using writing as a way of self-stimulating. Attempting to serve this student's needs in the general

education classroom, as our other students with special needs are served, has led me to question the types and benefits of inclusion for students with special needs, particularly those with Autism.

I believe that full inclusion is highly beneficial for all students, regardless of the severity of their disability, when considering the social aspects alone. I have witnessed students with more severe disabilities who were exposed to a great number of inclusive social settings who demonstrated significantly more pro-social behaviors than students with similar disabilities who were more limited in their social experiences and interactions with their non-disabled peers. I believe that students with more severe disabilities, particularly cognitive impairments, should not be included as much in the general education setting during core curriculum times as they may not be able to comprehend the lessons, especially as they advance through the grade levels. Students with these more severe needs may cause more distractions or interruptions in the general education setting and impede the learning of their peers while not significantly benefitting academically from the experience. While this is my belief, there are many who believe that full inclusion is appropriate for all students with special needs when given the support of accommodations and modifications within the inclusive setting (Zigmond & Baker, 1996).

I have heard a variety of opinions on this subject from general and special education teachers, special education paraprofessionals, school administrators, and parents or other family members. I believe that everyone feels inclusion is important, yet there is a lot of disagreement about how much inclusion is appropriate for the intensity of various disabilities.

With this meta-synthesis I intend to investigate the following questions:

- 1) Does inclusion benefit all students with special needs?
- 2) What types of inclusion practices are better for specific types of disabilities?
- 3) What benefits are obtained by including students with special needs in the general education classroom?

1.3 *The purpose of this meta-synthesis*

This meta-synthesis, which focused on varying inclusive practices and the outcomes of those practices, had multiple purposes. One purpose was to locate and identify journal articles which detailed a variety of inclusive practices and the outcomes of those practices. A second purpose was to identify how these inclusive practices differ depending on the disabilities of the children involved in the study. A third purpose was to determine which types of inclusive practices have higher success rates for different disability types. A fourth purpose was to classify each article by publication type, to identify the research design, participants, and data sources of each study, and to summarize the findings of each study. My final purpose of this meta-synthesis was to identify successful inclusion practices and gain an understanding of how they could be applied in my own special education classroom.

1.

2. **Methods**

2.1 *Selection criteria*

The 41 journal articles included in this meta-synthesis met the following selection criteria.

1. The articles explored issues related to inclusion for students who receive services in special education
2. The articles explored a variety of inclusion settings and the level of success of those settings.
3. The articles were published in peer reviewed journals related to the field of education
4. The articles were published between 1995-2013

2.2 *Search procedures*

Database searches and ancestral searches were conducted to locate articles for this metasynthesis.

2.2.1. *Database searches*

I conducted Boolean searches within the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC, Ebscohost) using these specific search terms:

1. (“inclusion”) AND (“best practice”).
2. (“inclusion”) AND (“special education”).
3. (“inclusion”) AND (“student achievement”).

These database searches yielded a total of 37 articles that met my criteria for inclusion in this metasynthesis (Broekelmann, 2012; Bucalos & Lingo, 2005; Calculator & Black, 2009; Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Daniel & King, 1997; Daniels & Vaughn, 1999; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2013; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Douglas, 2010; Ernest, Heckaman, Thompson, Hull, & Carter, 2011; Florian & Linklater, 2010; Flower, McDaniel, & Jolivette, 2011; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Greenhill & Whitehead, 2010; Guldberg, Parsons, MacLeod, Jones, Prunty, & Balfe, 2011; Guldberg, 2010; Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, &

Jacobson, 2012; Humphrey, 2008; Jorgensen & Lambert, 2012; Karge & Lasky, 2009; Lieberman-Betz, Vail, & Chai, 2013; Lynch & Irvine, 2009; Marino, 2010; McAllister & Hadjri, 2013; McCray & McHatton, 2011; McGinnity, 2008; McLaren, 2013; McMaster, 2013; Orr, 2009; Regan & Michaud, 2011; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012; Sindelar, 1995; Trepanier-Street, 2010; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012).

2.2.2 Ancestral searches

An ancestral search involves reviewing the reference lists of previously published works to locate literature relevant to one's topic of interest (Welch, Brownell, & Sheridan, 1999). I conducted ancestral searches using the reference lists of the previously retrieved articles. These ancestral searches yielded four additional articles (Freeman & Alkin, 2000; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000; Iovannone, Dunlap, Huber, & Kincaid, 2003; Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004).

2.3. Coding procedures

I used a coding form to categorize the information presented in each of the 45 articles. This coding form was based on: (a) publication type; (b) research design; (c) participants; (d) data sources; and (e) findings of the studies

2.3.1. Publication type

I evaluated and classified each article according to publication type (e.g., research study, descriptive article, guide, opinion piece/position paper, annotated bibliography, and review of the literature). *Research studies* employ systematic methods to gather and/or analyze quantitative and/or qualitative data. *Descriptive articles* describe experiences and phenomena but do not

employ systematic methods to gather and analyze data. *Guides* recommend specific strategies and/or explain how practitioners might implement particular programs, policies, or curricula. *Opinion pieces/position papers* explain an author's opinion about a particular issue; these articles may support or advocate for particular educational objectives, political views, policy positions, or philosophical ideas. *Annotated bibliographies* include a list of articles on a given topic with a brief summary of each piece of work. *Reviews of the literature* summarize and synthesize the essential themes of previously published works on a particular topic (Table 1).

2.3.2. *Research design*

Each empirical study was further classified by research design (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods research). Quantitative research uses numbers to provide information. Qualitative research uses language to explore and explain the issues researched. Mixed methods research uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods within a single study.

2.3.3. *Participants, data sources, and findings*

Participants in each study were identified (e.g., teachers of inclusion classrooms, teachers of self-contained classrooms, students with a variety of disabilities). Data sources for each study were also identified (e.g., assessments, observations). The findings of each study were also summarized (Table 2).

2.4. *Data analysis*

I used a modified version of the Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method previously employed by Duke (2011) and Duke and Ward (2009) to analyze the 41 articles included in this metasynthesis.

Significant statements were first identified within each article. For the purpose of this metasynthesis, significant statements were identified as statements that addressed issues related to: (a) inclusion success rates; (b) full inclusion; (c) partial inclusion; (d) mainstreaming; (e) team teaching; and/or (f) aide support. I then generated a list of non-repetitive, verbatim significant statements with paraphrased formulated meanings. These paraphrased formulated meanings represented my interpretation of each significant statement. Lastly, the formulated meanings from all 41 articles were grouped into theme clusters, represented as emergent themes. These emergent themes represented the fundamental elements of the entire body of literature (Table 3).

3. Results

3.1. Publication type

I located 41 articles that met my selection criteria. The publication type of each article is presented in Table 1. Fifteen of the articles (36.6%) contained in this meta-synthesis were research studies (Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Daniel & King, 1997; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Florian & Linklater, 2010; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Puce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000; McCray & McHatton, 2011; Orr, 2009; Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012). Nine of the articles (22%) were descriptive articles (Broekelmann, 2012; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2013; Douglas, 2010; Ernest, Heckaman, Thompson, Hull, & Carter, 2011; McGinnity, 2008; McLaren, 2013; Regan & Michaud, 2011; Sindelar, 1995;

Trepanier-Street, 2010). Nine of the articles (22%) were reviews of the literature (Calculator & Black, 2009; Flower, McDaniel, & Jolivette, 2011; Freeman & Alkin, 2000; Guldberg, Parsons, MacLeod, Jones, Prunty, & Balfe, 2011; Guldberg, 2010; Iovannone, Dunlap, Huber, & Kincaid, 2003; Lieberman-Betz, Vail, & Chai, 2013; Lynch & Irvine, 2009; Marino, 2010). Five of the articles (12.2%) were guides (Bucalos & Lingo, 2005; Daniels & Vaughn, 1999; Humphrey, 2008; Jorgensen & Lambert, 2012; McAllister & Hadjri, 2013). Two of the articles (4.9 %) were opinion pieces/position papers (Greenhill & Whitehead, 2010; McMaster, 2013). One of the articles (2.4%) was an annotated bibliography (Karge & Lasky, 2009).

Table 1

Author(s) & Year of Publication	Publication Type
Broekelmann, 2012	Descriptive article
Bucalos & Lingo, 2005	Guide
Calculator & Black, 2009	Review of the literature
Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011	Research study
Daniel & King, 1997	Research study
Daniels & Vaughn, 1999	Guide
DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2013	Descriptive article
Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012	Research study

Douglas, 2010	Descriptive article
Ernest, Heckaman, Thompson, Hull, & Carter, 2011	Descriptive article
Florian & Linklater, 2010	Research study
Flower, McDaniel, & Jolivette, 2011	Review of the literature
Freeman & Alkin, 2000	Review of the literature
Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010	Research study
Greenhill & Whitehead, 2010	Opinion piece/position paper
Guldberg, Parsons, MacLeod, Jones, Prunty, & Balfe, 2011	Review of the literature
Guldberg, 2010	Review of the literature
Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012	Research study
Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012	Research study
Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000	Research study
Humphrey, 2008	Guide
Iovannone, Dunlap, Huber, & Kincaid, 2003	Review of the literature
Jorgensen & Lambert, 2012	Guide
Karge & Lasky, 2009	Annotated bibliography
Lieberman-Betz, Vail, & Chai, 2013	Review of the literature
Lynch & Irvine, 2009	Review of the literature
Marino, 2010	Review of the literature
McAllister & Hadrji, 2013	Guide
McCray & McHatton, 2011	Research study
McGinnity, 2008	Descriptive article
McLaren, 2013	Descriptive article
McMaster, 2013	Opinion piece/position paper
Orr, 2009	Research study
Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004	Research study
Regan & Michaud, 2011	Descriptive article
Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999	Research study
Scanlon & Baker, 2012	Research study
Sindelar, 1995	Descriptive article

Trepanier-Street, 2010	Descriptive article
Vickerman & Blundell, 2012	Research study
Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012	Research study

3.2 Research design, participants, data sources, and findings of the studies

I located 15 studies that met my selection criteria (Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Daniel & King, 1997; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Florian & Linklater, 2010; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000; McCray & McHatton, 2011; Orr, 2009; Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012). The research design, participants, data sources, and findings of each of the studies are identified in Table 2.

Table 2

Authors	Research Design	Participants	Data Sources	Findings
Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011	Qualitative	10 participants among the following: special and general education teachers, physical therapist, principal, paraprofessionals, and parents of students with severe disabilities	Face to face interviews which were recorded and later transcribed; 19 artifacts which include: mission and vision statements, agendas and minutes from faculty and team meetings, monthly newsletters, information from school website, and student work samples; field notes of weekly observations of daily activities and interactions related to the students with severe disabilities	Students supported by these participants were believed to have an exceptional feeling of belonging in their school. The school climate was open and welcoming of the students with severe needs and the community supported some projects help the students' access more sport and recreational facilities on school grounds. The researchers were concerned that, although there is a strong sense of community in the schools in which the interviewees worked, enabling the students to feel socially connected to their peers and become

				involved in a variety of social activities, that there was not the same level of focus to help these same students achieve academically.
Daniel & King, 1997	Quantitative	207 third-through fifth-grade special education students and their parents	22-item questionnaire completed by the parents, students' academic gains on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), internalizing (sum of scores for the withdrawn, somatic complaints, and anxious/depressed subscales) and externalizing (sum of scores for the delinquent and aggressive behaviors sub scores) on Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) as rated by teachers and parents, and Self Esteem Index (SEI) completed by the students	Inconsistent results: academic achievement was higher for special education students in inclusion classrooms in one grade but lower in the others. Consistently there were more behavior problems and lower self-esteem among all students in inclusion classrooms than those in non-inclusion (third and fourth grades). In fifth-grade classrooms there were more behavior problems among students in random inclusion classrooms than in cluster inclusion classrooms (fifth grade inclusion was handled differently than lower grades in the school district used in the research). Parents of students in inclusion classrooms reported a higher degree of concern about their child's school programs than parents of students in non-inclusion classrooms.

Dessemonnet, Bless, & Morin, 2012	Quantitative	34 children with intellectual disabilities who are fully included in general education classrooms with support and a control group of 34 comparable children in special schools	Academic achievement tests-Lern-und Entwicklungsstand (LE) 4 th -7 th grade and 6 th -9 th grade levels were administered three times over two school years.	Adaptive Behavior Assessment System, 2 nd edition was completed twice by the students' parents and teachers-at the beginning and end of two school years. Children made slightly more progress in literacy skills; no differences were found in the progress of developing mathematic skills or adaptive behaviors.
Florian & Linklater, 2010	Qualitative	Students of the University of Aberdeen in Scotland's School of Education Professional Graduate Diploma in Education's Further Professional Studies course Learning Without Limits for the 2007-2008 school year	Audio recordings of tutorial sessions and class discussions of a professional studies class entitled 'Learning Without Limits.'	Teachers became more sensitive to their inclusion students' feelings and more reflective of their own teaching practices related to this population of students. These findings are based on comments made by teachers in the professional studies class over the course of the school year as recorded in transcripts of the class sessions.
Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010	Mixed method	Face to face interviews with 9 professionals; postal surveys of 97 educational professionals, social care, health, and children's center workers; 31 parents and caregivers; and	Literature review; face to face interviews with children, young people, and key professionals; a postal survey of locally-based professionals; focus groups for children, young people, parents,	Those most at risk of exclusion are refugees, asylum seekers, or those of families with complex needs. Greatest success comes from multi-agencies working together to share knowledge and provide different inclusion supports to

		53 children and young people	and care providers to determine factors in lowering the risk of exclusion in education.	children. It is important for children, young people, and their families to be involved in the development of extended services.
Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012	Quantitative	300 questionnaires were randomly distributed to kindergarten and primary teachers in Jordan, United Arab Emirates, and the Southwestern United States. 225 teachers responded.	Questionnaire survey using a Likert-type scale to determine the attitudes regarding inclusive education and what key factors, both demographically and academically, might affect attitudes.	Negative attitudes concerning inclusion are affected by key areas such as teacher preparedness, grade levels, and previous experience with inclusive teaching. There was no statistically significant relationship found between attitudes and demographics such as teacher age, gender, level of experience in general teaching.
Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012	Quantitative	Sample size varied from 37 to 40 states and 58,393 to 61,401 schools depending on the school year. Sample size of analysis of four year trends covered 16 to 32 states and 5,460 to 45,972 schools.	School level data reported by states through <i>EDFacts</i> , a U. S. Department of Education initiative to collect and use K-12 performance data: adequate yearly progress status and results for AYP targets for 2006-07 through 2008-09 school years; data on number of students with disabilities tested under Title 1	Data from the 2008-09 school year from 40 states shows that 35% of the school are accountable for the performance of students with disabilities on standards set for Adequate Yearly Progress. Of These schools 14% of the ones who failed to meet AYP did so solely based on the performance of students with disabilities.

			accountability for 2005-06 through 2008-09 school years; data on school improvement status for the 2007-08 through 2009-10 school years	
Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000	Qualitative	Three different case studies were conducted with separate participants. Case 1: 4-year old student with severe cerebral palsy in an employer run day care, 3-4 year old class. Case 2: Two 4-year olds, both with speech and language delays and one with occupational therapy needs in a preschool located within a public school setting. Case 3: 5-year old with Down syndrome and significant developmental delays across all domains in a self-contained special education classroom in the morning and an inclusive childcare center	Video tapes of each child participating in preliminary activities to determine goals to work on during embedded learning opportunities (ELO), data collection during the implementation of the ELO activities, and data collection and video tapes of generalization activities after completion of ELOs.	Teachers of the students found that they had a better focus on the individualized goals for the students and that they saw more progress in their students; however, they found it difficult to maintain use of this strategy while providing instruction to the rest of the class.

		program in the afternoon.		
McCray & McHatton, 2011	Mixed methods	115 undergraduate elementary and secondary education majors who were enrolled in a course on integrating exceptional students into a general education setting	Surveys administered during the first class of the course and at the end of the course. Both surveys contained 22 Lykert-type items, and the second survey included five open-ended questions.	Quantitative results showed that participants were more positive toward inclusion at the end of the course; however, 30.4% were either undecided or did not agree that students with disabilities, particularly those with cognitive impairments or multiple disabilities, could be educated in general education classrooms. Qualitative open-ended questions measured affect and knowledge skills of education students concerning inclusion preparedness.
Orr, 2009	Qualitative	15 co-researchers and graduates of Eastern Michigan University's special education pre-service program whom had been considered outstanding students and were in their initial 3 years of teaching in special education	Individual recorded interviews which were transcribed; information was elicited regarding their teaching placements, challenges, inclusionary practices of their schools, barriers to inclusion they have observed and any inclusion supportive practices present within their teaching settings.	There are no perfect models for inclusion and each district and school within the district will have their own philosophies of inclusion. Preparedness was found to be crucial for inclusion success. Most participants mentioned that the current system of education: negative attitudes of general education teachers, lack of support from administrators, and lack of knowledge about best

				inclusionary practices; is not prepared to accomplish inclusion.
Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004	Quantitative	22 middle and junior high school students with intellectual disabilities from three school districts in the Midwest (urban, suburban, and rural populations). 20 students had the label of mental retardation and 2 were labeled as having a learning disability. Four 6 th graders, four 7 th graders, eleven 8 th graders, and three 9 th graders. Ages ranged from 11 to 15 years old. Students were divided into two groups with similar abilities and self-determination levels represented.	The Arc's Self-Determination Scale; a 14 item criterion-referenced measure to indicate changes in problem-solving or study planning skills; Measuring Goal Attainment process	By promoting self-determination, students with intellectual and developmental disabilities can achieve progress in the general curriculum. Other skills supported through self-determination include: goal setting, problem solving, and self-regulation. These are instructional areas which are beneficial to all students and therefore support inclusive use of these skills with a variety of students.
Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999	Qualitative	Five rural Texas students with learning disabilities and their parents: two sixth-grade males, one fifth-grade male, two sixth-grade females, five	Interview responses of students and their parents, responses from three separate focus groups containing five teachers each. Discussions related to the	Parents and students expressed increases in student self-confidence, self-esteem, camaraderie with other students, and support from teachers who had higher expectations of them

		mothers and one father; and fifteen regular education teachers.	perception of the students and their parents and teachers about participating in inclusion programs in a rural school.	in the inclusion program compared to their former non-inclusive program when they were in lower grades. Teacher discussions indicated that there had been an increase in student confidence and academic performance. Teachers also believed that the interventions to improve learning made a difference in the increase of their academic performance.
Scanlon & Baker, 2012	Qualitative	12 High school teachers, 5 of whom were special educators who co-taught in inclusive regular education classrooms and in resource settings which included a 'skills for learning' class. The 7 regular education co-teachers taught English language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and science. Two special educators did not participate in the third focus group and 3 regular	Digital voice recordings of focus group meetings; field notes taken during the sessions; draft graphical representation of the accommodations model based on analysis of notes and recording	Participating teachers value co-teaching as an approach to inclusive teaching to push special education students to the same or similar level as lower achieving non-disabled students. Teachers are co-equals regarding classroom management; however, roles for teaching content are different with the special education teacher focusing on meeting the IEP goals and teaching students new accommodations, while the general education teacher focuses on content instruction.

		educators joined in the third session due to interest in the project.		
Vickerman & Blundell, 2012	Qualitative	500 Learning support assistants in primary, secondary, and special schools were sent questionnaires, 142 responded.	Postal questionnaires, taped and transcribed follow up telephone interviews	77.7% of respondents work in a learner support or teaching assistant role; most had only received generic special education training, not related to supporting students in physical education; of those who had received training specific to physical education, most did not feel it helped their perceived competence in helping support students in this area; the majority felt their working relationship with the PE teacher was very effective; a critical factor in developing inclusive practice in PE is the need for PE teachers and learning support assistants work collaboratively in planning activities
Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012	Mixed methods	Pre-service teachers enrolled in the third year of primary teacher education program; 138 potential participants, 97 respondents in the first phase and 102	Survey using Likert scales and open ended questions; Likert scale questions were drawn from the Concerns about Inclusive Education Scale (CIES) and the Self-Efficacy	Levels of concern regarding acceptance, workload, resources, and academic standards were evident but low. Duration of practicum experiences did not allow enough time for pre-service teachers to develop self-efficacy

		respondents for the second phase	toward future Interactions with People with Disabilities Scale (SEIPD)	beyond their beginning levels; pre-service teachers would be better served if they are shown and provided practice in using effective practices in the classroom.
--	--	----------------------------------	--	---

3.2.1. Research design

Seven of the 15 studies (46.6%) included in this meta-synthesis used a qualitative research design (Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Florian & Linklater, 2010; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000; Orr, 2009; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012). Five of the studies (33.3%) employed a quantitative research design (Daniel & King, 1997; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012; Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004). Two of the studies (13.3%) employed a mixed methods research design, collecting

and analyzing a combination of both quantitative (i.e., numerical) and qualitative (i.e., non-numerical) data (McCray & McHatton, 2011; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012).

3.2.2. Participants and data sources

The 15 studies included in this meta-synthesis examined data from special and general education teachers, paraprofessionals, students in primary and secondary schools, families with children in primary or secondary school, school performance records, and college students in teacher preparation programs. Six of the studies (40%) contained data from students (Daniel & King, 1997; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000; Palmer, Wehmeyer, Gipson, & Agran, 2004; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999). Five of the studies (33.3%) contained data from teachers (Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Hamaidi, Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012). Four of the studies (26.7%) contained data from students enrolled in teacher preparation programs (Florian & Linklater, 2010; McCray & McHatton, 2011; Orr, 2009; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012).

The studies contained in this meta-synthesis used a variety of methods to gather data. Seven of the studies (46.7%) used Interviews and transcripts to collect data from families, teachers, administrators, and students. (Carroll, Fulmer, Sobel, Garrison-Wade, Aragon, & Coval, 2011; Florian & Linklater, 2010; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Orr, 2009; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Scanlon & Baker, 2012; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012). Six of the studies (40%) used survey questionnaires to collect data from Students, families, school professionals and pre-service teachers. (Daniel & King, 1997; Frost, Elmer, Best, & Mills, 2010; Hamaidi,

Homidi, & Reyes, 2012; McCray & McHatton, 2011; Vickerman & Blundell, 2012; Woodcock, Hemmings, & Kay, 2012). Three of the studies (20%) used standardized scores of student achievement and school performance (Daniel & King, 1997; Dessemontet, Bless, & Morin, 2012; Harr-Robins, Song, Hurlburt, Pruce, Danielson, Garet, Taylor, & Jacobson, 2012).

3.2.3. Findings of the studies

The findings of the 15 studies included in this meta-synthesis can be summarized as follows:

1. Teacher and paraprofessionals who have had more training about inclusion and are more prepared for teaching students in inclusive settings have more positive attitudes and are more accepting of students with disabilities in their classrooms.
2. Academic gains for inclusion students were often minimal and inconsistent among academic skills such as literacy. Social skills, self-confidence, self-esteem, and peer friendships had a higher degree of success in inclusion programs.
3. Team and multi-agency efforts involving all stakeholders such as parents, special education teachers, students, general education teachers, paraprofessionals, and outside agencies showed the greatest amount of success in preparing a plan of inclusion for the child. Administrative support from the principal was a key factor in inclusion success.

3.3. Emergent themes

Five themes emerged from my analysis of the 41 articles that are included in this meta-synthesis. These themes include: (a) Frequent attitudes and opinions of teachers concerning inclusion of students with disabilities.; (b) Program factors to the successful inclusion of students

with disabilities.; (c) Strategies for improving students' academic success in an inclusive classroom.; (d) Strategies to support positive student behavior in inclusive classrooms; and (e) Effects of teacher preparedness in the successful implantation of an inclusive classroom.. These five theme clusters and their associated formulated meanings are identified in Table 3.

Table 3

Theme Clusters	Formulated Meanings
Teacher attitudes and opinions towards inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social aspects of inclusion can be given more attention at the expense of academic advancement. ● General education teachers may feel that they do not have appropriate training or experience to support students with special needs in their classroom. ● Resources and staffing may be limited causing teachers to feel that they cannot appropriately support students with special needs in an inclusive setting. ● Each teacher may have a different interpretation of inclusion ● Inclusion, especially during social times such as lunch and recess, will provide opportunities for students with disabilities to interact with their peers and help them to recognize their similarities.
Program factors to the successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● General and special education teachers collaborate to plan or modify lessons or team teach within the inclusive classroom.

<p>inclusion of students with disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support from administration within the school for the inclusive program aids in the program's success. ● Teachers have accepting and positive attitudes towards students with disabilities. ● Parental involvement is a high priority. ● Focusing on positives during parent/teacher conferences may increase a student's self-image and teacher/student relations. ● Teachers commit their time to planning and executing a lesson. ● Students are included in academic and functional settings. ● The school has a universal mission statement governing the education of all students. ● Related service providers collaborate with the special and general education teachers to determine how to support the student's needs (OT, PT, speech) within the general classroom setting.
<p>Strategies for improving students' academic success in an inclusive classroom.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Special education teachers can support the success of their students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms by teaching a small group in that setting ● Provide the students with disabilities activities and class work which is appropriate and engaging for the student. ● Direct support to the student within the inclusive classroom from a special education teacher or paraprofessional will help them. ● Noise levels and other distractions are kept to a minimum during work times. ● Use of conceptual anchors (video, story, or scenario) to create a framework for engaging students and building on prior knowledge. ● Use flexible and creative differentiated instruction with student input. ● Use cooperative learning activities requiring instructional conversation and mutual learning. ● Use authentic or relevant problems or scenarios the student can relate to. ● Individual and group accountability based upon the skill levels of the group members. ● Model appropriate behaviors to be used within a group setting. ● Consistently monitor student learning by questioning/interviewing the students. ● Ensure that group partners encourage the participation of students with disabilities and provide support as needed. ● Provide clear guidelines for the activity. ● General education teacher has engaging classroom lessons and activities
<p>Strategies to support positive student behavior</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Token economies can help support appropriate behaviors in inclusive settings for students with disabilities whose needs include behavior support, such as students with Autism.

<p>in inclusive classrooms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Positive student interrelations contribute to positive student behaviors. ● Peer partnering in heterogeneous classrooms promotes feelings of acceptance that lead to improved behaviors. ● Displaying consistency can promote a feeling of safety with students with disabilities that leads to positive behaviors and interactions. ● Explicitly teaching social skills programs in whole class settings creates a common set of vocabulary and expectations between students with disabilities and their peers.
<p>Effects of teacher preparedness in the successful implantation of an inclusive classroom.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers should have training related to the specific disabilities of their students. ● Pre-service training in collaboration with special educators increases the sense of efficiency of working with inclusion students. ● A belief system that is inconsistent with an inclusion paradigm undermines successful teaching and learning in the inclusive classroom. ● Many teacher preparation programs lack specific training on instructional approaches for use by general educators in instructing students with disabilities. ● Pre-service general education teachers often display attitudes of compliance with inclusion rather than affirmation or acceptance of the strengths of students with disabilities.

4. Discussion

In this section, I will summarize the major themes that emerged from my study of the 41 articles included in this meta-synthesis. I then connect the emergent themes to my work as a special educator.

4.1 Teacher attitudes and opinions towards inclusion

Teachers may have developed a variety of attitudes and opinions about inclusion based on their training and experiences, or lack of them. Many teachers who have had several years of experience teaching general education classes may not have been required to take any courses introducing them to special education as more recently trained teachers may have experienced. Since they may not have had this educational training or experience, they may feel uncomfortable having students with special needs in their classrooms due to feelings of unpreparedness.

Since teachers may interpret inclusion differently, students in inclusive programs may receive significantly different inclusion services based upon the attitudes and opinions of their assigned general and special education teachers. If staffing and resources are limited it may be more difficult to support students in inclusive settings unless there are multiple students with special needs in the same grade level who could be placed into the same general education classroom with the support of a paraprofessional. If the students are spread out over a variety of grade levels or they have significantly different needs, making it more difficult for one person to support several students at the same time, teachers may feel that they cannot support the students in an inclusive setting appropriately.

Frequently teachers introduce students with special needs into the general education setting during social times such as lunch and recess or the special area portions of the day which may include music, physical education, and library before they include them in academic activities. This practice allows students time to interact with their non-disabled peers and may help all students discover similarities among themselves while inclusion during academic activities could accentuate the differences between them. While there are many benefits to

inclusion at these times, it may be at a cost to academic advancement if students are not also included in academic activities with their peers in the general education setting.

When I began my bachelor's degree in elementary and special education one of the first required classes for everyone to take was an introduction to special education. The teacher explained that it was required because it had been discovered that many general education teachers did not have an understanding of the different types of disabilities or appropriate ways to work with students with special needs. In talking to several of my co-workers, I have learned that most of them who have been teaching for more than ten years have never taken a course about special education. Another special education teacher at my school explained their attitudes or thoughts about special education in these terms, "they think special education is a place and do not realize it is a service." As a special education teacher I may need to educate teachers about their students' disabilities and work with them to provide the most appropriate inclusive experience for our shared students. Supporting inclusion for our shared students may mean that I work with the teacher to help him or her understand teaching techniques which will be most beneficial to the student or schedule a paraprofessional to attend to the student within the classroom and provide necessary additional supports for the student if his or her needs are such that a general educator may not be able to support the student's needs and continue to provide instruction for the rest of the class.

4.2 Program factors to the successful inclusion of students with disabilities

Collaboration is an important element in the successful inclusion of students with disabilities. It is important for all members of the IEP team to collaborate and determine the best

ways to include each student they work with. The general and special education teachers should collaborate on lesson plans and ways to modify lessons or team teach lessons when students with special needs are included in academic activities. As they plan, prepare, and execute lessons in this manner they will become more comfortable with the strategies they have chosen or may discover ways to make the collaboration more successful through trial and error. It is important that they learn from related service providers the ways they can support the students' occupational and physical therapy and speech needs within the general education setting while providing the student opportunities for inclusion.

Collaboration among teachers often requires the support of the school's administrative staff as well. When they have this backing they may have easier access to tools and supports necessary for the inclusion of all students with special needs. The principal may fund academic materials, supports for physical needs of a student, or hire additional staff to support students in inclusive settings. If it is truly the school's mission to serve all students' educational needs the administration will provide what is necessary to help all students reach their full potential.

It is important for parents and students to meet with the general and special education teachers for conferences. As teachers share with the student and his or her parents at a conference they must focus on the positives as a way of increasing the student's confidence about his or her abilities academically and socially. As the positives are shared, the student's self-image and student/teacher relations may increase because of what the student hears the teacher tell his or her parents. The student's voice should be heard in relation to how they feel about their inclusion in academic, social, and functional settings.

As a special educator I collaborate on a daily basis with the paraprofessionals I work with and on a weekly basis, or more frequently as needed, with the general educators who teach the students on my case load. I also work with the related service providers to learn how to support my students' non-academic needs in their education programs. Our occupational therapist has taught me some exercises to use with all students to help them improve hand dexterity and refocus their attention during instruction and written activities. On a weekly basis I am in contact with the parents of my students to update them on their child's progress toward goals, new accomplishments, and to discuss any concerns I have. During these conversations I also provide time for the parents to ask questions or express any concerns they have. I am fortunate enough to have an administrator who is a former special educator. He is highly supportive of providing all students the supports they need to meet their full potential in academic and social skills. In collaborating with this wide variety of people I have gained many new ideas for collaboration and inclusion which I will use with future students and in future collaborative meetings.

4.3 Strategies for improving students' academic success in an inclusive classroom

Special education students will be most successful academically in an inclusive classroom when the teachers provide appropriate instruction, make the lessons engaging, and provide opportunities for the students to work with their peers to complete academic tasks. Special education teachers or paraprofessionals may teach a small group which includes the student with special needs or provide direct support to the student in the general education setting. By asking the student appropriate questions the teacher or paraprofessional will be able to monitor the student's understanding of the content and be able to provide targeted support as the responses reveal are needed. Prior to beginning any lesson or activity, special and general

education students will benefit from being provided with clear guidelines and expectations which should include low noise levels and minimal distractions during work times.

Special education students will be more apt to learn when the lessons are appropriate and engaging. Teachers, both general and special education, should use a variety of conceptual anchors, such as videos, stories, or scenarios, to create a framework for engaging the students and building upon their prior knowledge. Problems or scenarios used within the lesson or activity should be authentic or relevant to the students in order to allow them to relate to the topic of discussion or to the presented problem. By using student input to develop creative methods for providing differentiated instruction the lessons and assignments will be appropriate to the student's academic level while containing similar content to the assignments given to the student's peers. Using these techniques, the teacher will maintain the student's interest and engagement which will lead to a positive academic outcome.

Cooperative learning experiences within the classroom support student success as students with special needs participate in group activities in which instructional and academic conversations lead to mutual learning. The teacher should prepare the students to work collaboratively by modeling appropriate behaviors to be used within the group, explain the expectations of individual and group accountability related to the tasks involved, and set parameters to ensure that all students are encouraging and providing support necessary for the participation of each member within the group.

My current position is a half time special education and half time Title I teacher. Since I have a division of my time I am very limited in the amount of time I have to be in a classroom to provide direct services to students. Within my own classroom I work with a variety of small

groups which are comprised of general and special education students who receive similar instruction as an intervention or as part of their education program. During these groups I ask questions and use student responses to gauge understanding of the lesson. I modify or reteach lessons as necessary to support student learning. I use a variety of techniques, such as group choral responses, movement, and relating the new information to the students, as a way of engaging all students in the learning activities. To the fullest extent possible for the interventions I teach, I make every effort to help students make connections with their own experiences and the information being taught.

I do not use collaborative groups for instruction or activities as it would not fit with the combination of ages, abilities, or interventions I currently teach or provide in the timeframe I have for each group. When I have an opportunity to work with older students who have an increased communication and academic ability over those I currently work with, I plan to use more collaborative techniques to support learning. I have seen some teachers use group activities with younger students; however it took significantly more time than I am allotted with my groups at this time. I know firsthand that students always seem to enjoy the interactions of working collaboratively and it helps build social and communication skills in addition to academic skills. Providing activities which address the academic and social needs of my students at the same time is very important to me and I attempt to incorporate social interactions among students during our transitions between the general education setting and my resource classroom.

4.4 Strategies to support positive student behavior in inclusive classrooms

Teachers can employ several techniques to support positive behavior within an inclusive classroom through their personal behaviors and by teaching all students behaviors which will

reinforce appropriate behaviors from students with special needs. A teacher should explicitly teach a social skills program to the whole class to help develop a common set of vocabulary and expectations among all students, those with and without a disability. By being consistent regardless of the student or their disability in the way behavior problems are addressed, students will feel safe in knowing what is expected and what the consequence of an inappropriate behavior will be. Teachers of students with behavior support needs, such as students with Autism, may use a token economy to support the appropriate behaviors expected of the students.

While teaching social skills to the class, a teacher may encourage the students to put what they are learning into practice through positive interrelation activities. When students have more positive interrelations with their peers they typically will demonstrate positive behaviors. A teacher may also use peer partnering to promote acceptance of students with special needs in the classroom environment. When a student with special needs feels they have friends within the classroom their acting out frequently decreases because their frustrations from feeling isolated while in an inclusive setting dissipate.

I have two students with Autism with whom I use a token economy. I have found that using it specifically in regard to supporting social interactions with others in the school has made an enormous difference for these boys' social lives. One of the students has improved from barely responding to my "Good morning. How are you today?" to immediately answering in an appropriate manner and sometimes greeting me first. His general education teacher has told me that he now enters the classroom in the morning and greets her and nearly every student in the classroom by name as they pass his desk to hang up their backpacks. He was recently awarded

the Student of the Month certificate for kindness due to his classroom behaviors and interactions. He is now working on looking at the face of the person to whom he is speaking with.

I also ensure that every student knows the expected behaviors in my classroom for every activity they will be doing. I believe that when a student knows what is expected of them that they feel more comfortable and ready to learn and participate without having the anxiety of being unsure they are doing the right thing. Based upon some of my students' needs I will soon be starting a lunchroom social group. There will be a special table in the lunchroom to which I will invite a variety of students with and without special needs to eat with me. During this time I will model and have everyone practice appropriate conversations for social settings. I have a few students who either do not participate in conversations at lunch or recess or only talk to me. I want to use this time to help them learn how to begin a conversation which others may want to participate in or how to ask questions of others to begin a conversation. While I will not be using a token economy during this portion of the day, I will be providing a lot of verbal coaching and praise to students as they build these conversational skills.

4.5 Effects of teacher preparedness in the successful implantation of an inclusive classroom

The training pre-teachers receive in relation to special education and inclusion will influence their success in teaching in an inclusive classroom. Many teacher preparation programs do not provide training in instructional approaches for teaching students with special needs. Teachers with this lack of training may display an attitude of compliance with inclusion rather than accepting or affirming the students with disabilities and recognizing their strengths within the classroom. If a teacher has a belief system which does not align with the concepts of

inclusion his or her attitudes may undermine the successful teaching and learning possible in an inclusive classroom.

When pre-service teachers receive collaborative training with special educators and experience inclusive settings they tend to develop a sense of efficiency in teaching in this manner. For them it reduces the anxiety and intimidation levels when they are teaching their own classroom and have children with special needs included in the class. Regardless of pre-service training, all teachers should be provided training related to the specific disabilities of their students so they have an understanding of the manifestations of the specific disability and also have a working knowledge of strategies for teaching which would be most suitable to use with the student.

I had an excellent pre-service education which required me to perform over 150 hours of practicum in a wide variety of settings and with a wide variety of age groups and disability types. I was also required to interview a small variety of teachers in order to gain an understanding of their experiences in the classroom in relation to special education. Through these experiences and my student teaching experience in general and special education settings I have seen inclusive practices which were both positive and negative. As a special education teacher I have worked with teachers who are very accepting of the students with special needs, yet I also have worked with teachers who became so upset at what they felt was a disruption to their class that they practically ordered paraprofessionals to remove the student for the smallest disturbances. Although I have not done any instruction with the teachers I work with in relation to our shared students' disabilities, I have explained some of their specific needs and how to help them to be successful in the inclusive classroom. Based on this new knowledge of the importance of

understanding a student's disabilities and good strategies for teaching a person with the disability, I intend to provide more specific information about each students' disabilities with their classroom teacher in the future and also provide specific information on supporting learning in an inclusive setting. The better educated I can help general educators become, particularly those who have more teaching experience but possibly less instruction related to special needs as a newer teacher may have, the better inclusive instruction we can provide for our shared student.

5. Conclusion

This meta-synthesis helped me to better understand how important collaboration about students is. Although I have found that some teachers are so busy that they do not desire to spend much time collaborating with the special education teacher about only one or two students, in the end it is much more beneficial to the students with special needs for the teachers to collaborate and make good instructional decisions based upon the students' individual needs. When there is an initial investment of time at the beginning of the school year or upon the arrival of a new student, the rest of the year becomes much smoother because teachers have had time to determine how they will handle instruction through the use of small groups within the classroom, student collaborative learning tasks, and other engaging strategies.

I also have come to realize through this meta-synthesis the importance of having a positive attitude related to inclusion. Inclusive classrooms which are taught by general and special educators working in conjunction with one another and maintaining positive attitudes toward all students within the classroom will be more likely to entice all students to learn and progress toward their academic and IEP goals. I believe that when teachers exhibit acceptance

and positivity toward all students it creates a community of acceptance among all students in the class. Helping the students to develop a community of learning will benefit students with special needs academically and socially.

When students are provided with engaging lessons, activities, and opportunities for collaborative learning with their peers they will be more successful in school. Using a variety of engaging tools such as videos, and hands on projects within the classroom to help students become more involved in the lesson and helping them to make connections with their prior knowledge and the new instruction will lead to better retention of the information. It is important to help students with special needs make connections with every aspect of learning and encourage them to fully participate in collaborative work environments by setting parameters and expectations related to their personal level of participation within the group. By staff members maintaining positive attitudes about inclusion, collaborating with one another to provide appropriate inclusive instruction, and engaging special education students in the lessons and learning activities all inclusive classroom efforts will be more successful regardless of the child and his or her disability.

References

- Broekelmann, C. (2012). Ihear® internet therapy program: A program. *The Volta Review*, 112 (3), Winter, 417-422.
- Bucalos, A. B., & Lingo, A. S. (2005). Filling the potholes in the road to inclusion: Successful research-based strategies for intermediate and middle school students with mild disabilities. *TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus*, 1 (4), Article 1.
- Calculator, S. N., & Black, T. (2009). Validation of an inventory of best practices in the provision of augmentative and alternative communication services to students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 18, 329-342.
- Carroll, D., Fulmer, C., Sobel, D., Garrison-Wade, D., Aragon, L., Coval, L. (2011). School culture for students with significant support needs: Belonging is not enough. *International Journal of Special Education*, 26 (2), 120-127.
- Daniel, L. G., & King, D. A. (1997). Impact of inclusion education on academic achievement, student behavior and self-esteem, and parental attitudes. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91 (2), 67-80.
- Daniels, V., Vaughn, S. (1999). A tool to encourage "best practice" in full inclusion. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 31 (5), 48-55.

- DeMatthews, D. E., & Mawhinney, H. (2013). Addressing the inclusion imperative: An urban school district's responses. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 21* (61), 1-27.
- Dessemontet, R. S., Bless, G., & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 56* (6), 579-587.
- Douglas, P. (2010) 'Problematising' inclusion: Education and the question of Autism. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 18* (2), 105-121.
- Duke, T. S. (2011). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth with disabilities: A meta-synthesis. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 8*, 1-51.
- Duke, T. S., & Ward, J. D. (2009). Preparing information literate teachers: A metasynthesis. *Library & Information Science Research, 31*, 247-256.
- Ernest, J. M., Heckaman, K. A., Thompson, S. E., Hull, K. M., & Carter, S. W. (2011). Increasing the teaching efficacy of a beginning special education teacher using differentiated instruction: A case study. *International Journal of Special Education, 26* (1), 191-201.
- Florian, L., & Linklater, H. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive education: Using inclusive pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning for all. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40* (4), 369-386.
- Flower, A., McDaniel, S. C., & Jolivette, K. (2011). A literature review of research quality and effective practices in alternative education settings. *Education and Treatment of Children, 34* (4), 489-510.
- Freeman, S. F. N., & Alkin, M. C. (2000). Academic and social attainments of children with

- mental retardation in general education and special education settings. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21 (1), 3-18.
- Frost, N., Elmer, S., Best, L., & Mills, S. (2010). Ensuring access and inclusion for marginalised children in extended services: Identifying the barriers and promoting choice. *British Journal of Special Education*, 37 (3), 113-121.
- Greenhill, B., & Whitehead, R. (2010). Promoting service user inclusion in risk assessment and management: A pilot project developing a human rights-based approach. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39, 277–283.
- Guldberg, K., Parsons, S., MacLeod, A., Jones, G., Prunty, A., & Balfe, T. (2011). Implications for practice from ‘international review of the evidence on best practice in educational provision for children on the autism spectrum.’ *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 26 (1), 65-70.
- Guldberg, K. (2010). Educating children on the autism spectrum: Preconditions for inclusion and notions of ‘best autism practice’ in the early years. *British Journal of Special Education*, 37 (4), 168-174.
- Hamaidi, D., Homidi, M., & Reyes L. V. (2012). International views of inclusive education: A comparative study of early childhood educator’s perceptions in Jordan, United Arab Emirates, and the United States of America. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27 (2), 94-101.
- Harr-Robins, J., Song, M., Hurlburt, S., Pruce, C., Danielson, L., Garet, M., Taylor, J., & Jacobson, J. (2012). *The inclusion of students with disabilities in school accountability systems*. (NCEE 2012-4056). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation

- and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education.
- Horn, E., Lieber, J., Li, S., Sandall, S., & Schwartz, I. (2000). Supporting young children's IEP goals in inclusive settings through embedded learning opportunities. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 20* (4), 208-223.
- Humphrey, N. (2008). Including pupils with autistic spectrum disorders in mainstream schools. *Support for Learning, 23* (1), 41-47.
- Iovannone, R., Dunlap, G., Huber, H., & Kincaid, D. (2003). Effective educational practices for students with autism spectrum disorders. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 18* (3), 150-165.
- Jorgensen, C. M., & Lambert, L. (2012). Inclusion means more than just being "in:" Planning full participation of students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities in the general education classroom. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 8* (2), 21-36.
- Karge, B. D., Lasky, B. (2009). Spotlight on special education. *National Staff Development Council, 30* (3), 49-52.
- Lieberman-Betz, R. G., Vail, C. O., & Chai, Z. (2013). Examining response to intervention using a framework of best practice from early childhood special education. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal, 21* (1), 51-67.
- Lynch, S. L., & Irvine, A. N. (2009) Inclusive education and best practice for children with autism spectrum disorder: An integrated approach. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13* (8), 845-859.
- Marino, M. T. (2010). Defining a technology research agenda for elementary and secondary students with learning and other high-incidence disabilities in inclusive science

- classrooms. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 25 (1), 1-27.
- McAllister, K., & Hadjri, K. (2013). Inclusion and the special educational needs (SEN) resource base in mainstream schools: Physical factors to maximize effectiveness. *Support for Learning*, 28 (2), 57-65.
- McCray, E. D., & McHatton, P. A. (2011). "Less afraid to have them in my classroom": Understanding pre-service general educators' perceptions about inclusion. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Fall, 135-155.
- McGinnity, A. (2008). Inclusion: Sharing a vision of learning for schools, parents and young people. *Child Care in Practice*, 14 (1), 95-103.
- McLaren, S. J. (2013). Is inclusive education right for every child? An account by the parent of a child with high and complex needs due to autism spectrum disorder. *Kairaranga*, 14 (2), 26-34.
- McMaster, C. (2013). ERO caught in the act (again): Limiting inclusion to suit policy. *Kairaranga* 14 (2), 47-51.
- Orr, A. C. (2009). New special educators reflect about inclusion: Preparation and K-12 current practice. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 3, 228-239.
- Palmer, S. B., Wehmeyer, M. L., Gipson, K., & Agran, M. (2004). Promoting access to the general curriculum by teaching self-determination skills. *Exceptional Children*, 70 (4), 427-439.
- Regan, K. S., & Michaud, K. M. (2011). Best practices to support student behavior. *Beyond Behavior*, Winter, 40-47.
- Ritter, C. L., Michel, C. S., & Irby, B. (1999). Concerning inclusion: Perceptions of middle

- school students, their parents, and teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 18 (2), 10-16.
- Scanlon, D., & Baker, D. (2012). An accommodations model for the secondary inclusive classroom. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 35 (4), 212–224.
- Sindelar, P. T. (1995). Full inclusion of students with learning disabilities and its implications for teacher education. *The Journal of Special Education*, 29 (2), 234-244.
- Trepanier-Street, M. (2010). Education and medical professionals collaborating to prepare early childhood teachers for inclusive settings. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 31 (1), 63-70.
- Vickerman, P., & Blundell, M. (2012) English learning support assistants' experiences of including children with special educational needs in physical education, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27 (2), 143-156.
- Woodcock, S., Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2012). Does study of an inclusive education subject influence pre-service teachers' concerns and self-efficacy about inclusion? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (6), 1-11.
- Zigmond, N., & Baker, J. M. (1996). Full Inclusion for Students with Learning Disabilities; Too Much of a Good Thing?. *Theory Into Practice*, 35(1), 26-34.