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The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the perceived teacher efficacy in co-teaching in inclusive classrooms among Resident Educators in Ohio. Novice teachers are required to participate in the program for the first four years of their teaching experience. Research shows that co-teaching is a necessary and effective practice in meeting the needs of all students. Higher teacher efficacy leads to more effective instruction. Data were collected utilizing the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale along with demographic questions. A total of 53 Resident Educators were included in the data analysis in December 2015. The study population included primary through high school special and regular education teachers.

Inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the three research questions. The first research question examined program (special education vs. regular education) differences in the number of college courses that discussed co-teaching along with the efficacy items and subscales from the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale. Special education Resident Educators reported significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching than regular education Resident Educators. Special education teachers were also significantly more confident in designing learning tasks to ensure the individual needs of the students with disabilities were accommodated. And even more compelling, special education teachers were more able to serve as advocates for students with special needs because they possessed higher perceived self-efficacy in the governing laws and policies. The results showed that the increased perceived self-efficacy of special education teachers allowed then to more readily inform others who know little about the laws and policies related to the inclusion of students with disabilities than regular education teachers. Regular education Resident Educators, however, were significantly more
confident in having students work together in pairs or in small groups than special education Resident Educators.

The second research question examined the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale items and the four subscales in relation to the number of years of teaching experience. Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy on one item in the Efficacy in Managing Behavior subscale, calming a student who is disruptive or noisy, than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching.

Research question three examined item and subscale differences based upon prior experience in inclusive teaching using t-test for independent samples. Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching.

Three main conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study. First, special education teachers and those with more experience have more opportunities to learn about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Second, students majoring in special education receive more training in co-teaching. Lastly, Resident Educators are self-efficacious with inclusive teaching. The findings of the study offers policy and leadership implications for k – 12 education practice and higher education teacher preparation.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the background of the problem and key components that will be further supported in the next chapter. The rationale for conducting this study, purpose, research questions, theoretical framework, significance, key terms, delimitations, limitations, and assumptions are also discussed.

Background of the Problem

Federal education policies and subsequent decisions stress the importance of improving teaching and learning by incorporating scientifically researched best practices in the classroom (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) is a landmark court case that ended segregation in schools based on race and argued separate cannot be equal. The belief that separate cannot be equal extends beyond the race of the students and now includes students with disabilities and learners of the English language. A nonnegotiable vision for social justice is that every child is eligible to receive a quality education in a heterogeneous setting that is not segregated (Capper & Frattura, 2009). Research shows that integrated educational environments allow all students to learn together in small-group and large-group settings (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Children have greater academic gains when high expectations are set for student success (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004).

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* stipulates that school districts around the country address achievement gaps by more effectively educating underachieving students who may face challenges such as lower socioeconomic status, disabilities, English as a second language, or any other issue that may inhibit equal access to an effective public education in order to close achievement gaps (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Harvey, Yssel, Bauserman, and
Merbler (2010) note that the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* requires students to have access to learning in a general education classroom; therefore, inclusion has become imperative.

**Federal Initiatives**

Federal legislation has increased the mandates governing public school curriculum standards and assessment accountability (U.S. Department of Education, 2003; 2010). Students with special needs are a significant focus in the overall goal of federal and state legislation to increase the achievement of students. The federal policies that focus on increasing school accountability for student achievement require schools to examine the way educators teach and assess students (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Students with disabilities and learners of the English language are also included in federal policies focusing on student achievement (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career, 2014). Federal policies are created to promote the academic achievement of students; however, only 32% of fourth-grade students were able to read proficiently, or at grade level, in the 2000 – 2001 school year. And alarmingly, students’ reading scores have remained stagnant since 1975 (National Assessment of Educational Progress as cited in U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

**Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965**

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* requires equal access to education for students, including learners with disabilities (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965). Title I of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* provides financial assistance to local education agencies that are educating students with concentrations of low-income families in an effort to ensure students have equal opportunities to obtain a quality education. Title I funds, as described in the *Improving America’s School Act of 1994*, are
designed to close the gap between students attending high-poverty and low-poverty schools (Improving America’s School Act, 1994).

Title I grants represent significant federal funds specifically for improving the achievement of students identified as disadvantaged. Students identified as disadvantaged are low-achieving students attending high-poverty schools, limited in English proficiency, children of migrant or Native American families, disabled, neglected or delinquent, or young children that have parents with literacy needs (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965). The focus on disadvantaged students is based on the belief that education is good for society, improves the life of individuals, and is morally important (Improving America’s School Act, 1994).

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* reauthorizes the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* and requires that all students, including those with special needs, acquire a quality education by having access to the general curriculum. The Act also stipulates students must be taught by highly qualified teachers in an effort to help address and close the achievement gap between high-performing and low-performing students (No Child Left Behind, 2002). The purpose of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (*NCLB*) is to increase student achievement by ensuring students obtain a high-quality education and score at least proficient on challenging academic achievement standards and assessments (No Child Left Behind, 2002). The U. S. Department of Education (2003) notes that *NCLB* is designed to overhaul federal education for students and establishes four central pillars, or themes. The four pillars include stronger accountability for assessment results, improving education based on scientifically researched best practices to advance teaching and learning, expanding choices for parents, and increasing state control and flexibility regarding the use of funds (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).
This investigation focuses on the second pillar, which is improving education based on scientifically-researched best practices; however, the interconnectedness of the pillars continues to be the focus of education reform in Ohio.

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act**

The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004* is partially guided by the *NCLB* mandate. A major component of school districts’ ongoing quest for improving student achievement is the continual responsibility to meet the components of Public Law 94-142, *Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975*, later changed to Public Law 101-476, *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004* (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004). The first purpose of the *Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004* is to ensure teachers are prepared to educate students with exceptional needs and that parents receive the necessary materials and information. A major change between *Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975* and *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004* is that special education teachers must be designated as highly qualified teachers in an effort to meet the *NCLB* mandate (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004). Since the *Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004* requires special education teachers to be highly qualified (U. S. Department of Education, 2014b), an annual report is compiled to share key findings including special education teachers and student ratio. The U. S. Department of Education (2014b) report notes 94.2 percent of full-time equivalent special education teachers were highly qualified in 2010. As a country, there were 6.4 full-time equivalent special education teachers per 100 students in the fall of 2010 with 6.0 of the teachers being highly qualified. In comparison, Ohio had 7.9 full-time equivalent special education teachers per 100 students served under *Individuals
with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 in the fall of 2010 with 7.7 of the teachers being highly qualified.

A second purpose of the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004 is to assess the effectiveness of educating students with disabilities, including educating students in the least restrictive environment (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004). The least restrict environment is defined as educating students with disabilities in classrooms with students without disabilities. Students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment because research indicates that the students benefit in this type of instruction environment (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1990). A key change in the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004 is that the starting point for students is inclusion in the regular education classroom as opposed to a more restrictive setting. Students with disabilities need to be in the regular education classroom as much as possible and are to be placed in a special education classroom only when their needs cannot be met in a regular education classroom (Education for all Handicapped Children Act, 1975; Individuals with Disabilities Act, 1990; Marx, Hart, Nelson, Love, Baxter, Garlin, & Whitby, 2014).

The U. S. Department of Education (2014b) released an annual report to articulate the progress our country is making with the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004. The report discusses assessing the effectiveness of efforts to educate students with disabilities, including educating students in the least restrictive environment. In 2001, 40.7% of the 5,670,680 students ages 6 – 21 in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and Bureau of Indian Education schools, served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act were identified as having a specific learning disability. Students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) are described as having psychological processing disorder that impacts all aspects of language, such
as listening, thinking, speaking, reading, writing and spelling, or mathematic processing and are the largest identified disability category. The percentage of students identified as SLD educated in the regular education classroom for 80% or more of the academic day increased from 48.2% to 61.1% between the years of 2002 through 2011 (U. S. Department of Education, 2014b).

The second most identified disability is speech or language impairments at 18.5% (U. S. Department of Education, 2014b). The percentage of students identified as having speech or language impairments educated in the regular education classroom for 80% or more of the academic day is 86.95%. High school dropout rates for students identified as having speech or language impairments decreased from 2001-2002 through 2010-2011 by 19.9%.

Ohio students between the ages of 6 and 21 that are served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 are in the regular classroom for a majority of the school day. Ohio had 58.7% of students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 in the regular education classroom for 80% or more of the academic school day in 2011. An additional 23% of the students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 were in the regular education classroom between 40% and 79% of the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b).

A third purpose of the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004 is to ensure that students with disabilities have a free appropriate public education that meets their needs. A key change between the 1990 and 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 is that school districts are unable to qualify students for special education services based solely on a discrepancy between student achievement and aptitude tests. School districts are now required to couple the discrepancy with evidence that the student failed to respond to other interventions. The intervention stipulation is part of the Individuals with
Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 due to an over-identification of students with learning disabilities (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004). Instead, schools are required to place students in an intervention program and monitor their progress to determine if the content is successfully learned.

A final purpose of the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004 is to assist states in implementing early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities. The U. S. Department of Education (2014b) annual report also examines early intervention for infants and toddlers. There were 331,626 infants and toddlers, or 2.8 percent of the population birth to age two, served in our country and the District of Columbia in 2011. The number of infants and toddlers served increased from 2.2 percent to 2.8 percent from 2002 through 2011. A majority of the infants and toddlers, 86.6 percent, receive their services at home. Another group examined were children between the ages of three to five, which comprised 730,558 children or 5.9 percent of the population, served in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Bureau of Indian Education in 2011. The most diagnosed disability for the children ages three to five is speech or language impairments at 45.9 percent (U. S. Department of Education, 2014b).

Response to Intervention

The Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004 introduces Response to Intervention to ensure students struggling academically receive assistance sooner (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). Response to Intervention is a movement that maximizes student success on the state achievement assessments and prevents inappropriate disability identifications for students (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). The Response to Intervention process reduces special education referrals by having various levels of
intervention available to all students in the general education classroom (Fox, Carta, Strain, Dunlap, & Hemmeter, 2010). The process has three suggested levels, or tiers, that allow educators to assess all students and track their learning progress throughout the school year to determine the most effective course of action with four suggested options. The four options include a school-wide system to prevent student failure, screening of students, monitoring progress, and using the collected data to make instructional decisions. Each school district is able to create their own instructional or behavioral system to ensure all students succeed.

The National Center on Response to Intervention (2010) suggests three levels of student support: primary, secondary, and tertiary, in order to keep common language among schools, districts, and states. During the universal screening process, all students in the school district are assessed to identify students as making adequate progress, some risk of failure without intervention, or high risk of failure without specialized support to meet their needs (Fox et al., 2010). The National Center on Response to Intervention (2010) suggests screening all students at the start of the school year; however, some districts screen all students two or three times a year.

After the screening is complete and data is complied, the students are placed in the most appropriate level. The National Center on Response to Intervention (2010) suggests that all students receive the first level, which is the core curriculum received in the regular classroom as a whole group. Core curriculum is the mandatory course of study adopted by local school boards or Departments of Education. Some students may be placed in level two, in addition to level one. Level two may take place in the regular education classroom or in another classroom setting. Those students receive small group instruction designed to help close the achievement gap by receiving interventions that have specific instructional procedures, duration, and frequency. The duration and frequency is typically 10 to 15 weeks for 20 to 40 minutes and occurs 3 or 4 days a
week (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). Students are dismissed from level two when they show growth.

Students are moved to level three if they do not show growth after receiving level two interventions, which requires individualized interventions to help them succeed. The National Center on Response to Intervention (2010) suggests monitoring student progress frequently during level three interventions. Tertiary intervention is more intensive and individualized than level two interventions (Fox et al., 2010). The goal of level three is to remediate existing problems and prevent the occurrence of other problems (Ervin, n.d). Teachers should continue to assess students in order to make informed decisions about their own teaching and the learning of the students (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010).

**Race to the Top Fund**

Response to Intervention dovetails with the $4.35 billion Race to the Top (RttT) federal initiative aimed at improving student achievement as part of the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, offered to states in three phases (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). The goal of RttT is to reform education by designing data systems to measure student success, such as Response to Intervention. RttT focuses on creating rigorous standards and assessments to enable students to be successful after high school, ensuring effective teachers and principals are educating students, and improving low-performing schools. States were able to apply for the federal grants by detailing their RttT plans and the United States Department of Education awarded grants to eleven states and the District of Columbia in 2010 (Crowe, 2011).

Ohio was awarded $400 million in grant funds and was then required to implement their Race to the Top plans (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). Koppich and Esch (2012)
explained that most of the states that applied for Phase 2 RttT funds specified they would initiate new processes for teacher evaluation and differential pay.

**Inclusive Instruction**

Federal initiatives, such as *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004*, *NCLB*, and RttT grants, require educators to possess effective classroom instruction and assessment skills to determine the most effective method to educate children (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2014a; U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Marzano (2007) stressed that effective schools' most influential component is effective teachers in the classrooms. Classroom teachers are pivotal as irreplaceable leaders of reinventing effective instructional practices (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010). Educators are increasingly accountable to implement instructional strategies and formative assessments to ensure the success of all students (Graham-Day, Fishley, Konrad, Peters, & Ressa, 2014). Formative assessments are defined as assessments that are administered as the students are in the process of learning new content or skills (Marzano, 2007).

Collaboration among educators and administrators is essential to meet the federal goal of all children being proficient in mathematics and reading. Co-teaching has emerged as an effective instructional strategy to meet the needs of the 21st-century student. Bacharach, Heck, and Dahlberg (2010) examined collaboration through a different lens by conducting a study on the topic of co-teaching during student teaching. Each year the students who taught in a co-teaching environment made greater academic gains than the students who were instructed in one of the non-co-teaching classrooms. When the researchers analyzed the students’ mathematics and reading state assessments scores, statistically significant findings were calculated with students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunches and students enrolled in special education services.
Both groups demonstrated significant gains. Students who were learning English as a second language also showed more growth in their reading scores on the state achievement assessment.

**Collaboration Among Educators**

Effective inclusive teachers are vital with the inclusion of special education in federal policies. Harvey et al. (2010) noted that *NCLB* insists students have access to learning in a general education classroom; therefore, inclusion has become imperative. Students receive the core instruction in the classroom to ensure they are learning grade level material and in order for inclusion to be effective, collaboration has to occur between special and general education teachers. Transformations transpire in classrooms when collaboration among educators occurs (Bond, 2011). Isolation and lack of collaboration precludes the development of expertise in pedagogical and leadership skills spanning the range of all learners (Bond, 2011; Frattura & Capper, 2007). Professional development and professionalism occur when teachers provided feedback to one another on a regular basis after observing each other in the classroom. As a result, student achievement increases when teachers collaborate and reflect on classroom practices (Bond, 2011).

Many researchers agree on the importance of teaching pre-service teachers how to effectively work collaboratively with other educators (Ardnt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al. 2010; Main, 2010; Santagata & Guarino, 2012). Unfortunately, most pre-service teachers do not receive instruction during their preparatory training on collaborative teaching (Main, 2010).

**Classroom and Behavior Management**

Extensive research demonstrates the need for pre-service teachers to be effectively trained to implement effective classroom leadership strategies (Gaudreau, Royer, Frenette, Beaumont, & Flanagan, 2013; Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). Reupert and Woodcock (2010)
stressed the importance of pre-service teachers receiving effective preventative classroom
management strategies modeled earlier in their educational training and more frequently. In
addition, pre-service teachers need to be provided time to practice the strategies under the
guidance of a mentor, such as classroom mentor teacher or a person within the teacher education
program. Gaudreau, et al (2013) stressed teachers with higher perceived self-efficacy in
managing students in the classroom are more willing to have students with behavioral difficulties
in their classroom.

Effective teachers have a powerful influence on student learning regardless of school and
district ratings (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001) and Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) stress
the need of educators to note the differences between classroom management and classroom
leadership. Classroom management entails teachers managing activities, such as schedules,
classroom supplies, and classroom noise. In contrast, classroom leadership requires teachers to
lead students to understand the content standards and motivate students as they overcome
challenges. Ritter and Hancock (2007) stressed that effective classroom leadership significantly
impacts student learning in school.

Ohio Standards for Teachers and Ohio Resident Educator Program

Effective instruction, collaboration, and classroom learning environment are key
components of the Ohio Standards for Teachers (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). The
purpose of the seven standards created for educators in Ohio is to guide professional
development and align learning, instruction, curriculum, and assessment (Ohio Department of
Education, 2007). The first standard requires teachers to respect the diversity of the students in
the classroom and understand how students learn and develop. Teachers are expected to model
respect for all students, including those based on cultural differences, language skills, or
academic ability. The first standard also expects educators to meet the needs of all students in the classroom by understanding how students learn. Standard two expects teachers to know and understand the content area in which they are instructing. Teachers are required to know how to plan lessons to teach the content and use effective instructional strategies. The third standard expects teachers to use a variety of assessments to inform instruction, evaluate the students, and ensure the students are learning the material. These assessments allow the teacher to gather useful information to plan and differentiate future instruction (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Differentiated instruction is defined as a method of teaching that modifies the content, process, product, and effect based on the students readiness, interest, and learning profile (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010).

Standard four requires teachers to plan and deliver effective instruction to ensure each student in the classroom grows academically. In addition to differentiated instruction, as in standard three, teachers are expected to communicate clear learning goals to the students and link the classroom activities to the learning goals (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). The fifth standard focuses on teachers creating a learning environment in the classroom that promotes learning and achievement for each student. An effective learning environment includes a variety of strategies that allows students to work independently, collaboratively in small groups, or as a whole class. The sixth standard focuses on teacher collaboration and communication with students in the class, the parents of the students, other educators, administrators, and the community. Effective collaboration and communication enables teachers to share responsibility in an effort to support student learning in the classroom. Lastly, standard seven expects teachers to take responsibility for professional growth as a teacher and a member of the learning
community. Teachers are agents of change to positively impact student learning by engaging in purposeful professional development (Ohio Department of Education, 2007).

The Ohio Resident Educator Program and the Resident Educator Summative Assessment support Ohio’s seven standards for the teaching profession by providing continued professional development, guiding educators to more effective teaching practices (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). During the 2013 - 2014 academic school year, Ohio regulated whether or not Resident Educators were to receive their professional license to teach as determined by the results of the Resident Educator Summative Assessment (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a).

The Ohio Resident Educator Program is a four-year program that is designed to support novice teachers during their first four years of teaching. A Resident Educator is a first-year through fourth-year teacher in Ohio. Regular and special education Resident Educators complete the Resident Educator Summative Assessment during their third year of teaching that entails completing five tasks that require them to demonstrate their teaching skill and the impact of their teaching on student learning. Swan, Wolf, and Cano (2011) suggest the use of supportive mentors for novice teachers due to the decline in self-efficacy in multiple areas examined.

**Rationale**

Federal policies that focus on increased student achievement require school districts to examine the way educators teach and assess students (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). A rationale for conducting this study derives from the findings of other researchers such as Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) who indicated a dearth of research focusing on perceived teacher efficacy in educating students with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Research suggests that self-efficacy is a determining factor in creating a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning (Bandura, 1993). The self-efficacy framework is used extensively in educational
research (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Sharma et al. (2012) base the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale on Bandura’s self-efficacy behavior change framework. Bandura (1993) noted the learning environment that is created in the classrooms is due in large part to the self-efficacy of teachers. The self-efficacy teachers possess with their ability to instruct students does influence the atmosphere in the classrooms (Bandura, 1993).

Another rationale for conducting this study derives from research noting that co-teaching is used in inclusive classrooms to meet the needs of various learners; however, research is lacking examining teachers’ confidence in co-teaching with those educators not currently in a co-teaching assignment (Panscofar and Petroff, 2013). Bandura (1997) and Pajares (2002) noted the terms self-efficacy and confidence are similar; however, self-efficacy is a construct grounded in theory since the concept encompasses the context of the situation and the task at hand, whereas, confidence only includes the context of the situation. Several researchers have examined self-efficacy in education using the theoretical framework created by Bandura (Leyser, Zeiger, & Romi, 2011; Malinen, Savolainen, Engelbrecht, Xu, Nel, & Nel, 2013; Swan, Wolf, & Cano, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007) and those are explored in Chapter 2.

This study examined Resident Educators in Ohio to gain a deeper understanding of their perceived self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy. The significance of this line of inquiry rests with studies showing that teacher efficacy influences classroom behavior and increases student academic gains (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative study is to examine the perceived teacher self-efficacy with inclusive classrooms among Resident Educators in Ohio. This study seeks to assess whether
special education Resident Educators differ from regular education Resident Educators in the number of college courses in co-teaching and their perceived self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy. Harvey et al. (2010) examined 124 universities that offered teacher preparation programs and reported 70% of the universities did not offer a course on co-teaching. The pre-service teachers in the special education program agreed, with statistical significance, that coursework on collaboration was in the program; however, regular education elementary and secondary pre-service teachers had less agreement.

This study also examined whether third-year and fourth-year Resident Educators differ from first-year and second-year Resident Educators in their perceived self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy. Further, the study examined whether Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusionary teaching differ from Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive settings in their perceived self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy. Ritter and Hancock (2007) stressed that effective classroom management significantly impacts student learning in school. When discussing student behavior management, researchers agree on the need for pre-service teachers to be effectively trained to implement effective classroom management strategies (Gaudreau et al., 2013; Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). Lastly, the study examined whether the number of college courses that discussed co-teaching differ between regular education and special education majors.

The sample for this study included 53 first-year through fourth-year Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio. All 150 first-year through fourth-year Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio were invited via email to complete demographic questions and the Teacher
Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) scale developed by Sharma et al. (2012). The categorical independent variables included the type of teacher preparation program, teacher demographics, and inclusionary setting experience. Resident Educators were also identified as a graduate of a special education program or a regular education program, as a first-year, second-year, third-year, or fourth-year teacher, and as to whether or not they had prior experience with inclusive teaching. The dependent variables were the number of college courses taken that discussed co-teaching and their perceived self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy.

**Research Questions**

This study answered the following research questions in order to examine Resident Educators in Ohio:

1. Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching and significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators?

2. Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching?

3. Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusion teaching?
Theoretical Framework

Bandura (1977) is the creator of the integrated behavior change framework of self-efficacy. The theory of self-efficacy suggests people examine various sources of information related to their capability to perform a task and use that information to make their behavior choices. Efficacy refers to the beliefs that one would successfully produce positive, effective results by performing a certain behavior. The more self-efficacy people believe they possess within themselves, the more likely they are to increase their effort to complete the task at hand (Bandura, 1977).

When people assess the expectations of difficult tasks and their own predicted performance, they examine magnitude, generality, and strength. The magnitude of a task is related to the difficulty of the particular feared task. People with low self-efficacy focus on the easier tasks, while people with high self-efficacy attempt to accomplish the most daunting tasks (Bandura, 1977). Gibson and Dembo (1984) noted magnitude applies to educators when tasks are examined to determine the level of difficulty wherein they felt efficacious. Gibson and Dembo (1984) wrote extensively on self-efficacy and their contributions provide valuable research support for this investigation.

Efficacy expectations vary in generality (Bandura, 1977). Experiences that are incapable of being applied to other experiences lack generality, whereas experiences that are capable of extending to many different situations possess generality. Gibson and Dembo (1984) reflected that teachers with low self-efficacy might have a narrow range of teaching situations that allow them to feel confident. However, teachers with high self-efficacy may generalize teaching situations and apply the skills to other circumstances in the classroom.
Strength is the final dimension that impacts efficacy expectations. When people have weak expectations, they quickly terminate their efforts to be successful after a negative experience. On the other hand, people with strong expectations master the skill by working through the challenges and setbacks in order to be successful (Bandura, 1977). Strength applies to teachers as they determine the ease of which a lesson or activity can be modified during a lesson (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Teachers can prevent student failure when they have the strength to differentiate instruction for diverse students in the classroom (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Effective expectancy analysis requires magnitude, generality, and strength to be assessed in order for people to predict their performance on tasks (Bandura, 1977).

**Significance of the Study**

This study informs practice, policy, and research. As stated previously, federal policies mandate that schools develop strategies to more effectively educate all students, including students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. In the majority of cases, the least restrictive environment will be the regular classroom setting. Data reported annually through the state-mandated local report card indicate many schools in Ohio are not performing adequately in educating students with disabilities. Resident Educators are a significant population as they are responsible for developing and delivering effective instructional strategies to all students, kindergarten through high school. The results of the research conducted in this study allow school districts and universities to make more informed decisions about the need to ensure Resident Educators are prepared to educate all of the students in the classroom. School districts can use the results of the study to inform decisions about ongoing professional development needs, specific novice teacher needs, the effectiveness of mentor teachers, and other Resident Educator issues that may emerge that need to be addressed. The information from this study
inform strategies to promote the growth of more self-efficacious Resident Educators through the development of effective instructional practices, classroom management strategies, professional collaboration and collaborative teaching practices, and overall tools to meet the needs of all students. The study results provide research support for developing teacher collaboration as a required teacher competency. The results of the study inform teacher preparation programs to ensure that teacher graduates are prepared for inclusive classrooms when they enter the workforce.

Leyser et al. (2011) conducted a study to examine the differences in self-efficacy among general and special education pre-service teachers and reported those majoring in special education had significantly higher self-efficacy on all factors tested compared to the pre-service teachers majoring in general education. In the study, some general education pre-service teachers reported they had received very little or no training in working with students with disabilities. The students majoring in special education reported intensive course work throughout their program in working with students with disabilities.

The TEIP scale was developed to fill a gap by ensuring an instrument was available to allow researchers to measure teacher efficacy in educating students in inclusive classrooms. Sharma et al. (2012) specify the need of the TEIP scale to be used to gather information about teacher efficacy in more cultures and contexts. The instrument was developed and examined pre-service teachers in four countries: Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, and India. This study further advances the TEIP scale by providing a different country and context, as the participants are Resident Educators in the Ohio.

**Definition of Key Terms**

The key terms that are used throughout the research are defined.
**Achievement Gap**: A significant and constant disparity in academic achievement between different groups of students.

**Collaboration**: Teachers collaborate effectively with parents, the local community, other teachers, administrators, and other staff members to improve student achievement (Ohio Department of Education, 2007).

**Common Core**: Standards in mathematics and English language arts that outline the learning goals students should be able to do at the end of each grade level.

**Co-teaching**: Cook and Friend (1995) define co-teaching as having at least two teachers instructing a diverse group of students in a single classroom.

**Co-teaching experience**: Co-teaching experience is the experience of co-teaching with another educator in the same classroom with the same group of students.

**Education of the Handicapped Children Act**: The purpose is to ensure students with disabilities have a free appropriate public education available to them that includes special education and other related services to meet their individual educational needs (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

**Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965**: The federal policy required equal access to education and higher standards for students, including students with disabilities, and higher quality teaching and learning (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965).

**Formative assessment**: Assessments that are administered as the students are in the process of learning new content or skills (Marzano, 2007).

**Inclusive classrooms**: Students with diverse needs are educated in a regular education classroom.

**In-service teacher**: A certified teacher currently in the teaching profession is an in-service teacher.
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: This reauthorized the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 to ensure students with disabilities have a free appropriate public education available to them that includes special education and other related services to meet their individual educational needs and prepare them for future employment and further education (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was amended to align to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Turnbull, 2005).

Least restrictive environment: A separate educational environment, or classroom, is only recommended for students with disabilities when the needs of the students with disabilities cannot be met in the regular classroom (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

Local Report Cards: School district and individual school report cards that include student performance on state assessments (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind Act, 2002). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires schools to have highly qualified teachers, meaning teachers with a full certification, bachelor’s degree, and knowledge in both subject material and teaching pedagogy observed and documented, in the classroom.

Pre-service teacher: A university student in an education program is a pre-service teacher.

Race to the Top: A federal competitive grant program that encourages educational innovation and rewards States that are achieving substantial gains in student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

Resident educator: A first-year through fourth-year teacher in Ohio is a resident educator.
Self-efficacy: The theory of self-efficacy suggests people examine various sources of information related to their capability to perform a task and use that information to make their behavior choices (Bandura, 1977).

Summative assessment: Assessments that are administered at the end of a unit, semester, or school year (Marzano, 2007).

Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice: The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) scale is an instrument designed for educational purposes to measure the self-efficacy of classroom teachers to apply inclusive classroom practices (Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin, 2012).

Teacher preparation program: Pre-service teachers chose to major in teaching special education or regular education.

Value added: Value added calculates student assessment data over a period of time in order to measure learning achievement (U. S. Department of Education, 2014).

**Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions**

The delimitation of this study is that the research focuses on schools in Ohio. The participants in the study are Resident Educators embarking on their first through fourth year of teaching.

Aspects of this study that limit generalizability include a convenience sample of Resident Educators in Ohio. The homogeneous population could pose issues when generalizing the information to the general teaching population and populations beyond Ohio. The small sample size of 53 Resident Educators in one county in Ohio is a limitation in this study. All 150 Resident Educators were invited to complete the survey; however, the survey yielded 53 participants, a 35% survey response rate. Shih and Fan (2009) conducted a meta-analysis comparing response rates in surveys conducted by e-mail and mail. The surveys sent by e-mail
had an average response rate of 33% and 53% was the average response rate for surveys by mail. Therefore, this study did exceed the average response rate for emailed surveys. Lastly, the study is limited due to the fact that the participants in this study supplied the self-reported data.

Assumptions are made in order to allow this study to make a significant contribution to the current research on self-efficacy in inclusive teaching. One assumption is that the participants understood the items in the TEIP scale and answered honestly. Sharma et al. (2012) calculated the TEIP scale to be reliable across various cultures; therefore, reliability of the TEIP scale in the United States of America for in-service teachers must be assumed.

**Organization of the Study**

The chapters in this study are organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents a detailed description of the theoretical framework used in this study and reviews literature on self-efficacy and co-teaching. Chapter 3 provides details pertaining to the research design, methodology, data analysis procedures, and limitations concerning internal and external validity. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study and an analysis of the data collected. Lastly, Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of this study and also includes recommendations for future research and policy implications.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A nonnegotiable vision for social justice is that every child belongs in a heterogeneous setting and high achievement for all students is a priority (Capper & Frattura, 2009). Integrated educational environments allow all students to learn together in small-group and large-group settings (Frattura & Capper, 2007). In schools, administrators hire educators who possess the knowledge and skills to educate students with various needs in heterogeneous classrooms (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Teachers educate students to change the intelligence of the students since intelligence is not fixed (Hattie, 2012). Student achievement is maximized when teachers have the capacity to educate students with a wide range of diverse needs (Frattura & Capper, 2007).

Federal court cases and subsequent decisions stress that improving teaching and learning by incorporating scientifically researched best practices in the classroom is imperative (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954) is a landmark court case that argued separate cannot be equal and ended segregation in schools based on race. Educational laws expanded the notion that separate cannot be equal by including more students in the regular education classroom. For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 requires equal access to education for students, including students with disabilities (Elementary and Secondary Act, 1965). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 stipulates that school districts around the country expand programs to better educate the underachieving students with lower socioeconomic status, disabilities, English language deficiencies, or any other student lacking equal access to an effective public education in order to close achievement gaps (US Department of Education, 2003). Harvey et al. (2010) note that the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires that students have access to learning in a regular
education classroom; hence, inclusion has become imperative. Students receive the core instruction in a regular education classroom to ensure they are learning grade-level material.

**Historical Context**

Over the last 50 years, federal policies have been created to promote the academic achievement of students. The *Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975* stipulates students are educated in the least restrictive environment and individualized education programs are created for students with special needs. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* reauthorized the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (No Child Left Behind, 2002).

**Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975**

A provision in the *Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975* guarantees students with disabilities a free appropriate public education that meets their individual needs (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975). Placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment was a major change in education when the law was put into place. The least restrictive environment is defined as students with disabilities being educated with peers who are not disabled, unless the severity of the disability is confirmed with testing, evaluations, and the needs of the students with disabilities cannot be effectively achieved in the regular education classroom.

Prior to the enactment of the least restrictive environment, more than eight million students were identified as having a disability; however, one million of the students were excluded from the public school system due to their disabilities (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975). Teachers educated 5,789,884 students with disabilities between the ages of 6 and 21 in 2011. Over 94% of the students with disabilities were educated in a regular education classroom at some point during the school day; furthermore, more than 60% of the
aforementioned students were in the regular education classroom for at least 80% of the school day in 2011 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b).

Another important provision in the *Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975* is the creation of individualized education programs for students with special needs (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975). The individualized education program is a written document for each student with special needs that includes the present level of educational performance, annual goals, and specific educational services that need to be provided to the student. An annual evaluation is completed to determine whether or not instructional objectives are reached (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* was reauthorized as the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (No Child Left Behind Act, 2002). The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (*NCLB*) requires schools to have highly qualified teachers in the classrooms, meaning teachers with a full certification, bachelor’s degree, and knowledge in both subject material and teaching pedagogy that is observed and documented. School districts are expected to provide professional development for teachers to improve reading and other instructional programs as part of *NCLB*. The expectation is that the programs and materials are grounded in scientific research as a valid and reliable source to improve student learning in the classroom (US Department of Education, 2003).

*NCLB* overhauls federal education for students and establishes four central pillars, or themes. The four pillars include stronger accountability for assessment results, improve education based on scientifically researched best practices to improve teaching and learning,
expand choices for parents, and expand state control and flexibility regarding the use of funds (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

**Pillar one.** The accountability for the assessment results pillar of *NCLB* states that students must be assessed in mathematics and reading in grades 3 through 8 and a minimum of one time in high school, grades 10 through 12 (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Ohio, as well as other states, is responsible for designing their own assessments that are aligned to the states academic content standards and developing data reporting systems for parents and community members (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). The percentage point difference between students with and without disabilities was 32.3 percentage points during the 2010-2011 academic school year, 32.6 percentage points during the 2011 - 2012 academic school year, and 33.7 percentage points during the 2012 - 2013 academic school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b). Ohio has adopted the Common Core State Standards and has started assessing students statewide using a new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers assessment system throughout the 2014-2015 academic school year (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, 2014). The underlying purpose of the Common Core State Standards is to prepare students for college or career after high school graduation by teaching rigorous and relevant standards in the classroom (Phillips, 2015).

**Pillar two.** Improving teaching and learning by incorporating scientifically researched best practices in the classroom is another pillar established from *NCLB* (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). The second pillar is the focus of this investigation. Marzano (2007) stresses that effective teachers in the classroom is the most influential component of effective schools. *NCLB* stipulates that school districts around the country expand programs to better educate the underachieving students with lower socioeconomic status, disabilities, English language
deficiencies, or any other student lacking equal access to an effective public education in order to close achievement gaps (US Department of Education, 2003).

The Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession, The Ohio Standards for Principals, and the Ohio Standards for Professional Development were designed simultaneously by an Educator Standards Board at the request of the Ohio General Assembly in an effort to improve teaching and increase student achievement (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). The Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession are placed on a continuum of proficient, accomplished, and distinguished to guide teachers as they self-assess their professional knowledge and practices in the classroom. The principals are able to use the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession to coach and mentor teachers while using a common language created by the standards. The Ohio Standards for the Principals enable the principals to share leadership roles in a collaborative effort to improve student achievement. Effective professional development standards enable the teachers to continually develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the needs of their students (Ohio Department of Education, 2007).

Significant federal funding has tempted district initiatives to improve teaching and learning, such as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 was implemented to stimulate the economy, help create jobs, and invest in areas vital to our country, such as education. Race to the Top is part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 that provides grants to help with education and has $4.35 billion in funds (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). The Race to the Top grant reforms education by creating rigorous standards and assessments that enable students to be successful after high school, designing data systems to
measure student success, ensuring effective teachers and principals are educating students, and improving low-performing schools.

School districts in Ohio opted to apply for federal funds through the Race to the Top grant to seek federal funds to increase high school graduation rates, improve the graduation rate between underrepresented and majority students, reduce gaps in academic performance on national and state assessments, improve reading and mathematics assessment scores, and increase college enrollment. The school districts that chose to participate in Ohio’s Race to the Top grant fully implemented a new teacher and principal evaluation system during the 2013-2014 academic school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System uses the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession to examine the strengths and areas of growth for teachers (Ohio Department of Education, 2012). Student growth on state assessments is a mandatory component of the evaluation of teachers that instruct tested grades and subjects (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). Ohio teachers continue to be formally observed and evaluated by their principals during the school year.

**Pillar three**. The third pillar of NCLB expands choices for parents and supports a new local report card in Ohio (Ohio House Bill 555, 2012). Local report cards are reports that are published annually for each school district and individual schools to provide transparent academic successes and challenges to communities and parents, which include student performance on state assessments and graduation rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). School districts are charged with communicating the academic progress of the schools to parents via a parent-friendly, detailed report that explains the results of the assessments (U.S. Department of Education, 2003; 2013).
Ohio has modified the report card to provide more detailed information based on student achievement on state assessments and high school graduation rate (Ohio House Bill 555, 2012). A value added measure is included in the report card. The value added measure is a statistical growth model that is based on changes in student assessment scores over a period of time and isolated the amount of learning associated to a specific school or classroom teacher (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). Ohio House Bill 555 (2012) has created a new Ohio report card by assigning letter grades, A, B, C, D, and F to thirteen measures that reflect the performance of the school districts and individual schools. Districts and schools are able to earn an A by having at least two standard error of measure above the mean score, and a B is received when districts score at least one standard errors of measure above the mean, but less than two standard errors of measure above the mean. A grade of C is earned for scoring less than, but not greater than, one standard error of measure below or above the mean score. Grades of D and F are calculated by scoring between one and two standard errors of measure below the mean score respectively. When examining the value added in academic achievement of students with disabilities, only 97 out of 610 school districts earned an A, and only 105 school districts earned a B (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

NCLB requires schools to meet adequate yearly progress, meaning each state decides the minimum level of improvement the students must meet on their achievement assessment in mathematics and reading from one year to the next. For example, students in Ohio taking a fourth-grade state mathematics assessment are required to show one year worth of growth from their third-grade state mathematics assessment.

Every three years, Ohio elevates the student level of achievement that must be attained. Twelve years following the implementation of NCLB, the expectation is that all students in the

**Pillar four.** The Race to the Top program, which is part of the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, supports the fourth pillar of *NCLB* by encouraging state control and flexibility regarding the use of funds (U.S. Department of Education, 2014a). Ohio has designated over $200 million of the Race to the Top grant for school districts around the state that support new initiatives in education, such as professional development on Common Core State Standards, Ohio Teacher Evaluation System, Ohio Resident Educator Program, and intervention at persistently low-achieving schools. The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System is research-based and transferable to the diverse school districts in Ohio, for instance, rural, urban, and suburban school districts (Ohio Department of Education, 2012). Teacher performance consists of one half of the total evaluation for a teacher and is determined by classroom observations and conferences by an evaluator, such as a principal, whereas, the other one half of the total evaluation incorporates student growth measures on state or local assessments.

**Resident Educator Program**

The Ohio Resident Educator Program is supported by Race to the Top funds (Ohio Department of Education, 2015). The Ohio Resident Educator Program is designed to support novice teachers in their first through fourth years of teaching by providing formal professional development and support with a certified mentor. Resident Educators, or novice teachers, are assigned a certified mentor to assist in strengthening their teaching practices (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). The Ohio Resident Educator Program aims to increase teacher effectiveness.
by providing a support network along with formative and summative assessments (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).

The Ohio Resident Educator Program is comprised of six Resident Educator Program Standards. The first standard focuses on program administration and leadership at the district level to ensure a support system is in place for the Resident Educators. Standard two details the role and engagement of the principals. Principals help support and guide the Resident Educators by engaging in two-way communications with the Resident Educators and the mentors. Principals also help establish and protect the time needed for the Resident Educators and mentors to complete necessary assignments. The third standard notes the importance of systems alignment and linkages between the teacher preparation programs at universities and the Resident Educator program to further develop the Resident Educators into being successful teachers. Standard four ensures quality mentors are carefully selected and trained to help support the Resident Educator. The fifth standard focuses on professional development and learning communities for the Resident Educators. The professional development is individualized and differentiated to meet the needs of the Resident Educator and the mentor as they work together to help the Resident Educator improve their teaching, student learning, and confidence. Standard six focuses on performance assessments that are formative and summative. The mentors and Resident Educator use formative assessments to reflect on areas of strength and areas for growth; however, they are not shared with administrators unless the Resident Educator chooses to share the information. Summative assessments are used to assess the knowledge and skills of the Resident Educators. They are assessed on the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession and student growth on assessments (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).
Resident Educators are supported their first two years as they practice and refine the art and science of teaching students by reflecting on their lessons and implementing adjustments as necessary (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). The Resident Educators demonstrate their teachings skills and are scored using a performance assessment, Ohio Resident Educator Summative Assessment, during their third year of teaching (Ohio House Bill 64, 2015). The Resident Educators complete five different tasks that are based on the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (Ohio Department of Education, 2014).

**Response to Intervention**

The art of teaching requires educators to implement a range of deliberate interventions to create cognitive change in students (Hattie, 2012). The *Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004* introduces Response to Intervention to ensure students struggling academically receive assistance sooner (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). The National Center on Response to Intervention (2010) describes a movement to guarantee students success on the state achievement assessments and require collaboration among teachers and district leaders as a result of policy changes made by the federal government. Response to Intervention has four components, which include a school-wide system to prevent student failure, screening the students, progress monitoring, and using the collected data to make instructional decisions.

Students receive the core instruction to ensure they are learning grade-level material. When students need level two or further intervention, their learning may occur outside the general education classroom with another teacher, such as a reading specialist or special education teacher. In that case, the classroom teacher must work collaboratively with the other teacher to set up a time to work with that child and discuss the areas the student needs assistance
in order to learn the material. Collaboration between the educators is necessary to assist the children in learning and monitoring their progress (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). If students are unsuccessful in learning the necessary content, schools may use Response to Intervention as a procedure that ensures the students receive the necessary interventions in order to be successful in their schooling.

**Theoretical Framework**

Gibson and Dembo (1984) note teacher efficacy is thought to increase student academic gains. Educational studies have been conducted to measure the self-efficacy of teachers for a variety of reasons (Leyser et al., 2011; Malinen et al., 2013; Swan et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). This section provides an overview of Bandura’s self-efficacy theory.

Bandura (1977) is the creator of the integrated behavior change framework of self-efficacy. The theory of self-efficacy suggests people examine various sources of information related to their capability to perform a task and use that information to make their choice behavior. Efficacy refers to the beliefs that one would successfully produce positive, effective results when performing a certain behavior. The more self-efficacy people believe they possess within themselves, the more likely they are to increase their effort to complete the task at hand. Bandura (1993) states that the self-efficacy of teachers impacts the learning environment in classrooms.

**Determine Self-Efficacy**

Performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal are four important sources of information that people use to determine efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Performance accomplishments, the most influential source, are important since the participant actually experiences the events and learns from attempting to be successful. Vicarious
experiences allow the participants to learn from watching others successfully complete the task. Verbal persuasion involves others coaxing the participant into attempting the task by making the participant believe success is possible. Emotional arousal is the final source of information the participant uses before attempting the task. The participant examines anxiety and stress levels (Bandura, 1977). The four sources of information provide diverse ways for individuals to gather information and determine efficacy.

Haverback and Paraulet (2011) conducted a study that examined the differences between two field experiences for pre-service teachers using performance accomplishments and vicarious experiences. One group was placed in a field experience that required the pre-service teachers to learn to teach reading through performance accomplishments, or by educating the students themselves, through having the opportunity to tutor students one-on-one for 30 minutes a week for a total of 10 weeks, while the other group learned to teach reading vicariously, or by observing the classroom teacher instruct the class. Statistical significance was not found between the two groups on the Reading Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale; however, the tutors reported lower self-efficacy than the observers. During the interviews of randomly selected tutors and observers, 88.89% of the tutors indicated the field experience had the greatest contribution to their increase in efficacy, while only 28.57% of the observers contributed the change in efficacy to field experience. Tutors revealed that educating students was more challenging than it appeared and found the field experience more relevant to the increase in efficacy and content knowledge than the observers, which indicated pre-service teachers value opportunities for performance accomplishments.
Self-Efficacy Cognitive Process

Self-efficacy is fluid since people assess situations to determine whether or not they had the skills and capabilities to try the task at hand. If people deem the task is beyond their skill set, they avoid the task (Bandura, 1977). Haverback and Parault (2011) note teachers may have high self-efficacy in teaching reading, but have low self-efficacy in educating students in science. As people process their level of self-efficacy, they separate environmental events in their life from information they hold inside themselves; that process is called cognitive processing (Bandura, 1977). The four factors that influence the cognitive processing of self-efficacy are enactive, vicarious, exhortative, and emotive. Enactive relates to performance accomplishments. People perform confidently in some situations, yet they do not attempt to take part in other circumstances. People who believe their successes are a direct result of their skills, not some external aid in their environment, improve their self-efficacy. Vicarious, the second factor, relates to vicarious experience and is the opposite of enactive. People who sense the success of the fearful situation is imaginary do not gain self-efficacy since they are not using information they hold inside; instead, they rely on observing others that achieved success in their environment.

When people observe a behavior, they make judgments on their own ability to perform the task by examining the similarities between themselves and the person performing the desired task and the characteristics of the person performing the task. For example, the observer examines the performer’s age, level of expertise, difficulty of the task, perseverance, and situation in which the successful task occurs. Exhortative factors ties in directly with verbal persuasion. People may increase or decrease their level of self-efficacy after examining the perceived creditability of the person providing verbal persuasion. Self-efficacy is more likely to
increase if the person believes the verbal persuasion being received is coming from a credible, prestigious, trustworthy, and experienced person. The final factor that influences the cognitive process is emotive which connects to emotional arousal. Self-efficacy likely increases when people view situational factors as pleasing and not stressful (Bandura, 1977).

**Self-Efficacy Processes**

Bandura (1993) further examines perceived self-efficacy in four processes: cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes. The cognitive process enables the individual to visualize scenarios that are encountered when attempting to accomplish a task that is difficult. A person with a strong sense of efficacy is able to visualize positive scenarios ending in success. On the other hand, a person with a weak sense of efficacy visualizes negative scenarios ending in complete failure. A strong sense of self-efficacy requires people to believe they can be successful in accomplishing a difficult task using their prior knowledge and skills.

Motivation is tied directly to the information that is gathered during performance accomplishments. Self-efficacy beliefs provide motivation by monitoring the goals people have set for themselves, the amount of effort they disburse working toward meeting the goal, the amount of time they endure challenges, and durability to failure while they attempt to accomplish the goal set forth. People with high self-efficacy have proactive and reactive control and put forth greater effort even after they fail to accomplish the task they are working on at the time. After the goal is met, people with strong self-efficacy set more challenging goals for themselves in order to stretch their abilities. When people have low self-efficacy, they lack motivation and give up when facing hurdles and failures. Bandura (1977) notes the importance of incentives, in addition to having the skill-set and knowledge to complete a task. If a person did
not have any incentives to successfully complete the task, even when they possess high self-efficacy, the task will not be completed.

The affective self-efficacy is connected to emotional arousal. A weak sense of self-efficacy causes people to experience high levels of anxiety, magnifying the danger of threats, and fretting about scenarios that rarely occur. People with a strong sense of self-efficacy are capable of controlling the stressors in the situation (Bandura, 1993).

Bandura (1977) explains the setting of the situation influences self-efficacy during the process of selection. People avoid situations they believe are beyond their capabilities when they feel threatened, but actively pursue challenging situations and act confidently when they believe the activities in their setting are within their capabilities to control the outcome (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1993).

As people determine their level of self-efficacy when approaching a situation, sometimes it is acceptable to be inaccurate (Bandura, 1989). Optimistic self-appraisals of efficacy are beneficial during safe activities since people exhibit additional effort to transcend their regular performances in order to improve their skill set. On the other hand, optimistic self-appraisals of efficacy are quite hazardous and even deadly when there is little room for error during dangerous situations.

**Co-teaching**

Researchers have defined co-teaching in a variety of ways. Cook and Friend (1995) define co-teaching as having at least two teachers instructing a diverse group of student in a single classroom. Co-teaching is defined as special and regular education teachers sharing the teaching responsibilities in the same classroom with the same students (Cramer & Nevin, 2006; Panscofar & Petroff, 2013; Vannest, Hagan-Burke, Parker, & Soares, 2011). Another study has
examined co-teaching through the lens of a pre-service teacher and a licensed cooperating teacher (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010). The definitions of co-teaching arrangements are not an exhaustive list; however, the arrangements highlighted are explored in more depth. The following studies reveal pertinent information about co-teaching in classrooms.

**Special Education Teacher Utilization**

Vannest et al. (2011) conducted a quantitative study that examined four types of special education programs in regards to teacher time use during the day. The participants taught special education students in adaptive behavior units, resource rooms, content master centers, and co-teaching environments. The adaptive behavior units were described as self-contained classrooms for students with extreme behavior problems and emotional disorders to spend all or part of the day. Other participants had a resource room for students with mild and moderate disabilities to receive at least half of their instruction. The content mastery program enabled the students to receive their instruction in a regular education classroom and visit a special education teacher as needed for assistance in learning the classroom material. The final program, co-teaching, enabled the special and regular education teacher to share teaching responsibilities in the same general education classroom. The purpose of the study was to provide an update of special education program types and the roles of teachers in the four various programs. The sample of 31 special education teachers with a range of 1 to 26 years of teaching experience were observed and tracked using 10 activity codes for 7,734 hours.

The quantitative study examined how the participants spent their time during the entire school day in the fall and again in the spring. The results indicated a difference in time use by special education teachers within the four programs. Statistical significance between the mean differences of the four program types was found when examining the time teachers spent on
instructional support, academic instruction, special education paperwork, special education assessment, nonacademic instruction, and state-mandated assessments. Co-teachers spent more time on instructional support and nonacademic instruction, and less time on preventative behavior management. There were some commonalities across the program types. The teachers in each of the program types spent about the same amount of time on classroom assessments and general education paperwork.

**Efficacy in Co-teaching**

Cramer and Nevin (2006) performed mixed methodology research with the purpose of revealing whether a relationship existed between regular and special education co-teachers’ ratings of their compatibility on relationships, actions and behaviors, and authentic classroom practices. The participants comprised of 46 co-teachers from 22 schools in one urban school district. The participants completed two surveys, the *Co-Teacher Relationship Scale* and *Are we really Co-Teachers Scale* at an Inclusion Exposition. Some of the participants, 16 co-teachers from 2 high schools and 2 elementary schools, also participated in the observation and interview section of the study. The researchers went to the classrooms at a later date to observe and interview the participants with open-ended questions after taking the surveys.

Qualitatively, the interviews centered around open-ended questions that asked the participants about students with disabilities in their classroom, support needed to be successful co-teaching, defining inclusive education, defining co-teaching, and training in co-teaching and inclusion. Special and regular education teachers noted the need for administrative support along with encouraging and effective training in co-teaching. The participants also believed all students need to be included and participating in the regular classroom while exposed to grade-level
material. The results indicated similarity in school settings, high school and elementary, and the role of the teacher, regular or special education (Cramer & Nevin, 2006).

Quantitatively, the results of the surveys were calculated using analysis of variance on all of the survey responses (Cramer & Nevin, 2006). The Are We Really Co-Teachers Scale did not produce any statistically significant items on the 34 items. The Co-Teacher Relationship Scale produced one statistically significant survey item, the teachers’ rating of their own confidence as a teacher when related to the number of years of co-teaching experience. Teachers with more years of co-teaching experience were more confident as teachers.

Hang and Rabren (2008) differed in their findings to identify perspectives of students and teachers and efficacy of educators during their first year of co-teaching. The researchers noted statistical significance was not found for efficacy. The high school to elementary teachers participants consisted of 14 special and 31 general education teachers during their first year of co-teaching and 58 students with disabilities. Data were collected through observations, surveys created for the study, and a record analysis.

**Opportunities to Learn About Co-teaching**

Panscofar and Petroff (2013) conducted a study that examined professional development experiences with the purpose of examining training in co-teaching received by pre-service and in-service teachers in relation to actual co-teaching experience. The sample for the study included 129 teachers across 5 districts in one Mid-Atlantic state.

The participants completed an online survey, Co-teaching Experiences and Attitudes Survey, and t tests were calculated to examine differences across groups in pre-service and in-service professional development, teacher confidence, interest, and attitudes about co-teaching across the demographics. The statistically significant findings included that novice teachers had
more opportunities to learn about co-teaching during teacher training than veteran teachers. Participants currently co-teaching stated they had more opportunities to learn about co-teaching as an in-service teacher, had greater confidence, and interest in co-teaching than non-co-teachers. Special education teachers reported more opportunities to study co-teaching during pre-service and in-service training and had greater confidence and interest in co-teaching than regular educators.

The findings in the study were echoed. Harvey et al. (2010) noted special education pre-service teachers revealed collaboration coursework was provided; however, elementary and secondary regular education pre-service teachers indicated coursework in collaboration was not part of their program. Students majoring in curriculum and instruction also noted lack of training in working collaboratively with others in an educational setting.

**Pre-service Teachers Co-teaching Experiences**

Main (2010), Arndt and Liles (2010), and Santagata and Guarino (2012) completed qualitative studies that examined co-teaching with pre-service teachers. In all three studies, the pre-service teachers were open to the idea of co-teaching, but required support when implementing teaching strategies. Main (2010) conducted a case study in Australia and found the students’ levels of confidence in transferring their teamwork skills varied among the participants in the study. The participants noted the disadvantages of working in groups were social loafing, poor communication skills, and different expectations. Arndt and Liles (2010) described a concern participants expressed for co-teaching was different expectations. The special education and social studies pre-service teachers felt their different knowledge bases and practices were isolated and viewed their roles differently as co-teachers in the same classroom. Santagata and Guarino (2012) also found different expectations in co-teaching. The study found the
collaboration that takes place in professional development settings did not match how the pre-service teachers’ conceive collaboration. The pre-service teachers were able to plan lessons together and thought collaboration was useful in reflecting on improvements to lessons and in analyzing student thinking and learning.

Bacharach et al. (2010) examined co-teaching with a student teacher and a cooperating teacher. The purpose of the four-year, mixed-method study was to concentrate on math and reading achievement scores of students in grades K-6 in co-taught and non-co-taught classrooms. The purpose was expanded during the second year to examine the differences of students receiving special education, free and reduced-priced lunch, and English-language learners in their math and reading achievement scores in grades K-6 in co-taught, non-co-taught, and one-licensed teacher classrooms. The sample included a total of 826 pairs of co-teachers across the span of four years in one school district in Minnesota. All of the co-teaching pairs included one cooperating teacher, and one pre-service student teacher from St. Cloud State University.

Quantitative data was gathered using pre-assessments and post-assessments and was examined using the Woodcock-Johnson III research edition (WJIII-RE) with a stratified random sample using a random-numbers table to select classrooms. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) was administered at certain grade levels once a year.

The results showed statistical significance in reading W scores using the analysis of variance for each of the four years, and math exhibited statistical significance two out of four years when examining co-taught and non-caught classrooms. Students in a co-taught classroom had significantly higher academic gains on the reading posttest all four years and on the math posttest two out of four years than students in a non-co-taught classroom. The students in the co-taught classroom outperformed the students on the math posttest in a non-co-taught classroom all
four years; however, only two years showed statistical significance. A chi-square analysis was examined for the MCA by categorizing co-taught or not co-taught versus proficient on the assessment or not proficient. Statistical significance was found in reading and math scores in co-taught classrooms each of the four years. When examining co-taught, non-co-taught, and one-licensed teacher classrooms, classrooms with co-teaching did obtain high levels of proficiency on the MCA. Hang and Rabren (2008) also found the reading and math scores of students with disabilities were statistically higher after being in a co-taught classroom with educators co-teaching for the first time.

Statistical significance was obtained for students in special education, free and reduced-priced lunch. Students receiving special education services and students on free and reduced lunch in co-taught classrooms were significantly more likely to show gains in reading and mathematics. Statistical significance was not found for English-language learners (Bacharach et al., 2010).

Qualitative data was gathered by interviewing over 400 students in grades K-6 over the four-year study. Students noted many benefits of co-teaching, such as, being able to get help right way, more material being covered in class, fewer classroom disruptions, better behavior, assignments were graded quicker, more connected to the school, able to do different activities since there were two teachers, and having different teaching styles.

**Self-Efficacy**

Bandura (1977) is the creator of the integrated behavior change framework of self-efficacy. The theory of self-efficacy suggests people examine various sources of information related to their capability to perform a task and use that information to make their choice
behavior. Efficacy refers to the beliefs that one would successfully produce positive, effective results by performing a certain behavior.

**Predictors for Teacher Self-Efficacy**

Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer (2004) and Stanovich and Jordan (1998) attempted to locate predictors of teacher efficacy. Collaboration among the teachers in the building was imperative in both studies. Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer (2004) examined the self-efficacy of primary teachers in a *Responsive Classroom (RC)* approach. The *RC* approach to teaching was created to improve the qualities and abilities of teachers in the classroom by training teachers on practices and priorities to guide instructional and social interactions in the school and classroom. The purpose of the study was to measure whether *RC* implementation predicted the teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward their teaching, disciplinary and teaching priorities, and if positive outcomes were connected with intervention attempts. The participants for the study consisted of 69 regular education teachers in grades K through 3 within one urban, Northeastern United States school district.

The quasi-experimental study involved several different questionnaires being completed in the fall by the participants. The instruments were a *Demographic and Classroom Description Questionnaire, Classroom Practices measure, Teacher Resources Questionnaire, Teacher Self-Efficacy Measure adapted from Bandura, Attitude Toward Teaching as a Career measure*, and *Teacher Belief Q-Sort*. The results of the study were determined using regression analyses examining teachers’ experience with *RC* in relation to the self-efficacy and attitude towards teaching as a profession. After school type and teacher characteristics were controlled for, teachers using *RC* practices had greater disciplinary self-efficacy, efficacy to create a school climate that was positive and to influence decision-making. The findings in the study supported
the association between teachers’ practices and high self-efficacy beliefs. The RC approach to teaching encouraged collaboration among the teachers (Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer, 2004).

Stanovich and Jordan (1998) also sought to use self-efficacy to predict teaching efficacy. The study included predictive effective teaching in heterogeneous classrooms from multiple variables, including self-efficacy. The participants included 31 regular education teachers in grades 2 through 8 from 12 schools in 2 districts in one metropolitan area in Canada. Data was obtained by observing the participants once in their classroom for half a day. The observers went in pairs to observe the participants teaching using a 31-item checklist organized into four categories: classroom management, time management, lesson presentation, and level of integration, to observe effective teaching behaviors.

The participants were also interviewed with questions centered on the teachers’ strategies implemented in the classroom with students in their current class that were at-risk or exceptional. The participants and the principals completed questionnaires about attitudes toward inclusion, Attitudes toward Mainstreaming Scale, and the Regular Education Initiative Teacher Survey. Classroom teachers also completed an efficacy scale and principals completed an adapted questionnaire about general teaching practices in their building.

Results reflected that beliefs of the principals relative to inclusive education were statistically significant as a strong predictor of effective teaching in the classroom. Principals that had a strong belief regarding inclusive education were a strong predictor of effective teaching taking place in the classroom. Stanovich and Jordan (1998) noted that the findings indicated staff development centered on effective teaching in inclusion classes and creating a culture of collaboration should be school-wide. Providing in-class staff development for teachers with inclusive classrooms may include modeling effective teaching strategies, such as co-teaching,
may improve teaching and learning. Flexible grouping that was based on instructional needs was connected with student achievement.

**Experience Working with Students in Special Education**

An international study on self-efficacy explored inclusive practices in three varied countries (Malinen et al., 2013). The purpose of the study was to investigate teacher self-efficacy for inclusion by using information from China, Finland, and South Africa in order to improve teacher education. The participants from China included 451 teachers from 132 different schools in Beijing. Finland had a total of 855 participants from 6 municipalities in Eastern Finland and 1 from the South-West region. The participants from South Africa included a convenience sample of 605 teachers from various socio-economic and cultural contexts from various locations in the country. The participants completed a questionnaire that measured teacher self-efficacy using the *Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices* (TEIP). In addition to completing the TEIP, the participants provided demographic information such as, interaction with students with disabilities, amount of training related to inclusive education, teaching experience, and experience in teaching students with disabilities, in order to gather independent variables.

The results had commonalities in all three countries. The participants’ self-efficacy was explained by the experiences the teachers had in educating students with disabilities even when teacher type (regular or special education) was controlled. The experience of teaching students with disabilities had the strongest results for explaining teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices. Another international study also found teaching experience that included working with students with disabilities significantly predicted positive attitudes with inclusion using the *Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices* (TEIP) in China (Malinen, Savolainen, & Xu, 2012). Malinen et al. (2013) calculated that in all three countries, about two-thirds of the
participants indicated they received little or no training on inclusive education. The results also revealed some differences between the countries. Teacher type in China (regular or special education) had statistical significance in self-efficacy in collaboration and managing student behavior. Regular education teachers in China felt more efficacious in managing student behavior than special education teachers. Male participants in Finland had statistically significantly higher efficacy in managing student behavior than the female participants.

Leyser, et al. (2011) studied the difference in self-efficacy among general and special education teachers in Israel. The researchers gathered 687 general education teachers and 305 special education teachers to participate in the study. The educators completed several instruments, included that Hebrew Extended Teacher Efficacy Scale by Rich, Lev, and Fisher, a short version of the Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Scale, and a Teacher Efficacy for Student Social Relations Scale. After calculating descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis of variance, and analysis of variance, statistical effect for all of the self-efficacy factors were found with the intensity of training to teach students with special needs. Special education teachers had significantly higher efficacy scores on all of the self-efficacy factors compared to general education teachers.

**Self-Efficacy with Disruptive Behavior Management**

Ritter and Hancock (2007) stressed that effective classroom management significantly impacted student learning in school. Researchers agreed on the need for pre-service teachers to be effectively trained to implement effective classroom management strategies (Gaudreau et al., 2013; Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). Gaudreau et al. (2013) conducted a study to examine the effect of a teacher training program designed for early elementary teachers to strengthen the teachers’ perceived self-efficacy to manage students in the classroom with difficult behavior.
The quasi-experimental study involved 56 first-grade and second-grade teachers in Quebec City. The teachers were randomly assigned to the experimental or waitlist group.

The experimental group participated in teacher training program one year ahead of the waitlist group. All of the participants took one pretest in the fall before receiving training on effective classroom management strategies for students with difficult behavior. A posttest was then administered at the end of the school year once the training was completed, and another posttest at the end of the summer for stability of impact on the teacher training. The pretests and posttests were the French-Canadian version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and the Teacher Interpersonal Self-Efficacy Scale. The results indicated statistical significance due to the fact that the experimental group developed personal teaching efficacy and perceived self-efficacy in behavior management after the training compared to the control group. Gaudreau, et al (2013) stressed the higher the perceived teacher self-efficacy in managing students in the classroom, the more willing the teachers were to have students with behavioral difficulties in their classroom.

Reupert and Woodcock (2010) conducted a study with the purpose of identifying classroom management strategies that pre-service teachers employed in the classroom, the confidence level in using various classroom management strategies, and discover the strategies the pre-service teachers found most successful. The participants consisted of 336 pre-service elementary teachers in Canada enrolled in a one-year teacher education program. One cohort completed the Survey of Behavior Management Practices created by the researchers to examine the frequency, confidence, and success in behavior management strategies during their first semester, while the other cohort completed the survey during their final semester of school.
Statistical significance was calculated when examining classroom management strategies. The pre-service teachers used initial correction strategies more frequently than prevention, rewards, or later correction strategies in the classroom. Initial correction strategies included the pre-service teacher moving closer to the student causing disruptions, nonverbal signals, or saying the student’s name. Prevention strategies included enforcing regular routine and teaching appropriate classroom behavior. Extra computer time and a school merit program were examples of rewards, and later correction behavior management strategies were being sent out of the classroom and contacting parents. Statistical significance was also determined since the pre-service teachers were more confident in initial correction and prevention than rewards and later correction strategies. Reupert and Woodcock (2010) stressed the importance of pre-service teachers having effective preventative classroom management strategies modeled earlier in their educational training and more frequently; in addition to providing pre-service teachers time to practice the strategies under the guidance of a mentor, such as classroom mentor teacher or a person within the teacher education program.

Noted researchers in the field agree that to achieve an effective classroom environment, students must have clear expectations and know the boundaries of appropriate behavior (Marzano, 2007; Stoughton, 2007; and Mundschenk, Miner, & Nastally, 2011). Marzano (2007) defined classroom rules as clearly stating expectations regarding expected student behavior. Procedures were explained as the behaviors necessary to follow the rules. Effective classroom teachers ensured time was allocated to interact with the students about the classroom rules and procedures and explicitly describing the rationale and need of each rule and procedure. Interactions included allowing the students to take responsibility for creating classroom rules and procedures at the start of the school year.
Stoughton (2007) conducted a study after learning pre-service teachers struggled with managing student behavior during field experiences. The participants in the study consisted of two cohorts of elementary pre-service elementary students. Narrative Analysis of journal writings was used since the pre-service teachers conducted written reflections while responding to a question posed in class concerning behavior expectations and practices the pre-service teachers observed during field experiences. The pre-service teachers agreed effective classroom management could be established by creating clear expectations at the beginning of the school year and adhering to those rules. Marzano (2007) also agreed on the importance of establishing rules and procedures at the start of the school year. Stoughton (2007) noted the pre-service teachers were bewildered by contradictions between teachings in the course and observations in the classroom. For example, during their pre-service field experience, teachers noticed a lack of rewarding some students and demeaning students, which conflicted with the information taught at the teacher education program.

Ritter and Hancock (2007) examined the relationships between teachers’ certification, level of experiences, and classroom management orientations. The type of teacher certification was categorized as traditional by earning a four-year baccalaureate degree at an accredited university or college teacher preparation program, or alternative by gaining certification through any other route. Level of experience was categorized as novice or experience. Novice teacher had less than two consecutive years of teaching experience, while experienced teachers had a minimum of five years of experience. The classroom management orientations were categorized as interventionist, non-interventionist, or interactionalist by examining the ways teachers managed classroom activities, such as learning, student behavior, and social interaction. The sample consisted of 158 middle school teachers that completed the Attitudes and Beliefs on
Classroom Control Inventory, classroom observations, and some participant interviews. Statistical significance was calculated with relationship between the classroom management style, certification, and experience. Specifically, traditionally certified teachers with years of experience had less controlling classroom management than alternatively certified experienced teachers, traditionally certified novice teachers, and alternatively certified novice teachers. The traditionally certified teachers with years of experience were more likely to allow the students in the classroom to have choices in classroom activities.

**Self-Efficacy with Inclusive Instruction**

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is an accrediting body for universities that prepare students to work in preschool through high schools and is acknowledged by the U.S. Department of Education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008). The mission of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is to ensure universities improve teacher preparation by ensuring graduates possess the necessary knowledge to effectively help all of the students learn in the classrooms. The voluntary, peer-reviewed process expected universities to produce knowledgeable, caring, and qualified school employees. The process examines six distinct standards that are scored as unacceptable, acceptable, or target-based on the education offered by the university to the pre-service teachers. Standard four focuses on opportunities of the students to educate diverse populations at the university and in preschool through high school experiences. The fourth subsection of standard four expects universities to enable the university students to have experience working with diverse students in preschool through high school. Diversity is defined as male and female students from various socioeconomic statuses, a minimum of two ethnic or racial groups, learners of the English language, and students with disabilities. Pre-service teachers are expected to learn about and
work in classroom with diverse students in an inclusive setting (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008).

Allday, Neilsen-Gatti, and Hudson (2013) and Harvey et al. (2010) revealed university teacher preparation programs were lacking in providing pre-service teachers knowledge on communicating with special education teachers. Undergraduate pre-service elementary education teachers received a mean of 0.19 hours, less than 0.3%, of college coursework on strategies for effective communication with special education teachers and 6% of the universities studied required a course on collaboration (Allday et al., 2013). Harvey et al. (2010) examined 124 universities that offered teacher preparation programs and reported 70% of the universities did not offer a course on co-teaching. The pre-service teachers in the special education program agreed, with statistical significance, that coursework on collaboration was in the program; however, elementary and secondary pre-service teachers had less agreement. The curriculum and instruction students were neutral in the offering of collaboration courses.

Researchers examined coursework on teaching inclusion to pre-service teachers at universities (Allday et al. 2013; McCray and McHatton, 2011; and Harvey et al., 2010). Allday et al. (2013) examined 109 colleges and universities that offered undergraduate elementary education certification, in which 64% were part of The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Data was gathered via university websites and catalogs in an effort to examine course requirements to earn a degree in elementary education using four categories that were identified by in-service teachers as needing more professional development. The four categories were knowledge of the characteristics of students with disabilities and the role and responsibility of a teacher in special education, differentiated instruction, effective classroom management strategies, and strategies to effectively communicate and collaborate with teachers
in special education. The minimum number of credit hours necessary to graduate from one of the universities studied averaged 124.39 credit hours with 59.80 dedicated to teacher education requirements.

Allday et al. (2013) argued pre-service teachers might not be taught the information they need as a practicing teacher based on the results of the study. Category one, knowledge of the characteristics of students with disabilities and the role and responsibility of a teacher in special education, was indicated on an average of 2.35 hours or 3.9% of the coursework for undergraduate elementary education. Nearly one third of the universities failed to meet the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education standard four on diversity; however 64% of the universities were part of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Differentiated instruction or inclusion, category two, was taught for an average of 1.12 hours or 1.9% of the required credit hours. The study revealed 27% of the universities in the study offered at least three hours of coursework directly connected to the inclusion of students in the classroom with disabilities. Category three, effective classroom management strategies, was overtly taught an average of 1.55 hours, 2.6% of the required hours, with 41% of the universities requiring a three-hour course on effective classroom management. Lastly, category four, strategies for the undergraduate elementary education majors to learn strategies to effectively communicate and collaborate with teachers in special education was 0.19 hours or less than 0.3%. Only 6% of the universities required a course on collaboration (Allday et al. 2013).

Harvey et al. (2010) examined the way universities educate pre-service teachers on teaching inclusive classrooms. The sample for the study included 124 faculty members from 124 different universities that offered at least one of the following programs: special education, elementary education, secondary education, or curriculum and instruction. Harvey et al. (2010)
emailed the faculty members the Pre-service Teacher Preparation for Inclusion Assessment Survey to the identified sample. Statistical significance was confirmed concerning the different educational departments offering coursework in collaboration. University students majoring in special education agreed to having collaboration coursework; however, elementary and secondary had less agreement and those majoring in curriculum and instruction were neutral on their coursework in collaboration. Significant agreement was also calculated that universities offered courses in teaching students that were exceptional or in special education. Coursework on co-teaching was not available at 70% of the universities involved in the study (Harvey et al., 2010).

A study conducted by McCray and McHatton (2011) examined general education pre-service teachers at one university on their perceptions about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular education classroom. The 77 elementary and 38 secondary education pre-service teachers were surveyed at the start and at the end of a required course on integrating exceptional students in the regular education classroom, which was the only required course about inclusion and special education necessary to earn certification at the university. Statistical significance showed more positive perceptions toward inclusion of students with exceptionalities at the end of the course. The survey results also revealed 30.4% of the pre-service teachers were undecided or did not agree that student with disabilities could be educated in a regular education classroom when examining students with intellectual and multiple disabilities; however, 97.3% of the participants agreed that students with learning disabilities could be educated in the regular education classroom, and 92.1% agreed that students with hearing disabilities could also be educated in the regular education classroom (McCray and McHatton, 2011).
Differences in Self-Efficacy Among Educators with Varying Experience

Longitudinal studies have been conducted to gather data in order to determine if changes in teacher self-efficacy occur during various points in teaching. Swan et al. (2011) studied a group of pre-service agriculture teachers and followed the group to the end of their third year of teaching. The participants completed the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale four times. When examining the self-efficacy of student engagement, the graduates that entered the teaching profession after graduation had a large effect size when compared to the participants that did not enter the teaching profession after graduation. The participants indicated the lowest teacher self-efficacy, instructional strategies, and student engagement scores at the end of their first year teaching and the highest at the end of their student teaching. When examining classroom management, the participants also scored highest at the end of their student teaching; however, the lowest scores were calculated at the end of their third year of teaching. Swan et al. (2011) stressed mortality did occur in their study since only three participants responded to all four surveys. Due to the decline in self-efficacy in multiple areas examined, Swan et al. (2011) suggest the use of supportive mentors for novice teachers.

Hoy and Spero (2005) studied graduate students obtaining a Master’s of Education without prior teaching experience and followed the group to the end of their first year of teaching. The participants completed the short form of the Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Scale, Bandura Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, and the OSU Teacher Confidence Scale. All of the measures indicated significant increases in self-efficacy from the time the participants started the Master’s of Education initial teaching certification program to the end of the program. Two scales indicated significant decreases in self-efficacy at the end of the first year of teaching. Both
studies noted self-efficacy was highest among the participants at the end of student teaching and was the lowest at the end of their first year of teaching.

De la Torre Cruz and Casanova Arias (2007) conducted a study in Spain with 188 pre-service teachers and 151 in-service teachers using a Spanish version of the Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Scale and a few items from the Emmer Hickman Classroom Management/Discipline that focused on classroom management and disciplinary efficacy. Statistical significance was found for the teachers with more classroom experience who reported higher self-efficacy with classroom management, discipline, and overall efficacy. The mean for the amount of time teaching was 15.33 years.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) examined potential sources of teacher self-efficacy to locate differences between novice and experienced teachers. The participants ranged in teaching experience from 1 to 29 years of classroom teaching experience and had a mean of 8.2 years of teaching experience. Educators with 1 to 3 years of teaching experience were considered novice teachers, while teachers with more than four years of teaching were experienced teachers. The instrument utilized in the study was the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) along with questions about support and satisfaction. Experienced teachers had significantly higher self-efficacy than novice teachers in overall self-efficacy, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

A difference between the longitudinal studies conducted by Swan, Wolf, and Cano (2011) and Hoy and Spero (2005) and the studies by de la Torre Cruz and Casanova Arias (2007) and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2005) was the latter studies included in-service teachers with a wide range of teaching experience. The mean for the amount of time teaching was 15.33 and 8.2
years, whereas the former studies focused on teachers with one to three years of teaching experience.

Summary

Qualitative research confirms co-teaching as an effective teaching strategy (Bacharach et al., 2010); however, there has been little quantitative research conducted on co-teaching (Murawski & Swanson, 2001). Vannest et al. (2011) examined the way special education teachers spent their time during the day and discovered they only spent 20% of their day on academic instruction. Many researchers (Ardnt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2010; Main, 2010; Santagata & Guarino, 2012) have agreed on the importance of teaching pre-service teachers how to effectively work collaboratively with other educators. Harvey et al. (2010) note that the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 wanted all students to have access to learning in a general education classroom; therefore, inclusion became imperative. All students received the core instruction to ensure they were learning grade-level material. In order for inclusion to be effective, collaboration had to occur between special and general education teachers. Teacher preparation programs at universities across the country should prepare their students to work collaboratively in schools. This study will examine entry-year teachers to learn whether or not universities are taking the advice of current researchers and implementing collaborative teaching in the pre-service education coursework.

The studies that examined self-efficacy spanned five continents, Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, and North America, and used a variety of instruments to collect data. International study discovered teaching experience that included working with students with disabilities significantly predicted positive attitudes with inclusion (Malinen et al., 2013; Malinen et al., 2012). Researchers agreed on the need for pre-service teachers to be effectively trained to
implement effective classroom management strategies (Gaudreau et al., 2013; Reupert & Woodcock, 2010). Allday et al. (2013) and Harvey et al. (2010) revealed university teacher preparation programs were lacking in providing pre-service teachers knowledge on communicating with special education teachers. Two studies (Swan et al., 2011; Hoy & Spero, 2005) noted self-efficacy for teachers was the lowest after the first year of teaching. Ohio recently implemented a Resident Educator that pairs a novice teacher with a mentor for the first four years of teaching.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the study research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, data analysis, and assumptions and limitations. The factors utilized to examine teachers’ self-efficacy with inclusive classrooms are thoroughly described. This background information will enable a deeper understanding of the variables before exploring the findings of this study in chapter four.

**Purpose and Overview of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the perceived teacher efficacy with inclusive classrooms among Resident Educators in Ohio. This investigation sought to assess whether special education Resident Educators differ from regular education Resident Educators in the amount of college courses that discussed co-teaching and perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy. The Resident Educators’ years of experience were compared to their perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy. Furthermore, this investigation sought to assess whether Resident Educators with prior experience teaching inclusive classes differ from Resident Educators without prior experience teaching inclusive classes in their perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy.

**Research Design**

This quantitative study utilized a causal-comparative research design to examine differences between Ohio Resident Educators. Possible causes for the noted differences between Ohio Resident Educators were examined in this study. The independent variables for the study were categorical and included type of teacher program (special or regular education), years of
experience (one, two, three, or four), and whether or not the participants had prior experience teaching inclusive classrooms (yes or no). The study participants were a homogeneous group as they were all current Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio.

Participants

This causal-comparative research study examined a non-randomized convenience sample of first-year through fourth-year Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio. The first-year through fourth-year Resident Educators in Hancock County were invited to participate in the inquiry by receiving an email explaining the study. A Qualtrics link to the demographic questions and the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale (TEIP) were included in the email. Qualtrics is a tool that allows surveys to be created and distributed electronically. A consent form was attached to the email as well.

Data were collected from Resident Educators in Ohio nearing the end of the first semester in December 2015. One hundred-fifty Resident Educators were invited to participate in the study and 53 participated in the data collection and data analysis for a 35.3% response rate. A majority, 71.7% \((n = 38)\), of the participants were involved in a regular education teacher preparation program, 20.8% \((n = 11)\) were involved in a special education teacher preparation program, and 7.5% \((n = 4)\) majored in a dual regular and special education teacher preparation program. The Resident Educators with dual majors were combined with the special education Resident Educators resulting in 15 participants, or 28.3%, in the special education prepared group. The study included 17.0% \((n = 9)\) first year teachers, 18.9% \((n = 10)\) second year teachers, 43.4% \((n = 23)\) third year teachers, 18.9% \((n = 10)\) fourth year teachers, and 1.9% \((n = 1)\) missing response. Primary (grades kindergarten through 2), intermediate (grades 3 through 5), middle (grades 6 through 8), and high school (grades 9 through 12) teachers were represented in the
study. There were 15.1% \((n = 8)\) primary, 32.1% \((n = 17)\) intermediate, 15.1% \((n = 8)\) middle school, and 35.8% \((n = 19)\) high school teachers with 1.9% \((n = 1)\) missing response. This study included 15.1% \((n = 8)\) male and 83% \((n = 44)\) female teachers with 1.9% \((n = 1)\) missing response.

Additionally, 52.8% \((n = 28)\) of the participants graduated from a public institution and 47.2% \((n = 25)\) graduated from a private institution. Of the study participants, 52.8% \((n = 28)\) had prior experience teaching in an inclusive classroom, 45.3% \((n = 24)\) did not have prior experience teaching in an inclusive classroom, with 1.9% \((n = 1)\) missing response. The participants indicated the number of courses in which they were enrolled that discussed co-teaching in inclusive classrooms, and of the respondents 20.75% \((n = 11)\) were enrolled in zero, 20.75% \((n = 11)\) were enrolled in one, 26.4% \((n = 14)\) were enrolled in two, and 32.1% \((n = 17)\) were enrolled in three or more courses as illustrated in Table 1.
Table 1

*Demographic Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher preparation program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as a teacher*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level currently teaching*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of institution attended to earn degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experience in an inclusive classroom*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses enrolled in that discussed co-teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing response
**Instrumentation**

The instrument used to collect data from the participants in this study was the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) scale. Sharma et al. (2012) developed the TEIP scale to measure perceived efficacy in teachers to instruct in inclusive classrooms. The TEIP scale consists of eighteen items using a six-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The items examine three factors: Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, and Efficacy in Managing Behavior. Each factor is comprised of six items in the TEIP scale, and the items are placed in random order to scatter the three factors throughout the scale. The survey also provides an Overall Efficacy score by examining all eighteen statements. The TEIP scale was administered to the first-year through fourth-year Resident Educators through a link to Qualtrics via email. The questions are presented in Table 2.

The *t*-test for independent samples were utilized for the three research questions. The three subscales, Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, and Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and the Overall Efficacy from the TEIP scale served as the four dependent variables. Additionally, *t*-tests for independent samples were calculated on each of the eighteen items that comprise the TEIP scale. Statistical significance is obtained when *p* is greater than or equal to .05. The effect sizes for each significant finding were also calculated. Effect size evaluates the difference between the means of the two groups (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). For this study, the effect size was calculated using the *r*², coefficient of determination, which represents the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable.

Additional questions were included that requested participants indicate whether they were regular education, special education, or dual majors during their teacher preparation program;
whether they were a first, second, third, or fourth year teacher and whether they were primary (grades kindergarten through 2), intermediate (grades 3 through 5), middle (grades 6 through 8), or high school (grades 9 through 12) educators. The participants were also asked to indicate their gender, the type of institution in which they earned their teaching degree, and whether or not they had any prior experience teaching in an inclusive classroom. The final demographic question allowed the Resident Educators to indicate the number of courses in which they were enrolled at their institution that discussed co-teaching in inclusive classrooms.

Sharma et al. (2012) established content evidence validity for the TEIP scale by having six experts in four different countries evaluate the scale using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 6 for each item: a one indicated the item did not or barely measured the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers to implement inclusion, and a six indicated the item definitely measured the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers to implement inclusion. As a result of the content validity evaluation, six items were removed from the scale for low scores and minor changes were made to other items. The experts reviewed the scale again after the changes were made to the items.

Factor analysis was used to demonstrate the validity of the TEIP scale. Factor analysis is a tool that allows for the examination of instrument items by grouping variables that are moderately or highly correlated with one another ((Fraenkel et al., 2012). In this case exploratory factor analysis was performed on 26 items and three factors emerged. Sharma et al. (2012) administered the TEIP scale to 609 participants after the expert review. Additional items were deleted and three factors remained after rerunning the exploratory factor analysis. Reliability was established for the TEIP scale using Cronbach’s alpha to measure internal consistency. Internal consistency refers to a method used for estimating reliability that only requires one administration of the instrument and the value of alpha ranges from .00 to 1.00 without negative
values (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The alpha values from the four countries were 0.84 to 0.91. The reliability scores of the three factors were 0.64 to 0.97 (Sharma et al., 2012).
### Table 2

**Demographic Questions and Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What type of teacher preparation were you involved in during college?</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How many years have you been a teacher?</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Please indicate the grade level you currently teach.</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Please indicate your gender.</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did you graduate with your teaching degree from a public or private institution?</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do you have prior experience teaching in an inclusive classroom?</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How many courses were you enrolled in at your institution that discussed co-teaching in inclusive classrooms?</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught.</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>I am confident in designing learning tasks so that individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated.</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>I can collaborate with other professionals in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups.</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.</td>
<td>Managing Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>I am able to provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused.</td>
<td>Inclusive Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions 8.1 – 8.18**

**Overall Efficacy**
Procedures

Human Subject Review Board approval was obtained prior to collecting data from the participants using the instrumentation. This study was exempt due to minimal risk to human subjects. The Resident Educator Program Coordinators at each school district were contacted by email to describe the study and each received a follow up telephone call. An email distribution list was obtained from the Resident Educator Program Coordinators that included the email addresses of the Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio. One participant did not want to participate and asked the Resident Educator Coordinator not to share an email address. The Resident Educators received an email from the researcher containing an explanation of the study, an informed consent, and a link to the survey. The survey included demographic questions and the TEIP scale. A reminder email was sent to the Resident Educators one week after the first email. The participants were thanked for completing the TEIP Scale. Incentives were not offered for completing the survey. The response rate for the survey was 35.3% since 150 Resident Educators were invited to complete the survey and 53 Resident Educators completed the survey. The scores were downloaded from Qualtrics into an Excel spreadsheet and data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching and significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators?
2. Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching?

3. Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusion teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusion teaching?

**Data Analysis**

After data were moved into SPSS, factor scores were calculated for perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy by computing the mean of the respective items. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all items and subscales. The inferential analysis was guided by the three research questions (see Table 3). This study utilized three categorical independent variables for the three research questions: type of teacher preparation program, years as a Resident Educator, and experience with inclusion teaching. Five dependent variables were utilized in the analysis. Four were from the TEIP scale factor scores of perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy. Another dependent variable was the number of college co-teaching courses. Since the three research questions were examining mean differences between two groups, *t*-test for independent samples was utilized.
Table 3

*Research Questions, Variables, and Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching, and significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators?</td>
<td>College co-teaching courses, Efficacy to use Inclusive Instruction, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, Overall Efficacy</td>
<td><em>t</em>-test for independent samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education program</td>
<td>1 = regular ed. 2 = special ed. or dual certification</td>
<td>Teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching?</td>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instruction, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, Overall Efficacy</td>
<td><em>t</em>-test for independent samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Resident Educator</td>
<td>1 = 1 - 2 years 2 = 3 - 4 years</td>
<td>Years as Resident Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusion teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusion teaching?</td>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instruction, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, Overall Efficacy</td>
<td><em>t</em>-test for independent samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in inclusion teaching</td>
<td>1 = yes 2 = no</td>
<td>Experience in inclusion teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

This study examined the perceived self-efficacy among Resident Educators in Ohio. Data analysis included descriptive and inferential statistics to examine differences between groups and $t$-tests for independent samples. This chapter provides results beginning with the descriptive statistics, followed by the inferential results for each research question. A summary of the findings concludes the chapter.

**Descriptive Statistics**

All of the research questions in this study examined the perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy of Resident Educators. The mean and standard deviation of each item, subscale and Overall Efficacy in the TEIP scale were calculated for the 53 participants.

The TEIP scale consists of 18 statements for the participant to rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). Six items examine the perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, six items examine the perceived Efficacy in Collaboration, six items examine the perceived Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and all 18 items provide the Overall Efficacy score. The descriptive statistics for analysis items are delineated in the following paragraphs.

Six items examined the perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions from the TEIP scale. Descriptive statistics revealed that item 8.14, *I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups*, had the highest mean ($M = 5.33$) and item 8.10 ($M = 4.92$) had the lowest mean with *I am confident in designing learning tasks so that individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated* in the perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions subscale. The results for the mean and standard deviation for perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions are displayed in Table 4.
Table 4

*TEIP Scale Items Measuring Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught.</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>I am confident in designing learning tasks so that individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>I am able to provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused. Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions Subscale</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions Subscale</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics also analyzed the six items that examined the perceived Efficacy in Collaboration from the TEIP scale as illustrated in Table 5. The highest mean for the perceived Efficacy in Collaboration subscale ($M = 5.21$) was calculated for item 8.12; *I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.* The lowest mean ($M = 3.87$) was question 8.16, *I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.*
Table 5

**TEIP Scale Items Measuring Efficacy in Collaboration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides or other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficacy in Collaboration Subscale

The descriptive results for the six items measuring Efficacy in Managing Behavior are presented in Table 6. Item 8.11, *I am able to get children to follow classroom rules*, had the highest mean (*M* = 5.34) in the subscale and for the TEIP scale. The lowest mean (*M* = 4.02) was for item 8.17, *I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.*
Table 6

**TEIP Scale Items Measuring Efficacy in Managing Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Efficacy in Managing Behavior Subscale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall Efficacy</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Overall Efficacy mean ($M = 4.94$) was calculated by incorporating the results of all eighteen statements from the TEIP scale. As presented in summary in Table 7, the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions had the highest mean ($M = 5.11$). The lowest mean ($M = 4.78$) was calculated for the Efficacy with Collaboration subscale.

Table 7

**Summary of Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions</td>
<td>8.5, 8.6, 8.10, 8.14, 8.15, 8.18</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Collaboration</td>
<td>8.3, 8.4, 8.9, 8.12, 8.13, 8.16</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Managing Behavior</td>
<td>8.1, 8.2, 8.7, 8.8, 8.11, 8.17</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficacy</td>
<td>8.1 - 8.18</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inferential Results by Research Question**

The $t$-test for independent samples were utilized for the three research questions. The three subscales, Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, and Efficacy in
Managing Behavior, and the Overall Efficacy from the TEIP scale served as the four dependent variables. Additionally, *t*-tests for independent samples were calculated on each of the eighteen items that comprise the TEIP scale. Statistical significance is obtained when *p* is greater than or equal to .05. The effect sizes for each significant finding were also calculated. Effect size evaluates the difference between the means of the two groups (Frankel et al., 2012). For this study, the effect size was calculated using the $r^2$, coefficient of determination, which represents the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable.

**Research Question 1**

Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discuss co-teaching, and higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators?

Research question 1 examined program (special education vs. regular education) differences in the number of college course that discussed co-teaching, individual efficacy items, and TEIP subscales. Among the 23 dependent variables, number of co-teaching courses, TEIP individual statements, and TEIP subscores that were examined, only four statistically significant (*p* < .05) differences were revealed as presented in Table 8. Special education Resident Educators ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.01$) reported significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching than regular education Resident Educators ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.13$); ($t (51) = -2.08, p < 0.05$, two-tailed, $r^2 = 0.08$).

Differences in the efficacy subscores and Overall Efficacy did not indicate statistical significance; however, when each item from the TEIP scale was analyzed individually, statistical significance was observed for three items: 8.10, 8.14, and 8.16. For item 8.10, special education Resident Educators ($M = 5.60, SD = .51$) were significantly more confident than regular
education Resident Educators \((M = 4.66, SD = .78)\) in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities were accommodated; \((t (51) = -4.31, p < 0.01, \text{two-tailed}, r^2 = 0.27)\). In contrast, regular education Resident Educators \((M = 5.42, SD = .55)\) were significantly more confident than special education Resident Educators \((M = 5.07, SD = .48)\) with item 8.14, *I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups* \((t (51) = 2.10, p < 0.05, \text{two-tailed}, r^2 = 0.08)\).

Finally, statistical significant group differences were also found for item 8.16, in the Efficacy in Collaboration subscale. Special education Resident Educators \((M = 4.60, SD = 1.24)\) had significantly higher perceived efficacy than regular education Resident Educators \((M = 3.58, SD = 1.24)\) for item 8.16, *I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities* \((t (51) = -2.69, p = 0.01, \text{two-tailed}, r^2 = 0.12)\).
### Table 8

**Regular Education and Special Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Regular Education Only ((n = 38))</th>
<th>Special Education ((n = 15))</th>
<th>(T)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Co-teaching Courses</td>
<td>2.50 1.13</td>
<td>3.20 1.01</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.16 0.59</td>
<td>5.33 0.62</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.89 0.80</td>
<td>5.07 0.46</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>4.66 0.78</td>
<td>5.60 0.51</td>
<td>-4.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>5.42 0.55</td>
<td>5.07 0.48</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>4.97 1.00</td>
<td>4.93 0.88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>5.24 0.75</td>
<td>5.47 0.52</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions</td>
<td>5.06 0.52</td>
<td>5.26 0.41</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.11 0.61</td>
<td>5.20 0.56</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.14 0.67</td>
<td>5.07 0.70</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.24 0.97</td>
<td>4.20 1.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>5.16 0.82</td>
<td>5.33 0.72</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>5.03 0.94</td>
<td>5.47 0.64</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>3.58 1.24</td>
<td>4.60 1.24</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Collaboration</td>
<td>4.70 0.62</td>
<td>4.98 0.56</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.29 0.69</td>
<td>5.20 0.94</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.08 0.54</td>
<td>5.33 0.62</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.84 0.79</td>
<td>4.73 0.88</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.03 0.64</td>
<td>4.80 0.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>5.37 0.59</td>
<td>5.27 0.59</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>3.87 1.28</td>
<td>4.40 1.18</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Managing Behavior</td>
<td>4.91 0.54</td>
<td>4.96 0.65</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficacy</td>
<td>4.89 0.45</td>
<td>5.06 0.42</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question 2**

Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching?

Research question 2 examined the 18 survey items and the four subscales in relation to the number of years of teaching experience. The first-year and second-year teachers ($n = 19$) were grouped together, and the third-year and fourth-year teachers ($n = 33$) were grouped together. The $t$-test for independent samples inferential statistics for years as a Resident Educator and their perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instruction, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, Overall Efficacy, and all eighteen items from the TEIP scale are presented in Table 9. Significant group differences were not revealed for any of the subscales or Overall Efficacy. A single item (8.2), which contributed to Efficacy in Managing Behavior subscale, was statistically significant. Resident Educators in their third-year and fourth-year of teaching ($M = 5.27$, $SD = .52$) had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching ($M = 4.95$, $SD = .62$) for item 8.2, *I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy* ($t (51) = -2.03$, $p = 0.05$, two-tailed, $r^2 = 0.07$).
Table 9

*Years as a Resident Educator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Years 1 - 2 (n = 19)</th>
<th>Years 3 - 4 (n = 33)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Collaboration</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Managing Behavior</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficacy</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3**

Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching?
Research question 3 examined item and subscale differences based upon prior experience in inclusive teaching using t-test for independent samples (see Table 10). Twenty-eight teachers reported prior experience in inclusive teaching while 24 teachers indicated no prior experience in inclusive teaching. Significant group differences were not found for the three subscales or the Overall Efficacy. Only one item, 8.16, *I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities*, produced a significant difference. Results indicate that Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching (*M* = 4.21, *SD* = 1.10) had significantly higher perceived efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching (*M* = 3.42, *SD* = 1.44) for item 8.16 (*t* (50) = 2.26, *p* < 0.05, two-tailed, *r*² = 0.13).
Table 10

Prior Experience in Inclusive Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Prior Experience (n = 28)</th>
<th>No Prior Experience (n = 24)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Collaboration</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Managing Behavior</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficacy</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This study sought to examine the perceived self-efficacy among Resident Educators in Ohio with Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy. A total of 53 participants were included in the data.
analysis in December 2015. Data were collected utilizing demographic questions and the TEIP scale. This study was guided by three research questions. A summary of the research questions and pertinent results are presented in Table 11.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the perceived Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions, Efficacy in Collaboration, Efficacy in Managing Behavior, and Overall Efficacy. The Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions subscale had the highest mean, ($M = 5.11$), while the lowest mean ($M = 4.78$) was calculated for the Efficacy in Collaboration subscale. The overall mean for the TEIP scale was 4.94.

The three research questions utilized the $t$-test for independent samples. Research question 1 examined teaching preparation program as the independent variable. Special education Resident Educators had significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching than regular education Resident Educators. Statistical significant group differences were revealed for three items from the TEIP scale. Special education Resident Educators were significantly more confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities were accommodated and informing other people about laws and policies related to the inclusion of students with disabilities than regular education Resident Educators. Regular education Resident Educators were significantly more confident with item 8.14, *I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups* than special education Resident Educators. Research question 2 examined Resident Educators years of experience. A single item within the Efficacy in Managing Behavior subscale indicated statistical significance. Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching for item 8.2, *I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy*. Research question 3, examined the difference
in perceived self-efficacy with Resident Educators and their prior experience in inclusive teaching. Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching had statistically significant higher self-efficacy with informing other people about laws and policies related to the inclusion of students with disabilities than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching.
Table 11

**Summary of Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching, and significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators? | Special education Resident Educators had significantly:  
  • more college courses that discussed co-teaching.  
  • higher confidence in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities were accommodated.  
  • higher perceived self-efficacy in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.  
  Regular education Resident Educators were significantly more confident in having students work together in pairs or in small groups.                                                                                                       |
| 2. Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching? | Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy in calming a student who is disruptive or noisy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 3. Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusion teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusion teaching? | Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching had statistically significant higher self-efficacy in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching. |
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study, discussion of the research questions related to existing literature, and conclusions. Chapter 5 also provides recommendations for leadership, policy, local school districts, and suggestions for future research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived teacher self-efficacy with inclusive classrooms among Resident Educators in Ohio. The rationale for the study was suggested from other researchers who found a lack of evaluative measures for perceived teacher efficacy in educating students with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The TEIP scale was developed to fill that gap by ensuring an instrument was available to allow researchers to measure teacher efficacy in educating students in inclusive classrooms. According to the instrument authors, Sharma et al. (2012), the scale allows and specifies the need for the collection of teacher efficacy data from more cultures and contexts. The TEIP scale was developed with pre-service teachers in four countries: Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, and India. This study further advances the TEIP scale by providing a different country than one used to create the instrument and a different context as the participants are Resident Educators in the Ohio, not pre-service teachers. Gibson and Dembo (1984) noted teachers with low self-efficacy may have had a narrow range of teaching situations that allowed them to feel confident. However, teachers with high self-efficacy may have generalized teaching situations and applied the skills to other circumstances in the classroom.

This study examined three research questions using the TEIP scale. In order to address the three research questions, this quantitative study utilized a causal-comparative research design to examine differences between Resident Educators in Ohio. The study participants were from a
homogeneous population of current Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio. A distribution list was obtained from the Resident Educator Program coordinators that included the email addresses of the Resident Educators in Hancock County, Ohio. The Resident Educators received an email from the researcher explaining the study, an informed consent, and a link to the survey. The scores were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

**Discussion by Research Questions Related to the Literature**

The significant findings of the three research questions from this study were analyzed and found to be supported by federal policy and prior research conducted by other researchers. Four findings were analyzed for the first research question. The second and third research questions each examined one finding from the survey the participants completed.

**Research Question 1**

Do special education Resident Educators have significantly more college courses that discuss co-teaching, higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than regular education Resident Educators?

Inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the college courses that discussed co-teaching, the TEIP scale subscores, and each TEIP item. The first research question revealed results that were statistically significant in four key areas. As the discussion illustrates the findings are supportive of prior research and federal policies.

Special education Resident Educators reported significantly more college courses that discussed co-teaching than regular education Resident Educators. The results are echoed in previous studies (Panscofar & Petroff, 2013; and Harvey et al., 2010). Panscofar and Petroff (2013) conducted a study that examined professional development experiences with the purpose
of examining training opportunities in co-teaching received by pre-service and in-service teachers. Special education teachers reported significantly more opportunities to study co-teaching during pre-service and in-service training than did regular education teachers. Harvey et al. (2010) noted similar statistically significant results in a study that used a survey pertaining to collaborative coursework. The study found that pre-service special education teachers were afforded collaborative coursework, while regular education pre-service teachers indicated coursework in collaboration was not part of their program. Knowledge in collaboration is a prerequisite for teaching in inclusive classrooms; therefore, experiences in collaborative coursework provided the opportunity for pre-service teachers to fulfill a prerequisite and to learn the federal requirements of inclusive education (Harvey et al., 2010).

Secondly, the first research question revealed special education teachers were significantly more confident in designing learning tasks to ensure the individual needs of students with disabilities were accommodated. Graham-Day, et al. (2014) stressed that special education is to be individualized for each student; hence, special education teachers are knowledgeable in designing clear learning targets, collecting data, and analyzing the data to inform their instruction. This finding may be attributed to the fact that special education teachers have had decades of practice in writing individualized education programs for students of all ages. This skill in learning task design has been a requirement since the Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975 was passed. This Act established individualized education programs for students with special needs (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975). The individualized education program is a document for each student with special needs that includes the current level of educational performance, annual goals, and specific educational services that must be provided to the student. Annual evaluations are conducted to determine
whether or not instructional objectives are reached (Education of the Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

Additionally, according to this research special education teachers had higher perceived self-efficacy in informing others who know little about laws and policies related to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Special education teachers receive more college coursework about inclusion. McCray and McHatton (2011) revealed elementary and secondary education pre-service teachers at one university were only required to take one course about inclusion and special education to earn their certification. Allday, et al. (2013) examined 109 colleges and universities that offered elementary education certification. The universities averaged only 2.35 credit hours, or 3.9% of the necessary hours for certification, assigned to learning about the characteristics of students with disabilities. Moreover, nearly one third of the universities did not have required content for the regular elementary education pre-service teachers to learn about the instructional needs of students identified for special education services. This is a significant factor. Although pre-service teachers are lacking coursework on educating special education students, federal laws require students with disabilities be placed in regular education classrooms.

A major change in the Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004 is the starting position for students with disabilities. In times past the starting position for students with disabilities may have been in a special education classroom. However, with the enactment of Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004 the starting position is in the regular education classroom (Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act, 2004). The U. S. Department of Education (2014b) released an annual report to articulate the progress our country is making with the Individuals with Disability Education
Improvement Act of 2004. Ohio had 58.7% of students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 in the regular education classroom for 80% or more of the academic school day in 2011. An additional 23% of the students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 were in the regular education classroom between 40% and 79% of the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b).

Teacher collaboration is an integral part of acquiring the knowledge necessary to educate students in an inclusive classroom. Teachers have a difficult time sharing knowledge and expertise when they are isolated (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Graham-Day et al. (2014) stressed the importance of regular education teachers to seek assistance from special education teachers in designing and implementing teaching strategies to use in inclusive classrooms to increase student learning by gathering data using formative assessments.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) note teacher efficacy is thought to increase student academic gains. People with strong expectations master the skill by working through the challenges and setbacks in order to be successful (Bandura, 1977). Strength applies to teachers as they determine the ease of which a lesson or activity can be modified during a lesson (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Teachers can prevent student failure when they have the strength to differentiate instruction for diverse students in the classroom (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Bandura (1993) states that the self-efficacy of teachers impacts the learning environment in classrooms.

Also of interest from the findings of research question one was that regular education Resident Educators were significantly more confident in having students work together in pairs or in small groups. The Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004 introduced Response to Intervention to ensure students struggling academically receive assistance in a timelier manner (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). The
Response to Intervention process reduces special education referrals by having various levels of intervention available to all students in the general education classroom (Fox, et al., 2010). The fifth standard of the Ohio Standards for Teaching Profession states that educators create learning environments in their classrooms that promote learning for each and every student. The standard focuses on teachers creating a safe environment that is supportive and is to foster the opportunity for students to work independently, collaboratively in small groups, or as a whole class (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Marzano (2007) discussed the benefits of students working collaboratively in groups. Since regular education teachers have larger class sizes than special education classrooms, the students are able to work in collaborative groups. Special education teachers have a limited number of students in their classroom at a time. Items 8.10, *I am confident in designing learning tasks so that individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated*, and 8.14, *I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups*, were located in the same subscale, Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions; however, the results were competing against one another due to special education teachers having higher efficacy on item 8.10 and regular education teachers having higher efficacy on item 8.14 in the same subscale.

**Research Question 2**

Do Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching?

*T*-test results indicated that Resident Educators in their third and fourth year of teaching had significantly higher perceived self-efficacy on one item in the self-efficacy with managing student behavior subscale. Residents in their third and fourth year were significantly more likely
to calming a student who is disruptive or noisy, than Resident Educators in their first and second year of teaching. Research supports the findings that self-efficacy in managing student behavior increases with experience (Allday et al., 2013; Ritter & Hancock, 2007 and Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Allday et al. (2013) argued pre-service teachers might not be gaining the necessary behavior management skills required for practicing teachers. Effective classroom management strategies were overtly taught an average of 1.55 hours, or 2.6% of the required hours, with 41% of the universities requiring a three-hour course on effective classroom management. Swan et al. (2011) discussed the importance of examining teacher self-efficacy since it may impact teacher attrition, meaning the educator leaves the profession. Teachers with low self-efficacy may quit the profession after their first year. Most teachers decline in self-efficacy from student teaching to their first year of teaching; therefore novice teachers need adequate support.

Ritter and Hancock (2007) noted teacher graduates with traditional four-year degrees from an accredited college or university with more than two years of experience were more likely to allow the students in the classroom to have choices in classroom activities. Teachers need to be able to change teaching strategies during lessons to adapt to the learners in the classroom (Hattie, 2012). Effective classroom leadership significantly impacts student learning in school (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) discovered experienced teachers had significantly higher self-efficacy than novice teachers in overall self-efficacy, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Novice teachers with low self-efficacy discover ways to implement better instructional strategies to improve their teaching and increase their self-efficacy, or they quit the profession. Hoy and Spero (2005) studied graduate students obtaining a Master’s of Education without prior teaching experience and followed the group to the end of their first year of teaching and found significant decreases in self-efficacy at the end of
the first year of teaching. Pre-service teachers and first year teachers underestimate the intricacy of leading a classroom and managing various tasks simultaneously. Swan et al. (2011) discovered a conflicting result as they studied a group of pre-service agriculture teachers and followed the group to the end of their third year of teaching. When examining classroom management, the participants also scored highest at the end of their student teaching; however, the lowest scores were calculated at the end of their third year of teaching. This may be attributed to teacher burnout, attrition, and lack of classroom management professional development.

Research Question 3

Do Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching have significantly higher self-efficacy with inclusive instruction, collaboration, managing student behavior, and overall self-efficacy than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching?

_T-test_ of independent samples were conducted to analyze group differences in TEIP scale subscores, Overall Efficacy, and each TEIP item. Resident Educators with prior experience in inclusive teaching had statistically significant higher self-efficacy in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities than Resident Educators without prior experience in inclusive teaching. Item 8.16 is the same item that produced a statistically significant finding for the first research question when comparing special education and regular education. Special education Resident Educators had significantly higher perceived efficacy than regular education Resident Educators for item 8.16, _I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities._

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is an accrediting body for universities that prepare students to work in preschool through high schools and is acknowledged
by the U.S. Department of Education. Pre-service teachers are expected to learn about and work in classroom with diverse students in an inclusive setting (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008). Allday et al. (2013) noted differentiated instruction or inclusion, the second category in-service teachers identified as needing more profession development, was taught for an average of 1.12 hours or 1.9% of the required credit hours, and 27% of the universities offered at least three hours of coursework directly connected to the inclusion of students in the classroom with disabilities. Pre-service teachers are not being adequately taught how to differentiate instruction or teach inclusive classrooms since they are identifying those topics as key topics for more professional development.

A study conducted by McCray and McHatton (2011) examined general education pre-service teachers at one university on their perceptions about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular education classroom. The elementary and secondary education pre-service teachers were surveyed at the start and at the end of the only required course on inclusion. Statistical significance showed more positive perceptions toward inclusion of students with exceptionalities at the end of the course. The increased scores on the survey could indicate the course was effectively educating students about inclusive classrooms, yet the course was the only mandated one on inclusion and was taken towards the end of their studies. Students need time to adequately learn about inclusive classrooms and have opportunities to observe and teach in inclusive classrooms. Ohio students between the ages of 6 and 21 served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 are in the regular classroom for 80% or more of the academic school day in 2011. An additional 23% of the students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 were in the regular education classroom between 40% and 79% of the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b).
Inclusive classrooms are common in schools; therefore, pre-service teachers need prior experience instructing in inclusive classrooms prior to graduation.

**Conclusions**

The findings of this examination support the continued discussion and support for equipping schools with educators who are efficacious. The findings of this examination support three major conclusions. The findings in this study guide the three main conclusions. First, special education teachers and those with more experience have increased opportunities to learn about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Additionally, pre-service teachers attending NCATE accredited universities are expected to serve in classrooms with diverse students in inclusive classrooms, however their preparation may be lacking in the actual instruction leading to the self-efficacy required to be successful (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008). As noted in the results of this study, regular education teachers and teachers with one and two years of experience do not have the self-efficacy to inform others about laws and policies related to inclusion. Given that the majority of school settings are those where regular and special education students are educated collaboratively, it would seem essential that all teachers be aware of the related laws and policies. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* reauthorized the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* and requires that all students, including those with special needs, acquire a quality education by having access to the general curriculum, while being taught by highly qualified teachers in an effort to help address and close the achievement gap between high-performing and low-performing students (No Child Left Behind Act, 2002). The *Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004* stresses the starting position for students with
disabilities is in the regular education classroom (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010), which illustrates the need for increased preparation for regular education teachers. McCray and McHatton (2011) revealed elementary and secondary education pre-service teachers at one university were only required to take one course relative to inclusion and special education to earn their certification. Allday et al. (2013) examined colleges and universities that offered elementary education certification and found they averaged 2.35 credit hours, or 3.9% of the necessary hours for certification, assigned to learn about the characteristics of students with disabilities. Moreover, nearly one third of the universities did not have required content for the regular elementary education pre-service teachers to learn about special education. Differentiated instruction or inclusion was taught for an average of 1.12 hours, or 1.9% of the required credit hours. The study revealed 27% of the universities in the study offered at least three hours of coursework directly connected to the inclusion of students in the classroom with disabilities. Allday et al. (2013) argued pre-service teachers might not be taught the information they need as a practicing teacher based on the results of the study. Regular education teachers and novice teachers need to be informed about laws and policies regarding the education of students to ensure the students are having their needs met in the regular education classroom. Low self-efficacy scores for regular and novice teachers reveal teacher preparation coursework for regular education teachers is not adequately preparing Resident Educators to be self-efficacious about laws and polices relating to inclusion.

The second main conclusion drawn from this study is students majoring in special education receive more training in co-teaching. Co-teaching is defined as special and regular education teachers sharing the teaching responsibilities in the same classroom with the same students (Cramer & Nevin, 2006; Panscofar & Petroff, 2013; Vannest et al., 2011). The finding
is not unique to this study. Panscofar and Petroff (2013) noted special education teachers reported significantly more opportunities to study co-teaching during pre-service and in-service training. Harvey et al. (2010) reported pre-service special education teachers revealed collaboration coursework was provided as part of their matriculation, while regular education pre-service teachers indicated coursework in collaboration was not included as an integral part of their program. Since co-teaching is a partnership, both participants need to be adequately trained to work together collaboratively. The findings of this study, in conjunction with existing research suggest co-teaching would be more effective if all teachers are trained to work collaboratively to educate all students.

Lastly, a main conclusion extracted from this study is that Resident Educators are self-efficacious with inclusive teaching according to the descriptive statistics that incorporated all of the participants that completed the TEIP scale. When examining the Resident Educators with and without prior experience in inclusive teaching, the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions was higher than the Overall Efficacy mean score. Although, 24 of the 52 participants did not have prior experience in inclusive teaching, the Resident Educators indicated they were self-efficacious in the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions subscale since that subscale had the highest mean, ($M = 5.11$) of all of the subscales and Overall Efficacy. The more self-efficacy people believe they possess within themselves, the more likely they are to increase their effort to complete the task at hand (Bandura, 1977). Gibson and Dembo (1984) noted that teachers with high self-efficacy may demonstrate more ability to generalize teaching situations and apply the skills to other circumstances in the classroom. Bandura (1993) stated that the self-efficacy of teachers impacts the learning environment in classrooms. People may increase or decrease their level of self-efficacy after examining the perceived creditability of the person providing verbal
persuasion. Self-efficacy is more likely to increase if the person believes the verbal persuasion being received is coming from a credible, prestigious, trustworthy, and experienced person (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy likely increases when people view situational factors as pleasing and not stressful (Bandura, 1977).

Effective professional development standards enable teachers to continually develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the needs of their students (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Resident Educators are supported through professional development activities in their first two years of practice. The goal is for the Resident Educators to refine the art and science of teaching students by reflecting on their lessons and implementing adjustments as necessary (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). The professional development is individualized and differentiated to meet the needs of the Resident Educator as the mentor and Resident Educator work together to help the Resident Educator improve their teaching, student learning, and confidence (Ohio Department of Education, 2011). The goal of the Resident Educator program is to ensure that mentors and principals provide the creditable verbal persuasion and support needed by the Resident Educators to be self-efficacious with inclusive teaching. As indicated at the beginning of the chapter, the discussion of the results of this study present implications for the training of pre-service teachers to meet the needs of the student population. The implications include dedicated coursework for all pre-service teachers in educational laws and policies related to the inclusion of students with disabilities and co-teaching. Experience teaching in inclusive classrooms while in college is imperative. The next section of this chapter discusses how this study may inform higher education and public education.
Recommendations for Leadership and Policy

Institutions of higher education, state educational leadership, and school districts can utilize the findings of this study to inform leadership and policy while examining the Resident Educator program in Ohio. Resident Educators are a significant population as they are responsible for developing and delivering effective instructional strategies to kindergarten through high school students. The findings from the research conducted in this study allow school districts and universities to make informed decisions to create courses of study and policies ensuring Resident Educators are prepared to educate and meet the needs of all of their students. The following paragraphs offer three recommendations for public education and higher educational institutions.

The first recommendation for higher education leadership is to ensure all pre-service teachers are instructed on effective co-teaching strategies, not just students majoring in special education. Panscofar and Petroff (2013) noted special education teachers reported more opportunities to study co-teaching during pre-service and in-service training and had greater confidence and interest in co-teaching than regular educators. A main goal of co-teaching is to increase the ability of the teacher to instruct a wide array of students. Special education teachers are able to teach the regular education teachers instructional strategies (Capper & Frattura, 2009). Special education teachers are experienced in designing clear learning targets, collecting data, and analyzing the data to inform their instruction. They are able to help regular education teachers effectively instruct in inclusive classrooms. Main (2010), Arndt and Liles (2010), and Santagata and Guarino (2012) completed qualitative studies that examined co-teaching with pre-service teachers. In all three studies, the pre-service teachers were open to the idea of co-teaching, but required support when implementing teaching strategies. Teacher preparation
programs need to ensure all novice teachers are prepared to work collaboratively with other educators, including co-teaching environments, upon entering the workforce. Providing a more balanced instruction on co-teaching at universities is necessary since regular and special education teachers will be educating students together. Teacher training institutions should not offer discipline or major specific co-teaching preparation, but should require such training for all teachers.

Second, higher education leadership and state education leadership should ensure that pre-service and in-service teachers are proficient and current on federal education laws and policies concerning the inclusion of students with disabilities. A major component of school districts’ ongoing quest for improving student achievement is the continual responsibility to comply with the components of Public Law 108-446 (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004). The first purpose of the Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act of 2004 is to ensure teachers are prepared to educate students with special needs. In 2001, 40.7% of the 5,670,680 students ages 6 – 21 in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and Bureau of Indian Education schools, served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act were identified as having a specific learning disability. The percentage of those students educated in the regular education classroom for 80% or more of the academic day increased from 48.2% to 61.1% between the years of 2002 through 2011. Ohio students between the ages of 6 and 21 served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 are in the regular classroom for 80% or more of the academic school day in 2011. An additional 23% of the students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 were in the regular education classroom between 40% and 79% of the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2014b).
Effective collaboration and communication enable teachers to share responsibility in an effort to support student learning in the classroom (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Institutes of higher education should stress the importance of laws and policies relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities in their coursework and through seminars for students completing practicum courses. State educational leadership could develop training seminars or workshops to be used by teachers and administrators during professional development days.

Lastly, Resident Educators need continued support and guidance from their mentors, principals, and other educators to ensure they continue to grow professionally and maintain their high self-efficacy with inclusive instruction. Descriptive statistics calculated for this study reveal the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions subscale mean had a higher mean than the overall TEIP scale. Federal initiatives, such as NCLB, RttT, and Response to Intervention, require educators possess effective classroom instruction and assessment skills to determine the most effective method to educate children (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2014a; U.S. Department of Education, 2003). The Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act of 2004 introduced Response to Intervention to ensure students struggling academically receive assistance more readily (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). The Response to Intervention process reduces special education referrals through the implementation of various levels of intervention available to all students in the general education classroom (Fox et al., 2010). Standards three and four of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession expects teachers to use a variety of assessment strategies to inform instruction, evaluate students, and ensure students are learning the material (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). These assessments allow the teacher to gather useful information to plan and differentiate future instruction. Teachers, pre-service and in-service, are evaluated on their
knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. The study suggests teachers are efficacious with inclusive instruction due to instruction and teacher evaluations that incorporate the state teaching standards.

**Recommendations for Local School Districts**

Local school districts can utilize the findings from this study to assist Resident Educators as they move from novice to experienced teachers. Resident Educators are valued members of teaching staffs and are responsible for educating students. The findings from the research inform actions of teachers and administrators at local school districts to improve the self-efficacy of Resident Educators. The following paragraphs offer co-teaching and self-efficacy recommendations for teachers and administrators at local school districts.

At the local level, experienced teachers can take time to formally and informally mentor Resident Educators. Experienced teachers possess the knowledge, power, and responsibility to promote the growth of self-efficacy of Resident Educators through valuable and meaningful classroom instructional involvement. Experienced teachers can help the Resident Educators by ensuring the Resident Educators are a valued member of the teaching staff by engaging in meaningful conversations that allow all of the teachers to collaborate in the development of effective instructional practices. In-service teachers should be supported to establish ongoing and consistent time each week to engage in meaningful discussions that enable the sharing of resources, ideas, and unit planning. Principals can be valuable resources in this process by ensuring collaboration time is protected and uninterrupted.

In order for co-teaching to be effective, both teachers need to be willing to enter into a co-teaching experience. Experienced teachers can serve to model an effective experience by co-teaching a unit or a subject with Resident Educators. The teachers may work to plan lessons and
share collaboratively as equal partners. This relationship should be one in which the Resident Educator is not perceived as an aide or helper in the classroom, but as an equal teacher with the opportunity to offer instructional expertise. This time should not only include future planning, but also allow for thoughtful reflection on strategies to improve previous classroom engagement. Administrators may further this goal by ensuring the schedule is conducive to co-teaching. For example, if the Resident Educator and experienced teacher desire to co-teach a social studies unit, both teachers need to have their schedules coordinated so that the subject is taught at the same time each day in both classrooms. This will allow the experienced teachers and Resident Educators to study co-teaching models and collaboratively decide which model is best suited for the subject, students, and learning goals.

Cook and Friend (1995) defined six methods of co-teaching. The team-teaching method involves both teachers leading the class simultaneously. The teachers share the teaching responsibility by teaching collaboratively. In a simultaneous teaching classroom, stations are established that enables the teachers to divide the content and students. The students are placed in two equal sized groups during the station teaching method. Each teacher takes a group and instructs the lesson and once the lesson is completed, the students switch stations and learn from the other teacher. Parallel teaching also involves dividing the class into two equal sized groups, however, the teachers instruct the same lesson simultaneously in an effort to decrease the students to teacher ratio. Alternative teaching involves one teacher leading a large group of students while the other teacher instructs a small group of students. The small groups of students are able to receive enrichment, be retaught the skills from previous lessons, or receive assistance if they missed any part of the instruction. The one teach, one observe method allows the Resident Educator to observe experienced teachers. One-teach, one-assist enables one teacher to lead the
instruction while the other teacher assists as needed. This method enables the Resident Educator to lead the lesson while the experienced teacher offers support. Alternatively, the experienced teacher leads while the Resident Educator supports to learn a new teaching method. This model is more likely to be familiar to the Resident Educator, as it is a common student teaching instructional practice. The Resident Educators learns to how to implement new curriculum programs, teaching strategies, or formative assessments. The Resident Educators and experienced teachers work collaboratively to implement co-teaching strategies.

Developing effective behavior management skills is an area where most Resident Educators require assistance and can significantly enhance the growth of self-efficacy. Experienced teachers can assist Resident Educators by sharing ideas and modeling effective classroom management strategies. If the school has a school-wide behavior management system, the experienced teacher can model how to implement the system in the classroom. Additionally, experienced teachers can involve Resident Educators in meetings with previous teachers to gather information that may be useful in creating behavior management strategies for individual students. This experience demonstrates how to utilize the knowledge available from previous teachers relative to students’ interests and methods to motive the students in the classroom. This will allow Resident Educators to use the knowledge to create classroom behavior management systems that are consistent and meaningful for the students. By gathering information from experienced teachers and creating a behavior management plan in advance, the Resident Educator can effectively create a classroom environment that is conducive to learning. As pre-service teachers, the Resident Educators may have implemented the classroom management system utilized by their coordinating teacher and may not have been exposed to alternative
strategies. The Resident Educators need guidance in creating their own classroom behavior management system.

Resident Educators and experienced teachers can work together to improve the Resident Educators’ efficacy in collaboration. Resident Educators are a valuable member of the teaching staff and bring new, innovative ideas to the classroom. In Ohio, many Resident Educators are not permitted to be in a self-contained classroom as a policy in the teacher certification process therefore, collaboration and modeling is necessary. Many Resident Educators will be sharing students with other teachers throughout the school day. Teacher based teams are created as part of the schools effort to provide structured collaboration for teachers to focus on effective instructional practices and student learning. Teacher based team meetings provide a valuable opportunity for teachers to communicate with each other. The grade level or subject teachers can schedule a time to meet each week to discuss curriculum. The experienced teachers can help the Resident Educator learn about school resources to teach the content standards. As previously noted Resident Educators can learn by observing the instruction of experienced teachers. Administrators can assist in this process by serving as a substitute teacher for the Resident Educator to enable the novice teacher to be able to observe other classrooms. After the observation, the Resident Educator and experienced teacher can meet to discuss the lesson and teaching methods. Experienced teachers and Resident Educators can work together to enhance the Resident Educators’ efficacy in collaboration.

Experienced teachers can assist Resident Educators with their self-efficacy in inclusive instruction. As noted in the research, this is an area that requires continued opportunities for growth and expertise. Experienced teachers and administrators need to work with the Resident Educators to ensure their self-efficacy continues to grow, and not decline, during inclusive
instruction, especially since some teachers have not experienced teaching in inclusive environments. Resident Educators can meet with experienced teachers who provide instruction at the same grade level and subjects to share resources, ideas, and differentiated instructional strategies to enhance the classroom lessons. Special education, regular education, and English as a second language teachers that share students could work collaboratively to ensure the needs of the students are being met. For example, special education and regular education teachers could co-teach part of the day to decrease the student to teacher ratio in the regular education classroom.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study has further advanced the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice scale and contributed to the existing body of research on inclusive instruction. Sharma et al. (2012) specify the need of the TEIP scale to be used to gather information about teacher efficacy in more cultures and contexts. Further use of the TEIP scale with pre-service and in-service teachers would be beneficial. Longitudinal data using the TEIP scale would provide more information on teacher self-efficacy in the four subscales and Overall Efficacy. A longitudinal study with pre-service teachers completing their student teaching and following the same participants during their first four years of teaching would provide a different context for the TEIP scale.

Second, this study examined Resident Educators in one county as opposed to all Resident Educators in Ohio. Duplicating the research to include all Resident Educators in the state would provide more generalizability. Resident Educators in various parts of the state would provide more heterogeneous samples, such as urban school districts. Adding Resident Educators from a wider range of school districts would allow for a comparison of results to understand if similar findings appear.
Another recommendation for future research is to incorporate questions about the perceived effectiveness of the Resident Educator program in Ohio. The participants in this study have an overall mean score that was higher than the Efficacy in Collaboration and Efficacy in Managing Behavior subscales. The Overall Efficacy score was slightly lower than the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions. Another study would assist to answer more discreet questions about the reasons Resident Educators feel self-efficacious and whether or not those reasons are related to the Resident Educator program and the support received by the mentors and principals. A standard in the Resident Educator Program focuses on professional development and learning communities for the Resident Educators. The professional development is individualized and differentiated to meet the needs of the Resident Educator and the mentor as they work together to help the Resident Educator improve their teaching, student learning, and confidence (Ohio Department of Education, 2011). A future study could examine if Resident Educators are efficacious due to the professional development or the mentors. Additionally, the Resident Educators could be asked open-ended questions to provide feedback about the Resident Educator program and how the program can better meet the needs of all Resident Educators. Since the program is for all Resident Educators, a study could investigate if primary, intermediate, middle, high school, special education, and regular education teachers feel the program is beneficial and offer suggestions. The Resident Educators could provide suggestions on aspects of the program they would like to change and aspects they want to keep the same.

Finally, a meta analysis and comparison of coursework by major from teacher preparation programs could be examined. Special education majors receive more coursework on co-teaching and are more knowledgeable about laws and policies with inclusion. A study could
be conducted to research the fundamental rationale for the differentiation of courses for different majors.

In summary, the purpose of this study was to examine the perceived teacher self-efficacy with inclusive classrooms among Resident Educators in Ohio. The rationale for the study was suggested from other researchers who found a lack of evaluative measures for perceived teacher efficacy in educating students with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. This study further advances the TEIP scale by providing a different country than one used to create the instrument and a different context as the participants are Resident Educators in the Ohio, not pre-service teachers. Gibson and Dembo (1984) noted teachers with low self-efficacy may have had a narrow range of teaching situations that allowed them to feel confident.

This study examined three research questions using the TEIP scale. In order to address the three research questions, this quantitative study utilized a causal-comparative research design to examine differences between Resident Educators in Ohio. The significant findings of the three research questions from this study were analyzed and found to be supported by federal policy and prior research conducted by other researchers. Four findings were analyzed for the first research question. The second and third research questions each examined one finding from the survey the participants completed. The findings of this examination support the continued discussion and support for equipping schools with educators who are efficacious. The findings of this examination support three major conclusions. Institutions of higher education, state educational leadership, and school districts can utilize the findings of this study to inform leadership and policy while examining the Resident Educator program in Ohio. Resident Educators are a significant population as they are responsible for developing and delivering effective instructional strategies to kindergarten through high school students.
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APPENDIX A. INSTRUMENT

Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale with Demographics

Q1 What type of teacher preparation program were you involved in during college?

- Regular Education
- Special Education
- Both

Q2 How many years have you been a teacher?

- 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years

Q3 Please indicate the grade level you currently teach.

- Primary (grades K - 2)
- Intermediate (grades 3-5)
- Middle School (grades 6-8)
- High School (grades 9-12)

Q4 Please indicate your gender.

- Male
- Female

Q5 Did you graduate with your teaching degree from a public or private institution?

- Public
- Private

Q6 Do you have prior experience teaching in an inclusive classroom?

- Yes
- No
Q7 How many courses were you enrolled in at your institution that discussed co-teaching in inclusive classrooms?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

Q8 Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can assist</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
families in helping their children do well in school.

I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught.

I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.

I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.

I can control

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruptive behavior in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get children to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classroom rules.

I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.

I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the classroom.</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups.</td>
<td>I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)</td>
<td>I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relating to the
inclusion of
students with
disabilities.
I am confident
when dealing
with students
who are
physically
aggressive.
I am able to
provide an
alternative
explanation or
dexample when
students are
cconfused.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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