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ABSTRACT

THEAKER, SHERRI L., Ph.D., June 2008, Teacher Education, Special Education

Pre-service Teachers’ Attitudes Toward Integration: Does A Student Teacher Placement In An Integrated Classroom Make A Difference? (246 pp.)

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether a student teaching placement in an integrated classroom would promote a positive change in pre-service teachers’ attitude toward children with disabilities. Sixty-nine senior level pre-service teachers in early childhood education completing preschool student teaching participated in this study.

Using a true-experimental design, participants were randomly assigned to two groups using a matched pair technique. The control group was placed into a preschool classroom with no children having disabilities and the experimental group was placed in a classroom with at least one child with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Participants completed the Opinions Relative to Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI) scale at the end of their student teaching experience (Antonak & Larivee, 1995). The analysis compared the mean scores of a
post-test attitude survey of two groups of pre-school student teachers using a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). MANOVA results did not reveal a significant result among student teaching placement sites on attitude factors, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .906$, $F = 1.67$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .094$ but offered insight to the literature. Demographic information and open-ended question responses added support to the notion that increased experiences with children with disabilities could positively influence the attitudes of pre-service student teachers.

This study, accompanied by other research, indicates that direct experiences with children with disabilities influence the development of attitudes toward integration. This study lays the groundwork for future preparatory program development in that it suggests the importance of placing pre-service teacher with role models that hold higher degrees. It also supports the infusion of special education throughout course work and direct contact experiences.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The twenty-fourth report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) noted that in 1999-2000, 95.9% of students with disabilities were served in regular school buildings. Forty-seven and three tenths of the students were served outside of the regular classroom in alternative placements such as resource rooms for less than 21% of the school day. Students labeled as having low incidence disabilities such as deafness, blindness, and multiple disabilities, are more likely to spend most of their day outside of the general classroom while children with high incidence disabilities such as learning disabilities, and speech language impairments were more often found to be served in the regular classroom (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

When considering the data provided by the United States Department of Education, one can appreciate the importance of providing a positive learning environment for both typically developing children and those with
disabilities in general education classrooms. The practice of integrating children with disabilities into general education classrooms has increased as a result of rising societal concerns and legislative acts, but the manner in which universal programs of integration have been implemented is questionable and inconsistent (IDEA, 1990; IDEA, 1997; NCLB, 2001; Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990, states that the first educational placement consideration for students with disabilities, the least restrictive environment (LRE), is to be in the general education classroom before alternate options are considered. Rheams and Bain (2005) noted that early childhood integration models that use developmentally appropriate strategies permit children with disabilities to make remarkable advances in their overall development. In contrast, without appropriate interventions in an integrated classroom, children with disabilities are more likely to engage in solitary play and remain segregated from typically developing peers. Attributes that contribute to the discrepancies in integration models are suggested to be an interpretation
of the methods of integration, funds to execute the programs, administrative support, and teacher preparation (Aldrich, 2002; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Campbell, Gilmore, & Cuskelly, 2003; Cook, Semmel & Gerber, 1999; Hammond & Ingalls, 2003; Jeon & Peterson, 2003; Rose, 2001; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Stoiber, Gettinger, & Goetz, 1998; Vanderfaeille, DeFever, & Lombaerts, 2003; Weisel & Tur-Kaspa, 2002; Yoon & Gilchrist, 2003). Aldrich (2002) suggested that the frequency of the practice of integration has increased but the effectiveness of the practice is questionable, resulting in only 25% of today’s teachers feeling they possess the skills needed to implement an effective integrated program. Empirical data revealed that 65% of teachers support the general concept of integrating students with disabilities with typically developing children but only 40.5% conceptually agreed that integration could work. Lack of conviction from personnel delegated to implement integration models and a deficit in positive attitude toward the concept may account for the shortcomings of integration execution (Aldrich, 2002; Cook et al., 1999). It has been suggested
that a lack of confidence in teaching skills may lead to negative attitudes toward the notion of integrating children with disabilities in general classrooms (Alghazo, Dodeen, & Algaryouti, 2003; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003).

Such findings, along with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandates have prompted preparatory programs to reconsider the effectiveness and accountability of their programs for training teachers qualified to meet the needs of all children in their classrooms. The curriculum for pre-service teachers should assess students on their ability to demonstrate commitment to the education and welfare of all learners, specifically through dispositions and attitudes. Bullock and Hawk (2005) suggested that pre-service teachers should display an appreciation for democratic values, social justice, and diversity within the school community. Pre-service teachers should also demonstrate respect for the dignity of all stakeholders in the education environment and acknowledge multiple perspectives when developing a curriculum for children in their classrooms.

Individual experiences such as socioeconomic status, cultural backgrounds, languages, peer/social groups,
disabilities, multiple intelligences, talents, and prior learning may help the pre-service teacher develop a better understanding of the whole child, that can in turn aid the teacher in designing a curriculum that uses the child’s strengths as a basis for development (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; Gardner, 1983). Putting highly qualified teachers in the classroom was found to raise children’s level of achievement. Specifically, to be a highly qualified teacher you must meet the following criteria: hold a bachelor’s degree, full state certification or licensure, and prove that they know the topics that they teach (Ohio Department of Education, 2004a).

The Division of Early Children (DEC) of the Council for Exceptional Children, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) both advocate for the practice of integration of children with disabilities in early childhood classrooms (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; DEC, 2000).

Pre-service teacher education institutions have tried different methods within course work to increase positive attitudes, but the most successful method takes place when pre-service teachers have increased direct
contact with children with disabilities (Alghazo et al., 2003; Campbell et al., 2003; Shade & Stewart, 2001). There is a belief that preparatory programs still are not effective in training pre-service teachers about the reality of having children with disabilities in their classrooms (Alghazo et al., 2003; Shade & Stewart, 2001). Preparatory programs need to focus on preparing pre-service teachers to recognize the different categories of disabilities, to identify the child who is not developing typically, to apply adaptive curriculum methods, and to remediate learning problems. To insure that programs are effective, researchers suggest that training institutions combine formal training with classroom experience, or role-playing with content material (Campbell et al., 2003; Shade & Stewart, 2001).

Preparatory program directors need to be aware that by incorporating more courses with direct supervised contact hours relative to children with disabilities, they are more likely to produce pre-service teachers who show increased levels of confidence, a more positive attitude, and greater conviction of the benefits of including children with disabilities in their classrooms (Alghazo et
Preparatory programs, as required by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), must assess pre-service teachers on their ability to demonstrate commitment to the education and welfare of all learners specifically through dispositions and attitudes. NCATE is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as the body that accredits colleges and universities in preparing teachers and other professional personnel for working with children in pre-kindergarten through grade twelve (NCATE, 2002). NCATE is a voluntary process, but in some instances, states mandate universities to obtain accreditation. According to NCATE, pre-service teachers should demonstrate respect for the dignity of all stakeholders in the education environment and acknowledge multiple perspectives (Bullock & Hawk, 2005). Therefore, additional research is needed as to the efficacy of preparatory programs to produce pre-service teachers that
meet the criteria needed to demonstrate respect for all involved in the integration process.

Evidence from empirical research finds that pre-service teachers place blame for their negative attitudes on lack of experience and knowledge (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis et al., 2002; Hoover, 1985; Marshall et al., 2002; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Shippen et al., 2005). Scholars indicate that in order for integration of any sort to be effective, general education teachers need to have ample experiences with children having disabilities. Traditional course work, along with direct contact with children with disabilities at the pre-service and in-service levels, was found to create more positive teacher attitudes toward implementation of integration in their classrooms (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Shade & Stewart, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

Attitudes hold significant power over the success of the integration of students with disabilities in our schools (Shippen et al., 2005). In education, teacher attitudes are important constructs that guide the teacher-
thinking process, knowledge acquisition, teacher strategies, and classroom management (Jeon & Peterson, 2003). In order to promote successful integration, educators’ attitudes toward people with disabilities have been recorded at every level of the spectrum, which in turn, has prompted researchers to have great interest in determining how to promote positive teacher attitudes (Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hastings & Oakford, 2003). Armitage and Connor (2002) suggest that to predict an attitude, we must measure the strength of the attitude. The ability to change an attitude hinges upon the capacity of the person to comprehend and retain information received through a persuasive message from a role model or through being an active participant (Brinol & Petty, 2003). General education teachers’ attitudes towards disabilities have the ability to be changed through new environmental experiences, such as providing information about the disability and through direct experiences with children with disabilities (Baum & McMurray-Schwarz, 2003; Harasymiw & Horne, 1976; Hoover, 1985).

The empirical research unveils a multitude of descriptive studies with limited experimental designs
using student teaching as a venue. The literature addresses how direct experience and knowledge will enhance a pre-service teacher’s attitude toward children with disabilities. The literature review for this research discusses five studies that use the student teaching environment as a vehicle for influencing pre-service teachers’ attitudes and dispositions toward integrating children with disabilities into general classrooms. Thus, this study is unique in contributing to the current literature regarding the importance of direct contact through using an experimental design during a student teaching experience.

Student teaching provides time, while being directly supervised, for pre-service teachers to implement the skills and knowledge they have obtained throughout their previous course work. In this study, pre-service teachers completed 11 weeks in an integrated student teaching placement. Many of the studies reviewed used descriptive measures and non-experimental designs for the group of pre-service teachers enrolled in a specific course, but not yet in student teaching. In one study conducted by Hoover (1985), two groups were compared after completing a
course in adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of children with disabilities needs. However, this study did not use pre-service student teaching as its venue (Hoover, 1985). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine whether pre-service teachers exhibited a positive change in attitude toward children with disabilities after being randomly placed into an integrated, 11-week, student teaching placement assignment.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether a student teaching placement in an integrated classroom would promote a positive change in pre-service teachers’ attitude toward children with disabilities. In determining the effect of the student teaching placement in an integrated setting, the following research question was studied:

1. How do the attitudes of pre-service teachers placed in integrated classrooms compare with the attitudes of pre-service teachers’ placed in student teaching placements without integration?
Demographic information pertaining to the pre-service teacher included gender, age, education level attained, number of special education courses taken, and personal experiences with persons with disabilities. This study collected demographic information about the cooperating teacher including years of experience, number of special education courses completed, educational level, gender, and licensure/degree, and personal experience with persons with disabilities. In addition to demographic information about the pre-service and cooperating teacher, classroom demographics such as number of children with IEPS, and disability types were gathered.

Null Hypothesis

Parallel with the above research question the research hypothesis was as follows:

1. There is no difference in the attitudes between pre-service teachers placed in an integrated classroom and pre-service teachers placed in a classroom that does integrate children with disabilities.

Significance

Continual evaluations of attitudes are pertinent in evaluating the effectiveness of programs (Shade & Stewart,
Contrary to popular belief, studies have revealed that encounters with children with disabilities do not predict whether a teacher will be more willing to include children with disabilities in their classroom (Alghazo et al., 2003; Hoover, 1985; Jeon & Peterson, 2003; Shade & Stewart, 2001). The reasons for such discrepant findings are attributed to inadequate contact with children having various disabilities and lack of conviction by the pre-service teacher to learn more about integration (Alghazo et al., 2003; Hoover, 1985; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003; Wolfe & Falk-Ross, 2002). Some researchers have concluded that taking one course about special education does not reliably predict that pre-service teachers are more willing to include children with disabilities in their classroom. Rather, it has been noted that teachers who take personal initiative to enroll in special education-related course work typically have a more positive outlook toward integration (Bearn & Smith, 1998).

There is no sound evidence that one or even two courses relating to special education is beneficial to the improvement of attitudes; however, there is evidence supporting course content accompanied by direct contact of

The expected benefits from this study are that the results may support the notion that direct supervised contact with children with disabilities has a positive effect toward improving pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward including children with disabilities in their general education classroom. With a true experimental design, this research had the ability to add causal information to the literature. Providing a supervised student teaching placement with children with disabilities in an integrated setting may increase sensitivity to diversity and, thereby, pave the road to a more confident teacher candidate who has less anxiety toward integration (Alghazo et al., 2003; Harasyimiw & Horne, 1976; Wolfe & Falk-Ross, 2002).
Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations- Factors that limit the generalization of the study’s findings due to sampling and conceptual issues are listed below.

1. Only students from one university were sampled for the study, limiting the generalization to a specific geographic area.

2. Early childhood education preschool student teachers were targeted for this study. No other teacher licensure area was targeted for this project.

3. Quantitative information was only gathered for this study even though qualitative information could have added a wealth of knowledge to the conclusions.

4. Only pre-service teacher attitudes were surveyed as opposed to both pre-service and in-service.

5. Survey research relied on the participant providing reliable information through self-report, personal perception, and self-selector.

The delimitations section is closely related to the limitations section described above.
Delimitations- The scope of the study was bound by the following parameters:

1. Only early childhood pre-service teachers were surveyed. No other groups of pre-service teachers were included.

2. The sample of students was taken from only one university’s main and regional campuses, which geographically covers a rural Appalachian area.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were essential to the research and were taken from the literature.

Attitude- An individual’s ability to respond in a positive or negative manner toward a person, object, institution, or distinct aspect (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Jeon & Peterson, 2003; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002).

Early Childhood Pre-service Teacher- Student seeking age-three to grade-three licensure in the state of Ohio.

Early Childhood Student Teaching Placement- The pre-service teacher must complete an eleven-week supervised student teaching component prior to degree completion.
General Education Preschool Student Teaching

Placement- Children in these programs were functioning at a typical rate of development.

Inclusion- The belief that instructional practices and technological support are available to accommodate all students in the schools and classrooms they would otherwise attend if not disabled (Hammond & Ingalls, 2003; Lindsey & Ghose 2001; Leatherman & Niemeyer, 2005). Turnbull, Turnbull & Wehmeyer (2007) describe inclusion as having four key elements: home-school placement, the principle of natural proportions, “restructuring teaching and learning, and age- and grade-appropriate placements” (p. 42).

IDEA- The Federal law mandates that all children with a qualified disability between the ages of three and 21 be provided a free and appropriate public education.

Individualized Education Plan (IEP) – The IEP is a plan developed for the child with disabilities. The plan signifies objectives and strategies, which will assist in the education and growth of the child.

Integration- For the purpose of this study, the term integration rather than inclusion was used so that broader
and less stringent characteristics apply. An effective integrated classroom must incorporate the following attributes: collaboration and available support services; meaningful individualized education plans (IEP); adequate pre-service and in-service training; administrative support; and a positive attitude toward integration (Aldrich, 2002; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hammond & Ingalls, 2003; Jeon & Peterson, 2003; Rose, 2001; Vanderfaeille et al., 2003; Weisel & Tur-Kaspa, 2002; Yoon & Gilchrist, 2003).

Integrated Classroom—For the purpose of this study, an integrated classroom was one in which children with and without disabilities interacted collaboratively in classroom activities and in which at least one child with a disability and Individualized Education Plan (IEP) was present.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) — To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are non-disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the
regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (Turnbull et al., 2007).

Special Needs Preschool Student Teaching Placement—The majority of the children in special needs preschool classes have an Individualized Education Plan.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)—NCATE is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as the body that accredits colleges and universities in preparing teachers and other professional personnel for working with children in pre-kindergarten through grade twelve (NCATE, 2002).

Preparatory Program—A program approved and licensed by the state department of education to prepare future teachers for the classroom.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction to the Literature

This review of literature examines pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward children with disabilities and the relationship that student teaching placements have on these attitudes toward integration. First, in order to have a thorough understanding of the material presented in this review, a general knowledge of the history of integration of children with disabilities leading up to the passage of IDEA, LRE, and the measures taken to meet the spirit of integrating children with special needs into the general education environment is examined. Second, theoretical, and philosophical perspectives as well as variables that may affect the development of a pre-service teachers’ attitude toward children with disabilities are covered. Third, queries in relation to teacher preparatory programs such as course content, direct contact hours, student teaching placements and their bearing on pre-service teacher attitude development is outlined. Finally, relevant research concerning attitude development toward integration pertaining to the effects of student teaching in an integrated unit is examined.
Critical Review of Relevant Literature

Historical Events

The education system has evolved from one to two systems, dating from the nineteenth century to present day. In the nineteenth century, the public school system was a new entity to the United States in which children were educated in one classroom; varied needs and age ranges were addressed and housed in one classroom (Lovitt, 1993). As the population increased in the United States because of immigration, classrooms became inundated with children, resulting in grouping by age. The curriculum at the time became much more organized and specialized to deal with the diverse nature of the students.

Prior to World War II, children with disabilities were not educated in the public school environment. Throughout the early 1900s, children with disabilities were placed into special schools or institutions. During the 1950s and the late 1960s political change, litigation, and legislation transformed how society viewed the integration of all groups into society. In Brown v. Board of Education (1954), the Supreme Court decided that “separate-but-equal” educational environments were a
breach of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Although this litigation was based on race, families and advocates used this as the basis of their argument for children with disabilities to receive a free and appropriate education (Salend, 2008).

Advocates for integration began to have a strong voice in the community. They felt it was a moral imperative that children with disabilities be integrated into general education classrooms and believed that it provided positive social benefits to children’s development (Cook et al., 1999). The 1960s brought discussions of merging special and regular education fields together because the services were not delivering equal treatment to all children.

Lilly (1971) suggested that the structure of special education needed a revamped framework in order to provide quality services to children with disabilities. No longer should special education be a separate field for child-centered approaches but instead should be a training-based service model. Lilly contended that prior to the 1970’s the field of special education was unable to provide empirical evidence demonstrating they were providing a
higher level of education for students with disabilities than their “regular” education comrades (Lilly, 1970). Lilly stated that rather than defining “exceptional children” we should be finding definitions for “exceptional situations within the schools.” His opening definition read as follows:

An exceptional school situation is one in which interaction between a student and his teacher has been limited to such an extent that external intervention is deemed necessary by the teacher to cope with the problem. (p. 48)

Morally, this definition alters the viewpoint that children with disabilities are the reason for school problems and removal of the child to a self-contained classroom will remedy all concerns about integration. This shift in thought focuses on removing the burden from the child with the disability to the school district, so that it may focus on what is needed to provide a quality education for all children enrolled. As these two viewpoints cause heated debate, attitudes toward where children should be educated were being formed by educators
in the field, families in the communities, and legislators.

**IDEA and LRE**

The 70s brought yet another push to integrate children with special needs into general education environments. In 1975, a pivotal law concerning special education in the public schools was enacted. The Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), originally signed into law as The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA), Public Law (P.L.) 94-142, increased the role of the Federal Government by providing an educational bill of rights with the promise of financial incentives for states (Yell, 1998). The law mandated that all children with a qualified disability between the ages of 3 and 21 be provided a free and appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE). P.L. 94-142 also ordered that qualified children had the right to the following services: nondiscriminatory evaluation; an individual educational plan (IEP) with related services as needed; service delivery in the least restrictive environment; procedural due process, parent involvement; and a free and appropriate public education. Various
amendments since 1975 have addressed the education of children with disabilities; however, the most contentious and confusing aspect of IDEA was, and still is, the concept of “least restrictive environment,” a term that has been used to describe the practice of integrating students with disabilities into the general education environment.

When referring to the concept of a least restrictive environment, the law asserts that students with disabilities, to the maximum extent appropriate, are to be educated with their peers without disabilities. Students are only to be removed from the general education environment when the severity of the disability is such that they cannot receive an appropriate education in a regular education classroom with supplementary aides and services (IDEA Regulations, 34 C.F.R. 300.550). In the event that segregation is inevitable, the schools must provide students with disabilities the opportunity to interact with their peers without disabilities when appropriate. Schools must provide a continuum of placement options that include regular classes, resource rooms, special classes, special schools, homebound instruction,
and instruction in hospitals and institutions (IDEA Regulation, 34 C.F.R. 300.551). Determination of where services are to be delivered is prescribed on an individual basis by the IEP team.

Currently as IDEA intended, children with disabilities are to be educated as close to the typical environment as possible. Recent data indicates the majority of children with disabilities are being integrated into regular school environments (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Integrating students with disabilities into a general education environment is defined by Lipsky and Gartner (1997) as “The provision of services to students with disabilities, including those with severe impairments, in the neighborhood school, in age-appropriate general education classes, with necessary support services and supplementary aids (for the child and the teacher)” (p. 763). Integration should also assure the child’s success academically, behaviorally, and socially in order to prepare the child to participate as a full contributing member of the society (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). The lack of a clear definition of integration puts practices at...
risk for a disarray of provided services due to individual interpretation of the guidelines (Raber, Roach, & Fraser, 1998).

Funding Issues that Impact Placement Decisions

Although IDEA’s focus emphasizes the individual rights of students with disabilities, states and local school districts often make placement decisions based on financial and structural reasons (Palley, 2006). IDEA is a rights-based law, which is only partially funded by the federal government and poses economic difficulties for state implementation of the law. All 50 states choose to implement the act with only 17% of the cost of implementation covered by federal funds (National Governors’ Association, 2003). Before 1997, funds were allocated based on the number of children with disabilities in the state. A shift in funding formulas now allows states and schools to use funds in a manner they deem fit rather than solely based on disability labels. These state allocations may be determined by teacher, type of classroom, percentile of expenditures that the Local Education Administration (LEA) incurs, pupils enrolled in special education per district, number of students in
separate placements, and by specific disabilities (Parrish & Wolman, 1999). The array of funding options obviously affects how integrated education settings are specified.

With states still providing the majority of the funding for special education services, placement and implementation procedures of the LRE are influenced by case law in different circuits (Palley, 2006). In 1983, the Roncher v. Walter case disputed the assignment of students to segregated placements prior to investigating individual differences. Placing students solely according to their disability label clearly violates federal law because each individual case warrants careful considerations to make proper conclusions (Kluth, Villa, & Thousand, 2002).

In the Roncher v. Walter (1983) case, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit ruled that “cost is a proper factor to consider since excessive spending on one handicapped child deprives other handicapped children,” although, “cost is no defense if the school district has failed to use its funds to provide a proper continuum of alternative placements for handicapped children” (p. 1063). More recently, in 1997, the Hartmann v. Loudoun
*County Board of Education,* the Court of Appeals outlined three conditions that must be met prior to refusing a student integration into a typical environment: (a) no benefit to student from the regular education setting; (b) benefits of integrating are outweighed by the segregated setting; and (c) student is disruptive. This court case hinders the rights of students with disabilities to be included in a nonrestrictive setting due to the broad subjective nature of these guidelines. Structural change within educational settings will not change when rulings such as this, result in guidelines that may lead to continued exclusion of students with disabilities.

Congress revisited how educational programs were being provided to students with disabilities and passed amendments to IDEA that included language that afforded students greater access to the general education curriculum. Under IDEA ’97, an educator’s first consideration, as always, was to educate students with disabilities in general education environments. The programs for these students had to align with the state or local standards that applied to all students (IDEA, 1997).
Satisfying LRE requirements generates a constant need to produce teachers that are qualified to meet the needs of children with disabilities. Pre-service preparatory programs have begun altering curricula so their graduates have the tools to face the challenges of integration and LRE (Alghazo et al., 2003; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Campbell et al., 2003; Sesow & Adams, 1975). Lilly (1983) suggested that teacher-training programs should have two roles in order to meet the requirements of the LRE and integration. First, programs need to train pre-service teachers to be instructional specialists, and second, they should afford them with basic skills in special education so they may integrate students with disabilities into their general education environments. Integration of students with disabilities is not a procedure that can occur without providing proper training for general education teachers.

Moreover, without proper training, pre-service teachers are launched into the field without skills to implement quality programs. Lack of skills leads to a lack of competence; subsequently, negative attitudes toward the notion of integration and LRE result. (Alghazo et al.,
IDEA provides a framework for improved educational services for all children with and without disabilities. Research has increased the understanding of what constitutes a quality education including decision-making, instructional practices, positive behavioral supports, inclusion, technology, and family involvement (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hoover, 1985; Marshall et al., 2002; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002).

Least Restrictive Environment is a paradigm that provides the education system with unclear interpretations of the implementation, leading to an efficacy debate. Studies show that interacting with children with disabilities helps typically developing children obtain a better understanding of other peoples’ behaviors, accept differences, increase their appreciation toward diversity, decrease their fear of differences; and preparation for
future living occurs (Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hammond & Ingalls, 2003; Leatherman & Niemeyer, 2005). The essential message of integration is to end the stigmatizing and discriminatory exclusion of students who need special services (Hammond & Ingalls, 2003). In fact, adults with disabilities attribute negative attitudes and behaviors from people in the community to be barriers for their success to function in society, emphasizing the long-term effects of stigma in school (Brownlee & Carrington, 2000).

Teachers in school systems can hold similar negative attitudes. Therefore, regular as well as special education teachers need to be given proper pre-service training to implement appropriate curricula for students in their classrooms. When provided with this training, pre-service teachers can acquire skills that will increase their competence as well as their positive attitudes toward integration (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001).
Attitudes

To improve our education system, teachers need to maintain a positive attitude toward change. An attitude is a multidimensional design comprised of three components: cognition, affect, and behavior (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Haddock & Maio, 2004; Weisel & Turkaspa, 2002; Wilczenski, 1995). The cognitive components include peoples’ beliefs, knowledge, and evaluative perceptions about the target attitude. The affective component is the emotional response or belief toward the target attitude, and the behavior component is the overt actions toward the target attitude. All components are interrelated even though defined as separate entities (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Haddock & Maio, 2004; Weisel & Turkaspa, 2002; Wilczenski, 1995). Bohner and Wanke (2002) suggest that attitudes provide a simple structure for organizing and handling an otherwise complex and ambiguous environment when determining a person’s behavior toward a person or object. Therefore, through their overt actions, attitudes held by teachers affect a student’s academic achievement, behavior, and emotional development (Jeon & Peterson, 2003).
According to the 26th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004), more than one third of all children ages three to five receiving special education services were in early childhood environments. The report defined early childhood environments as those programs designed for children without disabilities. Odom (2000) contended that even though the topic of integrated preschool programs was broached in the early 1970s, it was not clearly stated as a service alternative under IDEA until the 1990s. Odom (2000) also voiced that programs, not children, need to be ready for integration. The report stated that children ages six to eleven made up 46.3 percent of the total six to twenty-one age group receiving special education services. Ninety-six percent of the six to eleven group was integrated into the regular education system in some manner; almost half of these children spent most of their day in general education classrooms. Jeon & Peterson (2003) found that pre-service teachers preparing to teach children from birth to age 8 held a more positive attitude toward children with disabilities than those preparing to teach older primary students. Through
providing a sound foundation in pre-service programs, teachers may gain pertinent information that increases their level of confidence and attitude toward integrating children with disabilities.

The course work required for pre-service teachers in early childhood programs tended to incorporate more courses pertaining to special education and integration than school-age programs. Jeon and Peterson (2003) and others found that the production of favorable attitudes toward integration occurred when more special education courses were taken that included adaptive techniques (Seson & Adams, 1982).

**Theoretical and Philosophical Perspectives**

Likewise, social psychologists have grappled with the topic of changing and measuring attitudes for years. They have surmised that by measuring attitudes through direct reports from the person, researchers can determine the strength of the response to the targeted object (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Haddock & Maio, 2004). Norman Anderson argues through the “Information Integration Theory,” which posits that attitudes and beliefs are formed and modified as people receive and
interpret new information; information is combined with prior attitudes and beliefs (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). A person’s new belief, a reflection of this culmination, is the motivation that can lead to avoiding a situation or having a negative or positive reaction toward an object or person (Haddock & Maio, 2004).

Attitude change requires teachers to examine the ethical implications of their work. Carr (1993) claims that:

The knowledge and understanding, which should properly inform the professional consciousness of the competent teacher, is . . . a kind of moral wisdom or judgment, which is rooted in rational reflection about educational policies and practices and what, is ethically, as well as instrumentally, appropriate to achieve them. (p. 265)

The ethical teacher must make academically and morally sound decisions about the formation of groups of people and how the individuals within the group context should be evaluated. The teacher must consider issues of fairness and care. Kohlberg has found that developmentally,
children become aware of differences in needs around age eight (Santrock, 2003).

With this new knowledge, children have the capability of noticing when people are being treated differently. Therefore, when a teacher possesses a negative attitude toward children with disabilities, the effects on the children may be detrimental to development (Brownlee & Carrington, 2000). Teachers become socialized into a culture of acceptance early in their career, a paradigm often centered around whether to accept unfair or inappropriate directives from administrators or to accept that the best way to keep out of trouble is to avoid ethical challenges (Campbell, 2003). Often, the actions and reactions of the teacher send subtle messages to students about how they are thought of as people, not simply just as learners (Campbell, 2003).

Teachers may agree on the objective principles of fairness and honesty within the school or classroom, but interpret them differently. When considering a child with a disability, what one teacher may regard as a caring alternative to treating all students equally because some may require more attention than others, another teacher
may see as a violation of justice that demands impartial and equal treatment of all. Teachers, at times, may find themselves saying, “It is not my job to educate children in my classroom with disabilities”; or “If I wanted to be a special education teacher then I would have gone to school to be one” in order to mask the ethical problems around them.

Theorists indicate that one’s beliefs influence one’s actions, and professional ethics are nothing more and nothing less than virtue in action (Campbell, 2003; Cook, 2002). Interpreting actions and beliefs as well as ethical and moral behavior now enter into the realm of considerations when seeking to improve the attitude of a teacher toward integration. Campbell (2003) emphasizes how prolific scholars view ethics as central to the very essence of teaching, not as a by-product of the teaching process. However, hesitation to accept more responsibilities, even with administrative support, becomes a common point for teachers (Sergiovanni, 1992). The teacher culture has covert restrictions that hinder a teacher from making some ethical and moral decisions.
Some contend that pre-service programs have ignored the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching. Campbell (2003) among others, argues that through course work, students should be challenged to critically analyze case studies and problem solve scenarios they may face in their classrooms. Through providing experiences with positive role models, pre-service teachers may learn appropriate moral and ethical techniques to meet the needs of all children in their classroom. Campbell (2003) states:

Ethical teachers need not be perfect, they do need, however, to be receptive to the development and enrichment of their own ethical knowledge, and united in the professional goal of enhancing collective ethical knowledge. Teachers may work to perfect both the sense of moral accountability and the overall practice of the profession itself. (p. 140)

Therefore, this study will provide pre-service student teachers with an experience to determine its ability to facilitate the promotion of a teacher’s self-confidence and potentially enhance characteristics of a more positive, ethical person.
Variables Influencing Teacher Attitudes Toward Integration

Historically, since the enactment of Public Law 94-142, regular education teachers have fallen into the mindset that special educators have some magical powers that enable them to provide the ultimate education package to a child with disabilities. This belief results in a negative attitude toward the inclusion of children with disabilities into general education classrooms (Shade & Stewart, 2001). External factors contributing to the negative attitudes are lack of confidence; lack of experience with teaching children with disabilities; lack of support from administration; degree of the disability, inadequacy of available materials; planning time; teachers' personalities; and class size (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Campbell & Gilmore, 2003; Cook et al., 1999; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Marshall et al., 2002; Rheams & Bain, 2005; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002; Wilczenski, 1995). The empirical research shows child and personal variables appear to be the factors that affect the attitude of the individual most significantly.
Child Related Variables That Influence Teacher Attitudes

The characteristics of children with disabilities and/or educational problems have influenced teachers’ attitudes (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Cook, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). The degree to which a child’s age, physical and sensory, cognitive, and behavioral and emotional delays impact the classroom are factors that teachers refer to when including a child with a disability (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Teachers tend to be more accepting of children with physical and sensory delays as opposed to emotional and behavior disorders, in part due to classroom management concerns (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Cook, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

Using an attitude survey, Hasting and Oakford (2003) determined that the “nature” of the disability influenced teachers’ attitudes toward integration. The study was conducted on a volunteer basis with 93 pre-service teachers. Likewise, Cook (2002) concluded that pre-service teachers reported that integration is beneficial to children with learning disabilities, emotional/behavioral disorders, mental retardation, and multiple disabilities.
Even though participants felt that children with these previously mentioned categories benefited from integration, they did not feel that all pre-service teachers could actually implement an appropriate program for children with disabilities. The researcher in the present study used the same attitudinal scale used in the study by Cook (2002) although Cook altered the survey to focus on different disability categories. The participants noted more strengths than weaknesses regarding integration about personal characteristics such as “patience”. The pre-service teachers also expressed that they did not have sufficient experience in working with children with disabilities, but felt their theoretical knowledge base was sufficient.

A common theme emerged from the literature that conceptual knowledge was important, but contextual direct teaching experiences were necessary in order to increase the confidence and attitudinal levels of pre-service teachers toward integration.

Personal Variables That Influence Teacher Attitudes

Personal variables that may hinder or support a positive attitude toward integration were identified as
the number of years experience and self-efficacy in working with children with disabilities, educational level, personality traits, and pre-service training (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Jeon & Peterson, 2003; Larrivee & Cook, 1979). Jeon and Peterson (2003), in a study of 297 undergraduate students majoring in early childhood education, found that personal experience such as having a relative with a disability or interacting with people having disabilities in a non-educational setting was a significant predictor of positive attitudes towards children with disabilities. The researchers used a regression model with major area of study, number of special education courses completed, personal relationships with children with disabilities, and work experience as the variables. The model explained 6.6 percent of the total variance. After controlling for the other factors, pre-service teachers that had personal experiences with people having disabilities held more positive attitudes toward disabilities.

When investigating personality traits of pre-service and/or in-service teachers, dominant and authoritarian personalities held less positive attitudes toward the
integration of children with disabilities. It is believed that rigidity in thought processes may explain these attitudes (Ajzen & Fishbern, 1980).

Overall, the most prominent findings indicate that an increased confidence level in the ability to work successfully with children having disabilities warrants a positive attitude toward integration (Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Weisel & Tur-Kaspa, 2002).

Bandura (1997) suggests that confidence or self-efficacy is defined as one’s belief in one’s own capabilities. Bandura suggests four factors that work to accomplish higher confidence levels. Experience, social modeling, persuasion, and interpretation of physical strength, and the ability to reduce stress and depression are factors that influence one’s self-efficacy.

In accordance with Bandura’s research on self-efficacy, increased special education coursework, positive direct contact with children having disabilities supervised by positive role models should provide educational environments for pre-service teachers to increase their positive attitude toward integration of children with disabilities (Tucker et al., 2005). Soodak,
Podell, and Lehman (1998) implied that teachers with a high confidence level concerning their use of differentiated instruction were more likely to express a more positive attitude toward integration. Jerome Bruner (1960) stated, “one who is insecure, who lacks confidence in himself, may be unwilling to run risks” (p. 65).

It is fair to assume that when pre-service teachers feel competent in effectively accommodating the curriculum for all children in their classrooms, their attitude toward integration will increase (Hastings & Oakford, 2003). Hoover (1985) conducted a comparison study with 61 pre-service elementary teachers enrolled in their last field experience prior to student teaching. Thirty-one of the participants, randomly assigned to a special education classroom, were required to be involved in implementing adapted lesson plans and observations. The control group, placed in a regular classroom environment, received minimal field experience following a special education course. Near the end of the field placement experience, the cooperating teachers were required to complete surveys as to whether or not the ability of the pre-service teachers to work in an integrated program had increased
and it was reported that further extensive experiences were needed to increase pre-service teachers’ abilities in effectively accommodating the curriculum for children with disabilities.

**Teacher Preparatory Institutions and How They May Influence Teacher Attitudes Toward Integration**

The NCLB (2001) and IDEA (2004), support that teachers are to be highly qualified in the areas they teach, adding to the importance of fostering positive attitudinal change. The outcomes of students enrolled in special education programs cannot be improved without qualified teachers to implement the curriculum. Staff, as determined by IDEA, is to be highly qualified in the core academic subjects they teach. Many special education teachers teach across grade levels and as a result, IDEA ’04 has provided some flexibility in determining qualifications of special education teachers teaching multiple subjects. It is likely that in order to meet the highly qualified mandate, students will receive their primary instruction in core academic subjects in the general education classroom with the consultation services of a special education staff member (CEC, 2005). IDEA
states that highly qualified teachers will use scientifically-based instruction to implement practices (U. S. Government, 2003). A position statement authored by Kauffman, Lanfrum, Mock, Sayeski, and Sayeski (2005) states:

Teachers should be well trained in the content areas for which they will be responsible. They should be able to select materials, plan lessons, and deliver instruction in a way that allows most students to learn material in an expected amount of time. Good teachers should also be trained in how to monitor students’ progress that falls below expectations. They should know how to modify content and lesson delivery in such cases to provide a better chance of student learning. They should also be able to recognize when these modifications are not working. A good teacher understands the need to call in special help and knows when to turn the job of teaching a particular student over to someone else. (p. 4)

This framework of preparation and practice is directed to all teachers, not just teachers in special education, and suggests that pre-service institutions have the daunting
task of creating a curriculum that will produce teachers that exhibit all of the previously mentioned skills.

From the time of the passage of IDEA, educational institutions have undertaken the challenge to develop a curriculum that includes course work in special education. Through providing such instructional experiences, a reduction of negative attitudes and an increase in self-efficacy toward implementing adaptive curriculum for children with disabilities occurs (Alghazo et al., 2003; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Campbell et al., 2003; Sesow & Adams, 1975). In a literature review conducted by Avramidis and Norwich (2002) it was suggested that without a “coherent” curriculum plan in teacher preparation, the attempt to integrate children into regular education classrooms would be a challenge.

Given this research, it is conducive for teacher preparatory institutions to offer course work that touches upon the areas of collaboration, communication, ethical, and moral responsibilities, disability categories, technology, and accommodations. Through providing content information accompanied by direct experiences, pre-service teachers may develop a stronger confidence level in their
ability to implement appropriate strategies to integrate children with disabilities into their classrooms.

Similarly, Brownlee and Carrington (2000) suggested teacher education programs should include more direct contact experiences in integrated programs. They conducted a qualitative study of eleven third-year education students that had limited experience with children with disabilities. After conducting interviews, the pre-service students revealed that through contact with students with disabilities, they began to have a more positive perception of integration. They focused more on the child first rather than the disability, contributing to their ability to adjust their style of interactions. Through personal reflections, pre-service teachers concluded they had undergone a positive attitude change but suggested that more practical experiences with children with disabilities were still needed. While teacher preparation programs have addressed competencies for pre-service regular educators in their curricula, the issue now becomes what types of learning experiences actually provide for the greatest impact on attitudes. The following section discusses three major areas for pre-
service teacher learning: traditional course work; field experiences; and student teaching.

Course Work

The courses required by teacher education programs have been found to influence a pre-service teachers’ attitudes about integration. Andrews and Clementson (1997) recommend that pre-service teacher education courses cover background contextual information as well as the “teaching methodologies.” Students seeking a general education teaching degree typically are given limited special education courses and limited experience with children with disabilities. Andrew and Clementson (1997) suggested that introductory courses should employ active learning techniques to help make students aware of their attitudes toward disabilities.

The controversy lies with exactly how many courses are needed to promote a positive attitude toward integration. Some argue that one course is not enough to influence attitude development, while others argue that 10-15 credit hours in special education course work will have positive effects on attitude (Larke, 1990; Leyser, 1988). Andrews and Clementson (1997) contend that while it
is important to infuse special education courses into the curriculum, it is equally important to concurrently engage pre-service teachers in activities that allow them to become involved with the course content. They suggest instructors use activities such as “simulation activities, awareness activities, role playing, problem solving activities, and open-ended discussions” (p. 7). A significant finding from employing such activities was an increase in knowledge-base. However, it was concluded that the 67 respondents in the study were skeptical that all teachers could teach students with disabilities.

Cumulative growth of teachers due to maturity and experience likely lends to the development of more positive attitudes toward children with disabilities. Carroll, Forlin and Jobling (2003) found that after 220 students completed a course in special education they were able to focus on the person first and then the disability. Prior to the completion of the course, the students felt “ignorant” and lacked confidence in their abilities to interact with a person having a disability. They suggested special education content would be more beneficial if infused throughout the course work of the program rather
than in just one course. Significant results from increased interactions with children having disabilities resulted in decreased levels of discomfort in the areas of reduced ignorance, uncertainty and coping about interacting with children with disabilities.

Larrivee and Cook (1979) suggested the mere enrollment in courses that reflect information about special education or direct service with students with disabilities does not influence attitudes. However, the perceived efficacy of the experiences influences a pre-service teacher’s attitude toward people with disabilities.

Likewise, Shippen and associates (2005) found that 326 pre-service students in an introductory course in special education, using a pre- and post-test survey method significantly reduced their anxiety and hostility toward integration. The authors attributed this decrease to students’ increased awareness of the rights of students with disabilities as defined in IDEA. It was noted that even though students expressed increased anxiety toward integration after receiving information in the introductory course, they felt more calm about integration
due to increased content knowledge pertaining to disabilities.

Field Experience

Perceived confidence in providing a program for children with disabilities may be enhanced through the provision of field experiences throughout a teacher preparation degree program. After conducting a study on 181 undergraduate pre-service teachers, Cook (2002) concluded seniors had more positive perceptions of integration than freshman. He attributed these findings to seniors having had more instructional and direct experience with children with disabilities. He also inferred this could have been due to few or limited required field experiences in integrated classrooms throughout the seniors’ program. When students are not given ample experiences in integrated classrooms, personal experiences outside of their training program became the basis for their attitude toward integration.

Aldrich (2002) reported similar findings in relation to confidence with implementing developmentally appropriate programs for children with disabilities. She conducted a non-experimental, quantitative descriptive
study with 172 early childhood pre-service teachers during their student teaching or final semester of course work. Surveys measured attitudes, beliefs, and perceived knowledge about integration. Findings indicated that students held optimistic beliefs and attitudes about integration, and were knowledgeable, but felt they were not trained to implement an integrated program in their future classrooms. Aldrich suggested students should be actively involved in IEP development, adapting lesson plans, and classroom management so that their degree of self-efficacy would improve. The more interaction a pre-service teacher has with integrating children with disabilities into their classroom, the more confidence they will gain.

The degree of a child’s disability also may hinder positive attitudinal development (Cook, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003) and challenge a pre-service teacher’s confidence. Student teachers reported increased negative thoughts toward integrating children with behavioral and emotional disorders into their classroom than children with intellectual disabilities (Hastings & Oakford, 2003). They suggested the provision of supports and resources can
enhance the likelihood that a teacher would support the concept of integration. Students with the most challenging problems may require greater supports and resources. Therefore, the availability of resources would influence their ability to integrate children with disabilities proficiently.

Campbell and associates (2003) found using an integrated university study with fieldwork pertaining to a specific disability (Down Syndrome), students had a more positive attitude toward the disability specifically, as well as toward integration in general. Through increasing knowledge pertaining to disabilities, accompanied with experience accommodating the curriculum for a child with a disability, pre-service teachers were more likely to feel they were capable of implementing a successful integrated program.

**Student Teaching**

Student teaching has been reported to be a momentous period in a pre-service teachers’ curriculum because they may attain beliefs, skills, and knowledge from a focused, extensive teaching environment (Doyle, 1997). It is important that during this experience, pre-service
teachers develop a positive belief about integration. Through providing a positive placement and role model, pre-service teachers may be able to appropriately translate theory into practice and ultimately favor the idea of integration (Niemeyer & Proctor, 2002).

Niemeyer & Proctor (2002) conducted a qualitative study with six pre-service teachers enrolled in student teaching. Students were placed in classrooms that integrated at least one child with a disability and had a cooperating teacher with at least three years teaching experience along with a teaching license. The researchers wanted to find out how pre-service teachers’ placements in such classrooms would affect their attitude toward integration. It was found that through student teaching in an integrated classroom, accompanied by previous course work, pre-service teachers held a positive attitude toward integration, along with the belief that they could be successful in implementing a quality-integrated program for children with disabilities.

In focus group interviews of the pre-service teachers who had been placed in these classrooms, the statement was made that seeing what a child with a disability was
capable of doing changed previous thoughts about integration. Student teachers' competence to adapt environments for children with disabilities played an important role in the development of positive attitude toward integration because they were more confident and positive about the concept of integration. Niemeyer and Proctor (2002) noted that the sample size of six was a limitation to the study. Therefore, further research with larger sample sizes was needed for generalization purposes.

A qualitative study by Donegan, Hong, Trepanier-Street, and Finkelstein (2005) using panel board discussions and journal entries revealed that by providing an experience in an integrated setting, student teachers demonstrated an increased understanding of teaching methodologies needed to educate children with disabilities in their classrooms. By integrating children with disabilities into their programs, student teachers were able to accommodate and meet the needs of children with disabilities when developing projects for classroom instruction. Pre-service teachers, because of the types of their experiences, gained increased abilities to observe
and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of students with disabilities. This study did not intend to explore the effects of student teaching on attitudes of inclusion, but their observations were found to be significant enough to report in the literature.

Aldrich (2002) similarly concluded that, in order for pre-service teachers to obtain a positive belief and attitude toward integration, they need to have a curriculum that addresses special education throughout the program. A supportive experience in successful integrated programs, as well as experience with the modification of curriculum for children with disabilities, needs to take place at the pre-service level. Such experiences could be obtained through providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to collaborate on IEP team decisions, teaching modified lessons, and planning for classroom management in their practicum as well as direct service experiences. However, little evidence has been presented in the literature as to how significant a student teacher’s placement is in the development of integration beliefs.
It stands to reason that course work, early field experiences, and opportunities to be successful with children with disabilities may prove to be the most powerful combination of sustained learning activities for pre-service teachers. Additionally, learning opportunities within student teaching may increase pre-service teachers’ confidence with integrating children with disabilities into their general education classrooms. To date, few studies have compared attitudes toward integration based on student teaching integrated preschool placements versus general preschool placements that provide no opportunity to interact and adapt curriculum for children with disabilities. The present study sought to fill this gap in the research.

Summary

Since the original passage of IDEA in 1975, the incidence of students with disabilities educated in general classrooms has increased from 43.4 percent, in 1993, to 48.2 percent in 2002. Regular educators have expanding responsibilities for adapting instruction to meet students’ differentiated learning needs. With the pressures of accountability measures for educators to
serve all children, fostering positive attitudes and skills in meeting the needs of children with disabilities continues to be important to teacher preparatory programs. After completing a qualitative study of in-service teachers, Smith and Smith (2000) concluded teachers felt their pre-service education programs did not properly prepare them for integration. Pre-service training is an influential time to promote the positive development of attitudes toward integration. Once in the field, challenges in the daily classroom environment may hinder teachers’ decisions toward implementing integrated programming.

To alter an attitude there is a need for transformation in thinking (Wolfe & Falk-Ross, 2002). Beliefs evolve from experiences and personal values that are internally and externally assimilated. Therefore, teacher education preparation must focus on the beliefs, attitudes, ethics, and moral characteristics of candidates in their programs in order to produce competent teachers (Boler, 2004; Campbell, 2003; Niemeyer & Proctor, 2002). Furthermore, curriculum for pre-service teachers should include course work in special education accompanied by
Numerous studies have affirmed that course work and field experience may influence pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward integrating children with disabilities into regular education classrooms. This process also appears to be one that requires time and perhaps maturity. Scant research has been conducted using student teaching placement sites to make causal predictions as to whether completing pre-school student teaching in an integrated program will promote a positive attitude toward integrating children with disabilities. This study sought to add significant evidence to the literature concerning the importance of requiring pre-service teachers to complete their student teaching in an integrated program.

The next chapter describes the methodology employed in the study along with the procedures followed for data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The present study examined pre-service teachers' attitudes toward children with disabilities. It compared the mean scores of an attitude survey of two groups of pre-school student teachers. Participants were randomly assigned to two groups using a matched pair technique. One group completed student teaching in classrooms that integrated children with disabilities and the other was placed in classrooms that included only children developing at a typical level. Secondarily, how much influence each dependent variable (benefits of integration, integrated classroom management, perceived ability to teach students with disabilities, and special versus integrated general education) had on the overall student attitude was examined in the analysis. Early childhood pre-service teachers completed preschool student teaching at one university and were asked to complete a survey at the end of their 11-week student teaching experience.

This chapter focuses on the methodology used in the study. The research design, operational definitions of variables, sample, instrument, pilot study, reliability,
and validity of the instrument, as well as data collection and analysis procedures are discussed.

**Research Design**

The design for this project was a true experimental design because preschool student teachers were randomly assigned to one of two groups and given a post-test attitudinal survey. The researcher had the capability of making causal interpretations because of the true experimental design. The focus of the experimental design was how the variables correlated as a group collectively and simultaneously. A comparison of the experimental and control group was made about the attitude toward integration in the final week of their student teaching experience. By using a post-test survey, threats to bias and validity were managed by reducing the fear of testing effect. The post-test design focused on comparing the two groups of pre-school student teachers’ mean scores on an attitudinal scale. The format made this study unique to the research field of attitudinal change toward integration because a group comparison was made in an experimental manner (Mertler, & Vannatta, 2005; Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006).
Operational Definition of Variables

The dependent variables for analysis were four subscales from a 25-item Likert rating scale (Likert, 1932). The developers of the scale, through factor analysis, determined the scale could be reduced to four factors: Benefits of Integration (8 questions), Integrated Classroom Management (10 questions), Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities (3 questions) and Special Versus Integrated General Education (4 questions) (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995).

The respondent rated each statement on a 6-point continuum from -3, “I disagree very much,” through +3, “I agree very much.” In order to have a positive total score the author of the scale positively scored the 12 negative questions by reversing the signs and added 75 to the sum (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). Total scores ranged from 0-150, with the higher score signifying a more favorable attitude toward integration.

The independent variable for the study was the preschool student teaching placement. There were two possible groups for this study. First, student teaching placement in an Integrated Program (IP) indicated a
preschool classroom placement serving children ages three to five in which at least one child with a disability had a working IEP. Second, student teaching placement in a Typical Program (TP) indicated a preschool classroom placement serving children ages three to five that were developing at a typical development level.

Demographic information sheets were distributed to the pre-service student teachers the third and fourth weeks of the quarter during seminar. The demographic information sheets included the following data:

**Age:** the chronological age of the pre-service teacher.

**Gender:** the biological sex of the participant, which included two categories: male coded as one and female coded as two.

**Education level:** The level of education of the classroom teacher and pre-service teacher was coded in years ranging from first-year university student to master’s degree.

**Number of special education classes taken:** It is a requirement for early childhood education students at the university in which participants were drawn, to complete
two special education courses, therefore determining any other courses in special education was a potential factor.

Personal experiences with persons with disabilities were coded into five ordinal categories: 1 = none, 2 = acquaintance (e.g., neighbor, store clerk), 3 = casual (e.g., fellow student, co-worker, and employee), 4 = close (e.g., roommate, near relative), 5 = intimate (e.g., spouse, child, and sibling).

Degree of cooperating teacher, in whose classroom the student was student teaching was coded into five ordinal categories: 0 = child development associates (CDA), 1 = no degree, 2 = associate degree, 3 = baccalaureate degree, 4 = master degree, 5 = doctorate.

Years of experience of the cooperating teacher: tabulated in a numerical manner.

Number of children with IEPs in the classroom: ranged from zero to 10.

Description of the Sample of Convenience

The sample for this study was 78 pre-service student teachers completing student teaching during summer and fall quarters of 2007 at a local university main campus and its five regional campuses. The participants in the
study were senior level students in early childhood education completing preschool student teaching. The pre-service student teachers completed an introductory special education course and a junior level course pertaining to modifying curriculum for children with special needs. The accommodation course required a direct contact component that gave students the opportunity to review an IEP of a target child and develop lessons for a child with a disability. Other related courses required for this program were guidance and management, diversity, child development, observing and recording children’s behaviors, and various parent and family education courses. In addition to content-based courses, the university required students to complete approximately 850 hours of direct experience in classrooms. Participants enrolled in preschool student teaching completed an eleven week; half-day teaching experience in programs for children aged three to five. Often the placements integrated children with disabilities into their program but this type of placement was not a requirement to be considered a qualified placement.
Random Assignment

Prior to the summer and fall quarter, student teaching supervisors distributed a cover letter describing the study along with a consent form and applications for placements during the summer and fall quarters to all preschool student teachers in the sample (see Appendix A). A matched-pair technique using age and gender was conducted at each campus (Tuckman, 1999). After matching congruent participants, the students were randomly divided into two groups. The applications for the placement site were numbered 1-120. In order to maintain confidentiality, the pre-service teachers’ names were not used for the encoding of information only the code number.

The application provided information such as age, gender and three potential placements for student teaching. One stipulation was that the student designated one placement of the three that was integrated. The integrated placement was noted with an asterisk (*). Once matched pairs were derived, the first student in the match was placed in the experimental group placement and the second student was placed in the control group placement.
**Instrumentation**

Participants completed the Opinions Relative to Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI) scale at the end of their student teaching experience (Antonak & Larivee, 1995). Participants were given the ORI in written form and also in an electronic format to increase response rate (APPENDIX C). The ORI is a scale that measures the attitudes that persons hold toward the integration of children with disabilities into regular education classrooms. Written permission from the authors was given prior to the implementation of the research for use of this survey (See Appendix E).

The scale was comprised of 25 questions, which the authors reduced into four subcategories. Benefits of Integration (Factor 1) (#3, 7, 11, 14, 17, 20, 21, 24), Integrated Classroom Management (Factor 2) (#1, 4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 22, 25), Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities Factor (Factor 3) (#2, 10, 19), and Special Versus Integrated General Education (Factor 4) (#5, 8, 13, 23) were found to be mechanisms that influence the concept of integration and its effectiveness. The Benefits of Integration category (Factor 1) has eight
questions about the benefits of integration not only for children with special needs but also for children developing typically. The second subcategory, Integrated Classroom Management (Factor 2), encompasses ten questions pertaining to the behavior of the students in an integrated program and classroom management techniques that may be required. The third category, Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities (Factor 3), is self-explanatory with its content addressed in three questions, as well as the fourth, Special Versus Integrated General Education (Factor 4), with four questions.

Selection/Development of Instruments

The ORI is a summated-rating scale originally designed in 1979 by Larrivee and Cook. Even though the original format, Opinions Relative to mainstreaming (ORM), yielded sound psychometric characteristics and was based on careful consideration of theories, the authors modified the tool in 1995 (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995; Antonak & Livneh, 1988). Revisions included changes in terminology to reflect views and language that are more current,
changes to the item-response format, and a deletion of 5 items.

Reliability and Validity Issues

The ORI was given to 433 participants and was found to be constant, and produced satisfactory scores for reliability and homogeneity. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .83 was reported for the overall scale. Significant and positive findings in research using the ORI provided support for the validation of the instrument (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995; Cook, 2002; Jobe, Rust, & Brissie, 1996).

In a study conducted by Cook (2002) the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was .88 for the entire scale. When looking at the four subscales individually the Cronbach’s coefficients were as follows: .82 (Benefits of Integration) (Factor 1), .83 (Integrated Classroom Management) (Factor 2), .73 (Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities) (Factor 3), and .63 (Special versus Integrated General Education) (Factor 4).

Similarly, in a study by Jobe and associates (1996) the overall scale alpha reliability coefficients were .90. Individually the subscales were Benefits of Integration = .88, Integrated Classroom Management = .68, Perceived
Ability to Teach = .76 and Special versus Integrated = .78. Calculations of Pearson correlation coefficients for the total score of the scale, four subscales, and demographic variables (gender, teaching experience, inclusion in-service training, and teaching experience in special education) were completed. There were significant although modest correlations between gender and Perceived Ability to Teach and Special versus Integrated General Education. Significant and positive correlations were also found between inclusion in-service training and Benefits of Integration and Perceived Ability. Experience teaching special education predicted a positive attitude toward integration.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted so that further empirical support for the instrument used in this research could be gathered. Thirty-one preschool student teachers at the same university completed the pilot study. The participants were all completing their student teaching in a preschool setting and were seeking the same degree and licensure as the participants in the actual study.
A letter to the participants (Appendix A) was given during the final weeks of their student teaching. Upon consent to participate in the study, candidates completed the 25-question survey. The data collected from the 31 candidates were entered into the SPSS. None of the surveys included missing data, therefore, all 31 surveys were utilized in the pilot study.

**Pilot Study Reliability Issues**

The 31 sets of responses comprising the pilot were subjected to item analysis and measurement of internal consistency using Cronbach’s Alpha available in SPSS. The overall scale had a high reliability of .81 for the 25 items. The mean score was 96.83 with a standard deviation of 14.51. Individually the subscales were as follows: .77 (Benefits of Integration) (Factor 1), .69 (Integrated Classroom Management) (Factor 2), .30 (Perceived Ability to Teach) (Factor 3), and .54 (Special versus Integrated) (Factor 4). Calculations of Pearson correlation coefficients for the total score of the scale, four subscales, and demographic variables (gender, teaching experience, inclusion in-service training, and teaching experience in special education) were completed. There
were significant although modest correlations between benefits of integration and integrated classroom management. Significant and positive correlations were also found between integrated classroom management and special versus integrated sites. It is noted that this correlation was low but signified a small relationship. The pilot study provided verification that the instrument was appropriate to use in the actual research project.

Data Collection Procedures

This research was granted exempt status by the Institutional Review Board (see Appendix D) prior to the onset of data collection. Informed consent for each participant was gained one quarter prior to the commencement of student teaching in order to perform random assignment (see APPENDIX A). In addition to the informed consent, each participant was given a cover letter explaining the procedures for the research (see APPENDIX B).

The data was collected between June 2007 and December 2007. Student teachers were required to attend weekly seminar classes in addition to their student teaching classroom-based experience. Therefore, seminar was the
most appropriate place to make contact for the data collection phases. Data collection occurred at two points throughout each quarter. The first data collection phase began between the third and fourth week of the quarter. The researcher prepared and mailed packets, with identification codes, containing the demographic information sheet (See APPENDIX C) to the student teaching supervisors to be dispersed during the student teaching seminar. The demographic sheet asked participants to provide the following information: age, gender, educational level attained, number of children with IEPs in the classroom, number of special education courses taken, personal experiences with persons with disabilities, degree of cooperating teacher, cooperating teacher’s personal experience with disabilities and cooperating teacher’s years of experience. In the event that the pre-service teachers could not answer any of the questions, they were allotted time to confer with their cooperating teacher. The researcher did not meet with the pre-service teachers at any time so that violations to validity through bias were avoided. Upon completion of the
booklets, the researcher obtained the packets from the student teacher supervisors via postal mail service.

The next phase of data collection occurred during the final weeks of the quarter. At this time, pre-service teachers were given a packet consisting of the ORI, five open-ended questions and a statement of appreciation. Each packet was labeled with the pre-service teacher’s identification code for confidentiality purposes. The researcher chose to use the ORI as a post-test only in order to anticipate for any threats to validity and bias (Tuckman, 1999). Upon the completion of the surveys, the student teaching supervisors returned them to the researcher via postal mail service.

Data Analysis Procedures

Perceived attitudes toward integration are not isolated by one behavior. Therefore, in order to paint a complete picture, a MANOVA was appropriate to use in this research because two groups were compared using the total ORI scale scores and the four subscale scores. In order to reduce the chance of a Type 1 error, the alpha was set a priori at .05 and the power was set at .80 for a two-tailed test (Cohen, 1988)
The research question for this study was as follows:
1. How do the attitudes of pre-service teachers placed in integrated classrooms compare with the attitudes of pre-service teachers’ placed in student teaching placements without integration?

To determine the differences between the two groups of pre-service student teachers, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was chosen to assess any significant main effects. The independent variable with two levels (student teaching placement in an integrated preschool classroom and student teaching placement in a regular preschool classroom) and the four subscales of the ORI were treated as the dependent variable. Wilks’ lambda was utilized for overall main effect testing. No post hoc procedures were needed for this research.

In addition to the MANOVA analysis, descriptive statistics, including means, frequencies, and standard deviations, were performed on the demographic data.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methodology used for this study along with statistics including demographics that were used to describe the sample population. The research
design, operational definitions of variables, and sample
were detailed in this chapter. In addition, the instrument
and pilot study along with reliability and validity of the
instrument were reported. The last section included an
explanation of the data collection and data analysis
procedures used in this study.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This study sought to determine whether placing pre-service student teachers in an integrated preschool setting would influence their attitudes toward having children with disabilities in their classrooms. Embedded in this chapter are the research question, data collection procedures, response rates, population characteristics, general demographic information, data entry and screening results, MANOVA assumption results, validity results, reliability results, MANOVA analysis and essential additional findings.

Research Question

The research attempted to answer the following question:

1. How do the attitudes of pre-service teachers placed in integrated classrooms compare with the attitudes of pre-service teachers’ placed in student teaching placements without integration?

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher contacted student teaching supervisors one quarter prior to the onset of the study, electronically and/or through a meeting at their campus. The research took place over two quarters commencing June
2007 and concluding in December of the same year. In order to meet the rigor of random assignment for this study, it was crucial to have consents signed by the pre-service teachers before the onset of their student teaching. To meet the diverse needs of each campus, the task of randomly assigning the pre-service teachers to their placements was done at each campus rather than through combined campus assignments. Upon the completion of consent to participate, the student teaching supervisor randomly placed pre-service teachers in either the experimental group (integrated preschool) or the control group (typical preschool) based on the age and gender (a mixed pair method) of the pre-service student teacher.

After pre-service student teachers were placed no contact was needed until the third and fourth weeks of the quarter when the demographic information was requested. At that time, the researcher sent packets, that included the demographic information sheets and a stamped-addressed return envelope. Concurrent with the mailings, the researcher sent emails to supervisors preparing them for the arrival of the packets so that time could be set aside in seminars to complete and go over the information. In
the event that pre-service teachers did not know the answers to questions, they were given the opportunity to take the demographic questions to their placement for assistance with the completion from their cooperating teacher. Once completed, the student teaching supervisors collected the information and returned them to the researcher through the postal mail system.

The same procedure, weeks eight through eleven, was followed when sending out the surveys to be completed. Upon the completion of the demographic information and the surveys, the researcher coded and entered the information into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 14.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL., v 14.0).

Response Rates

There were six campuses comprising 78 pre-service teachers that were polled for this study. Initially 74 pre-service teachers signed consent forms desiring to participate in the research study. The total number of returned demographic information sheets was 70 and 69 for surveys. The data analysis was run on 69 for a response rate of 88% (n = 69). Five respondents were excluded due
to missing survey data. Five pre-service teachers chose not to participate in any manner in the study.

Two of the six campuses at the end of summer quarter only returned a dismal 8 of the possible 23 surveys, for a response rate of 35%. Due to the importance of response rate for adequate power for the analyses, the researcher developed an electronic survey that could be accessed via the internet (see Appendix C). Emails were sent to pre-service teachers using their university accounts, initially, the second week of September and routinely each month through finals week of the fall quarter. Hard copies of the survey were sent to the permanent home addresses of pre-service teachers that had not returned them during the summer quarter. The pre-service teachers that did not respond during the summer quarter were sent an email requesting their participation (see Appendix F). The initial email request went out at the beginning of October and 3 responses were returned immediately. A second email went out in November yielding four more surveys and a final email was sent during the last week of November, which resulted in one more usable survey. The final email also went to three pre-service teachers from the fall
quarter that did not generate any response. All the described methods increased the response rate for those two campuses to 74%.

Table 4.0 displays the survey response methods used for this research.

Table 4.0

*Survey Response Method—In-class, Email, Postal Mail*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Entry and Screening Results*

Preceding the data analysis, the demographic information and ORI scale scores were reviewed through various SPSS procedures for data entry accurateness, missing values, and to test the assumptions for multivariate analysis. After reviewing frequencies and descriptive information, there were four cases with
missing values for the variables used in the analysis. Boxplots for factor 3 signified there were three cases with outliers but after review of the data, it was determined that all the information was correct and the cases would remain in the data set.

**MANOVA Assumption Results**

The three test assumptions to be met for this study were: (a) Independence of Observation Assumption, (2) Multivariate Normal Distribution in the groups, and (3) Homogeneity of Covariance.

**Independence of Observation Assumption**

According to Stevens (2002), the most accurate way to assure that independence has been met is to employ random sampling. This study randomly assigned participants to their placement site. The student teaching supervisors then administered the post-test surveys independently during class time. Even though the participants were from the same institution, it was reasonable to assume that the independence of observation was fulfilled.

**Multivariate Normality Assumption**

Multiple strategies to examine the criterion for multivariate normality were implemented. Stevens (2002)
suggests that by viewing graphic and non-graphic tests such as Shapiro-Wilks, histograms, normal Q-Q plots and bivariate scatterplots, it is plausible to reach the conclusion that the normality assumption has been met. The MANOVA is robust to violations of normality if the robustness is not from outliers but rather skewness. Graphically all normal Q-Q plots fell along a straight line signifying normality. The bivariate scatterplot displayed an elliptical shape suggesting that normality was tenable. The Shapiro-Wilks statistic also supported normality for this study.

In conclusion, the Shapiro-Wilks statistic (skewness and kurtosis coefficients) bivariate scatterplots, histograms, and normal probability plots were found to meet the assumption of multivariate normality. The source table for multivariate normality analysis is located in Appendix G.

**Homogeneity of Covariance Matrices Assumption**

Through reviewing the Box’s M statistic tests the analysis failed to reject the null (p = .542). This information confirms that the assumption of homogeneity of
covariance matrices was met. According to Stevens (2002), if a Box’s test was found to be significant at the $p < .001$ along with extremely unequal group sample size, robustness could not be assumed. In addition, it is imperative to meet the multivariate normality assumption prior to viewing the Box’s $M$ test because it is sensitive to nonnormality. If this is not determined first, the researcher may reject due to lack of multivariate normality rather than because of unequal covariance matrices.

Validity and Reliability Results

A post-test survey was implemented to manage all threats to bias and validity. In not using a pre-test, the fear of testing effect was reduced. Internal consistency was measured for the ORI scale and its subscales using the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The analysis for this reliability test yielded the following alpha coefficients: .82 for ORI scale, .75 (Benefits of Integration) (Factor 1), .70 (Integrated Classroom Management) (Factor 2), .19 (Perceived Ability to Teach Study) (Factor 3), and .31 (Special versus Integrated General Education) (Factor 4). It was expected that Factors 3 and 4 would have a lower
alpha because there were fewer items in each factor. Factors 1 and 2 yield very good alpha coefficients and the overall scale alpha was strong.

Table 4.1 presents the strength of the linear relationship between the four subscales. Factor 1, Benefits of integration, had a positive relationship with Factor 2, integrated classroom management and Factor 4, Special versus Integrated classrooms. Consequently, it may be interpreted that 32% of the pre-service teachers' attitude toward integrated classroom management accounts for the variation in the benefits of integration. The respondents' attitude toward special versus integrated classrooms accounted for 23% of the variability of Factor 1. Factor 2, integrated classroom management was the only variable that had a positive relationship with Factor 3, Perceived ability to teach children with disabilities. This relationship accounted for 11% of the variability in integrated classroom management views. Factor 2 also had a positive relationship with Factor 4, which yielded 13% of the variability in views about integrated classroom management. Factor 3, perceived ability to teach, had a positive correlation with Factor 4, special versus
integrated, accounting for 13% of the variability in their ability to teach children with disabilities. Consequently, a pre-service teacher’s score on their perceived ability to teach students with disabilities was influenced by how they viewed special versus integrated classrooms.

Table 4.1

*Pearson Intercorrelation Matrix for the Four ORI Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factor 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.484**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Factor 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Factor 3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.354**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Factor 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Intercorrelations are representative of entire sample (n=69)

**p < .01 level (2-tailed)

The intercorrelation bivariate matrix graph of the ORI subscales may be viewed in Appendix H.
Following proper screening of data and affirming the assumptions for MANOVA, the data was found to be ready for analysis.

Demographic Information

Gender and Age of Pre-service Teachers

The population from which the sample of convenience was drawn was the main campus of a university and its five regional campuses. The pre-service teachers were all seeking their bachelor degree in early childhood education with a license to teach children ages three to grade three. The mean age of the participants was 26.01 (SD = 6.23) with a range of 21 to 55 years of age. The majority of the participants 91.4% were female.

Educational Level Attained by Pre-Service Teachers

Student teaching is one of the last components for completion of the early childhood education degree. Therefore, 94.3% of the pre-service teachers were at the fourth year undergraduate level and 5.7% already held one four-year degree and were completing an additional four-year undergraduate degree in early childhood education.
Number of Special Education Courses Taken

Two of the required courses for the pre-service teachers were an introduction to special education course, and adapting curriculum for children with disabilities. Twenty-seven percent of the pre-service teachers reported taking additional special education courses in addition to the required components. These courses included sign language and introduction to communication disorders.

Pre-Service Teachers Personal Experience with Persons with Disabilities

The pre-service teachers in this study reported they had the following personal experiences: 10.1% had no experience with persons having disabilities; 13% had an experience through an acquaintance (e.g. neighbor, store clerk); 21.7% had experiences at the close level (e.g., roommate or near relative); 47.8% had experienced casual contact with a fellow student, co-worker, or employee that had a disability; and 7.2% of the group had contact at the intimate level (e.g., spouse, child, and sibling). Table 4.2 lists the details.
Table 4.2

Pre-service Teacher Personal Experience with Persons with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Children with IEPs and Disability Type

This study focused on placing the experimental group into a classroom that integrated children with disabilities. There were 69 valid cases in this study, 33 were placed in a classroom that did not have a child with a disability. Thirty-six of the pre-service teachers were placed in a classroom that had at least one child with a disability in the classroom. The range was from one child
to ten children in a classroom having a disability. Figure 4.0 displays the occurrence of each disability category.

**Figure 4.0: Occurrence of Each Disability Category**

*Degree/License of Cooperating Teacher*

The degrees that the cooperating teachers held are provided in Table 4.3. The number of years taught ranged from 0 to 29 with a mean of 9.2 years.
Table 4.3

Degree of Cooperating Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CDA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CDA stands for Child Development Associate.

Number of Special Education Courses Taken

There was a wide range of special education courses taken by the cooperating teachers due to the different degrees held. Approximately 32% of the teachers had no special education courses with 41.2% having at least two courses similar to the required courses of the pre-service teachers.
Cooperating Teacher Personal Experience with Persons with Disabilities

The personal experiences that the cooperating teachers had are listed in Table 4.4. It is noted that the majority of the teachers had at least a casual experience with persons having disabilities.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANOVA Analysis

A MANOVA was performed to determine the effect of being placed into an integrated versus nonintegrated pre-school student teaching placement on pre-service student teachers' attitude toward integration. The null hypothesis stated that there were no differences between the two groups of pre-service teachers.

In this research, the MANOVA was applied using the preschool student teaching placement as the independent variable and four factors from the ORI for the dependent variable. The four factors were Benefits of Integration/Factor 1 (8 questions), Integrated Classroom Management/Factor 2 (10 questions), Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities/Factor 3 (3 questions) and Special Versus Integrated General Education/Factor 4 (4 questions) (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). This method of analysis determined if there were any differences in attitudes as measured by the four factors of the scale. MANOVA results did not reveal a significant result among student teaching placement sites on attitude factors, Wilks' $\Lambda = .906$, $F = 1.67$, $p < .05$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .094$. Therefore, the decision was to fail to reject the null
hypothesis. The four subsets for the ORI had different numbers of questions; therefore, in order to better understand the Table 4.5 knowing the range for each subset was imperative. The respondents were asked to signify on a continuum from I disagree very much; I disagree pretty much; I disagree a little; I agree a little; I agree pretty much; to I agree very much.

Benefits of Integration, Factor 1, had eight items that could range from 0 to 48. The mean score for Factor 1 group 1 was 36.42 (SD = 6.86). The mean score for Factor 1 group 2 was 38.75 (SD = 5.03). Twenty-four would signify an average or between “I disagree a little” and “I agree a little” therefore both groups scored well above the mid-level point signifying that they “agreed very much” with the concept for benefits of integration.

Integrated Classroom Management, Factor 2, had ten items, that could range from 0 to 60. The mean score for Factor 2 group 1 was 36.87 (SD = 7.94). The mean score for Factor 2 group 2 was 36.88 (SD = 8.07). Thirty would be the mid level or between “I disagree a little and “I agree a little” therefore both groups were slightly above the
midpoint signifying a positive attitude toward Integrated Classroom Management (Factor 2).

Perceived Ability to Teach Students with Disabilities, Factor 3, had three items, that could range from 0 to 18. The mean score for Factor 3 group 1 was 8.64 (SD = 2.70). The mean score for Factor 3 group 2 was 7.72 (SD = 2.34). Nine would be the mid-level or between “I disagree a little and “I agree a little”. Group 1, the control group, had a higher level of perceived ability to teach students with disabilities but group 2 was less than one point lower. Both groups fell slightly below the mid-level suggesting that they were less positive on their views of self-efficacy in their ability to teach students with disabilities.

Special versus Integrated General Education, Factor 4 had four items, which could range from 0 to 24. The mean score for Factor 4 group 1 was 13.76 (SD=3.52). The mean score for Factor 4 group 2 was 13.56 (SD=3.10). Twelve would be the mid-level or between “I disagree a little and “I agree a little”. The groups were less than two tenths apart in their mean averages signifying they agreed integrated classrooms were more favorable environments for
children with disabilities to be placed for their educational needs. Figure 4.1 displays the mean ORI subscale scores.

![Mean Scores for ORI Subscales](image)

**Figure 4.1: Mean Scores for ORI Subscales**

Overall, when comparing the mean scores for the entire ORI, group 2, the experimental group, was slightly higher with a mean score of 96.92 (SD = 14.13). The range for the entire scale was 0 to 150. Group 1 was very close behind with a mean score of 95.70 (SD = 16.64). These mean scores would imply that the groups held a favorable attitude toward the notion of integration. Table 4.5
displays the mean scores, standard deviation and sample size values for group 1 and group 2.
Table 4.5


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95.70</td>
<td>16.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>96.92</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96.33</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Respondent Demographics and Additional Findings

This research project involved an extensive demographic section, which covered background aspects of the placement site, pre-service teacher, and the cooperating teacher. In previous research, the following variables were found to impact attitudes toward integration: Number of children with IEPs in the classroom, type of disability, special education courses taken by pre-service teachers, degree held by the cooperating teacher, number of years experience held by the cooperating teacher, pre-service teachers' personal experience with persons with disabilities, cooperating teachers' personal experience with disabilities. A discussion of the possible role these background variables played in explaining attitudinal development is presented along with the ORI scale scores as related to the various demographic areas.

Number of Children with IEPs in the Classroom

The literature indicates that two external factor contributing to negative attitudes are the degree of the disability and class size (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002;
Campbell & Gilmore, 2003; Cook et al., 1999; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Marshall et al., 2001; Rheams & Bain, 2005; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002; Wilczenski, 1995). It might have been expected that a pre-service teacher’s attitude toward integration would decrease with greater numbers of children with disabilities in a classroom. This was not the case in this research project. Thirty-six of the 69 pre-service teachers completed their student teaching in integrated preschool classrooms that ranged from having one to ten children with disabilities. Thirteen of the pre-service teachers had classrooms with one child with a disability. This group had a mean score on the ORI of 94.69 (SD = 13.46) indicating a high positive perception of integration. Eleven of the pre-service teachers had two children with disabilities and their mean score was 97.55 (SD = 12.13). Only one pre-service teacher was placed in a classroom with three children having disabilities and the same for a classroom with four children. These mean scores were 97.00 and 76.00 respectively. Three pre-service teachers had five children in their classroom yielding a mean score of 103.67 (SD = 3.06) while one pre-service teacher had six children with disabilities with a mean
score of 128. Four pre-service teachers had seven children with disabilities in their classroom yielding a mean score of 96.25 (SD = 8.77) and the final two pre-service teachers had 9 and 10 children yielding a mean score of 67 and 121. The case producing the lowest mean score of 67 had only one pre-service teacher and nine children with various disabilities one of whom was deaf. Figure 4.2 portrays the mean ORI score in relation to the number of children in a classroom with an IEP.

Figure 4.2: Mean ORI Scores Relative to # of Children with an IEP
Considering the entire group, it may not be necessarily true that as the number of children with disabilities increases, negativity toward integration also increases.

The literature suggests that issues other than the number of children with disabilities may influence attitude development because staff qualifications, available support services and staff, class size, and administrative support were not considered (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Campbell et al., 2003; Cook et al., 1999; Hastings & Oakford, 2003). Further research is needed to determine the impact of these support characteristics on pre-service teacher attitude and efficacy development, as the possible interaction between these variables and number of children with disabilities in a singular classroom is not clear.

Type of Disability

Not only is the number of students with IEPs a factor to consider with attitude development but also the degree to which a child’s physical and sensory, cognitive, and behavioral and emotional delays influence the classroom must be considered. These factors are repeatedly mentioned in the literature with respect to how they may hinder
positive attitude development in pre-service teachers (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Cook, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003). Specifically, the more involved a person’s disability is, predicts a greater reluctance to integrate, particularly when children with emotional and behavioral disorders are present (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Cook, 2002; Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). In this study, the total number of pre-service teachers placed in classrooms having only children with emotional disturbances was two. The mean score for those cases was 89, indicating they “disagreed a little” that integration was a good concept. There were ten pre-service teachers placed in classrooms that included children with multiple disabilities, one child also had emotional disturbances. The mean score for this group whose placements included from one to nine children with multiple disabilities was 101.9 indicating they supported the idea of integration. The remaining two classrooms had two children with disabilities both having emotional disturbances.

Although the literature suggests integrating children with emotional disturbances has a negative impact on
attitude development, this study suggests otherwise. It would be fair to deduce that the placements that integrated learners with multiple disabilities also provided supports and resources because these classrooms focused on children with disabilities. The initial two pre-service teachers’ placements were not programs that focused on disabilities. Written responses on open-ended questions suggested they would have felt more confident in adapting curriculum for children with emotional disturbances if appropriate supports and staff had been available. This research confirms Hastings and Oakford’s (2003) ideas that in providing appropriate support services and resources, pre-service teachers and in-service teachers’ attitudes toward their ability to integrate children with disabilities strengthen.

Special Education Courses Taken by Pre-Service Teachers

As all participants in this study attended the same pre-service early childhood program, they were required to take the same course work. The courses included one introductory course in special education as well as an adaptive curriculum course, which included twenty hours of direct field experience. In addition to the two special
education courses, other course work infused the topic of special education throughout. Fifty of the participants in this study took the two required courses in special education, seven took the required courses, and an added course in sign language, and twelve took the required coursework, and courses in sign language and communication disorders. The results for this study did not support Andrews and Clementson’s (1997) views that more course work in special education may increase positive attitudes toward integration. Those pre-service teachers completing the minimum required courses had a mean score of 97.56 whereas the seven completing three courses had a mean score of 91.42. The twelve participants completing four courses along with the other infused course work had a mean score of 94.08.

When taking into consideration these findings, the fact that the additional courses were geared toward communication disorders and did not have a required direct experience component opens up an area for further studies. Future studies may investigate pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward children with communication disorders and children who are deaf. The specific content, methods
and/or competency attainment of additional course work is often not discussed in the literature. Viewing these details may provide more information as to the specific effects that additional course work may have on integration of children with these types of disabilities (Andrews and Clementson, 1997; Larke, 1990; Leyser, 1988).

Degree and Number of Years in-Service of the Cooperating Teacher

Forty-eight percent of the cooperating teachers in the study held at least a four-year degree in education, 28% held a master’s in special education, 16% had completed a two-year associate’s degree in early childhood education, 7% held a Child Development Associate (CDA), and less than 2% reported having no formal education. The teachers’ years of experience ranged from zero to 29 with a mean of 9.2 years. Thirty-two percent of the teachers had not taken any special education courses during formal training or at the in-service level while 41.2% reported having at least two courses similar to the required courses of the pre-service teachers. Those teachers having master’s degrees said they “had too many courses in special education” to count.
Holly Holland (2005) maintains that by putting highly qualified teachers in the classroom, a child’s level of achievement will increase. If holding a higher degree is indicative of being highly qualified, then this research lends support to such a contention. The experimental group had 14 cooperating teachers who held a master’s degree in a special education-related field. Pre-service teachers placed in these integrated classrooms had an ORI mean score of 97.43 (SD = 16.54) while the control, which had five teachers with master’s degrees, had a mean score 90.2 (SD = 14.74). The experimental group placed with 32 cooperating teachers holding bachelor’s degrees had a mean of 97.93 (SD = 14.96) and the control group, which had 18 cooperating teachers, had a mean score of 94.72 (SD = 18.04).

The findings for the control group in placements where cooperating teachers held an associate’s degree or lower supported the literature for the need for special education course work. Eleven of the participants were placed in classrooms with teachers holding an associate’s degree, seven in the experimental group with mean score of
94.29 (SD = 8.58) and four in the control group with a mean score of 101.5 (SD = 11.79).

Five of the 33 pre-service teachers in the control group placed in a classroom with a teacher that had a CDA had a mean score of 102.8 (SD = 18.06). The range for this group was 77 to 123. There were no experimental participants placed with cooperating teachers holding a CDA. The experimental group exhibited a consistent increase in scores from being with a cooperating teacher having no degree to a master’s degree. The mean scores were as follows: no degree 94; associates 94.28 (SD = 8.56); baccalaureate 97.93 (SD = 14.96); and masters 97.43 (SD = 16.54). Figure 4.3 indicates the ORI mean scores in relation to the degree held by the cooperating teacher.
Figure 4.3: Mean ORI Score in Relation to Cooperating Teacher Degree

This trend could mean that pre-service teachers placed in integrated classrooms with cooperating teachers that hold baccalaureate degrees or higher may provide greater opportunities for developing positive attitudes and experiences with children with disabilities.

Tucker and associates (2005) suggest that the more experience a teacher had, the less positive their attitude towards integration. The cooperating teachers for both the experimental and the control groups ranged from first year teachers to teachers in their 29th year. The ORI mean scores for the pre-service teachers placed in these
classrooms ranged from 67 peaking at 111.5. Consistently high scores of approximately 107 were found when the participants were placed with teacher having 4 to 11 years experience. After the 12th year, there was a steady decline in overall scores, lending support to previous research. Figure 4.4 exhibits the years of experience held by the cooperating teacher accompanied by ORI scores of pre-service teachers placed.

![Figure 4.4: Mean ORI Score](image)

Similar results were found in a literature review by Avramidis and Norwich (2002) where teachers having 14 years’ or less held more positive views of integration.
Likewise, it was determined that the younger the teacher with fewer years experience, the more supportive they were to integrate children with disabilities. It is unclear if this may be a result of professional burnout, lack of professional development in special education related topics, or that they may have become less flexible with their acceptance of children with disabilities in their classroom. This study suggests that as teachers become more experienced, they may become more reluctant to accept the challenge of integration resulting in role modeling that transmits to the pre-service teachers' attitude development.

*Pre-Service and Cooperative Teachers Personal Experience with Person with Disabilities*

Jeon and Peterson (2003) state that having a positive personal experience with people with disabilities in a non-educational environment is a predictor of positive attitudes toward children with disabilities. The majority of the pre-service teachers and cooperating teachers in this study had contact with persons with disabilities in a casual manner. This experience included relationships with co-workers or fellow students. When looking at the overall
experience with disabilities levels of those reported in the demographics section, 89.9% of the pre-service teachers and 94.2% of the cooperating teachers had some type of experience with persons with disabilities. In fact, a rising trend in mean ORI scores was noted among pre-service teachers who reported close relationships with people with disabilities. Those who reported having intimate (e.g., spouse, child, and sibling) contact with persons with disabilities had a mean score of 103.0 (SD = 13.55) indicating a strong agreement with integration. Participants with close (e.g., roommate, near relative) experiences had a mean score of 100.33 (SD = 12.58). Casual (e.g., fellow student, co-worker, and employee) mean score 94.66 (SD = 15.79); Acquaintance (e.g., neighbor, store clerk) mean score 95.67 (SD = 18.47); and no experience mean score 93.57 (SD = 16.56).

The same was true for the pre-service teachers placed with cooperating teachers that had personal experience with persons with disabilities. The level of experience, mean ORI score, and Standard Deviation were as follows: Intimate 106.5 (SD = 15.93); close 101.08 (SD = 14.46); casual 92.70 (SD = 14.42); acquaintance 92.43 (SD = 17.46)
and none 90.25 (SD = 16.68). Figure 4.5 illustrates pre-service teachers’ personal experience and their mean scores relative to cooperating teachers’ personal experiences.

Figure 4.5: Mean ORI Relative to Personal Experience

These trends suggest, and are also supported by the findings of Jeon and Peterson (2003), that the more personal contact a teacher has with person with disabilities, the more likely it is for them to hold a more positive attitude toward integration. Positive close or intimate contact with persons with disabilities could also influence the success of integration.
Additional Findings

Pre-school student teachers were asked to answer five open-ended questions after they completed the survey. A complete list of questions by case number may be viewed in Appendix J. The questions were as follows: (1) What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates students with disabilities? (2) How do you feel your courses at the University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom? (3) Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how? (4) How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration? (5) How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration? The overall summations of the reports are described as follows:

1) What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates with disabilities?

The overall reports from the students indicate that they felt it was crucial to have experiences with children
having disabilities in the classroom. Some felt it solidified what they had learned in their text through putting their knowledge into practice.

2) How do you feel your courses at the University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom?

There were mixed views reported in regard to their competence to integrate children with disabilities into the classroom. The majority of the pre-service teachers conveyed they did not feel they were adequately prepared to integrate children into their classrooms. It was noted that having the content knowledge was essential, but without the direct experience to support integration, they still remained skeptical that they could make integration work.

3) Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how?

Pre-service student teachers overall felt that they knew integration was the best form of education for children with and without disabilities therefore, their
attitude did not change. One student did report a change due to the specific experience.

4) How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration?

Those that reported on this item felt that their student teaching supervisors were supportive about integration as long as the proper supports services were provided.

5) How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration?

Cooperating teachers, as described by the pre-service teachers, held a positive regard for integration. There were more accounts of hesitant or negative attitudes in this question than the previous. It also needs to be noted that these negative comments primarily came from pre-service teachers on one campus and it may be possible they were placed in the same classroom.

A complete list of question responses by case number may be viewed in Appendix I.
Summary

This chapter presented the results for the analysis detailed in chapter three. The research question, data collection procedures, response rates, population characteristics, general demographic information, data entry and screening results, MANOVA assumption results, validity results, reliability results, MANOVA analysis and a summary of additional findings were all presented in detail. It was determined through a true experimental design that there was no significant difference in attitudes of pre-service teachers as a result of their type of student teaching placement.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

This chapter contains a discussion of the major findings found in this study. After a brief overview of the purpose, design of the study, and reiteration of the research question and hypothesis, the overall respondent demographics are presented, discussing important group similarities. This section concludes with a discussion of findings, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Purpose and Design

The major purpose of this study was to explore if there was a difference in the attitudes of pre-service teachers toward integrating children with disabilities into their classroom based on whether they student taught in an integrated preschool or a preschool with only typically developing children. This study filled a gap in the literature by using an experimental design during student teaching. This sample of convenience was drawn from a university’s early childhood department across all six campuses using random assignment into their preschool
student teaching placement. Seventy-four pre-service teachers signed consent forms yielding 69 valid surveys used for the data analysis. The study had an 88% response rate.

Once all surveys were complete, the data was entered into SPSS. The data was screened for missing data, data entry accurateness, and the assumptions for multivariate analysis. After completing many steps the data was determined to be ready for analysis.

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

The research question for this study was:

1. How do the attitudes of pre-service teachers placed in integrated classrooms compare with the attitudes of pre-service teachers’ placed in student teaching placements without integration? There were no significant differences.

Parallel with the above research question, the null hypothesis was as follows:

1. There is no difference in the attitudes between pre-service teachers placed in an integrated classroom and pre-service teachers placed in a
classroom that does not integrate children with disabilities.

Additional questions of curiosity included the following:

1. What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates children with disabilities? Pre-service teachers reported that integration was a challenge but not impossible. They enjoyed meeting the individual needs of the children and seeing how children learn from each other. The overall impression was that it was a great experience for all parties involved.

2. How do you feel your courses at the University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom? The majority of the pre-service teachers conveyed they did not feel they were adequately prepared to integrate children into their classrooms and needed experiences that gave them opportunities to adapt curriculum, sit on IEP team meetings, write goals, collaborate with special education personnel, and interact on a daily basis with children having disabilities.
3. Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how? An overwhelming majority reported their thoughts had not changed. They always felt it was a good concept and seeing the benefits supported their beliefs about integration. Eight of the respondents did indicate that their thoughts had changed resulting from their experience. Seven of the pre-service teachers were from the experimental group supporting the notion of experience influencing attitudes toward integration.

4. How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration? The majority of the pre-service teachers reported their student teaching supervisors felt positive when proper support services were provided.

5. How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration? The majority of the pre-service student teachers reported their cooperating teachers in their student teaching placement held positive views of integration.
Summary of Quantitative Findings

This section clarifies the statistical findings within this study. While no significant differences were found on the total and subscale scores of the ORI between the experimental and control groups, there were some interesting facets of information that arose from the data. When comparing the mean scores for the entire ORI, the experimental group was slightly higher with a mean score of 96.92 (SD = 14.13) with a range of 0 to 150 for the scale. The control group was very close behind with a mean score of 95.70 (SD = 16.64). These overall mean scores suggest that both the experimental and control groups held a favorable attitude toward the notion of integration.

No significant differences between groups were found. The following section discusses the findings and how they relate to the literature.

Discussion of Quantitative Findings

The literature suggests that a lack of experience in an integrated classroom will result in a less favorable
attitude toward integration (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hoover, 1985; Marshall et al., 2002; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002). The literature was primarily descriptive in nature or non-experimental except for the study conducted by Hoover (1985). They indicated similar responses supporting that direct contact would increase ability and attitude. Therefore, in this research the experimental group should have earned a higher score on the ORI than the control group, taking in to account the previous studies, because of the lack of experience in an integrated classroom. Interestingly enough, this was not the case. There were no significant differences among the four subscales when comparing the experimental group to the control group. A discussion of specific questions and demographic information are presented in the following sections.

Responses to Specific ORI Questions

Although the pre-service teachers in both groups did not differ significantly in their attitude toward integration, when looking at three specific questions on
the ORI, some discrepancies in the way they answered specific questions provided some insights. The questions were directly associated with the pre-service teacher’s perceived ability to implement integration effectively and asked if integration should occur in the regular education setting.

Question #10 on the scale, “Regular classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with students with disabilities”, had a mean score of .94 (SD = 1.34) for the control group and .61 (SD = 1.22) for the experimental. Both mean scores fell closer to one (agree a little) suggesting a greater tendency toward a perception that they had the ability to work with children with disabilities. These findings follow the same trend the literature suggests, that through providing instructional course work involving special education and adaptive techniques, pre-service teachers will perceive themselves as having increased abilities to teach children with disabilities (Alghazo et al., 2003; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Campbell et al., 2003; Sesow & Adams, 1975).

Question #19 on the scale, “Regular teachers have
sufficient training to teach students with disabilities,” yielded a mean score of -0.36 (SD = 1.47) for the control group and -0.72 (SD = 1.54) for the experimental group. This signifies a perceived reluctance as to whether they adequately achieved skills through their course work to adapt the curriculum for children with disabilities efficiently. These results contradict the current empirical research implying that when pre-service teachers have a positive attitude toward integration they will display increased confidence levels in their ability to implement the practices of integration effectively (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprana, & Pastorelli, 2001; Tucker et al., 2005; Soodak, & Podell, 1993; and Soodek et al., 1998). Bandura (1997) suggests there are four key levels to consider when the goal is to increase confidence: social modeling, experience, persuasion, and the ability to reduce stress and depression on the individual’s part. The findings in this research do not support efficacy equaling positive attitude. Therefore, it may not be fair to assume that when a pre-service teacher exhibits a positive attitude
toward integration he/she also has a high perception of his/her ability to teach children with disabilities.

Question #23 “Teaching students with special needs is better done by special rather than regular teachers” produced similar findings. The previous two questions responses indicated that pre-service teachers felt they had the ability to integrate children with disabilities into their classroom but did not feel they were adequately trained to meet the task of integration. With such contradictory statements, determining who is best suited for effective integration could not easily be predicted. The control group for this question had a mean score of .15 (SD = 1.54) and the experimental -.02 (SD = 1.58). This signifies the groups were closer to saying that they “agreed a little” that specialists were better trained for the task of integration. This finding is similar to the previous one in that respondents were less confident that they had enough training for the task. Therefore, even though the pre-service teachers in this study reported feeling somewhat inadequately trained based on their responses to these particular questions, they still produced an overall positive attitude toward the concept
of integration. This is contrary to findings in previous studies stating that a lack of skills leads to a lack of competence, and subsequently, negative attitudes toward the notion of integration (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Hoover, 1985; Marshall et al., 2002; Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003; Weisel & Turkaspa, 2002). Pre-service teachers in the experimental and control groups both had an overall positive attitude toward integration but still felt they lacked skills to implement effectively.

Figure 5.0 illustrates the mean score for Questions 10, 19, and 23.
It could be considered that pre-service education programs are providing a greater infusion of courses addressing learners with disabilities both traditionally and field-based than in previous years. Through integrating course work and direct experience in a pre-service teacher’s degree completion program, it is suggested that a more positive attitude toward integration may be acquired (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Shade & Stewart, 2001).

This study’s sample was drawn from a university that required pre-service teachers to take two courses in
special education, one that required a direct service component. Other related courses required for this program were guidance and management, diversity, child development, observing and recording children’s behaviors and various parent and family education courses. In addition to content-based courses, the university requires students to complete approximately 850 hours of direct experience in classrooms.

The researcher cannot say exactly which classes have in-class discussions about special education, but textbooks used for the above-mentioned courses have special education infused in various capacities within their content.

Other factors that weigh into the infusion of special education into the curriculum are approaches used by the instructors. It is not known whether the instructors had any formal special education training or the nature of their attitudes or experiences with integration. The impact of such factors was not known when completing this research.

Niemeyer and Proctor (2002) suggest that when pre-service teachers complete student teaching in an
integrated classroom, they will hold a more positive attitude toward integration and a higher self-efficacy in implementing a quality program for all children. In contrast, this study found a minimal difference between the experimental group and the control. The mean score for the experimental group when considering their perceived ability to teach children with disabilities was 7.72 and the control was 8.64. Both groups fell slightly below the mid-level, suggesting they were slightly less positive on their views of how they perceive their ability to teach students with disabilities. Some comments obtained through the demographic information sheet stated the following:

“I think that it is beneficial for the child. I realized that being in an integrated program was a wonderful experience for me. I feel more confident in my teaching abilities and with working with children. I think that integrated programs benefit both children with and without disabilities and that these programs would be a great learning experience for any student teacher.”

Another student had more negative views toward her perceived ability to teach in an integrated classroom, “I
feel the courses have given just a taste of what I will need to know. I do not feel completely prepared to integrate a child with a disability in my classroom.”

The mean scores may be interpreted that the pre-service teachers felt somewhat confident they could adequately instruct children with disabilities in their classroom, but would have a higher confidence level if adequate services such as administrative support, additional staff, technology, etc., were available to help them accommodate all the children’s needs. Additional hours of supervised experiences in integrated settings may also increase confidence levels.

Campbell (2003) believes that pre-service teachers learn appropriate moral and ethical techniques to meet the needs of all children in their classroom while interacting professionally with positive role models. In the current study, respondents were asked to answer questions relative to their opinions about the benefits of integration. In support of Campbell’s views, the experimental group held a higher mean score of the benefits of integration. Some comments from the experimental group were “It is very important to integrate children. It promotes positive
differences and coping strategies for children and teachers.” “It benefits all children and teachers. They learn from one another and those with disabilities can strengthen social skills.” Likewise, other pre-service teachers commented:

“It is challenging but not impossible. Other children accept them yet at times have trouble understanding them. I am indifferent on fully integrated vs. not integrated. I feel that we need to evaluate each individual situation to determine what is best.”

“Each case is special; children with disabilities need to be looked at based on their own individual needs.”

It is evident these students, after completing a positive experience with integration and through positive role models, felt that integration did benefit all children. This also lends support to Bandura’s idea that experience and social modeling influence peoples’ self-efficacy levels (Bandura, 1997).

These comments reflect similar findings found in a study conducted by Carr (1993) who felt teachers need to reflect on their ethical implications in order to make
academically and morally sound decisions when setting up appropriate curricula to meet the individual needs of all children. Shippen and associates (2005) attribute similar findings to pre-service teachers' increased awareness of the rights of students with disabilities as defined in IDEA. Carroll et al., (2003) suggest that after completing a course in special education, pre-service teachers demonstrate the ability to focus on the child first rather than the disability.

In this study, after completing their student teaching, pre-service teachers "agreed very much" that there were benefits to integration. This supports current literature's contention that course content accompanied by direct contact with children with disabilities will have a positive effect on the parties involved (Alghazo et al., 2003; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Esperat et al., 1999; Marshall et al., 2001, Sesow & Adams, 1982; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Vanderfaeillie et al., 2003; Weisel & Tur-kaspa, 2002).

Through using an experimental design, this study helped to fill a gap in the literature in which pre-service student teachers' placement intended to control
for the type of experience and its impact. As Doyle (1997) contends, student teaching is an indispensable experience in pre-service teachers’ curriculum because they are given the opportunity to implement their interpretation of theory into practice. It is also important for the experience to be positive in order for the fostering of a favorable attitude toward integration. Even though this study did not result in significant findings, it did show that pre-service teachers in both groups maintained a positive attitude toward integration upon the completion of their preschool student teaching experience. In fact, both groups held favorable attitudes toward integration.

Donegan and colleagues (2005) suggest that during student teaching, pre-service teachers increase their abilities and skills to observe and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of students with disabilities. Some responses by participants in this study supported this idea. One pre-service teacher said that her cooperating teacher “showed us ways to monitor students’ progress so that we could use assessments to plan lessons and make experiences successful in the time we had.” Another comment supported the importance of positive role models
for fostering skills in documentation. She declared, “She is the one who taught me the importance of documentation and monitoring the progress of a child to use for referral of a child to be tested for an IEP.” Most importantly pre-service teachers in this research conveyed their ability to collaborate with support service personnel as well as their comprehension of the importance of integration on the overall development of a child with disabilities.

Empirical evidence does not suggest that regular education pre-service teachers hold a positive attitude toward integration nor does it typify that they have acquired the knowledge needed in order to identify what additional supports are required to provide a quality-integrated program (Niemeyer & Proctor, 2002). The pre-service teachers are more likely to continue to develop a positive belief about integration through completing their student teaching in a supervised integrated environment. In addition, as Niemeyer & Proctor (2002) suggest, education programs may foster future pre-service teachers’ ability to appropriately translate theory into practice and ultimately favor the idea of integration.
Limitations of the Study

Factors that limit the generalizability of the study due to sampling and conceptual issues are listed below.

- Only students from one university were sampled for the study, limiting the generalizability to a specific geographic area.
- Early Childhood Education preschool student teachers were the target population for this study. No other teacher licensure area was targeted for this project.
- Quantitative information was the focus for this study even though qualitative information was gathered through open-ended question responses. Through designing more of a mixed design, implementing the rigor for the qualitative methods, a wealth of knowledge could then be drawn to make further conclusions.
- Only pre-service teacher attitudes were surveyed as opposed to both pre-service and in-service.
- Survey research relies on the participant to provide reliable information through self-report and personal perceptions.
• The sample of students was only taken from one university’s main and regional campuses, which geographically covers a rural Appalachian area.

• The groups targeted for this research were required to student teach in both preschool and primary settings for their program completion, but this research only covered the preschool portion.

• The integrated preschool placements did not serve similar numbers of children with disabilities.

• Preschool sites varied from public to private entities with possible differing approaches and philosophies being held by these sites.

• Although the ORI met validity and reliability measures, the subscales should be used with caution as dependent variables because there were not equal numbers of questions in each subscale. Keeping this in mind, it was expected that Factors 3 and 4 would yield lower alpha scores.

• It was not an option on this survey for the pre-service teachers to indicate if a particular disability category influenced their attitude in any manner.
• Instructors for courses were different, leaving implementation of course content subject to the influence of varying views of integration and special education.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

After completing this study, the researcher found that future research is needed in the field of education in the following areas: content of course work, university instructor characteristics, ability versus self-efficacy, cooperating teacher characteristics, and classroom environment characteristics. The following are suggested paths to consider when designing future research.

**Content of Course work**

A great deal of literature suggests that pre-service teachers need added course work in special education to promote a more positive attitude toward integration with little consensus as to how many courses it takes to increase attitudes. However, it may not be the number of courses but an issue of exactly what the course work should include (Andrews & Clementson, 1997; Larke, 1990; Leyser, 1988). Pre-service teachers in this study were found to have completed courses relating to guidance,
diversity, assessment, and special education accommodations, among others but the researcher did not know exactly how special education was infused into each course. Future research could help curriculum developers understand which specific components pertaining to special education should be incorporated into course development for regular education pre-service teachers. It is conducive for future research projects to determine exactly how much special education information is included within non-special education course work. A review of textbooks and syllabi, accompanied by instructor and student surveys may increase an understanding of the impact the course work actually has on pre-service teachers' attitudes toward integration.

_Instructor of Course work: Training, Attitude, Teaching Approaches_

Other factors that weigh into the infusion of special education into the curriculum are characteristics of the instructor of record for the course. These characteristics include teaching approaches, special education knowledge and training, and attitude toward integration. The impact
of such factors was not known when completing this research.

Andrews and Clementson (1997) assert that while it is important to infuse special education courses into the curriculum, it is equally important to engage pre-service teachers in activities that allow them to become involved with role playing scenarios they may be faced with in their classrooms. Therefore, future research may need to investigate the impact that university instructors and their instructional methods have on pre-service teacher attitude and efficacy development.

Attitude versus Self-Efficacy

Two of the subscales of the ORI address self-efficacy. The overall scale had 25 questions and five had direct connections with self-efficacy. Although “perceived ability to teach students with disabilities” is a subscale of the ORI, it may be difficult to get a realistic view of a pre-service teacher’s actual efficacy toward integration. Additional questions relating to self-efficacy could lend valuable information to the degree that self-efficacy impacts attitude development but it
still remains to be seen how much personal beliefs play a part in a pre-service teacher’s professional development.

As with any survey, the researcher cannot control for personal views of particular topics. This study would imply that it is not fair to assume that when pre-service teachers exhibit a positive attitude toward integration they also have a high perception of their ability to teach children with disabilities. Self-efficacy or the perceived ability to address the varying needs of children with disabilities may be much more difficult to achieve, particularly for a novice, than just having a positive disposition towards the idea of integration. It may be plausible to develop measures that more clearly separate out general beliefs from self-efficacy. It may also be fair to suggest that efficacy development does not occur after completing one or even two courses in special education. Efficacy development is something that occurs over time and may take years to fine-tune. Temperament, personal beliefs, self-confidence, and time may also play a role in efficacy development. Norwich (1994), asserts that attitude development may be impacted through personal beliefs related to political outlook, socio-political
ideas, professional position, and contact with persons with disabilities. Individual efficacy development could vary based on numerous factors, but through providing adequate environments and curricular frameworks, preparation programs could impact positive attitude and efficacy development in pre-service teachers.

Factors Influencing Self-efficacy

As previously noted Bandura (1997) suggests that social modeling, experience, persuasion, and ability to reduce stress and depression are the factors that influence positive self-efficacy development. One could interpret, when considering teacher preparation programs, various components of the program could correlate with Bandura’s four factors of efficacy development.

Social Modeling

In the realm of preparation programs, social modeling may be specifically related to the cooperating teacher. This study suggests it is reasonable to believe that a cooperating teacher’s attitude and efficacy toward integration impacts a pre-service teacher’s development. The result of this study insinuates that preparatory programs should consider education levels and placement
characteristics when organizing field placements. Leyser, Kapperman, and Keller, (1994) assert that in-service teachers, having more experience with integration through professional education and direct contact, foster a significantly more positive attitude toward integration.

**Persuasion**

The persuasion component of Bandura’s self-efficacy development, in preparatory programs, could be the special education courses, and courses that infuse special education topics in the pre-service teacher’s curriculum (1997). Additionally, this study offered support for the belief that additional course work in special education results in favorable attitude and efficacy development. Other factors that may influence the persuasion component are the instructor’s view toward integration, their actual experiences in classrooms with integration, and their formal training in special education. As indicated, it remains to be seen exactly how many courses can possibly influence a pre-service teachers’ efficacy and attitude development.
Experience

Experience as related to pre-service teachers, can be defined as the hours spent in the classroom with children having disabilities. The pre-service teachers in this program were required to complete 850 hours in various classrooms prior to graduation but it is unknown, other than preschool student teaching, how many of the hours were spent in integrated placements. Although this study did not have significant results, it may be suggested that the preparation program, through field experiences and course work, provided a foundation for positive efficacy development. It was hypothesized that the experimental groups would have a higher score on the ORI, due to additional experiences with integration, but the mean ORI score was higher indicating that the control group could also have a sound basis for a positive attitude and efficacy development.

Ability to Reduce Stress and Depression

The ability to reduce stress and depression could be associated with the temperament of the pre-service teacher. Using additional measurement tools pertaining to temperament accompanied by attitude and efficacy tools may
separate out these as discrete entities or confirm that they interact with each other.

It is also reasonable to determine if a pre-service teacher considers “ability” to be the same as self-efficacy because this study would lead one to believe they are very different. Attitude and self-efficacy may be more closely related than researchers have considered. A great emphasis has been placed on the factors that influence attitude and self-efficacy separately but it may be beneficial to determine if a possible interaction of the two exists. Multiple measurement tools would need to be employed in order to establish whether any interactions exist.

Cooperating Teacher Characteristics

The demographic information provided in this study would lend support to placing pre-service teachers in integrated classrooms with cooperating teachers holding baccalaureate degrees or higher. Along with placement considerations, it may be feasible to determine how much a cooperating teacher’s attitude and efficacy influence a pre-service teacher’s attitude and efficacy development toward integration. This would once again support
Bandura’s (1997) theory of “efficacy” development. Demographic information gathered from this study, although scant, indicates that when a cooperating teacher holds a positive attitude toward integration, there may be a positive impact on pre-service teachers’ perceptions.

Other questions that arose from this research were how much influence the level of degree held by a cooperating teacher has on the attitude development of a pre-service teacher. This study would indicate that placements of pre-service teachers in classrooms with teachers holding a four-year degree or higher, in a special education-related field, foster a more favorable attitude toward integration.

Not only should future research measure pre-service teachers’ attitudes and efficacy about integration, but should also measure the cooperating teachers’ attitude and efficacy. This may help answer questions as to the impact of the cooperating teacher’s attitude in relation to pre-service teachers’ attitude and self-efficacy development.
Classroom Environment, Disability Type, and Available Support Services

The literature suggests that various placement characteristics may influence attitude development because of staff qualifications, available support services and staff, class size, and administrative support (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Campbell & Gilmore, 2003; Cook et al., 1999; Hastings & Oakford, 2003). Further research may determine the impact of these site placement characteristics on pre-service teacher attitude and efficacy development. Determining the effects of various disability categories on pre-service teachers’ attitude and efficacy development accompanied with what support services are needed in order to adequately develop curriculum for children with disabilities may provide further information as to the impact of these variables on attitudes and efficacy. Therefore, further information is needed as to which supports and services have the most impact on integration acceptance.

Summary

This research sought to use a novel approach to the study of positive attitudinal development in pre-service
teachers toward the integration of children with disabilities through the use of an experimental design that controlled for the type of student teaching placement. Tucker and associates (2005) postulated that to cultivate positive attitudes toward the integration of children with disabilities, there are three criteria that need to be considered. First, the pre-service teacher needs to have increased special education course work in their curriculum; second, they need positive direct experiences with children with disabilities; and third, the experience needs to be in an environment supervised by positive role models. This study would lend support to this statement in that it provided some information about the importance of providing a positive student teaching experience for pre-service teachers.

While the data between groups was not significantly different, it did support the concept of including special education course work in the curriculum along with experienced and educated mentors to affect attitudes toward integration. Questions remain as to how these variables associated with positive attitudes and self-efficacy development; interact with each other to guide
improvements in the preparation of early childhood teachers. Future research may attempt to parcel out which of these predict greater degrees of positive attitude and perceived ability of pre-service teachers. This in turn may inform possible changes in the preparation of early childhood teachers.

Integration of children with disabilities into the public school environment was a non-existent phenomenon in the early 1900’s. Political and societal changes since the late 1970s resulted in curricular and structural modifications at the pre-service preparation level. These modifications gave future educators the tools to embark upon the challenges of integration and LRE.

As noted throughout the literature, meeting the needs of children with disabilities results from pre-service teacher candidates achieving skills to implement developmentally appropriate programs for all children (Brownlee & Carrington, 2000; Campbell, et al., 2003). Modifications in the education system have progressed from children with disabilities being educated in separate institutions to the promotion of the LRE. As Lipsky and Gartner (1997) suggest, integration should be assessed by
the child’s success academically, behaviorally, and socially in the hopes of preparing the child to participate as a full contributing member of the society. For this to occur, pre-service programs must be guided by ongoing research that emphasizes not only course requirements but also attitude and self-efficacy development.

This study, accompanied by other research, indicates that direct experiences with children with disabilities influence the development of attitudes toward integration. Since the pre-service years are the most influential, preparatory programs may perhaps consider the characteristics of the placement environment, role model, course content, and instructor qualifications. This study lays the groundwork for future preparatory program development in that it suggests the importance of placing pre-service teacher with role models that hold higher degrees. It also supports the infusion of special education throughout course work and direct contact experiences.

Future studies may investigate the four factors that affect self-efficacy development to determine if and how
much impact efficacy has on attitude development. As
previously, noted, extensive experience with integration
may increase positive attitudes toward integration.
Experience in programs that do not integrate children with
disabilities has not been indicative of increased positive
attitudes and efficacy. Hence, it is central for
researchers and program developers to become aware of the
components that affect attitude and efficacy development
the most.
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APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM
Appendix A: Ohio University Consent Form

Title of Research: Pre-service Teachers’ Attitudes Toward Integration: Does A Student Teaching Placement In An Integrated Classroom Make A Difference?

Principal Investigator: Sherri Theaker

Department: Teacher Education

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

I. Explanation of Study

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether a pre-service teacher will exhibit a positive change in attitude toward children with disabilities after being randomly placed into an integrated student teaching placement. The students will be surveyed after being placed randomly in a preschool setting with children developing typically or in a placement that has integrated children with disabilities.

Procedures to be followed

First, read the letter describing the study prior to first day of student teaching. If you would like to participate, please sign the consent form. All consent forms will have a code signified at the top, rather than using your name, for confidentiality purposes. The bottom part of the form will have the code and placement options to be given to investigator upon completion. You list your top three choices for preschool student
teaching placements, one of which will need to be an integrated program, as defined in your packet. Next, you will complete the demographic information. Upon completion of consent, placements, and demographics, the investigator will be given the bottom portion of the form, which has had the name removed. The investigator will randomly place students in with a program that has students with disabilities integrated or in a program that does not practice integration. Students will complete student teaching and then during the tenth or eleventh week of the quarter complete a survey.

**Duration of subject’s participation**

The initial demographic and placement form will take approximately 5 minutes. The survey, to be filled out week 10 or 11 of the quarter, will take approximately 20 minutes.

**Identification of specific procedures that are experimental**

This is a low-stakes research project. No part of this research requires experimentation or poses any known risk to the participant.

**II. Risks and Discomforts**

All surveys will be coded to protect your privacy. You will place surveys in sealed envelope upon completion. If at any time you wish to cease your involvement with the project for any reason you may without any repercussions.

**III. Benefits**

Your participation in this study is vital for furthering teacher education research. This research will provide avenues for effective teacher training and for ensuring quality services for children with disabilities. Along with knowing that you were involved in
furthering research for teacher preparatory programs, you may also benefit in the following ways:

1. The data collected will be provided to the Teacher Education department at Ohio University so that the program may consider curriculum adaptations toward providing alternatives to improving a pre-service teacher’s attitude toward including children in their general education classroom.

2. Research tells us that one of the barriers to successful integration of students with disabilities is a teacher’s attitude. Through your involvement, your self-efficacy toward accommodating the curriculum and environment for a child with a disability will increase.

**Alternative Treatments (if applicable)**

No alternative treatments are required for this research

**Confidentiality and Records**

No one other than the researcher will have access to the records and survey in this research. Once the research is completed, the records will be destroyed. No identifiers such as name will be used for this research. Once the surveys are completed please placed in sealed envelope.

**Compensation**

While no compensation accompanies this research, the researcher anticipates that you will encompass a better understanding of children with disabilities and their families. In
addition, you will be given the opportunity to self reflect about your role in the life of a child developing typically as well as with a child having a disability.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Sherri Theaker, Med., College of Education, Ohio University, (740) 699-2525/theaker@ohio.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0064

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature ______________________________________ Date _________________

Printed Name _____________________________________
Appendix A: Ohio University Consent Form

Title of Research: Pre-service Teachers’ Attitudes Toward Integration: Does A Student Teaching Placement In An Integrated Classroom Make A Difference?

Principal Investigator: Sherri Theaker

Department: Teacher Education

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

I. Explanation of Study

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this pilot study is to determine whether a pre-service teacher will exhibit a positive change in attitude toward children with disabilities after being randomly placed into an integrated student teaching placement.

Procedures to be followed

First, read the letter describing the study prior to first day of student teaching. If you would like to participate, please sign the consent form. All consent forms will have a code signified at the top, rather than using your name, for confidentiality purposes. Students will complete the survey during the tenth or eleventh week of the quarter complete a survey.

Duration of subject’s participation

The initial demographic and placement form will take approximately 5 minutes. The survey, to be filled out week 10 or 11 of the quarter, will take approximately 20 minutes

Identification of specific procedures that are experimental

This is a low-stakes research project. No part of this research requires experimentation or poses any known risk to the participant.

II. Risks and Discomforts

All surveys will be coded to protect your privacy. You will place surveys in sealed envelope upon completion. If at any time you wish to cease your involvement with the project for any reason you may without any repercussions.

III. Benefits

Your participation in this study is vital for furthering teacher education research. This research will provide avenues for effective teacher training and for ensuring quality services for children with disabilities. Along with knowing that you were involved in furthering research for teacher preparatory programs, you may also benefit in the following ways:

3. The data collected will be provided to the Teacher Education department at Ohio University so that the program may consider curriculum adaptations toward providing
alternatives to improving a pre-service teacher’s attitude toward including children in their general education classroom.

4. Research tells us that one of the barriers to successful integration of students with disabilities is a teacher’s attitude. Through your involvement, your self-efficacy toward accommodating the curriculum and environment for a child with a disability will increase.

**Alternative Treatments (if applicable)**

No alternative treatments are required for this research

**Confidentiality and Records**

No one other than the researcher will have access to the records and survey in this research. Once the research is completed, the records will be destroyed. No identifiers such as name will be used for this research. Once the surveys are completed please placed in sealed envelope.

**Compensation**

While no compensation accompanies this research, the researcher anticipates that you will encompass a better understanding of children with disabilities and their families. In addition, you will be given the opportunity to self reflect about your role in the life of a child developing typically as well as with a child having a disability.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Sherri Theaker, Med., College of Education, Ohio University, (740) 699-2525/theaker@ohio.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0064

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature ___________________________ Date _________________

Printed Name ___________________________
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT TOOLS
April 4, 2007

Dear Student Teacher Supervisor:

I wanted to touch base with you, hopefully, prior to you beginning placements for your preschool student teachers. As you may recall from my last note I will be compiling data from summer and fall preschool student teachers. My research involves randomly placing early childhood education preschool student teachers to a program that integrates students with disabilities into the program. My definition of an integrated program is a preschool program that has at least one child with an IEP. Because of the random sampling involved with my research students will need to sign a consent form prior to you placing them. I have enclosed the consent form for your viewing. Once the student signs I would then need to assign them to one of their three choices.

I know this is a tricky method and would gladly come to your campus to meet with you to see what I can do in order to make this work at your campus. I need to have at least 80 students in order to pull off the power issues, therefore using main as well as all regional campuses is a must. I will call you next week to see if you have any questions or you may email me at theaker@ohio.edu.

Thank you so much for your continued support.

Sincerely,

Sherri L. Theaker, M.Ed
Ohio University Eastern Campus
45425 National Road
St. Clairsville, Ohio 43950
740-699-2525
Fax 740-695-7076
Dear Preschool Student Teacher:

I am requesting your assistance in compiling data concerning my doctoral research. I am a doctoral student in the College of Education at Ohio University and a faculty member at Ohio University Eastern Campus. My research topic relates to what a student teachers attitude is toward integrating children with disabilities into their classroom.

I would be thankful if you would agree to participate in my research. Prior to your placement, I would request that you make three suggestions for your placement site, one of which would be an integrated preschool program. An integrated program, for the purpose of this research, is a center that has at least one child with a diagnosed disability. With your consent, I would then randomly assign you to one of your three choices. With this in mind you would either be placed in an integrated classroom or a classroom that does not integrate children with disabilities. During the final weeks of your student teaching, I would ask that you complete a survey pertaining to your student teaching experience. The survey takes approximately 20 minutes of your time and would be completed during your student teaching seminar. No one but the researcher will have access to this information and the results will only be used for the purpose of this research. No attempts will be made to identify the respondents.

Research tells us that one of the barriers to successful integration of students with disabilities is a teacher’s attitude. Through your involvement, your self-efficacy toward accommodating the curriculum and environment for a child with a disability will increase and the research results will help teacher preparation institutions to consider curriculum that will give students ample experience with children having disabilities.

I sincerely appreciate your support and without you, my research cannot be possible. It is my hopes that this research will ultimately benefit the children in the classroom. Once the research has been completed, I will provide the results to you.

Thank you once again for your cooperation and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (740) 699-2525, theaker@ohio.edu.

Sincerely,

Sherri L. Theaker, MS.Ed.
Instructor, Ohio University Eastern Campus
Dear Preschool Student Teacher:

I am requesting your assistance in compiling data concerning my doctoral research. I am a doctoral student in the College of Education at Ohio University and a faculty member at Ohio University Eastern Campus. My research topic relates to what a student teachers attitude is toward integrating children with disabilities into their classroom.

I would be thankful if you would agree to participate in my pilot study. During the final weeks of your student teaching, I would ask that you complete a survey pertaining to your student teaching experience. The survey takes approximately 20 minutes of your time and would be completed during your student teaching seminar. Your input on this survey is for a Pilot test only and will be used for statistical purposes only. My formal research will be conducted throughout the Summer and Fall quarters. No one but the researcher will have access to this information and the results will only be used for the purpose of this research. No attempts will be made to identify the respondents.

Research tells us that one of the barriers to successful integration of students with disabilities is a teacher’s attitude. Through your involvement, your self-efficacy toward accommodating the curriculum and environment for a child with a disability will increase and the research results will help teacher preparation institutions to consider curriculum that will give students ample experience with children having disabilities.

I sincerely appreciate your support and without you, my research cannot be possible. It is my hopes that this research will ultimately benefit the children in the classroom. Once the research has been completed, I will provide the results to you.

Thank you once again for your cooperation and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (740) 699-2525, theaker@ohio.edu.

Sincerely,

Sherri L. Theaker, MS.Ed.
Instructor, Ohio University Eastern Campus
Preschool Student Teaching Placement Form

Code # _____________________

Name ______________________

List placement preferences, contact people, and phone numbers (preferable no more than one hour from campus. One of the three needs to be an integrated program if you have agreed to participate in the research study.

1.* ___________________________________________________________

2.___________________________________________________________

3.___________________________________________________________

*Indicates the placement that is an integrated program.

___________________________________________________________

Code #____________________

Placement__________________________________________________
APPENDIX C: INSTRUMENTS

198
CODE # ________

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How many children in your student teaching placement had an Individualized Education Plan (IEP)? _______

2. What were the disability types? __________________________________________________________

3. What is your gender? □ Male □ Female

4. What is your cooperating teacher’s gender? □ Male □ Female

4. What is your age? ______

5. Educational level that you have attained:
   □ first-year university student
   □ second-year university student
   □ third-year university student
   □ fourth-year university student
   □ baccalaureate degree
   □ master’s degree
   □ other ___________________
   Licensure area:_____________________________________________________

6. Number of special education courses you have taken:
   EDSP 271 _____
   EDTE 371C____
   HSLS 385 _____
   Other

7. Number of special education courses your cooperating teacher has taken:
   Course Titles:

8. What degree/licensure did your cooperating teacher hold?
   □ no degree
   □ Associate degree
   □ Baccalaureate degree
[506x709]□ Master’s degree
□ Doctoral degree
Licensure
area:_____________________________________________________

9. How many years experience does the cooperating teacher have? ______

10. What personal experiences with persons with disabilities have you had?

□ none
□ acquaintance (e.g., neighbor, store clerk)
□ casual (e.g., fellow student, co-worker, and employee)
□ close (e.g., roommate, near relative)
□ intimate (e.g., spouse, child, and sibling).

11. What personal experiences with persons with disabilities has your cooperating teacher had?

□ none
□ acquaintance (e.g., neighbor, store clerk)
□ casual (e.g., fellow student, co-worker, and employee)
□ close (e.g., roommate, near relative)
□ intimate (e.g., spouse, child, and sibling).
Opinions Relative To The Integration Of Students With Disabilities

**General Directions:** Please place a check mark in the square that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement. There are no correct answers: the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings. There is no time limit, but you should work as quickly as you can.

*Please respond to every statement*

**KEY**

-3: I disagree very much  
-2: I disagree pretty much  
-1: I disagree a little  
+1: I agree a little  
+2: I agree pretty much  
+3: I agree very much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is likely that the student with a disability will exhibit behavior problems in a regular classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increased freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regular-classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in a special classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her social independence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains a student with a disability than in one that does not contain a student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher’s time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The classroom behavior of the student with a disability generally does not require more patience from the teacher than does the classroom behavior of the student without a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special than by regular classroom teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The student with a disability will not be socially isolated in the regular classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!
What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates children with disabilities?

How do you feel your courses at Ohio University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom?

Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how?
How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration?

How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration?
### Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many children in your student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placement had an Individualized Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IEP)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the disability types?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your cooperating teacher’s gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ First-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Second year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Third-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Fourth-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Baccalaureate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level that you have attained:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ First-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Second year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Third-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Fourth-year university student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Baccalaureate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education courses you have taken:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ EDSP 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ EDTE 371C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ HSL 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of special education courses your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperating teacher has taken:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course titles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What degree/licensure did your cooperating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher hold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ No degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Associate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years experience does the cooperating teacher have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What personal experiences with persons with disabilities have you had?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance (e.g. neighbor, store clerk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (e.g. follow student, co-worker, and employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close (e.g. roommate, near relative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate (e.g. spouse, child, and sibling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What personal experiences with persons with disabilities has your cooperating teacher had?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance (e.g. neighbor, store worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (e.g. fellow student, co-worker, and employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close (e.g. roommate, near relative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate (e.g. spouse, child, and sibling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opinions Relative To The Integration Of Students With Disabilities

General Directions: Please place a check mark in the square that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement. There are no correct answers: the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings. There is no time limit, but you should work as quickly as you can.

*Please respond to every statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3: I disagree very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2: I disagree pretty much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1: I disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1: I agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2: I agree pretty much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3: I agree very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of regular-classroom teachers.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is likely that the student with a disability will exhibit behavior problems in a regular classroom.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students with disabilities can best be served in regular classrooms.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of the student with a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increased freedom in the regular classroom creates too much confusion for the student with a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regular-classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a regular classroom than in a special classroom.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her social independence.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is not more difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains a student with a disability than in one that does not contain a student with a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students with disabilities will not monopolize the regular-classroom teacher’s time.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom where possible.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The classroom behavior of the student with a disability generally does not require more patience from the teacher than does the classroom behavior of the student without a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special than by regular classroom teachers.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The student with a disability will not be socially isolated in the regular classroom.</td>
<td>Select your response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates children with disabilities?**

**How do you feel your courses at Ohio University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom?**

**Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how?**

**How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration?**

**How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration?**

[Submit] [Reset]
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APPENDIX E: MISCELLANEOUS FORMS
Attached is pdf file with ORI and permission letter. You have my permission but you will need to complete the form and return it to me. Good luck with your research,

Dr. Barbara Larrivee, Professor
College of Education
California State University
5500 University Parkway, FO-251
San Bernardino, CA 92407
Phone: (909)537-5670
Email: blarrive@csusb.edu

----- Original Message -----
From: Sherri Theaker <theaker@ohio.edu>
Date: Friday, September 22, 2006 5:37 am
Subject: ORI permission
To: blarrive@csusb.edu

> Good Morning Dr. Larrivee,
> I am a doctorate student at Ohio University in Teacher Education,
> specializing in special education as well as a faculty member and
> am seeking your permission to use the ORI survey for my dissertation research. I will be using a one-way MANOVA, post test
> on early childhood general ed. preservice student teachers. I am hypothesizing that by providing a student teaching site which
> includes students with disabilities that a preservice teacher will
> have a better attitude toward children with disabilities. I will
> random select the groups and also have the ability to have a
> control group situation. I am excited because I will be using the
> students at our main campus as well as the 5 surrounding regional
> campuses. If all works out I look to have an approx. n=95 to 120.
>
> I look forward to your response,
>
> Thank you,
>
> Sherri Theaker, MS.Ed
> Ohio University Faculty
>
Were the directions on how to fill out the survey clear?  Yes____  NO____

If no, why?________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

What suggestions do you have in regard to the design of the survey?_______

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

___________________________________________

How did you feel about integrating students with disabilities at your student teaching site? ________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!
Appendix F: CORRESPONDENCE TO PRE-SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHERS
Hello (student’s first name):

If you recall Dr. (student teaching coordinator) talked to you in your student teaching seminar about my research for my doctorate program. I am finishing my data collection and really need your help. If you would, please access the survey via the link below and complete. The more responses I get the better. It will only take 10 min. of your time. If you cannot remember anything from the demographic section just leave blank. Thank you so much and have a Happy Holiday season!!

The web site is
http://www.eastern.ohiou.edu/academic/theakers/survey.html

I know all of you are so busy and your time is of the essence :)

Sincerely,

Sherri L. Theaker

Sherri L. Theaker, M.Ed
Faculty
Early Childhood Education
Ohio University Eastern Campus
45425 National Road
St. Clairsville, OH 43950
Phone: (740)699-2525
FAX: (740)695-7076
theaker@ohio.edu
Hello All:

As many of you know I had requested your assistance with helping me to complete my research for my doctorate degree at Ohio University the first weeks of your seminar via (student teaching coordinator). Summer went by so quickly and many surveys did not get returned to me. So if you would please take the time and fill out the survey at the web site I have provided I would GREATLY appreciate your assistance. The web site is http://www.eastern.ohiou.edu/academic/theakers/survey.html.

I know all of you are so busy and your time is of the essence :)

Sincerely,

Sherri L. Theaker
Appendix G: SOURCES FOR NORMALITY
Boxplot for ORI Subscales
Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 1

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 1 for group = 1.00

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 1 for group = 2.00

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 2

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 2 for group = 1.00

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 2 for group = 2.00
Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 3

for group = 1.00

for group = 2.00

Normal Q-Q Plot of Factor 4

for group = 1.00

for group = 2.00
Appendix H: MULTIVARIATE NORMALITY BIVARIATE SCATTERPLOT

MATRIX
Bivariate Scatterplot Matrix
Appendix I: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS BY CASE NUMBER
Question #1: What are your thoughts after completing a student teaching placement in a program that integrates children with disabilities?

P1: I had no children with disabilities in my classroom so I am unable to provide an adequate response. However, the center does a fabulous job of integrating all students and lessons to meet everyone’s needs.

P7: I enjoyed the challenge of making sure his needs were being met. I also was able to see him grow by being placed with the students without disabilities.

P8: It is very important to integrate children. It promotes positive differences and coping strategies for children and teachers.

P12: I really didn’t have any student with disabilities.

P14: I was in an infant room with a child who had a medical IEP. Other than that I didn’t have much experience with disabilities in my classroom.

P16: I like having diversity of all kinds present—but I didn’t have any students with disabilities.

P18: Integration is more beneficial for all students.

P20: It benefits all children and teachers. They learn from one another and those with disabilities can strengthen social skills.

P23: It was a very new learning experience and I am glad I was placed in this type of environment. I feel that it is a great experience for all parties included. The children get to see both worlds (with and without disabilities).

P24: Everything of my location worked out fine. All of the students had equal inclusion in the classroom.

P25: In the beginning it was a bit overwhelming because the hands on experience had never been there before. Once I felt more comfortable it became a wonderful experience
and I feel very fortunate to have had this opportunity. The benefits from this experience will help me in any classroom setting I may encounter.

P26: My program was a program for children with disabilities and it integrated children without disabilities. I feel it was a great experience. The children that were integrated without disabilities were used as models for the children with disabilities.

P27: It is challenging but not impossible. Other children accept them yet at times have trouble understanding them. I am indifferent on fully integrated vs. not integrated. I feel that we need to evaluate each individual situation to determine what is best.

P28: I am grateful for the opportunity. I feel all prospective education need this opportunity to open their minds and classrooms to students with disabilities.

P29: I believe that every child should be integrated into a classroom setting even if they have disabilities. Those children with disabilities can feed off the students who do not have disabilities and make positive advances in their learning.

P31: I am very glad that I did it. I’ve learned a lot about children with special needs and methods of teaching that work well with them.

P33: I thought it was a great experience. The children were all very accepting of me. I learned valuable activities that helps a wide range of disabilities. It was a real eye opener for me to see the range and how one activity could help 6 children improve in one certain area.

P35: The children with disabilities can do as much or more than a typical child. It may take them a little longer to move around but they can pretty much do everything a typical child can do. It’s nice to have the typical children in with the children with disabilities because it gets the children familiar with the differences.
P40: Integration must be done on an individual basis. It is good for some students and bad for others.

P42: Integrating children in the regular classroom is a great idea as long as it is not so severe that it will interfere with other children’s learning. There also needs to be enough adults in the room to handle the children.

P44: My student teaching experience did require me to interact with special needs students.

P45: Each case is special, children with disabilities need to be looked at based on their own individual needs.

P50: I believe it is great for all students, although if a student’s behavior disrupts the learning of other students, that student should be assigned an assistant, so the teacher can focus on her job of teaching.

P51: I learned a lot from my placement. I feel that students going through the education programs need more training in regards to special education.

P54: It depends on the disability and the severity of it whether the child should be integrated into a reg. ed. Classroom.

P56: I feel like I learned how to manage a classroom without causing problems with the child with a disability. They transitioned well.

P61: I have an understanding of how to progress monitor the children in their cognitive skills.

P63: I feel comfortable working in the environment and adapting work for them, but it would be beneficial to have someone else there also.

P64: These children mostly benefit by being in a classroom that is integrated.

P65: I feel that it is beneficial for the teacher, students, and students with disabilities.
Integration depends on the disability. Students should be integrated into reg. classrooms as much as needed for them.

P67: It was not a major disability, so there wasn’t much difference on instruction and acceptance.

P68: I feel it is important to integrate children with disabilities. I feel I learned a lot more about integration and gained positive ideas to try with children with disabilities.

P70: All children can learn.

P71: I feel that you have to be willing to incorporate every child to the best of your ability. You have to be willing to research and finds ways to incorporate any child in the least restrictive environment.

P73: Mixed! The student I observed had several outbursts daily and required a lot of extra attention during times when all the students needed attention also (calendar time, etc.). He took time away from the other students. Besides this I think it is wonderful!

P75: It became stressful because our situation was very difficult. Shawnee Mental Health comes twice a week to do intervention.

P76: I had previous experience working in an autistic classroom so I knew what to expect to some degree. However, it was actually difficult for me to expect to distinguish which child had an IEP upon first entrance to the classroom and the first few days in the classroom. I definitely believe that children with IEP’s have a place in the general education classroom—they deserve just as much of a chance as any other child.

P80: I think it is good to integrate students with a disability and it shows us how it will be in a classroom when we teach.

P90: Integration is beneficial for the children but I think a professional adult in the room would be helpful.
P91: I see more opportunities offered for a student inside the regular classroom.

P92: I think that it is beneficial for the child. However, it would be great to have an aide come in with the child.

P94: Children are sometimes isolated without teacher involvement. I also feel that typical children pick up on behaviors and mimic the behaviors of the children with disabilities.

P95: Exhausted, there is a large hole in the integration process. Special accommodations are made but not explained to his peers. Their explanation is always “He’s different” Many students have commented we are all different.

P97: In my experience this quarter, integrating children with disabilities has its positive and negative aspects. Positives include social acceptance.

P99: At first, I was very nervous because I had no prior experience with children with disabilities. Within the first two weeks, I realized that being in an integrated program was a wonderful experience for me. I feel more confident in my teaching abilities and with working with children. I think that integrated programs benefit both children with and without disabilities and that these programs would be a great learning experience for any student teacher.

P100: The student’s with disabilities were some of my favorites. They enhanced the class. I have some concerns with social backlash but I think overall it benefited all the students.

P120: I only had one disability in my class, and it is not noticeable.

Question #2: How do you feel your courses at Ohio University have prepared you to integrate children with disabilities into your classroom?
P1: Very well. I have a basic understanding of my requirements of a teacher. I also understand most students will likely be accompanied by an aid that can help me find ways to teach them.

P7: I learned of some types of disabilities and ways of doing special education paperwork but I never really learned ways of making sure they were integrated into the classroom accurately.

P8: They have helped tremendously. We have been exposed and trained. I feel confident enough to work with students with disabilities.

P12: I feel like I am prepared.

P14: I feel as though I have the appropriate knowledge to integrate children with disabilities.

P16: I know a little bit more than I did coming in to OU—but I’m not very comfortable still.

P18: I feel that OU should provide more courses on integration in order to implement them accurately into our classroom.

P20: They have not prepared me that much. I feel I learned more being in a special ed. Room in high school.

P23: I feel that OU did a good job with the integration aspect but not so much with the class work. I feel some more classes should be added to the curriculum that deal with children with disabilities and special education.

P24: Very well. I referenced a few courses during my time in the classroom.

P25: The courses have been somewhat helpful but nothing can compare to the real experience.

P26: I feel that we were prepared for diversity and that helped with planning processes. I was able to plan lessons that were beneficial to all of my children.
P27: I feel there is always room to learn and experience more, but I also felt very confident with the knowledge that I have.

P28: I feel this course has been the most beneficial class. I, up to this point, have felt uneasy and unqualified to handle integration. Now I feel more comfortable and confident.

P29: I felt somewhat comfortable, but would have felt more comfortable if I had more classes in special education in preschool settings.

P30: I am somewhat prepared. I believe I have been more prepared by being exposed to or having the opportunity to work with talented special ed. Teachers. Actually working in a classroom has prepared me more than reading about something in a textbook.

P31: I feel that there should be more classes involving special needs required, but I used all my skills that I have learned about educating children.

P33: I felt prepared by having the factual information about each of the disabilities. The experience I had little working with. The student teaching experience really opened my eyes and I love every minute of it.

P35: I would have to say that I have learned more by doing my student teaching. I have gotten to see firsthand what it’s like to put typical children with children with disabilities. The children with disabilities may need some more assistance but I think it’s great thing to have the children mixed together.

P37: I feel that we have been trained well to integrate students.

P38: Yes, I do feel that I have been prepared both OU and in my cooperating placement.

P39: I feel prepared to handle children with slight disabilities in my classroom. I have learned tricks and strategies to keep children focused while teaching.
P40: I feel that OU has prepared me with “book smarts” but experience will better prepare me for a child with a disability in my classroom.

P41: I feel that all classes taught us how to adapt for various levels of learning. I am well aware of the differing disabilities and techniques to make these succeed.

P42: Not very well. The experience of actually dealing with children would be most helpful.

P44: Did help to prepare for classroom management and adaptive lesson plans.

P45: I think we should’ve had some sort of course on behavior management of children with disabilities rather than integrating into a week of another course.

P46: I feel that they helped us to understand different disabilities but did not give us advice on how to help the children with these disabilities.

P47: I feel that Ohio University has introduced me to realization that it will more likely happen then not. I think OU has given me the skills I need to do further research and find credible resources if this does happen.

P50: I think they have prepared me by discussing strategies to use in the classroom, and also identifying characteristics of disabilities.

P51: I was able to put some of my knowledge I learned at OU to practice, but learned more from working hands on with my students during my preschool placement. I feel we need more hands on experience in our courses at OU.

P54: I feel that I have some background knowledge, but not necessarily enough training to handle certain disabilities full time.

P56: Pretty well. I think we need more training.

P57: I have learned a tremendous amount.
P59:  Very Well Prepared

P61:  I feel that I have an understanding of the different disabilities that a child might have, but I feel that I could use more training in how to accommodate for them and their needs.

P63:  I feel pretty well prepared, but to be covered and benefit the child more I would be willing to take additional classes.

P64:  I think actual field experience has better prepared me than any courses.

P65:  Our courses have discussed this issue a lot, but unfortunately, my field experiences have not exposed me or prepared me for this. Maybe if there was a required placement that addressed this, I would be more prepared.

P67:  They have made me more aware of how many needs there are and I need to accommodate.

P68:  I feel the courses have given just a taste of what I will need to know. I do not feel completely prepared to integrate a child with a disability in my classroom.

P70:  Mild-moderate disabilities—yes.

P71:  The courses help me become aware of ways to integrate children with disabilities into my future classrooms. I know that I must be prepared to deal with all types of children.

P72:  I believe I am prepared somewhat, but plan to focus on special needs for my master’s program.

P73:  Really Well! We’ve had several courses on integration and diversity, so I feel as prepared as possible without more one-on-one interaction with students with exceptionalities.

P75:  I feel I am slightly prepared.
P76: I feel as though I understand the concept and am armed with ideas and strategies to use in this situation but I did not have an opportunity for one-on-one experience during my college career. I only took 2 courses that focused on special education.

P79: Very Well

P80: I feel they have prepared us for this.

P90: Well...you can’t be prepared enough for disabilities that come into the classroom.

P91: Not very well.

P92: Not very well could have been more extensive training.

P94: I am confident that I can handle most situations with minimal guidance from a special.

P95: I felt very prepared.

P97: I feel that I have been given a good foundation of understanding students with specific disabilities and how to include them in the regular classroom. I feel that I am not an expert nor am I close to being qualified to deal with certain disabilities. Only research and experience on my part will enable me to teach children of all abilities. I feel that I have been given enough resources to refer to and research a specific disability I will face with a child in my classroom.

P99: I do not believe the courses at OU prepared me at all to integrate children with disabilities into a classroom. I do, however, believe that being placed in an integrated classroom for my student teaching has GREATLY helped me and prepared me for working in an integrated classroom in the future.

P100: Very well. After assessing DAP it is easy to adapt lessons to suit all students. I would like more training with Autism and ADHD/ADD.
P120: 371C covered a lot of disabilities and gave me a better insight on some disabilities.

Question #3: Have your thoughts about integrating children with disabilities changed in any way from your student teaching experience? If so, describe how?

P1: No

P7: I feel that it is possible to integrate children with disabilities and watch them grow.

P8: No

P12: Not really

P14: No

P16: Nothing has changed.

P18: No—I think that integration should happen on all levels.

P20: No, I always will think integrating children with disabilities is necessary.

P23: They have not changed. I feel integration is a good thing as long as there is balance in the classroom. I feel that classrooms should only have so many children with disabilities in them at one time.

P24: No, I don’t see any problems with it as long as you have good support staff.

P25: No—I believe that all children should have the same opportunities with the exception of these children with such severe disabilities that wouldn’t benefit from a regular classroom. But that choice or decision should be left for the parents to make.

P26: I have always been a supporter of integration and I continue to support integration. I feel that it offers opportunities for learning for all parties involved.
P27: No, I feel just as strongly that we need to look at each individual and find what is best.

P28: Yes, I often feared the integration, but now am comfortable because of the first-hand knowledge I have acquired.

P29: No

P30: Not really. I believe children with disabilities should have the opportunity, at least part of the day, to be integrated into a regular inclusion classroom.

P31: I think it is more of a possibility if there is more than one teacher in the classroom.

P33: I always thought it was a good idea but now I can see how it does help emotionally, socially and with cognitive behaviors. The children really never see each other as being different.

P35: At first I wasn’t sure how it would be but after student teaching I’ve realized that it’s really a great idea. The children bounce ideas off one another and they really help each other get through tasks. They all care about one another and show care about one another.

P38: No, I did not have any experience with disabled students.

P45: No, I still believe that children with disabilities should be integrated to the fullest.

P46: No, I have always believed that children should be integrated.

P50: Yes, I have realized how important it is for teachers to have the proper supports in order to integrate students effectively.

P56: Yes, I feel more confident when I have disability children in my classroom.

P59: No
P61: No, but I have been an aide in a integrating preschool classroom prior to my student teaching experience.

P63: No

P64: No

P65: No

P67: No

P68: I have realized that it is more work for the teacher, however, I feel it is important for the child with disabilities to be integrated.

P70: Yes. Head Start teachers are trained.

P72: No

P73: Maybe a little after being able to stand back and watch teacher/student interaction. It can cause some mild frustrations on the teacher, child, and other students. An assistant in the classroom is a necessity.

P75: I know that it is necessary to include children with disabilities both from my experience and class work. I’m just learning how to work with them better through student teaching.

P76: No

P80: No I believe integration is a good thing for all types of students.

P90: No

P91: No, I’ve gained more experiences from other experiences.

P92: Not during pre-primary experience but my primary student teaching was more beneficial.
P94: Yes. I feel more comfortable now that I have everyday experience with children with disabilities.

P95: No

P97: In my experience I feel that the child with the disability was treated more favorable than the others. He had his own toys, his own desk spaces and received extra snack. Some treatment was not directly related to his disability condition. Other children have noticed this attention and seemed bothered somewhat. Children with disabilities should be included, but they should not receive special attention not related to their disability nor should typicals. I believe that if you have a child with a disability that is a danger to himself or others, you should have a full-time classroom aide. Without the aide in our classroom it would be impossible to complete activities!

P99: Yes, I feel more strongly about integrating children with disabilities into a regular classroom. I believe it is a positive experience for everyone involved.

P100: No, I always thought it was positive. Just don’t think I could do it well without an aid.

Question #4: How do you think your student teaching supervisor feels about integration?

P1: I think my supervisor feels integration is a crucial part of the total learning experience and values that aspect of her center.

P7: I think it is an important part of the education of both children with and without disabilities.

P8: I think she feels it is important to integrate students. It benefits children with and without disabilities.

P12: I think she believes.

P14: Similarly to me.
P16: She is all for integration.

P18: I feel that they agree with me on integration, but don’t know how it’s implemented at this age.

P20: I know she feels passionately about integrating children with disabilities and it only does great things for those children.

P23: I feel she supports it very much and she advocates the issue during classroom discussions. She feels it is important for children to interact regardless of their disability.

P24: For it, Let the students be together learning from one another. The more exposure the better.

P25: I believe that my supervisor is very much for integration. It benefits those with the special needs as well as the typical children.

P26: I feel my student teaching supervisor is a supporter of integration.

P27: I think she is for integration yet I think she feels that proper assistance and evaluations need to be done and maintained.

P28: I feel she thinks it is necessary part of the education of the whole child because it promotes empathy and acceptance of all students.

P29: I believe she thinks integration is positive and necessary for those children with disabilities to be a part of a classroom setting as well as positive for those students who do not have disabilities to except students who differ from them.

P30: I believe she feels very strong about integrating all types of students in a general education classroom.

P31: I think she sees it as beneficial to both the students with special needs and to students without special needs.
P33: She thinks it is a great idea for children to experience other children with disabilities.

P35: I think she really agrees with integration. It’s great for the children and they really learn a lot from one another. She would probably think so too. She would probably think the children learn from each other’s differences.

P38: I think she supports integration. She has discussed her previous experiences.

P40: I think she feels that it has good and bad affects for different children. She may be open-minded about integration in different circumstances.

P41: I believe she is very open to integration and is always willing to try new things so that all students may excel.

P42: Dr. Cao thinks that integration is appropriate.

P44: She strongly believes in integration and helps us to learn teaching strategies to help each child excel.

P45: In favor.

P46: I think that she feels that they need to be integrated in a classroom.

P50: I believe she supports integration, but also emphasizes effective teacher training and support.

P54: I am not sure.

P56: She agrees with it.

P57: She feels 100% about it.

P59: Not sure.

P61: I feel that she supports integration in the classroom. She feels that it is important socially and
emotionally. It also makes typical children compassionate.

P63: Good. Very positive about it! Talked positively about integration and taking additional classes to promote better perspectives and more training on the teachers part. This will benefit the child overall.

P64: Positively. She has always promoted the inclusion of these students in regular classrooms. She acknowledges that this is beneficial not only for the child with disabilities, but for the rest of the students as well.

P65: I feel that she agrees.

P67: I think she supports integration.

P68: I feel my supervising teacher is comfortable with integration. She welcomed the challenge.

P70: She is in favor of it.

P71: Encourage it and believes we should do whatever is best for the child.

P72: I believe she feels is important for both the child with and without disabilities.

P73: I feel that she loves children and really promotes interaction with all students. She works first hand with special students through Head Start, and has seen the benefits on integration for not only the special needs child, but all the other children as well.

P74: I think she is all for it!

P75: I think she is very educated and has good experience over the years with how to handle problems.

P76: The supervisor is a master teacher with years of experience in working with students with disabilities therefore I believe that her attitude towards integration is very positive. She is a true advocate for all children regardless of ability/disability.
P79: She feels extremely open and feels that integration should be done as soon as possible.

P80: I believe she believes in the integration.

P90: I think she appreciates it because she has a child with a disability!

P92: She is for it

P94: She is definitely for integration. It is important for all children and teachers to have those experiences and interactions.

P95: Not comfortable.

P97: Think she is 100% supportive of children with disabilities in the classroom.

P99: I believe she feels that it is a very positive approach to teaching.

P100: I’m sure she finds it rewarding and supportive to the learning environment.

P120: I think she agrees.

Question #5: How do you feel your cooperating teacher feels about integration?

P1: I feel that she agrees with the centers approach to integration and finds integration valuable to both students with and without disabilities and their learning as it takes place in the classroom.

P7: They seemed nervous at first but adjusted well after the first week and getting to know the child.

P8: I think they think it would benefit all the children in the classroom.

P12: She believes it’s good.
P14: Feels it is important and beneficial to all children involved.

P16: They are for it.

P18: I feel that they agree with integration, but should be more trained on integrating on such a young scale.

P20: She feels strongly about integration and benefiting children with disabilities as well as regular students.

P23: Well, obviously she agrees with integration because she teaches in a room with disabled children and typical children.

P24: She does not have a problem with it. As long as she is kept informed from admin staff and parents she can handle any new type of situation.

P25: Much for integration. Many positive outcomes.

P26: I believe that my cooperating teacher is a big supporter of integration. Her goal for every child with a disability in the classroom is for those children to attend public kindergarten.

P27: My cooperating teacher want what is best for the child. She was not opposed to integration only worried that she would do her best but not meet all their needs.

P28: She also feels integration is important and necessary if the student, teacher and parents have adequate support to educate the child.

P29: I feel that she believes that integration in early ages is necessary for positive learning experiences for both children with disabilities and those children without disabilities.

P30: I would have to say they are for it depending on the disability. There were children in my classroom that had major disabilities.
P31: I believe she also feels that it is beneficial to an extent but she also knows when a child needs more assistance than she can offer in her classroom.

P33: She is a great teacher. She is always looking for new ideas to help each of the children in her class. She is a life learner she always is trying new things.

P35: She’s a special education teacher and has been for 22 years. She really enjoys all the children and has good strategies to teach the children how to get along with one another. She really enjoys her job.

P38: My cooperating teacher has worked with disabled students in the past. She does like inclusion in preschool.

P41: I know that my facility does foster acceptance with integration. My cooperating teacher was very open to students with disabilities and took classes to prepare her for students with disabilities.

P42: She feels that integration is appropriate as long as there are enough teachers in classroom to help.

P44: Accepts all children as equal and they all have the right to learn.

P45: In favor.

P46: I believe that she thinks that children with disabilities should be in a special education room.

P50: I think she agrees that it is a good idea, although not at the expense to the other children’s learning. I also believe much of this depends on the type of and severity of a student’s disability, and what supports and additional staff are available.

P54: I think she feels it is a good thing if the teacher and student can handle it.
P56: She agrees with it as long as there is sufficient help from other adults. Of course, it depends on the disability severity.

P57: They agree 100%

P59: Not Sure

P61: I feel that my cooperating teacher supports integration. Prior to teaching in a classroom she was a reading intervention specialist. I feel that she has benefited from the reading intervention specialist and can incorporate her knowledge into an integrated classroom. She is the one who taught me the importance of documentation and monitoring the progress of a child. To use for referral of a child to be tested for an IEP.

P63: Good. Very positive about it! Really seeks to promote the educational environment and behavior modification. These really benefit the child or children the more the teacher knows and the more comfortable the teacher is with the training and concept level.

P64: positively. She has even identifies problems in her second-grade students that had not previously been identified. She fought for their inclusion and promoted acceptance by the remaining students.

P65: I feel that they agree. They showed us ways to monitor students progress so that we could use assessments to plan lessons and make experience successful in the time we had.

P67: Supports it as well.

P68: I feel our cooperating teacher was positive about integration. She gave us positive ideas to try with the student. She worked alongside us to try to gain a positive outcome.

P70: Definitely pro-active.

P71: Honestly, I feel that she would find it to be a problem. She found everything to be a problem though.
She didn’t reflect a person who was there with the children’s best interest in top priority.

P72: I believe she would rather not happen, as she seemed to have problems with daily challenges.

P73: She loves it! She said the personal satisfaction of seeing how far her special needs child had came throughout this year was unbelievable. He will always be her “special” boy.

P74: I now know she actually left the program she was in over the summer to take a job at MRDD to work with the disabilities children.

P75: I think she gets frustrated easily and depends on help from aids to deal with problems.

P76: My cooperating teacher is very accepting of all young children regardless of their ability or disability. She is used to working with at-risk students and students with IEP’s therefore her attitude towards integration is very positive she does everything possible to meet every child’s academic, social and emotional needs.

P79: Feels that should happen as soon as possible.

P80: She believes that integration is good for all students.

P90: Same as I do.

P92: I think that they feel that it is beneficial for the student.

P94: She encourages it in most cases. There are times where she separates the child with autism to not disrupt the classroom.

P95: Not comfortable.

P97: She is also 100% supportive of children with disabilities in the classroom. She is good at what she does and takes this matter seriously. She works closely
with the OT and PT to do what is appropriate for the child.

P99: She believes that integration is a wonderful idea. She thinks it benefits children with and without disabilities.

P100: She likes it but agrees that some special education should occur outside the class. This one-on-one time without interruption supports comprehension.

P120: I think that she welcomes it.