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Inclusion Works!

Over 20 years of research has consistently demonstrated that the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms results in favorable outcomes. Positive outcomes have been shown for both students with high incidence disabilities (learning disabilities and other “mild” disabilities) and those with low incidence disabilities (intellectual, multiple, and “severe” disabilities). This body of research includes quantitative studies where the standard is replication as well as qualitative studies that aim for complete, detailed descriptions in order to answer ‘how’ questions.

**Placement Matters:** Studies investigating the effects of placement in general education classrooms reveal positive outcomes in the areas of IEP quality, time of engagement, and individualized supports. Significant increases in IEP quality on measures of age-appropriateness, functionality, and generalization were found when students moved into general education classes from special education settings even though the special educator remained the same (Hunt & Farron-Davis, 1992). Within the general education classroom, there was an increase in the amount of instruction on functional activities as well as basic academic skills such as literacy for students with severe disabilities (Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis, & Goetz, 1994). In addition, students were observed to be less engaged and often more alone in self-contained classrooms.

Similar student engagement outcomes were reported in a study involving nine elementary students with severe disabilities who were observed in both special and general education settings. General education classrooms delivered more instruction, provided a comparable amount of 1:1 instruction time, addressed content more, and used non-disabled peers more and adults less (Helmstetter, Curry, Brennan, & Sampson-Saul, 1998). Furthermore, comparisons of the two settings revealed a significant difference in non-instructional time. In self-contained classes, 58% of the time was classified as non-instructional versus 35% of the time in general education classes.

To answer the question of individualizing supports, McDonnell and colleagues compared the instructional contexts of students with low incidence disabilities and their typical peers in...
general education settings. The students with severe disabilities were 13 times more likely than their peers without disabilities to receive instruction directed exclusively toward them during whole class activities, and were 23 times more likely to receive 1:1 instruction (McDonnell, Thorson, & McQuivey, 2000). This challenges the prevalent notion that students with disabilities cannot receive individualized supports in general education classrooms.

**Outcomes for Students with Disabilities:** Most research studies examining educational outcomes have found positive effects for inclusion. Baker and colleagues reviewed three meta-analyses that addressed the issue of the most effective setting for the education of students with disabilities. A small-to-moderate positive effect for inclusive placement was found in all three meta-analyses (Baker, Wang, & Walberg, 1994). More recently, Waldron, Cole, and Majd (2001) investigated the effects of inclusive programs for students with high incidence disabilities and their typical peers. This two-year study found that 41.7% of students with learning disabilities made progress in math in general education classes compared to 34% in traditional special education settings, without the presence of nondisabled peers. Gains in reading were comparable in both settings. When comparing progress with their typical peers, 43.3% of students with disabilities made comparable or greater progress in math in inclusive settings versus 35.9% in traditional settings. Similar academic gains were reported in a study examining the use of class-wide peer tutoring on the achievement of students with high incidence disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Significant increases in spelling, social studies and other academic indicators were observed (Pomerantz, Windell, & Smith, 1994).

Positive educational outcomes are not in the area of academics alone. The National Longitudinal Transition Study examined the outcomes of 11,000 students with a range of disabilities and found that more time spent in a general education classroom was positively correlated with:

a) fewer absences from school,

b) fewer referrals for disruptive behavior, and

c) better outcomes after high school in the areas of employment and independent living (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, & Levine, 2006).

Meta-analyses and comparative studies examining the educational outcomes of students with low incidence disabilities in inclusive versus segregated classrooms have found either no difference in outcomes or positive effects for inclusion (Hunt & Goetz, 1997). There is a body of empirical evidence that shows students with severe disabilities are able to acquire skills in a range of areas within inclusive classrooms. McGregor and Vogelsberg (1998) report that students demonstrate higher levels of social interaction with typical peers, social competence and communication skills improve (e.g., Hunt, Alwell, Farron-Davis & Goetz, 1996), and academic gains are made (McDonnell, Thorson, McQuivey, & Kiefer-O’Donnell, 1997).
addition, Kliwer and Biklen (2001) found that inclusive learning environments facilitated the acquisition of literacy and adaptive skills as well as enhancing students’ social relationships. In this domain of social outcomes, Fisher and Meyer (2002) conducted a two-year longitudinal study to examine social competence for 40 students with severe disabilities in inclusive and self-contained classrooms. Students in the inclusive settings had significantly higher mean scores on the ASC (Assessment of Social Competence) after a two-year period, and although students in self-contained classrooms made gains, they were not statistically significant. Falvey (2004) notes that “no studies conducted since the late 1970’s have shown an academic advantage for students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities educated in separate settings.”

Effect on typical peers: Concerns are often raised about the impact that students with disabilities, especially those with challenging behavior, have on the learning of typical students. Hollowood and colleagues investigated the degree to which the presence of students with severe disabilities affected the time allocated for instruction, the actual time used for instruction, and students’ engaged time. Results indicated no differences across the three domains when comparing classrooms that included students with severe disabilities and classrooms without students with severe disabilities (Hollowood, Salisbury, Rainforth, & Palombaro, 1995). The finding that engaged time for typical learners is not negatively impacted by the presence of students with severe disabilities was also replicated in other studies (Peltier, 1997; Staub & Peck, 1995).

In the area of academic progress, Waldron, Cole, and Majd (2001) report that more students without disabilities made comparable or greater gains in math and reading when taught in inclusive settings versus traditional classrooms where no students with disabilities are included. This suggests that inclusive classrooms provide greater access to the general education curriculum that benefits all students. Further evidence for the positive effects of inclusion on students without disabilities is reported by McGregor and Vogelsberg (1998). They found:

- inclusion does not compromise general education students’ outcomes,
- typical peers benefit from involvement and relationships with students who have disabilities in inclusive settings, and
- the presence of students with disabilities in general education classrooms leads to new learning opportunities for typical students.
Making Inclusion Work

Recognition that inclusion benefits both students with and without disabilities has led to research that seeks to define the necessary contexts, instructional practices, and curricular efforts that result in improved learner outcomes. Some of this research, especially for students with high incidence disabilities, is well documented and its effectiveness clearly established. For students with low incidence disabilities, the body of empirical evidence is smaller but favors inclusive settings with its use of strategies such as varied instructional arrangements and peer supports.

**Peer Mediated Instruction & Intervention:** The use of peer mediated instruction and intervention is often cited in the literature as one of the most effective strategies for inclusive classrooms. In several studies focused on students with mild disabilities, the use of peer-mediated strategies results in improved academic outcomes for all students including those considered at-risk academically (Sailor, 2002). In a review of the literature, Fisher, Shumaker, and Deshler (1995) reported significant increases in reading, spelling, math, social studies, and other academic indicators for studies investigating the use of class-wide peer tutoring models (CWPT) where students serve as tutors and tutees in acquiring basic academic skills and factual knowledge. Positive outcomes are accrued when training for tutors is emphasized and in some cases, results in large effect on student outcomes (Stenhoff & Lignugaris/Kraft, 2007). Increases for both elementary and high school aged students were noted.

Specifically for students with moderate to severe disabilities, CWPT has also shown to result in increased levels of engagement and academic responses as well as academic gains. Dawson and colleagues investigated the effects of CWPT for students with intellectual disabilities and their typical peers in general education classrooms. Results showed increases in spelling accuracy as well as greater levels of engagement with typical peers and a decrease in competing behaviors when compared to teacher-led instruction (Dawson, Delquadri, Greenwood, Hamilton, Ledford, Mortweet, Reddy, Utley, & Walker, 1999). Similar outcomes were reported by McDonnell and colleagues in a study that focused on the use of CWPT along with a multi-element curriculum and accommodations for students with severe disabilities (McDonnell, Mathot-Buckner, Thorson, & Fister, 2001).

More recent studies modeled after CWPT investigated the use of Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) as a method for improving academic outcomes for students with high incidence disabilities and struggling typical peers. Features of PALS include reciprocal tutoring
roles, opportunities to respond and experience success, structured activities, and supplemental practice of skills taught in the core curriculum. Fifteen years of pilot studies, component analyses, and large-scale experiments have shown improvement in the reading achievement of low, average, and high achieving students including those with high incidence disabilities (McMaster, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2007). In the large-scale field studies involving second through sixth grade classrooms, effect sizes of .22 to .56 were reported when compared to classrooms using a traditional teacher led approach to reading. Furthermore, Fuchs and his colleagues report greater social acceptance for students with learning disabilities in classrooms using PALS presumably due to the greater level of reciprocal engagement of those settings (Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes & Martinez, 2002).

In addition to the structured use of tutoring arrangements, the successful use of peers as supports in inclusive classrooms has also been documented for students with low incidence disabilities. In a study investigating the effects of peer delivered self-monitoring strategies on middle school students with significant disabilities, results showed an increase in percentages of occurrence across eleven identified academic survival skills for all students (Gilberts, Agran, Hughes & Wehmeyer, 2001). The role of peer training is a critical feature in the effective use of peer-mediated instruction. Two studies investigated the issue of contribution of peers to the generalization of social behaviors for elementary students with autism. In both studies, increases in social interaction with typical peers were noted with greater generalization of skills observed from groups with trained peers and less from groups with untrained or stranger peers (Kamps, Royer, Dugan, Kravits, Gonzalez-Lopez, Garcia, Carnazzo, Morrison, & Garrison Kane, 2002).

Peer support interventions are also emerging as an effective alternative to traditional paraprofessional support models for students with low incidence disabilities (Carter, Cushing, Clark & Kennedy, 2005). Several descriptive studies have documented the disengagement of teachers when a one-on-one paraprofessional service delivery is used (Giangreco, Broer & Edelman, 2001). Since the level of engagement and sense of ownership that general educators have with students with disabilities is a critical factor to success in inclusive classrooms, other support strategies must be explored. Cushing and Kennedy (1997) trained typical peers to adapt class activities, provide frequent feedback, and promote communication among other support strategies for three students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms. Results indicated that serving as a peer support resulted in higher levels of engagement for students without disabilities which is consistent with previous studies employing peer-mediated techniques. This challenges the assumption that having a typical peer support a student with a disability takes away from their participation in the classroom. In looking for optimal configurations, Carter and colleagues studied the effect of
of using two peers in a support role for students with severe disabilities. Data from the investigation showed an increase in social interaction as well as an increase in the amount of time students with disabilities were engaged in activities aligned with the general curriculum (Carter, Cushing, Clark & Kennedy, 2005). In these peer support arrangements, the paraprofessional’s role is broadened and shifts to providing guidance and support to the students serving as a peer support (Carter, Cushing & Kennedy, 2008).

**Instructional & Curriculum Adaptations:** Instructional and curriculum adaptations can be conceptualized in two categories. **Routine** adaptations include the use of varied grouping arrangements, materials, and goals while **specialized** adaptations are those made above and beyond routine ones that are in direct response to specific challenges faced by students (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998). Weymer and colleagues use the term *curriculum augmentations* to refer to efforts to augment or expand the general education curriculum to provide additional skills or strategies that help students succeed (Wehmeyer, Lance, & Bashinski, 2002). Research on curriculum and instructional adaptations that support students with disabilities in general education classrooms is varied.

For students with learning disabilities, many studies describe instructional methods that extend the typical adaptations and help to promote progress in the core content areas for all students (including those without disabilities). These include graphic or advanced organizers, self-regulation strategies, semantic maps, mnemonics, chunking, questioning, and visualizing strategies (Baker, Gersten, & Scanlon, 2002). Swanson and Hoskyn (2001) also confirmed the use of advanced organizers as an effective strategy for positively influencing student performance. The use of content enhancement routines, a type of advanced organizer, was shown to have dramatic results for students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms where the average unit quiz grade increased by ten percentage points (Lenz, Schumaker, Deshler, Boudah, Vance, Kissam, Bulgren, & Roth, 1993).

In addition to these, strategy instruction (teaching students how to learn) has been shown to improve academic achievement across grade levels for both students with and without disabilities (Fisher, Shumaker, & Deshler, 1995). Other techniques that have resulted in improved learner outcomes in inclusive classrooms include the use of materials other than grade level textbooks in the area of social studies (Gersten, Baker, Smith-Johnson, Dimino, & Peterson, 2006) and employing an inquiry-based approach to science with a focus on varied ways of communicating learning (Pulincsar, Magnusson, Collins, & Cutter, 2001).
In contrast to the vast array of evidence for the effects of adaptations for students with learning disabilities, research has recently begun to emerge related to the implementation of curriculum accommodations and modifications for students with significant disabilities (Fisher & Frey, 2001). For example, there are few studies examining the use of strategies such as graphic organizers for students with severe disabilities in inclusive classrooms. In a review of the literature, Lee and colleagues found no studies applying techniques such as chunking and mnemonics while many studies examined self-directed learning strategies such as choice making. However, very few of those studies were conducted in academic content areas (Lee, Amos, Gragoudas, Lee, Shogren, & Theoharis, 2006).

Historically, the focus of research on instructional strategies for students with severe disabilities has been on “functional life skills” that were taught outside of the general education curriculum (Soukup, Wehmeyer, Bashinski, & Bovaird, 2007). Browder and Cooper-Duffy (2003) report that less than 10% of studies with students with severe disabilities focused on academics, with some research showing success in functional academics and access skills in general education environments. Clearly, the use of curriculum adaptations such as content specific modifications is necessary for the successful inclusion of students with severe disabilities. While there is ample descriptive literature of methods and examples for making adaptations for these students, there is limited empirical evidence to date (Fisher & Frey, 2001).

Some descriptive studies investigated how students with severe disabilities access the core curriculum in general education classrooms. Salisbury and colleagues found that modifying curriculum based on students’ IEPs resulted in successful physical, social, and instructional inclusion of students with mild to severe disabilities in kindergarten through fourth grade (Salisbury, Mangino, Petrigala, Rainforth, Syryca, & Palombaro, 1994). More recently, Fisher and Frey (2001) describe the experience of three students (elementary, middle, and high) with significant disabilities and the supports/services necessary for them to access the core curriculum in general education classrooms. The prominent use of individualized, content specific modifications and accommodations were noted for all students. Examples of these individualized content specific modifications included reading picture books, having a picture communication symbol version of a textbook chapter, and unit vocabulary added to a student’s speech output device.

Soukup and colleagues (2007) also examined the use of adaptations for students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms as well as the relationship between access to the general education curriculum and classroom variables. Researchers found that students with

For students with severe disabilities:
- Less than 10% of studies focused on academics
- Research on the implementation of adaptations is just emerging
- Current evidence shows limited use of accommodations and modifications for students with severe disabilities
- Presence of modifications increases academic responding and decreases competing behavior
severe disabilities worked on grade level standards in 60% of the intervals and worked on standards linked to any grade for 20% of the intervals. Curriculum adaptations (changes to content representation, presentation, or student engagement) were observed in 18% of the intervals with no observations of curriculum augmentations (learning-to-learn strategies). In terms of classroom variables, large and small group instructional arrangements were predictive of greater access to the general education curriculum. Soukup and her colleagues conclude that students receiving instruction in general education were significantly more likely to be working on activities linked to the general education standards, although they were doing so without the types of adaptations that research suggests is critical for making progress (Soukup, Wehmeyer, Bashinski, & Bovaird, 2007). Following up on this work, Lee, Wehmeyer, Soukup, and Palmer (2010) studied the impact of curriculum modifications on student and teacher behaviors. Researchers observed 45 students with a range of disabilities and found that the presence of curriculum modifications predicted increased student engagement and decreased competing behaviors that would disrupt learning. In addition, the presence of modifications also resulted in teachers engaging in fewer management behaviors.

**Collaborative Practices:** The inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms necessitates collaboration between administrators, general educators, special educators, parents, and related service providers in order to deliver quality services to all students. In a survey to experts in the field of severe disabilities, Jackson and colleagues reported that collaboration was often cited as a foundation to the implementation of inclusive education (Jackson, Ryndak, & Billingsley, 2000). In many schools, collaboration takes the form of co-teaching where a general and special educator work together to deliver instruction to students with and without disabilities.

In a meta-synthesis of 32 qualitative studies, Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007) found that teachers generally supported co-teaching but the instructional techniques employed did not necessarily reflect prevailing best practices in the literature. The predominant model of co-teaching was “one teach, one assist” even though this is not a highly recommended practice in that the special educator often plays a subordinate role. In addition, evidence-based practices such as peer mediated and strategy instruction were infrequently observed. Some quantitative studies do exist that document the efficacy of co-teaching. Murawski and Swanson (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of this research and found only six studies worthy of the report. Results from these studies indicated an overall effect size of .40 on academic achievement, social outcomes, attitudes, absences, and referrals. Findings from both the qualitative and quantitative

---

**Research on co-teaching:**
- A few studies document moderate effect size for student outcomes
- Qualitative studies show predominance of “one teach, one assist” which is not considered highly recommended
- Infrequent observations of specialized adaptations
investigations suggests that co-teaching currently falls short of realizing its potential for delivering quality services to students in general education classrooms.

Collaboration among teachers and related service providers is also a critical factor in implementing effective inclusive education. Soto and colleagues found that general educators who have regular opportunities to collaborate and consult with professional peers show evidence of increased instructional skills as well as decreased tendencies to make referrals to special education (Soto, Müller, Hunt, & Goetz, 2001). Two studies by Hunt and colleagues further document the effectiveness of collaboration as a strategy for improving student outcomes in inclusive settings. In both studies, researchers document the successful teaming of teachers, related service providers, and parents in implementing support plans for students with severe disabilities and typical peers considered academically at-risk. Teams met on a monthly basis to delineate specific instructional adaptations and support strategies for students. Consistent implementation of these plans resulted in increases in academic skills, engagement in class activities, interactions with peers, and student-initiated interactions for all students (Hunt, Doering, Hirose-hatae, Maier, & Goetz, 2001; Hunt, Soto, Maier, & Doering, 2003).

Room to Grow

Reframing Inclusion: As the language of inclusive education has evolved from mainstreaming to integration to inclusion, so too has the practice. Mainstreaming operated on the notion of readiness for general education while integration focused on the enhancement of students’ social development. From a legislative, moral, and efficacy standpoint, the general education classroom is now the placement of choice for students with disabilities. These earlier descriptors of inclusion clearly framed it as a special education issue. In other words, it was about the separateness of special education versus belongingness with general education (Sailor, 2002).

Researchers and advocates of inclusion have placed a considerable amount of focus on meeting students’ needs through individualized instruction and adaptations of the general education curriculum for students with disabilities (Spooner, Baker, Harris, Ahrlgrim-Delzell, & Browder, 2007). Thus, special educators are typically responsible for retrofitting lessons (e.g., modifying the curriculum, providing intervention, teaching remedial skills) that have been designed by the general education teacher. So while general and special education may have a shared agenda, to a certain extent, the “separateness of special education” still exists.
Reframing the issue of inclusion by using the larger rubric of “universal design” may indeed move the practice so that it “belongs to general education.”

The universal design concept assumes high standards for all students and serves as a “blueprint for creating flexible goals, methods, materials, and assessments that accommodate learner differences” (Rose, 2001). The underlying premise of universal design is that teachers should plan instructional supports during the beginning of lesson planning instead of modifying materials as an afterthought (Hitchcock, 2001). In applying this concept, the burden shifts from the individual to the curriculum and curriculum design. Reframing the issue of inclusion in this way takes a sustainable approach to instruction where diversity is considered the norm and should be anticipated in all aspects of instruction and learning.

**Shaping Attitudes:** “Inclusion is a philosophy that urges schools, neighborhoods, and communities to welcome and value everyone, regardless of differences. Central to the philosophy of inclusion are the beliefs that everyone belongs, diversity is valued, and we can all learn from each other” (Renzaglia, Karvonen, Drasgow & Stoxen, 2003). Holding such an attitude can greatly impact the participation of students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. According to a study conducted by Robertson, Chamberlain, and Kasari (2003), when teachers have positive perceptions of their relationship with students with disabilities, the students’ behavior problems were reported to be lower, and the students were more socially included with peers. Prater (2003) also identified teacher attitudes as one of several elements that are critical in promoting the success of students with disabilities in general education settings.

**Survey of Principals:**
- Experience and exposure to special education concepts resulted in positive attitudes
- Principals holding a positive attitude were more likely to place students in less restrictive settings

In addition to the role that teacher attitudes play in the success of inclusive classrooms, it is widely acknowledged that an inclusive school culture begins with the committed leadership of principals. Praisner (2003) examined principals’ attitudes toward inclusion including their placement perceptions. Out of 408 principals surveyed, only one in five held positive attitudes toward inclusion. Factors that were associated with positive attitudes included experiences with students with disabilities and exposure to special education concepts. Furthermore, principals who had positive attitudes were more likely to place students in less restrictive settings. Clearly, teacher and administrator attitudes are critical factors that shape the experiences of students with disabilities. These findings hold particular implications for personnel supporting and providing technical assistance to teachers and staff. Efforts aimed at providing teachers and administrators with meaningful contact with people with disabilities as well as information on special education concepts makes a difference in the quality of students’ educational programming.
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