

HOW DO A REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER AND A
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER FUNCTION FULL-TIME
WITHIN AN INCLUSION CLASSROOM?

Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the
Department of Education and Human Development
State University of New York
College at Brockport
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Education

by

Lois Ann Grimes
State University of New York
College at Brockport
Brockport, New York

August 1997

SUBMITTED BY:

Lois Ann Grimes 7/28/97
Lois Ann Grimes Date

APPROVED BY:

Arthur E. Smith 7/29/97
Arthur E. Smith Date
Thesis Advisor

Gerald L. Begy 7/29/97
Gerald L. Begy Date
Second Reader

Patricia E. Baker 7/29/97
Patricia E. Baker Date
Director of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate how two third-grade teachers, a regular and a special education teacher, worked together in an inclusion classroom in a rural Western New York elementary school. The data were examined through qualitative analysis of transcribed protocols obtained by the researcher from observations of the teachers in their classroom.

The findings revealed patterns of the classroom teachers which enabled the two teachers to work together in an inclusion classroom. It was concluded that time and care was taken in planning, instruction, the physical layout of the room, curriculum goals and modifications, behavior management, and grading and evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I	
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Research Question.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Need for the Study.....	4
Definitions.....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	7
CHAPTER II	
Review of the Literature.....	8
School Reform.....	8
Social Aspects.....	9
Teaching Environment.....	11
Support of Inclusion.....	12
Team/Co-teaching.....	13
Potential Barriers.....	14
Modifications.....	14
CHAPTER III	
Design of the Study.....	16
Purpose.....	16
Research Question.....	16
Methodology.....	16
Subjects.....	16
Materials.....	17
Procedures.....	17
Analysis of Data.....	17
CHAPTER IV	
Analysis of Data.....	19
A Typical Day in an Inclusion Classroom.....	19
Patterns of the Classroom.....	26
Instructional Planning and Presentation.....	26
Physical Arrangement of the Classroom.....	28

Curriculum Goals and Modifications.....	28
Behavior Management.....	29
Grading and Evaluation.....	30

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Implications.....	31
Conclusions.....	31
Implications for Research.....	32
Implications for Teachers.....	32
Implications for Teachers' Training.....	33
References.....	34

CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to take a systematic look at a regular education teacher and a special education teacher who work together in an inclusion classroom and to investigate how they function within their classroom.

Research Question

How do a regular education teacher and a special education teacher function full-time within an inclusion classroom?

Introduction

Today there is a movement in public schools calling for students with learning disabilities and behavioral disorders to be included in regular education classrooms. Since 1975, with the passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), which required instruction to be carried out in the least restrictive environment, there have been many changes. Many questions have also been raised as to the best way to implement PL 94-142. Some districts interpreted this to mean segregated programs and resource programs, even though this was not the intent of the program. The disabled students were with the regular

education students for lunch, assemblies, and special classes such as physical education, music, and art. An outgrowth of PL 94-142 was mainstreaming, which:

referred to the partial or total integration of students into regular classrooms based on an individual's personal characteristics, capabilities, and educational needs. The decision to mainstream a student was made on an individualized basis with the intention of integrating students into regular classroom settings whenever possible. (Roberts & Mather, 1995, p. 47)

In the 1980s PL 94-142 was further bolstered by the passage of the Regular Education Initiative (REI). The idea was to "keep the children and adolescents in a regular classroom environment; address their academic and special education needs in a way that least isolates them from their peers; make these students feel less different" (Silver, 1991, p. 389). The aim was to improve the quality of learning opportunities for all students within the school community, regular education and special education students alike. Out of PL 94-142 and REI came the current movement of full inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular education classroom.

Currently special education is providing services to special education students placed in the regular education classroom. There are several options for setting up a program that integrates students of various levels. In some

schools, the special education students are included in a regular education classroom, with an aide, a consultant special education teacher, and resource pull-out programs to further supplement special education students. In other schools a regular education teacher team teaches with a special education teacher. The two teachers "work as a team, bringing skills, attitudes, competencies, and expertise to the learning environment" (Cole, 1992, p. 1). A third method of this integration is a combination of the above approaches to meet the individualized needs of these students. Decisions regarding which method is best for students should be made on an individual basis to create an educational setting in which all students work together.

Need for the Study

In today's public schools there is a movement to include students who have been classified by the Committee of Special Education in the least restrictive environment possible, the regular education classroom, as mandated by Public Law 94-142. When these students are placed in the heterogeneous regular education classroom it is important for teachers to

plan and to work together cooperatively. In order for this to happen, support is necessary from administration, parents, and more importantly each other. This study examined an inclusion third grade classroom.

Definitions

Learning Disabled (LD) These students have a psychological processing disorder that causes them to have a problem in understanding or using language. A child who is learning disabled has difficulty listening, thinking, speaking, reading, writing, or doing arithmetic. This child is learning at less than the level expected for him or her in that subject or skill area. A learning disability is not primarily due to a physical, mental, or emotional disability or to environmental, cultural, or economic reasons (A Parent's Guide to Special Education: Your Child's Right to an Education in New York State, 1994).

Least Restrictive Environment The placement situation for disabled students which is the most normal, least confining, and closeness of school programs to home based on the student's particular needs and problems (A Parent's Guide to Special Education: Your Child's Educational Rights in New York State, 1994).

Public Law 49-142 The aim of the law is to ensure a free and appropriate public education for all children. The provisions are: children should be educated in the least

restrictive environment, each disabled child should have an individual education plan (IEP), and evaluation procedures should be nondiscriminatory (A Parent's Guide to Special Education: Your Child's Educational Rights in New York State, 1994).

Inclusion Inclusion is the education of all special education students in the regular classroom for a majority of the school day. A special education teacher attends classes with these students. The special education teacher is responsible for the modification of materials and curricula to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities. In many cases, the special education teacher assumes the role of co-teacher with the regular education teacher. This collaborative relationship places the responsibility for educating all students on both teachers in the classroom (Cosden, 1990).

NOTE: Inclusion is further defined in each school district by its interpretation.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations should be considered when considering the findings of this study. The total number of subjects in this study is small. The study takes an indepth look at two teachers who work together in an inclusion classroom. Since only two teachers are the subjects of this study it is also limited as far as demographics. The results are valid in this rural school district and the findings may vary in other districts.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

School Reform

Public Law 94-142 clearly states that everyone has a right to education and it should be of equal quality to all in the least restrictive environment possible (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; York, Doyle & Kronberg, 1994). The aim is to integrate children with disabilities with the necessary supports they need into the general classroom with nondisabled peers (Friend & Cook, 1993). Monahan, Marino, and Miller (1996) state that the term inclusion is used by the education reform movement to challenge schools to the philosophy that all students can learn, even those with disabilities. Inclusion has an underlying belief that accommodations and supports must be provided to meet each child's needs (Meikemp & Russell, 1996).

Recently there has been a movement in school reform towards serving the needs of children with learning disabilities in the regular classroom rather than a self-contained classroom or pull-out programs (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Forlin, 1995; Gormley & McDermott, 1994; Lombardi, Nuzzo, Kennedy & Foshay, 1994). The aim is to adapt instruction to meet the needs of all children within the

regular classroom. This reform is seen as an attempt to improve the quality of learning opportunities for all students involved regardless of ability (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Whinnery, King, Evans & Gable, 1995).

Social Aspects

It has been asserted that students, regardless of ability, who are in the general classrooms have a higher self-concept. Findings revealed that students have improved social and behavior skills, and have improved academic performance (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Siegel & Jausovec, 1994). The placement of all students in regular classrooms provides opportunities for cooperative learning, peer instructional strategies to be utilized by all, improved motivation, reduced stigma for students with disabilities, and the chance to think of others as well as themselves (Banerji & Dailey, 1995; Gormley & McDermott, 1994). As concluded by Banerji and Dailey (1995) students of normal achieving ability and students with learning disabilities develop at a comparable pace in academic areas such as reading as well as affective areas.

A peer sociability survey was conducted by Madge, Affleck, and Lowenbraun (1990) among third, fourth, and fifth grade students. It was concluded that students in an integrated classroom model (ICM) had a highly significant

test-retest correlation of being picked by their peers than students in a pull-out resource mainstream classroom.

Madge, Affleck, and Lowerbraun (1990) used an ICM for students with learning disabilities and a regular classroom with resource room support for those students having learning disabilities to conduct their peer socialibility survey. Class pictures of each student were placed on a table in the order that each student sat in his/her respective class. Each student was called individually in random order and was told: "Pretend (teacher's name) gave you five stickers to hand out to five members of your class. Give me the pictures of the five class members you would select" (p. 441). This procedure was continued until all of the students were chosen. The choices were numbered one through the total number on a separate class list for each student. The numbers were then added together for each student to obtain a score to indicate where each student was ranked in the class. The tests were conducted twice over a five month period, May and December for two years and in May for the third year. The results concluded that while the special education students had lower social status than their non-special education peers, the students in the ICM had a higher social status than those who went out to a resource room.

Teaching Environment

Teachers in heterogeneous classrooms face the challenge of keeping all students engaged in meaningful learning activities. Self, Benning, Marston, and Magnusson (1991) determined that through the use of cooperative and collaborative learning, a supportive learning environment can accommodate all students and offer teachers a unique strategy for managing instruction in the heterogeneous classroom. "The project findings indicate that cooperative teaching is one effective intervention for providing service to high-risk students in the regular classroom" (p. 33).

O'Connor and Jenkins (1993) and Miller and Savage (1995) found that students who are more capable or better informed may enable the lower achieving students by assisting with interpretation of instructions, giving feedback and or correction, provide encouragement, and help them to go beyond their limits of what they could achieve on their own as long as guidelines were established. Collaboration and cooperation of the teachers can facilitate joint ownership of the special needs and problems presented by students within the inclusion classroom (Cosden, 1990). Johnson, Pugach, and Devlin (1990) concur that collaboration can enhance a supportive system within the classroom by allowing teachers the freedom to access each other's expertise to solve problems.

Support of Inclusion

For the implementation of the concept of inclusion to take place, parents, teachers, administrators, and any related staff must accept the program (Monahan, Marino & Miller, 1996). Administration needs to provide continuous in-service support and workshops focusing on attitudes and increasing these skills that enable teachers to work effectively with students of the inclusion classroom (Miller & Savage, 1995; Monahan, Marino & Miller, 1996; Siegel & Jausovec, 1994).

Siegel and Jausovec (1994) conducted a survey of teachers who had participated in in-service training on special education inclusion. Teachers reported a 95% better understanding of inclusion, a 100% better understanding of modifications, and a 95% better understanding of collaboration as well as more acceptance of inclusion students. Success in the inclusion classroom not only depends on the students, but also on teachers working and planning as a team to be facilitators of knowledge as well as presenters. Lessons may frequently be planned for all students to use manipulatives to allow students to demonstrate knowledge in varied ways (Rainforth, 1992).

Team/Co-teaching

"Co-teaching is the collaboration between a regular classroom teacher and a special educator for all teaching responsibilities of a classroom of students with and without disability" (Gately & Gately, 1993, p. 4). "Teachers must work as a team, bringing skills, attitudes, competencies, and expertise to the learning environment. Ownership must be shared, and the school must be viewed as a 'whole' school" (Cole, 1992, p. 1).

It is important to remember that with collaboration or co-teaching the ownership of the children's problems doesn't belong to the regular education teacher or to the special education teacher, but to both teachers who are working toward common goals (Codsens, 1990). Educators in this situation can operate as a professional team to jointly plan, teach, and remediate any problems with their comprehensive skills (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989).

The constant social interaction and modeling of the co-teachers, as they share, cooperate, make jokes, solve problems and make decisions, is an effective technique for teaching the kinds of social skills that are imperative for the full integration of students with disability in the mainstream. (Gately & Gately, 1993, p. 4)

Collaborative teaching not only has benefits for the students, but it also has benefits for the teachers. The social interaction between two professionals provides increased

feelings of worth, renewal, and partnership for both teachers (Gately & Gately, 1993). Cole (1992) asserts regular education teachers are "knowledgeable about curriculum and are skilled and experienced in large group management skills" (p. 8) while special education teachers "have expertise in targeting areas of difficulty with respect to student learning and behavior and have the skills necessary to adapt and analyze instructional materials and strategies" (p. 8).

Potential Barriers

Bauwens, Hourcade, and Friend (1989) state potential barriers to this style of teaching may be time, lack of cooperation, and increased workload. The obstacle of time can be overcome by regularly scheduled planning times, especially at the onset of team teaching. Concerns involving cooperation during the first year may be alleviated by training in cooperative teaching, experience, and the development of guidelines which will aid teachers in becoming more comfortable with team teaching. Teachers may have a perception of increased workload, which will diminish as experience with team teaching increases.

Modifications

Meikemp and Russell (1996), and Whinnery, King, Evans, and Gable (1995) state that in order for inclusion to be effective, communication between regular and special

education teachers is important. To implement inclusive programs in regular classrooms, appropriate adaptations for learning disabled students must be in place. Modifications for many learning disabled students may include allowing students extra time to complete assignments, open ended activities, role playing, use of manipulatives, concrete experiences, and the use of peer tutoring (Brady & Boyer, 1994; Robert & Mather, 1995).

For the policy of inclusion to be equitable this requires educators to ensure that all children, regardless of ability, achieve to potential when educated in the regular classroom. To fulfill this aim a teacher needs to be committed to providing a range of abilities within the regular classroom. (Forlin, 1995, p. 184)

Parents and teachers concur that the best reason for inclusion of the learning disabled students in the regular classroom is for more individualized attention for all students and enhanced self-esteem for all involved. Critics suggest there may be some less desirable implications of inclusion. They suggest there could be lack of sufficient planning time for teachers, the possibility of insensitivity of some the regular students towards the learning disabled students, and instructional and curriculum may be lowered (Lombardi, Nuzzo, Kennedy & Foshay, 1994; Riley, 1992; Silver, 1991).

CHAPTER III

Design of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to take a systematic look at a regular education teacher and a special education teacher who work together in an inclusion classroom and to investigate how they function within their classroom.

Research Question

How do a regular education teacher and a special education teacher function full-time within an inclusion classroom?

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects of this study were a third grade regular education teacher and a third grade special education teacher who team teach in a rural elementary school in Western New York. The ratio of learning disabled students to regular education students is 10:14 with an age range of eight to nine years.

The regular education teacher has had 31 years of teaching experience with the last three years in the inclusion classroom. The special education teacher has had eight years

of teaching experience; one year of high school resource room, four years in a self-contained special education room (15:1) for second to fifth grade students, and three years in an inclusion classroom.

Prior to the onset of the inclusion classroom these teachers made visits to existing inclusion classrooms. After starting their own inclusion classroom these teachers had been allowed to attend numerous conferences and workshops to further aid the development and refinement of their own classroom and to help understand their students.

Materials

The researcher used observations and transcribed notes to carry out the study and to aid in the formation of information.

Procedures

The researcher was a participant observer within the classroom on six full days over a period of six weeks. She gathered data by transcribed notes on lesson planning, lesson implementation, interactions between teachers, interactions among students and teachers, and problem solving within the classroom. The building principal was contacted to solicit his permission and cooperation.

Analysis of Data

Data were collected at each visit with information recorded and transcribed on paper. The data were analyzed qualitatively to look for consistent patterns of teacher behavior, how problems were solved, how goals evolved, the planning and sharing of responsibility, and both team and individual teaching.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to take a systematic look at a regular education teacher and a special education teacher who work together in an inclusion classroom and to investigate how they function within their classroom. The research question for this study was:

How do a regular education teacher and a special education teacher function full-time within an inclusion classroom?

A Typical Day in an Inclusion Classroom

The two teachers arrived approximately 30 minutes before the students started coming to the classroom. Sherry (the special education teacher) and Sally (the regular education teacher) took time to look at the daily plans. Sally wrote the spelling words for the week on the blackboard for students to check off in their spelling workbooks. Sherry said, "Sally, I'm going to photocopy some of the assignments for the rest of the week. Do you need anything copied?" Sally replies, "No, I think I'm set." Sherry went and arrived back just as the class was slowly arriving.

Sherry had written a math multiplication problem on the board for the students to work on as they arrive. "Class be sure you start solving the problem on the board" stated Sherry as she took out the attendance cards and lunch slip. "I need everyone seated so I can take attendance and do the lunch count." Sally walked around the classroom and checked on the students' progress on the math problem and gave hints or asked questions where needed. Announcements were on and the class quieted down to listen and stood to say the pledge when the announcements were finished. Sherry announced the leader for the day and he took the attendance and lunch count to the office.

Sherry started going over the math problem. "How many people were able to solve the problem? Good, I'm glad to see so many of you were able to solve it. Who would like to share what your answer was and how you solved it? Amanda, what did you get for an answer?" Amanda stood at her seat and gave her answer and explained how she solved it. Sally, who had been walking around the classroom, asked "Did anyone else solve it another way?" Several hands were raised. Two more students were called on to solve the problem. Sherry explained to the class that it isn't necessary to solve a problem just one way. "Some of you may draw pictures, some may use repeated addition, and others may use

multiplication to solve the problem. It makes no difference how it is solved as long as you are able to get the correct answer. Does anyone have any questions?"

The class got ready to take a money test for math. Sally was getting the test out along with the bubble sheets for their answers. Sherry drew pictures of items that could be bought at the school pencil store on the board and puts prices under each one. Sherry reminded students to "face the front of the class and not to talk because the review will help everyone." The students are asked various questions of what they could and couldn't buy if they had a certain amount of money. Students were asked which operation they needed to use to solve the problem and which number would go on top if they were subtracting. Sally noticed a group was chatting and walked around to see what was going on. The students stopped talking as they saw her approaching. The review was over and both teachers handed out the test. The students were reminded to take their time and do their best. Questions that were written were read to the entire class first and another wasn't read until everyone had finished. As students raised their hands indicating they had finished they were given their bubble sheet to complete. If the majority of the class had finished the test and a few

remained, they were asked to hand their test in and told they would be given additional time later.

It was then time for reading groups. Any seat work was explained and handed out before reading started. There were six reading groups and each teacher handled three. The students who weren't in a reading group had seat work to complete, any unfinished math assignment, and computer time for writing or math reinforcement. The computer time was done with partners most of the time. "Students are homogeneously grouped for reading to give small group attention to each level of reading and for skills," stated Sherry.

The first reading group was called and people at the computers were told "to settle and get to work." Sherry reminded her group to use some of the strategies they had learned as they read. Sally was discussing the story they read and moved on to skill pages. As the reading group students continued to work, the students at their seats were reminded to quiet down and to finish their seat work. The first reading group was finished and it was time for library. Both teachers walked the students to library, one at the front of the line and one at the back of the line. Before going back to the room they checked their mailboxes for messages and mail.

Once back in the room, Sally checked the late box and started correcting the late work, and Sherry started correcting the work that had been turned in for the day. Sherry wrote a note to a parent about coming in for a birthday party after she checked with Sally to confirm the day and time. Sally finished the late work corrections and said "Oh, I'm behind" and hurried out of the door to deliver social studies grades to the other third grade classrooms. Sherry looked at the clock and told Sally, "I'll pick the class up at the library so don't rush."

When the class came back to the room they were reminded to take a quick bathroom break, get their snacks, and two students were sent after the juice and milk. Sally told the computer group to "remember you need to keep working on your writing today and don't forget to save your work." The second reading group was called and then the third following the same procedures. It seemed automatic to the class because the students got ready without being told.

Reading groups were over and it was time for spelling. "Class get your spelling workbooks out and be ready with the first page you have been working on." The words were read out loud and then spelled. "Do you notice anything about the spelling words this week? Can you find a pattern?" asks Sherry. Ricky raised his hand and said, "The words are in the

past and they add ed to each word." "Good, I'm glad to see you remember what the past tense is. What part of speech do they belong to?" Becky cautiously raised her hand and said, "verbs." "You've done great. Don't forget to finish writing your spelling words three times each and the five sentences" reminded Sally. It was then time to wash up for lunch. On the way to the cafeteria the class was reminded to be quiet.

After lunch Sherry read to the class for 15 minutes while the students took a bathroom break. It was then time for social studies. The students were divided among the five third-grade classrooms and rotated every five weeks to cover all of the content area. Each third grade teacher covered a particular area of the third grade curriculum. When students from other third grade classrooms arrived, Sally began the lesson on the the cold lands unit (Alaska, The North Pole, Norway, and Finland). In this classroom, team teaching was used to cover the cold lands. Sally introduced the unit and Sherry read the trade books to the students. Both teachers covered the expository text and continually helped students understand the material presented. The classes was dismissed back to their respective classrooms.

It was then time for English. The students were told to "please take out your books and turn to page 215. We've done this in spelling so it shouldn't be difficult for you." The

students opened their books and saw the lesson was on singular and plural nouns. A discussion was carried on the difference between singular and plural nouns, how they were formed, and examples were done. The assignment was given and students were reminded to put their name on their paper and number each sentence. Sherry walked around the room handing out paper and Sally was checking to make sure everyone had gotten started. Sherry called a small group of students to a table to give reinforcement, and Sally was walking around to give help where needed and to answer questions. Students turned in the assignment as they finished. "If you are finished make sure you have all of your other work finished for the day. If you have finished you may use this time to read silently until freetime."

The last 20 minutes of the day was used as freetime for those who have finished all of their work and as a time to reteach or give extra help where needed for any student who needed it. It was also a time to help students with any social study assignments they had received from other classrooms.

It was then time for the students to go home. "Walkers may get their backpacks and line up quietly at the door. First bus students may get their backpacks and log on to the computers. Second bus students may get their backpacks and check the room and log on the computers after first bus

students leave." Sherry took two students down on the elevator daily because they couldn't use the stairs. All of the students have gone for the day and it was now time check the papers for the day. Each teacher took her own reading group papers, Sally took English, and Sherry took math. Spelling was taken by whoever finished first. As papers were being corrected, it was noted as to who needed extra help the next day in any subject, who hadn't handed papers in, and if there was a problem with a majority of the class in any particular area. A check was done to see if changes needed to be made for the next day's schedule and both teachers went home.

Patterns Of The Classroom

Instructional Planning and Presentation

Great care was taken to meet the needs of the individual students of the class while making the class function as a cooperative group. The teachers took time on Friday before school started, while students were in special, and a final time at the end of the day to plan together before plans were turned in for the next week. The teachers also had a half day articulation time once a month in which two substitutes

were in the classroom while the teachers took instructional material and outlined plans for the following month.

Planning was a team effort.

The only times the students were separated into groups were for reading groups. This was done to accommodate the various levels of reading ability of the students within the classroom. Even though there were six groups within the classroom, distinctions were not drawn between groups. Both teachers shared ideas and openly communicated with each other. It was noticed that even though the groups were not using the same material at the same time, it did make its way through the different groups.

Sherry taught math and Sally taught English. Both teachers provided support for each other while the other was teaching. Eye contact and nods of heads were frequently noticed as teaching was being carried out as a nonverbal form of communication. Care was given to meet the needs of all students. It was not unusual to see one of the teachers with an individual student or small group giving more information or reinforcing what had just been taught. Team teaching was used to teach social studies and science. Plans were made together and both teachers covered the content of the subjects. Many times as one teacher finished a sentence the other added a comment or carried on where the other

had finished. Humor within the classroom was evident as well as open channels of communication between the teachers.

Physical Arrangements of the Classroom

The physical arrangement was a collaborative decision. Both teachers discussed at length the placement of their desks and the arrangement of the students' desks. The teachers' desks were placed facing each other and then moved side by side with a two foot space between them to enable them to face their students and to take up less space. There didn't appear to be any separate territory in the classroom but a joint ownership between the two teachers.

The students' desks were arranged in groups of four, then to long rows across the room, and finally to groups of six. The last arrangement allowed for the class to be interspersed within the groups as far as ability and gender. Each group had at least one student who was able to provide support and information to all within the group. The physical arrangement of the classroom contributed to the dynamics within the classroom.

Curriculum Goals and Modifications

Both teachers had a well developed understanding of the New York State Standards for third grade and followed it accordingly. Time and care was taken for instructional planning each day, week, and month to assure goals were set and met throughout the year.

Modifications for the disabled included: extended time for assignments or tests, shorter assignments, or assignments being copied where necessary. Sherry handled the modifications for the disabled students and discussed them briefly with Sally before hand. The modifications were accepted by the students without question.

Behavior Management

Behavior management was important within the classroom. Rules, expectations, and consequences, as well as rewards for students' behavior were the same for all students. Both teachers managed the students' behavior and seemed very comfortable supporting the others decision as their own. Attention was called to positive behavior as well as reminders of classroom rules and procedures when needed. If there was a need for an individualized behavior management plan, it was discussed and agreed upon before it was implemented within the classroom.

Grading and Evaluation

The standard by which the disabled student and the regular student were graded was the same but the point system was different for each. Both teachers corrected papers and put grades on the work, but Sally kept records of all grades except for the reading groups Sherry had. Both groups of students were graded excellent (E), good (G), satisfactory (S), needs improvement (N), and unsatisfactory (U). The point system between each group was different as is seen below:

Regular Student

100-94	E
93-88	G
87-80	S
79-75	N
74- 0	U

Disabled Student

100-90	E
89-80	G
79-70	S
69-65	N
64- 0	U

Accountability of assignments was stressed to all students, and a daily check list was kept of all assignments to aid in keeping students current and to check who had homework each night.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of this study was to take a systematic look at a regular education teacher and a special education teacher who work together in an inclusion classroom and to investigate how they function within their classroom to answer the following question:

1.) How do a regular education teacher and a special education teacher function full-time within an inclusion classroom?

Conclusions

From this investigation, it can be concluded that time and care in planning daily, weekly, and monthly helped two teachers work together with ease. The checking each day to be sure everything was ready made the two teachers function together almost as if they were one. At times, it appeared as if they could read each others minds by the way they spoke to students and moved within the classroom. The two teachers concern for the success of the class, as well as individuals was also evident in the time and patience given to those who needed the extra help, regardless of their abilities. It was also shown in the way modifications were handled quietly for those students who needed it and

accepted by the entire class. The regular education teacher and the special education teacher believed in the inclusion classroom and took the time to make it work to the best of their ability.

Implications for Research

This investigation answered the question above. In the future, research of this nature should be carried out for a longer period of time to see growth and change throughout the year by the teachers and by the students. Research is also needed from other school districts to draw parallels and distinctions in different demographic settings of the inclusion classroom. Another area of research that should be investigated would be a new inclusion classroom. Visits should be done periodically the first year, the second year, and the third year to assess the growth and change that takes place by the two teachers within the classroom. A final suggestion for future research is in teacher preparation programs. Since in the future most classrooms will probably include students with a variety of learning problems, research should be conducted into the level and type of preparation future teachers are given in inclusion and collaborative teaching.

Implications for Teachers

This research should call attention to all teachers to help meet the needs of every student. Disabled students are not the only in an inclusion classroom; often they are a part of the regular classroom for part of the day. Many times the disabled student may be a part of the regular classroom with the help of an aide or a special education teacher as a consultant. Staff development and professional communication are essential for the success of all in these situations.

All teachers and staff should be encouraged to participate in workshops and conferences to enhance their ability to meet the needs of all students within their classrooms. This could give teachers the confidence to deal with students who have disabilities within their classroom. The inclusion of disabled students within the regular classroom can encourage all students to accept the differences in others and develop respect for the differences. Teachers can be valuable role models for students.

Implications for Teachers' Training

Programs which prepare future teachers need to take into account that the roles of teachers in the future will be different than the roles of the past. The future teachers need

to prepare for collaboration and cooperation within the classroom of the regular education and special education teacher. The isolation of these teachers needs to be diminished to meet the needs of the future.

REFERENCES

- Banerji, M. & Dailey, R. (1995). A study of the effects of an inclusion model on students with specific learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, (28), 511-522.
- Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. Remedial and Special Education, 10, (22), 17-22.
- Brady, H. & Boyer, W. (1994). The impact of special needs students on teachers in the rural areas of British Columbia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390614)
- Cole, C. (1992). Collaboration: Research and practice. CASE Information Dissemination Packet. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 358 653)
- Cosden, M. (1990). Expanding the role of special education: Challenge of the next decade. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, (2), 4-7.
- Forlin, C. (1995). Educators' beliefs about inclusive practices in Western Australia. British Journal of Special Education, (22), (4), 179-185.
- Friend M. & Cook, L. (1993). Inclusion. Instructor, 103, (4), 52-56.
- Gately F. & Gately S. (1993). Developing a positive co-teaching environment: Meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 604)
- Gormley, K. & McDermott. (1994). Modifying primary grade classrooms for inclusion: Daryll's 3 years of Experience. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 556)

Johnson, L., Pugach, M., & Devlin S. (1990). Professional collaboration. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, (2), 9-11.

Lombardi, T., Nuzzo, D., Kennedy, K., & Foshay, J. (1994). Perceptions of parents, teachers, and students regarding an integrated inclusion program. The High School Journal, 77, (4), 315-321.

Madge S., Affleck, J., & Lowenbraun, S. (1990). Social effects of integrated classrooms and resource room/regular class placements in elementary students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23, (7), 439-445.

Meikemp, J. & Russell, S. (1996). Bridging the gap curricular adaptations rural regular educators are using for inclusion. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 770)

Miller, K. & Savage, L. (1995). Including general educators in inclusion. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 322)

Monahan, R., Marino, S., & Miller, R. (1996). Rural teachers' attitudes toward inclusion. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 775)

O'Connor, R. & Jenkins, J. (1993). Cooperative learning as an inclusion strategy: The experience of children with disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 778)

Rainforth, B. (1992). The effects of full inclusion on regular education teachers. Final report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 059)

Riley, M. (1992). If it looks like manure.... Phi Delta Kappan, 74, (3), 239-241.

Roberts, R. & Mather, N. (1995). The return of students with learning disabilities to regular classrooms: A sellout?. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 10, (1), 46-58.

Self, H., Benning, A., Marston, D., & Magnusson, D. (1991). Cooperative Teaching project: A model for students at risk. Exceptional Children, 58, (1), 26-34.

Siegel, J. & Jausovec, N. (1994). Improving teachers' attitudes toward students with disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 120)

Silver, L. (1991). The regular education initiative: A deja vu remembered with sadness and concern. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24, (7), 389-390.

Whinnery, K., King, M., Evans, W., & Gable, R. (1995). Perceptions of students with learning disabilities; Inclusion versus pull-out services. Preventing School Failure, 40, (1), 5-9.

York, J., Doyle M. B., & Kronberg, R. (1994). What makes educators facilitators of inclusion?. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 722)