

Research on Inclusive Education Fall 2011

Inclusive education is characterized by presumed competence, authentic membership, full participation, reciprocal social relationships, and learning to high standards by all students with disabilities in age-appropriate general education classrooms with supports provided to students and teachers to enable them to be successful. This document describes seminal policy statements, research articles, and reports that demonstrate the positive outcomes of inclusive education.

Access to General Education Curriculum:

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 states: “Congress finds the following:

Disability is a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of individuals to participate in or contribute to society. Improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities. Almost 30 years of research and experience has demonstrated that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by having high expectations for such children and ensuring their access to the general education curriculum in the regular classroom, to the maximum extent possible.

- Leaders in the field (e.g., Wehmeyer & Agran, 2006) identify the general education classroom as the optimal place where access to the general education curriculum occurs.
- The IEPs of students with disabilities who are included in general education classes are of higher quality; that is, they include goals and objectives that are more closely related to desired adult outcomes and roles than the IEPs of students with disabilities who are in segregated classes. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

Teacher Outcomes:

- Although many teachers are initially reluctant about inclusion, they become confident in their abilities with support and experience. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Support from other teachers is a powerful and necessary resource to empower teachers to problem-solve new instructional challenges. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

Negative effects of a secluded setting:

- No studies conducted since the late 1970s have shown an academic advantage for students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities educated in separate settings (Falvey, 2004).
- Poorer quality IEPs (Hunt & Farron-Davis, 1992)

- Lack of generalization to regular environments (Stokes & Baer, 1977)
- Disruption of opportunities for sustained interactions and social relationships with typical students (Strully & Strully, 1992)
- Decrease in the confidence that general class teachers have for teaching diverse learners (Giangreco et al., 1993)
- Absence of appropriate role and behavior models (Lovett, 1996)
- Negative impact on classroom climate and student attitudes about difference (Fisher, Sax, & Rodifer, 2000)

Benefits increase for students with and without disabilities:

- Students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities educated in general education classrooms demonstrate better performance in reading and math (Cole, Waldron, & Majd, 2004) and significantly higher gains in adaptive behavior when compared with students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities educated in separate settings.
- The largest, longitudinal study of education outcomes of 11,000 students with disabilities, the National Longitudinal Transition Study, showed that more time spent in a general education classroom was positively correlated with:
 - Higher scores on standardized tests of reading and math
 - Fewer absences from school
 - Fewer referrals for disruptive behavior
- Better outcomes after high school in the areas of employment and independent living (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Levine, & Garza, 2006).
- This positive correlation was found for all students with disabilities, regardless of their disability label, the severity of their disability, their gender, or their family's socio-economic status.
- There is an overall “added value” to the general education classroom of students with disabilities and their support resources. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- The performance of students without disabilities is not compromised by the presence of students with disabilities in their classrooms. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- There is a small-to-moderate beneficial effect of inclusive education on the academic and social outcomes of students with disabilities. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

Social:

- Students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities in inclusive had a higher likelihood to be identified as a member of a social network by peers without disabilities. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Students with disabilities demonstrate high levels of social interaction in settings with typical peers. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Social competence and communication skills improve when students with disabilities are educated in inclusive settings. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Students with disabilities have demonstrated gains in other areas of development when they are educated in inclusive settings, such as level of engagement, involvement in integrated activities, affective demeanor, and social interaction. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Typical students derive benefits from their involvement and relationships with students with disabilities. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- The presence of students with disabilities provides a catalyst for learning opportunities and experiences that might not otherwise be part of the curriculum, especially relating to social justice, prejudice, equity, and so forth. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

Parents:

- Parent support for inclusion is positively impacted by actual experience with inclusion, although experience alone does not shape attitudes. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)
- Parents of students with disabilities are looking for positive attitudes, good educational experiences, and acceptance of their child among educators. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

Cost:

- There is evidence to suggest that while start-up costs may initially increase the cost of inclusive services, the costs over time decrease, and are likely to be less than segregated forms of service delivery. (McGregor and Vogelsberg 1998)

REFERENCES

- Baker, E. T., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1994/1995). Synthesis of research: The effects of inclusion on learning. *Educational Leadership*, 52, 33–35.
- Beukelman, D., & Mirenda, P. (2005). *Augmentative and alternative communication: Management of severe communication disorders in children and adults (3rd Ed.)*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Blackorby, J., Chorost, M., Garza, N., & Guzman, A. (2003). The academic performance of secondary students with disabilities. In M. Wagner, C. Marder, J. Blackorby, R. Cameto, L. Newman, & P. Levine, et al. (2003), *The achievements of youth with disabilities during secondary school. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study – 2 (NLTS-2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Brinker, R.P., & Thorpe, M.E. (1984). Integration of severely handicapped students and the proportion of IEP objectives achieved. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 168-175.
- Broderick, A., & Kasa-Hendrickson, C. (2001). “Say just one word at first”: The emergence of reliable speech in a student labeled with autism. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 26(1), 13–24.
- Calculator, S., & Jorgensen, C. M. (1991). Integrating AAC instruction into regular education settings: Expounding on best practices. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 7, 204-212.
- Calculator, S., & Jorgensen, C. M. (1992). A technical assistance model for promoting integrated communication supports and services for students with severe disabilities. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 13(2), 99-110.
- Calculator, S., & Jorgensen, C. M. (1994). *Including students with severe disabilities in schools: Fostering communication, interaction, and participation*. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group, Inc.
- Cole, C.M., Waldron, N., & Majd, M. (2004). Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. *Mental Retardation*, 42,136-144.
- Falvey, M. (2004). Towards realizing the influence of “Toward realization of the least restrictive environments for severely disabled students.” *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 29(1), 9-10.
- Finke, E.H., McNaughton, D.B., & Drager, K.D. (2009). “All children can and should have the opportunity to learn”: General education teachers’ perspectives on inclusive children

with autism spectrum disorder who require AAC. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 25(2), 110-122.

Fisher, D. (1999). According to their peers: Inclusion as high school students see it. *Mental Retardation*, 37(6), 458-467.

Fisher, D., Sax, C., & Jorgensen, C. (1998). Philosophical foundations of inclusive, restructuring schools. In C. Jorgensen, *Restructuring schools for all students: Taking inclusion to the next level* (pp. 29-47). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.

Fisher, D., Sax, C., Rodifer, K., & Pumpian, I. (1999). Teachers' perspectives of curriculum and climate changes: Benefits of inclusive education. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 5, 256-268.

Fisher, M., & Meyer, L. (2002). Development and social competence after two years for students enrolled in inclusive and self-contained educational programs. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 27, 165-174.

Fryxell, D., & Kennedy, C. 11. (1995). Placement along the continuum of services and its impact on students' social relationships. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 20, 259-269.

Giangreco, M. F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jon": Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 59(4), 359-372.

Guralnick, M. J., Connor, R., Hammond, M., Gottman, J. M., & Kinnish, K. (1996). Immediate effects of mainstreamed settings on the social interactions and social integration of preschool children. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 100, 359-377.

Helmstetter, E., Curry, C.A., Brennan, M., & Sampson-Saul, M. (1998). Comparison of general and special education classrooms of students with severe disabilities. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 33(3), 216-227.

Hunt, P., & Farron-Davis, F. (1992). A preliminary investigation of IEP quality and content associated with placement in general education versus special education classes. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 17, 247-253.

Hunt, P., Farron-Davis, F., Beckstead, S., Curtis, D., & Goetz, L. (1994). Evaluating the effects of placement of students with severe disabilities in general education versus special classes. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 19, 200-214.

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27, 77-94.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, PL108-446, 20 U.S.C. §§1400 et seq. (2004).

Jorgensen, C.M., McSheehan, M., & Sonnenmeier, R. (2007). Presumed competence reflected in the educational programs of students with IDD before and after the Beyond Access professional development intervention. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 32(4), 248-262.

Kasa-Hendrickson, C. (2005). “There’s no way this kid’s retarded”: Teachers’ optimistic constructions of students’ ability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(1), 55–69.

Kennedy, C. H., & Itkonen, T. (1994). Some effects of regular class participation on the social contacts and social networks of high school students with severe disabilities. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 19, 1-10.

Kent-Walsh, J., & Light, J. (2003). General education teachers’ experiences with inclusion of students who use augmentative and alternative communication. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 19(2), 104-124.

Kluth, P., Villa, R.A., & Thousand, J.S. (2002). “Our school doesn’t offer inclusion” and other legal blunders. *Educational Leadership*, December 2001/January 2002, 24-27.

Kochhar, C. A., West, L. L., & Taymans, J. M. (2000). *Successful inclusion: Practical strategies for a shared responsibility*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lovett, H. (1996). *Learning to listen: Positive approaches and people with difficult behavior*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.

Mortweet, S. L., Utley, C. A., Walker, D., Dawson, H. L., Delquadri, J. C., Reddy, S. S., Greenwood, C. R., Hamilton, S., & Ledford, D. (1999). Classwide peer tutoring: Teaching students with mild mental retardation in inclusive classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, 65, 524.

McSheehan, M., Sonnenmeier, R.M., & Jorgensen, C.M. (2009). Membership, participation, and learning in general education classrooms for students with autism spectrum disorders who use AAC. In P. Mirenda & T. Iacono (Eds.), *Autism spectrum disorders and AAC* (pp. 413-442). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McSheehan, M., Sonnenmeier, R., Jorgensen, C. M., & Turner, K. (2006). Promoting learning of the general education curriculum by students with significant disabilities. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 26(3), 266–290.

No Child Left Behind Act, 20 U.S.C. §§ 6301 et seq. (2002); 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.1 et seq. (2003).

Ryndak, D., Morrison, A., & Sommerstein, L. (1999). Literacy before and after inclusion in general education settings: A case study. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 24(1), 5–22.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion: A matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-28).

Sonnenmeier, R., McSheehan, M., & Jorgensen, C. (2005). A case study of team supports for a student with autism's communication and engagement within the general education curriculum: Preliminary report of the Beyond Access Model. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 21(2), 101–115.

Soto, G., Muller, E., Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (2001). Critical issues in the inclusion of students who use augmentative and alternative communication: An educational team perspective. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 17, 62 – 72.

Staub, D., & Peck, C. A. (1994). What are the outcomes for nondisabled students? *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 36-40.

Stokes, T.F., & Baer, D.M. (1977). An explicit technology of generalization. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 10, 349-367.

Strully, J. & Strully, C. (2003). Inclusion: A road worth taking. *Impact* 16(1), 1 & 27-29. Minneapolis, MN: Institute for Community Inclusion, University of Minnesota.

Theoharis, G., & Causton-Theoharis, J. *Include, belong, learn*. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/oct10/vol68/num02/Include,-Belong,-Learn.aspx>.

Wehmeyer, M., & Agran, M. (2006). Promoting access to the general curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. In D. Browder, & F. Spooner (Eds.), *Teaching language, arts, math, & science to students with significant cognitive disabilities* (pp. 15–37). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.

Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., Garza, N., & Levine, P. (2005). *After high school: A first look at the postschool experiences of youth with disabilities. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2(NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved on October 13, 2011 from http://www.nlts2.org/reports/2005_04/nlts2_report_2005_04_complete.pdf.