

## EFFECT OF INCLUSION ON THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .75 Factors 2

### Areas of Interest

Items under this analysis probe whether teachers believe they have time to attend to activities around inclusion, whether they perceive need to alter established teaching routines, and whether they perceive their efforts as having effect.

#### A. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Analysis of responses based on whether respondents were functioning as traditional system educators, inclusive system educators, or as teacher education students at university indicated ~~caution relative to~~ <sup>all groups were cautious regarding</sup> the effect inclusion would have on the regular classroom teacher. Means varied among the six groups involved (UE - University elementary; US - University secondary; IE - Inclusive elementary; IS - Inclusive secondary; TE - Traditional elementary; TS - Traditional secondary) from 3.88 to 4.56. ~~All groups evinced concern regarding effect on the teacher.~~ Concern increased from university students, who were at the "Disagree Somewhat" level, to inclusive system educators, and then to traditional system educators, who were between the

"Disagree Somewhat" and the "Disagree Generally" levels, <sup>indicative of</sup> the attitude that inclusive practice would be taxing.

For each pairing of elementary and secondary levels in the three basic groupings of traditional (TE & TS), inclusive (IE & IS), and university (UE & US), secondary level educators held greater reservation than did their elementary level colleagues.

Responses from elementary level university students were significantly different (.01) from all other groups except secondary level university students (USS). This latter group differed significantly from all other groups except elementary teachers in inclusive systems. The single significant difference among practising teachers was found between those at the elementary level in inclusive systems and all other practising educators in the study.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. General indications of reservation.
2. Progression through means of university (U) to inclusive (I) to traditional (T).
3. Progression of means from elementary to secondary.

#### **B.NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR IDENTIFIED EDUCATOR AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS**

The same groups discussed in the above analysis are considered here. However, they are considered across the regional level (AIE - Acadia Inclusive Elementary; CIE - Calgary Inclusive Elementary; YIE - York Inclusive Elementary; and so on for a

~~total of 18 groups).~~

~~As might be anticipated from the preceding discussion,~~  
~~respondent group means indicated caution when considering effect,~~  
 when ~~respondent were considered for these groups in terms of regions~~  
~~of inclusion on the regular classroom teacher.~~ Means ranged from  
 3.76 to 4.67 with 15 of the 18 groupings involved responding at  
 more than 4.00.

University students, both elementary and secondary, were  
 grouped closely together <sup>with</sup> ~~in holding~~ the lowest means. Though not  
 without exception, means then increased through inclusive system  
 elementary to secondary educator groups and to elementary and  
 secondary educators in traditional systems.

Despite difference in means, no significant differences were  
 found among practising educators in traditional or inclusive  
 systems at either the elementary or secondary levels. Significant  
 differences were found (.05) for York Elementary University  
 students (YUE) against six, primarily traditional system,  
 practising teacher groups. A single significant difference was  
 found between Acadia University Secondary students (AUS) and  
 Acadia Traditional system Secondary teachers (ATS).

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means across regions of U to I to T.
2. Direction of means from elementary to secondary.

#### **C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGION**

#### FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS

Relatively lower means were found for university student groups (AUE and AUS) than for groups of practising educators. Both university groups differed significantly from a number of practising teacher groups (AUE and AIS; <sup>U</sup>AUE and ATS; AUS and AIE; AUS and ATS).

Progression through means did not follow the inclusive to traditional pattern found in other analyses.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Indication of general reservations for all Acadia groups.
2. Progression through means of U to I to T.
3. Direction of means from elementary to secondary.

#### D. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS

Calgary respondents were distinguished from respondents in other regions in that ~~they had the tightest group means among the three regions, with~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~all in excess of 4.00~~ <sup>or is somewhat</sup> ~~The pattern of~~ <sup>were very similar</sup> progression in means from university student groups, to inclusive system groups, to traditional system groups seen earlier was repeated.

Significant differences were found between the university student groups and some practising educator groups. These primarily involved the CUE group, but one difference of interest

<sup>^</sup>  
(Calgary Uni Elem)

involved the Calgary Inclusive Elementary teacher group (CIE) compared to the Calgary Traditional Secondary teacher group (CTS).

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. General indication of reservation for all Calgary groups.
2. All means above 4.00, Disagree Somewhat.
3. Progression through means of US to I to T.

#### **E. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS**

Responses here were akin to those found in the preceding two analyses.

#### **F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS COMBINED)**

Generally speaking, patterns of response for traditional system teachers, inclusive system teachers, and university students previously seen held throughout this analysis, though not quite with the same degree of consistency of response. A similar statement would describe the relationship between elementary and secondary levels.

The central finding of interest here was that the grouping of "support personnel" held relatively less reservation on effect

n  
(AD's + Spec T's)

of inclusion on the regular classroom teacher than did ~~actual~~ <sup>was statistically</sup> classroom teachers. This difference ~~attained~~ <sup>was statistically</sup> significance on occasion (.01). Inclusive system support personnel differed from inclusive system secondary teachers and both elementary and secondary traditional system teachers. Traditional system support personnel were significantly different from traditional system secondary teachers.

In addition, university students, at both the elementary and the secondary levels, differed significantly from regular classroom teachers in almost every instance.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Support personnel (administrators and specialist teachers exhibited less reservation than did regular classroom teachers.

#### G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS

Means for all university student groups ~~continued to be~~ <sup>maintained the pattern of</sup> being <sup>means</sup> lower than for other groups. However, means for inclusive system educators and traditional system educators did not form the inclusive to traditional pattern found in earlier analyses.

~~The progression in level of means from the support personnel group to the regular classroom teacher group did reappear.~~ <sup>The difference between</sup> <sup>here</sup> No significant differences were found, other than one for each of

the elementary and secondary university student groups against traditional system secondary regular classroom teachers.

#### H. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS

Responses within the Calgary region <sup>showed a difference</sup> ~~indicated the same~~ ~~division~~ in means between the support personnel group and the regular classroom teacher group. This division attained significance for the inclusive system support personnel group <sup>when compared to</sup> ~~against the~~ Inclusive Secondary teachers (CIS), ~~the~~ Traditional Elementary teachers (CTE), and ~~the~~ Traditional Secondary teachers (CTS). Some support personnel groups means were lower than university student means.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Support personnel exhibited less reservation than did regular classroom teachers.

#### I. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS

Responses indicated ~~similar~~ <sup>similar to York</sup> differences between support personnel and regular classroom teachers ~~as observed through~~ <sup>other regional analyses</sup> increase in ~~means from one set of group to the other~~. The only significant differences found involved the University Elementary level group (YUE) and three regular teacher groups.

#### J. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM

## TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS

A second analysis to probe the support personnel group more specifically was undertaken. In this analysis support personnel were divided into administrators and specialist teachers. As in the earlier <sup>national</sup> analysis, both groups held lower means than did all regular classroom teacher groups. There was no particular order for the means of the two groups.

However, the majority of inclusive system representatives, <sup>& thus relatively more</sup> held lower means than did those from traditional systems. One significant difference, other than a number involving university students and regular classroom teachers, was found. This difference involved inclusive system specialist teachers and traditional system secondary teachers.

### Patterns of Interest

1. Inclusive system administrators and specialist teachers held lower means than did their traditional system opposites.

## K. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS

Administrators and specialist teachers held lower means than did regular classroom teachers. In addition, traditional system administrator and specialist teacher means were lower than those



of their inclusive system opposites. This is the reverse of the pattern for the same groups at the national level.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Traditional system administrators and specialist teachers held lower means than did their inclusive system opposites.

#### **L. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

No significant differences were found in this analysis dividing support personnel into administrator and specialist teacher groups. However, the majority of respondents in these two groups held lower means than did those in the regular teacher group. In addition, inclusive system respondents tended to hold the lowest means among all groups.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Administrators and specialist teachers were divided from regular classroom teachers in terms of progression through means.
2. Inclusive system respondents tended to hold lowest means.

#### **K. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

Finally, in this analysis with support personnel divided

into two groups, the patterns seen in the immediately preceding analysis were repeated.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Administrators and specialist teachers were divided from regular classroom teachers in terms of progression through means.
2. Inclusive system respondents tended to hold lowest means.

## REGULAR TEACHER AND RESOURCE TEACHER RELATIONSHIP

### Technical Information

Cronbach Alpha .68 Factors 2

### Areas of Interest

A major position within inclusive education is that the regular classroom teacher and the resource teacher can form a collaborative team working closely together in support of all students in the classroom, but particularly those with challenging needs. The individual items investigating this issue test whether educators believe that a close working relationship can be forged, that the two sides respect each other's contributions, and that they share a sufficient knowledge base to <sup>support</sup> ~~move~~ educational programs <sup>moving</sup> ~~forward~~.

### A. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

(Below A & + 19 (W))

Means for all groups fell between 2.48 and 2.73, indicating ~~close consonance on the average and~~ a positive view of the possibility of a close collaborative relationship developing. No significant differences among groups were found.

Found, however, was a progression from lower to higher means from the university student groups, to elementary level educators, and then to secondary level educators.

### Patterns of Interest

1. Positive view of relationship.
2. Progression through means from U to E to S.

## B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR ALL PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Regional group means ranged from 2.39 to 2.91 indicating a positive view of the possibility of forming close regular classroom teacher and resource teacher working relationships. No significant differences among groups emerged.

No clear pattern ~~of positioning of educators~~ in terms of traditional or inclusive systems <sup>ed's</sup> being more or less positive was found, other than that ~~more~~ traditional system educator groups fell toward the higher half of the listing of means. In the same manner, a greater number of secondary level educators fell in the <sup>higher</sup> ~~upper~~ half.

### Patterns of Interest

1. Positive view of relationship.

## C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ACADIA REGION FOR ALL PARTICIPANT GROUPS

No significant differences were found for inclusive system and traditional system groups in the Acadia region. Secondary level educators in both types of systems <sup>had</sup> ~~fell at the~~ higher mean.

than did elem or h group /  
 levels, but means indicated that all educators, whether in traditional systems, inclusive systems, or university teacher education programs, felt positively regarding the possibility of regular classroom teachers and resource teachers forming close working relationships.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Positive view of relationship.
2. Elementary level means lower than secondary.

#### **D. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN CALGARY REGION FOR ALL PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

Means for all Calgary region respondent groups under this topic were tightly clustered (2.40 to 2.66). Elementary level educators had means lower than those of their secondary level colleagues, though all, again, <sup>suggested a pos view.</sup> ~~were positively oriented.~~

No significant differences were found.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Positive view of relationship.
2. Elementary level means lower than secondary.

#### **E. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN YORK REGION FOR ALL PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

Once again all group means were ~~to the positive, side of the six-point scale.~~ Secondary educators in both traditional and

inclusive systems fell to the higher end and significant differences were found for both the inclusive elementary and the university elementary groups against the inclusive secondary group.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Positive view of relationship.
2. Elementary level means lower than secondary.

#### **F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS COMBINED)**

Support personnel were more optimistic with regard to the ~~possibility of close~~ regular classroom teacher and resource teacher working relationships ~~being formed~~ than were university teacher education students or practising regular classroom teachers. However, all tended to be more positive in responses than negative to any degree. Means for support personnel were 2.13 to 2.31 (2.00 = Agree Generally), whereas regular classroom teacher means ranged from 2.83 to 3.10 (3.00 = Agree Somewhat). University student means fell in <sup>between</sup> ~~the middle~~.

This <sup>picture</sup> ~~finding~~ of differences among groups was supported by the finding of significant differences between support and regular classroom teacher groups. The single exception to this pattern was the inclusive secondary support personnel group which

was significantly different only to the traditional system secondary group. Lesser numbers of significant differences were found for the university student groups against the regular teacher groups.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Administrator and specialist teacher groups were divided from regular teacher groups in holding lower means.
2. Inclusive system administrators and specialist groups held lower means than did their traditional system opposites.

#### **G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL GROUPS AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS**

All administrator and specialist teacher groups were more positive, as seen through means, than all regular classroom teacher groups. University student groups fell in between. The range of means in this analysis (1.91 to 2.87) included the two lowest (most positive) means among the three regions.

No significant differences were found for support personnel groups and regular teacher groups in the Acadia region.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Administrators and specialist teacher groups were divided from regular classroom teacher groups.

#### H. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL GROUPS AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS

Almost all support personnel group means were lower than regular classroom teacher means, though the range of means was modest (2.04 to 2.75). A single significant difference was found (IE support personnel to TS).

##### Patterns of Interest

1. Administrator and specialist teacher groups were divided from regular classroom teacher groups.
2. Direction of means was from elementary to secondary.

#### I. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL GROUPS AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER GROUPS

Almost all York region support personnel groups responded more favourably to the idea that close working relationships could be formed between regular classroom teachers and support personnel. Within this general statement, no significant differences were found.

##### Patterns of Interest

1. Administrator and specialist teacher groups were divided from regular classroom teacher groups.



## TEACHER CONFIDENCE IN ADMINISTRATOR SUPPORT

### Technical Information

Cronbach Alpha .79 Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

Items relating to administrators examine whether educators view the principal as a leader in ensuring that teachers are well supported for inclusive education, and that effective systems to support inclusion are in place. Indication of the principal's understanding of the classroom situation is also sought.

### A. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Results from the 1492 survey respondents indicate that educators generally are positioned in the middle of the road with regard to confidence in administrator support. Means range from 3.08 to 3.74 indicating that educators agree somewhat ~~almost~~ to disagree that they have confidence in their administrators in this area.

The lowest means were held by inclusive and traditional system elementary teachers. University student groups held the highest means, with secondary level educators in between. The reserve shown by university students is interesting in that these are the participants with the least direct experience with

administrators.

Inclusive system educator responses were significantly different from those of secondary educators and university students. Traditional elementary and secondary educators differed significantly from university students enrolled in secondary school teacher preparation programs.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. General direction of means was elementary to secondary.
2. Range of means was from Agree Somewhat to Disagree Somewhat.

#### **B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR ALL PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

All regional traditional system, inclusive system, and university student groups obtained means between 3.00 and 4.00, except for Calgary inclusive system educators whose mean was 2.86. This echos the overall findings of the previous analysis and the general finding of modest teacher confidence in administrator support. Though regional groups did not cluster together uniformly as means ascended, it was apparent that the general progression from lower to higher was Calgary to Acadia to York.

Within this general progression a second one from elementary to secondary level educators can be discerned for Calgary and

while

Acadia regions. York responses ~~were~~ more conservative than ~~all~~ Calgary and Acadia ~~inclusive and traditional system~~ responses, ~~but~~ also progressed from elementary to secondary. University students tended to exhibit the greatest reserve relative to administrator support.

CIE responses differed significantly from the majority of York region groupings and almost all university student groupings. CTE also differed significantly from YIS.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Range of means was from Agree Somewhat to Disagree Somewhat.

### **C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ACADIA REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS**

Few significant differences among inclusive and traditional system groups were found. Those found all involved university students (UE & US) who differed from IE, TE, and TS educator groups.

All means fell between 3.17 and 3.82 indicating relatively conservative appreciation for administrator support. Responding<sup>ent</sup> groups fell into an elementary, secondary, university student pattern of progress through means.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means was from elementary to

secondary in general.

2. Range of means was from Agree Somewhat to Disagree Somewhat.

#### **D. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN CALGARY REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS**

IE differed significantly from all secondary and university student groupings. In addition, TE differed from US. IE, with a mean of 2.86, was the single group in this series of three regional analyses to obtain a mean below 3.00.

A pattern of progression through means from elementary to secondary to university ~~student participants~~ was noted.

##### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means was from elementary to secondary generally.
2. Means clustered about Agree Somewhat.

#### **E. REGIONAL - YORK- ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN YORK REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS**

No significant differences were found for this analysis. Means for this region (3.40 to 3.86) suggest its groups are generally the most conservative of all groups in appreciation of administrator support. ~~for teachers including students with challenging needs.~~

A progress of means from elementary to secondary was found. *secondary ed groups means were the most conservative, highest*  
~~Unlike the two previous regional analyses where U obtained the~~  
~~university students who held this pos in the two previous regional~~  
~~most conservative means within each region, U fell in the middle~~  
~~analysis.~~  
~~rankings with the secondary educator groups highest.~~

### Patterns of Interest

1. Progression through means was from elementary to secondary.
2. Range of means was Agree Somewhat to Disagree Somewhat.

### F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS COMBINED)

When divided into groupings of regular classroom teachers and support personnel on a national level ~~of response~~, means range from 2.65 to 3.73. The lower means were held by support personnel with three of four of these groups being at 2.70 or less. Regular classroom teachers from both types of systems and university students were ~~more muted in the confidence~~ *less* ~~they evinced for support personnel support~~. University students again were the most conservative.

Support personnel from IEO, TSO, and ISO differed significantly from all groups except TEO and IET. This is the most widespread finding of significant differences among groups seen so far.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel and regular classroom teachers.

## **G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR TEACHER GROUPS**

No significant differences were found.

Support personnel held lower means than did other groupings with a support personnel, regular classroom teacher, university student progression. Three of four support personnel groups held means of 2.74 or less.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel and regular classroom teachers.

## **H. REGIONAL LEVEL - CALGARY - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR TEACHER GROUPS**

The pattern of means ~~previously noted~~ from support personnel to regular classroom teacher to university student held for this analysis.

IEO differed significantly from all regular teacher and university student groups except ITE. Both ISO and TSO differed significantly from university students.

Means in this analysis ranged from 2.30 to 3.66 with all

support personnel groups being 2.79 or less.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel and regular classroom teachers.

## **I. REGIONAL LEVEL - YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR TEACHER GROUPS**

No significant differences were found in this analysis.

In general, but not invariably, support personnel groups obtained lower means than did other groups. The previously established pattern of support personnel, regular teacher, university student was not found. Though three of the four support personnel groups held the lowest means (2.47 to 3.00), there was considerable variation in placement of all other groups.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between administrators and specialist teachers and regular classroom teachers.

## **J. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

When support personnel were divided into administrators and specialist teachers, differences between these two groups became apparent. Means for administrators were lower than those for

specialist teachers, which were generally lower than for regular classroom teachers and university students. Administrator means grouped at Agree Generally. Specialist teacher means ranged from Agree Generally to Agree Somewhat with regular teacher and university students moving closer to Agree Somewhat and ~~on closer~~ ~~to~~ Disagree Somewhat respectively.

Significant differences were found between secondary level administrators and inclusive system elementary teachers and most regular teacher and university student groups.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between administrator groups and all other groups.

#### **K. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

No significant differences were found when administrators and specialist teachers were separated out of the support personnel group.

However, as with the companion national analysis, administrators were grouped with the lowest means around Agree Generally, specialist teachers from Agree Generally to Agree Somewhat, and most regular teacher and university student groups from Agree Somewhat to Disagree Somewhat.



**Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between administrators and specialist teachers and regular classroom teacher and university student groups generally.

## REGULAR TEACHER WORKLOAD

### Technical Information

Cronbach Alpha      .66      Factors      2

### Areas of Interest

Regular teacher workload ~~attempts to examine~~<sup>s</sup> whether educators believe dramatic steps are required to reduce teacher workload in inclusive settings, whether teachers were faced with additional work with inclusion, and whether teachers believed included students would blend smoothly into classroom dynamics.

#### A. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

~~The area of~~ teacher workload drew the most reserved responses to any area of inclusion (~~except for~~<sup>other than</sup> teacher preparation for inclusion which will be discussed later). All means exceeded 4.00 (4.01 to 4.61).

A progression through means from university students to inclusive system educators to traditional system educators was found. University ~~student group~~<sup>other</sup> responses were significantly different from all ~~groups of practising teachers~~.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. All groups indicated significant reservation regarding regular teacher workload.

## B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR ALL REGIONAL GROUPINGS

No significant differences among groups of practising educators was found across regions on the basis of systems being traditionally or inclusively structured. YUE students differed from the majority of practising educator groups, save both Acadia inclusive system groups ATE and CIE. AUS students differed from most York and Calgary regular teacher groups.

University student groups clustered at the lower end of the means in this analysis while other respondent groups fell above them in no particular order, other than that the four York region groups obtained the highest means.

## C. REGIONAL - ACADIA- ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ACADIA REGION FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENT GROUPS

Acadia region IE, IS, and UE means showed a university student to elementary to secondary progression. University student groups differed significantly from educator groups, ~~particularly in the case of university students studying at the elementary school level.~~

### Patterns of Interest

1. Progression through means from U to I to T.

~~WESTERN~~ ~~WESTERN~~

D. REGIONAL - ~~CALGARY~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ~~WITHIN CALGARY~~

~~REGION~~ FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENT GROUPS

~~Western~~ Calgary region groups did not ~~exhibit smooth progression~~ from university to inclusive to traditional groups. ~~seen fully or partially in other analyses.~~ The University student groups ~~did~~ have the lowest means. Otherwise, group placement evidenced no particular pattern. ~~for traditional - inclusive or elementary - secondary relationships.~~

A limited number of significant differences involving the university elementary group and various other groups were found.

E. REGIONAL - ~~YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ~~WITHIN YORK REGION~~ FOR TRADITIONAL, INCLUSIVE, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENT GROUPS

A progression from university students to secondary to elementary levels was found, but no smooth progression through means was found for the traditional - inclusive system relationship.

Both university student group responses differed significantly from all ~~other~~ ~~traditional and inclusive system~~ group responses.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means from elementary to secondary.

F. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM

TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST  
TEACHERS COMBINED)

All means fell between 4.00 and 4.66 for this analysis. ~~As~~  
~~noted previously,~~ <sup>Means at this level are interpreted to indicate</sup>  
<sup>concern regarding T uild.</sup>  
~~reservation relative to the issue under consideration.~~ Once again  
a clear separation appeared between support personnel and regular  
teachers, ~~with support personnel having the lower means.~~ Tucked  
into the support personnel means were those of the university  
student groups.

Both university student groups <sup>held</sup> ~~were~~ significantly <sup>lower mean than</sup> ~~different~~  
<sup>did</sup> ~~from~~ all regular classroom teacher groups. In addition IEO  
responses were <sup>lower than</sup> ~~different from~~ regular teacher responses. TSO  
groups differed significantly from traditional system regular  
teacher responses.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel and regular classroom  
teachers.

**G. REGIONAL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR  
SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND REGULAR TEACHER GROUPS**

These analyses are discussed together as all results were  
similar.

The familiar division between support personnel groups and  
regular classroom teacher groups continued here. University

student group means fell between support personnel and regular teacher means.

A number of significant differences were found with most between ~~the~~ university student and ~~the~~ regular classroom teacher groups.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Division of support personnel from regular classroom teachers.

#### H. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS

When analysis was undertaken on the basis of regular classroom teacher, administrator, and specialist teacher groupings, the latter two groups were found to <sup>be less concerned regarding</sup> ~~hold means lower~~ <sup>T would than were ACT's.</sup> ~~than did the former group. Means ranged from Disagree Somewhat towards Disagree Generally.~~

University student groups differed significantly from all regular classroom teacher groups.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Division between administrator and specialist teacher groups and regular classroom teacher groups.

**I. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE  
AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST  
TEACHERS**

The three regional analyses obtained results similar to that found in the national analysis, ~~with these groupings.~~

Few significant differences were found, with the only ones of meaning being between the York elementary student group and all regular classroom teacher groups.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between administrator and specialist teacher groups and regular classroom teachers.

## TEACHER SELF CONFIDENCE IN INCLUSION

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .86 Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

This issue was examined through teacher confidence ~~across a~~  
~~range of categories of need student might experience,~~ <sup>their</sup> in teaching  
~~skills, in collaboration,~~ <sup>with colleagues</sup> and in inclusion being a positive  
 experience for children.

### A. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

~~Traditional system educator, inclusive system educator, and~~  
~~university student responses suggested that~~ <sup>A</sup> all groups felt  
 confident to somewhat confident in their ability to work with  
 included students. Means fell between 2.47 and 2.94. Groups with  
 means toward the upper <sup>end</sup> levels of this range may be seen as  
 tenuous in their confidence. The familiar progression pattern of  
 university students to elementary to secondary educators was  
 found.

The only significant differences were between UE and the IS  
 and TS groups.

### Patterns of Interest

1. All means less than 3.00.



2. Progression through means of U to E to S.

**B. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

No significant differences were found in comparisons across groups in the three regions. Though not unbroken, a progression from university students to elementary to secondary levels was noted.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means of U to E to S.

**C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGIONS FOR TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

No significant differences were found among groups in any of the three regional analyses.

Some reinforcement of the pattern of progression from university student to elementary level educators to secondary level educators was found. Patterns for the three regions were not uniform.

**D. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS COMBINED)**

Means indicated that all groups, ~~particularly the support personnel ones,~~ felt confident that regular classroom teachers had the skills and knowledge to include students with challenging needs. Support personnel means ranged from 2.13 to 2.31, the most positive group responses in any national level analysis. ~~Regular classroom teachers, while confident, were less so than were support personnel.~~

This finding was emphasized by the fact that all support personnel <sup>groups</sup> differed significantly from at least one regular teacher group. Traditional secondary and inclusive elementary support personnel differed from all classroom teacher groups; traditional elementary support personnel from three of four classroom teacher groups; and inclusive secondary support personnel from the traditional secondary teacher group. The university student group also displayed differences from some, but not all, regular classroom teacher groups.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel and regular classroom teachers.
2. Support personnel clustered about Generally Agree.  
Regular classroom teachers clustered around Agree

Somewhat.

#### E. REGIONAL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL GROUPS

~~Consistency was found in the separation of support personnel~~  
~~groups from regular classroom teacher groups from lowest to~~  
~~highest means.~~ University students were placed between the  
 support personnel and regular teacher groups.

Few significant differences were found in these three analyses.

##### Patterns of Interest

1. Patterns found were similar to those found for the preceding national level analysis.

#### F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS

Once again, administrators and specialist teachers held lower means than did their regular classroom teacher colleagues.

A number of significant differences were found. The majority ~~of these~~ were between elementary level specialist teachers and secondary regular classroom teachers or traditional system elementary regular classroom teachers.

1. The pattern of division between regular classroom teachers and the administrator and specialist teacher groups was

reiterated.

**G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE  
AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST  
TEACHERS**

Findings of division between the two support groups, administrators and specialist teachers, and the regular classroom teacher groups was reiterated here. The former two groups tended to cluster about Agree Generally and the classroom teachers in the region of Agree Somewhat.

## ADEQUACY OF TEACHER PREPARATION FOR INCLUSION

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .65 Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

This discussion deals with whether educators consider the regular classroom teacher professionally prepared to work with included students with challenging needs. Both preservice and inservice were examined.

#### A. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Responses indicated that study participants were ~~quite~~ concerned regarding ~~the~~ adequacy of teacher preparation for inclusive settings. No mean in this area was less than 4.41. ~~Overall, means indicated that~~ Respondents were more concerned regarding the issue of teacher preparation than any other.

One significant difference between inclusive system elementary level educators and traditional system secondary level educators was found. ~~Teachers were closely similar in their concern for teacher preparation.~~

### Patterns of Interest

1. This area was of the greatest concern among the ten areas of this overall analysis. All means were between Disagree

Somewhat and Disagree Generally.

**B. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

No significant differences were found for this analysis.

No definite pattern of progression through means was noted, though there was a tendency for traditional system groups to fall at the higher levels.

**C. REGIONAL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN EACH OF THREE REGIONS FOR THE THREE RESPONDENT GROUPS**

One significant difference was found in these three analyses. *Eds across Canada were similar in degree of concern* ~~When considered as separate entities, rather than as part of a larger national sample, educators in each region were~~ *regarding T. prep,* ~~equally concerned with the adequacy of teacher preparation for inclusive settings.~~

Though unvarying patterns of progress through means were not found, each of the three analyses indicated that secondary level educators had relatively higher levels of concern than did their elementary level colleagues.

**D. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL (ADMINISTRATORS AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS)**

This analysis revealed the familiar division between support personnel and classroom teachers, with university students falling approximately in the middle. However, that few significant differences were found, *All groups exhibited concern regarding* ~~served to support uniformity~~ *T. PKJ.* ~~of concern noted in other analyses.~~

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between administrator and specialist teacher groups and regular classroom teachers.

**E. REGIONAL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN EACH REGION FOR REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL**

No significant differences were found for any of these analyses.

Each analysis repeated the familiar progress through means pattern of separation between support personnel and regular classroom teachers on issues related to inclusion. Patterns for the ~~Acadia~~ and ~~Calgary~~ groups were consistent, while the ~~York~~ pattern was disrupted by the traditional system support personnel group having the highest mean.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. All three regions exhibited the familiar pattern of division between regular classroom teachers and other support personnel.

**F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

Patterns found ~~above~~ for other analyses were found, *Level*,

**G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

Patterns found ~~above~~ for other analyses were found. All groups indicated appreciable levels of concern for teacher preparation with respondents in the ~~Calgary~~ region having the highest ~~beginning and ending~~ means.



## RESPONSIBILITY FOR INCLUSION

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .65 Factors 2

### Areas of Interest

The responsibility of the regular classroom teacher for ~~taking a~~ lead role in planning for students with challenging needs, <sup>for</sup> implementing the plan, and <sup>for</sup> working collaboratively with support personnel <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ assessed under this area.

### A. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Educator groups Agreed Generally to Agreed Somewhat (2.67 to 3.21 on the response scale) that regular classroom teachers could accept responsibility for the inclusion of students with challenging needs. Secondary teachers were <sup>less positive</sup> ~~relatively reserved~~ on this issue, <sup>than were</sup> ~~compared to~~ their elementary level colleagues, though ~~still positive overall.~~

A significant difference was found between the traditional system secondary group and the inclusive system secondary group. Other significant differences were found between both secondary groups and both elementary groups, as well as the university student groups.

These significant differences outline the pattern of <sup>previously seen</sup>

elementary level groups obtaining the lowest means, followed by ~~the university student groups~~ and ~~the secondary level groups~~.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Relatively positive responses ranging from mid Agree Generally to Agree Somewhat.
2. Progression through means from elementary to secondary.

## **B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR THE THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

Two tentative patterns of response to the issue of regular classroom teacher responsibility emerged in this analysis. One suggested that the order of progression among regions was ~~Calgary~~ to ~~York~~ to ~~Acadia~~. The second was from elementary to secondary with university students varying in relationship to the other groups.

A number of significant differences between elementary and secondary level educators were found. The ~~Calgary~~ elementary inclusive system group differed from five of the six secondary groups, including both the CIS and CTS groups. ~~Calgary~~ elementary level traditional system (CTE) educators differed from three, including the CTS group. The ~~Acadia~~ traditional system (ATE) elementary and the ~~York~~ inclusive (YIE) system elementary group differed from YTS. A small number of significant differences between university students and YTS completed the picture.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means from ~~Calgary~~ to ~~York~~ to ~~Acadia~~.

## 2. Progression through means from elementary to secondary.

### C. REGIONAL - ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE IN EACH OF THE THREE REGIONS AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Within each region few significant differences existed. In all three analyses elementary group means were lower than secondary group means.

For the ~~Acadia~~ region significant differences were found between both traditional and inclusive system elementary groups and ~~tradional~~ system secondary level educators.

In the ~~Calgary~~ region significant differences were found for both elementary groups against both secondary groups, and for elementary level university students against both secondary groups.

The ~~Calgary~~ findings were repeated for ~~York~~ region, <sup>ln</sup> with the additional ~~of the university student secondary group to those~~ significantly ~~different to~~ <sup>from</sup> the traditional system secondary groups.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. A general, though not unbroken, progression through means from elementary to secondary.

### D. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The pattern of clear difference between support personnel and regular classroom teachers was not repeated in this analysis.

~~Among the significant differences found~~ <sup>sis</sup> elementary traditional and inclusive system support personnel and elementary regular classroom teacher groups differed <sup>from</sup> traditional and inclusive system classroom teacher groups. Inclusive system

support personnel differed from traditional system secondary classroom teachers as well.

### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Progression through means from elementary to secondary.

### **E. REGIONAL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Clear and consistent patterns of difference between support personnel and classroom teachers were not found in these three analyses. Here and there responses fell into the suggestion of a pattern of difference.

No significant differences were noted in the ~~Acadia~~ analysis.

For the ~~Calgary~~ region significant differences were found between the elementary support personnel groups and secondary level classroom teachers. Significant differences were noted between the two traditional system elementary groups and the traditional system secondary group as well.

Differences were found between ~~York~~ region elementary classroom teachers and university students against ~~York~~ traditional system classroom teachers.

### **F. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM EDUCATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST TEACHERS**

Means in this analysis began at a lower level than did those in other national level analyses with elementary administrators followed by elementary specialist teachers. Regular classroom teacher groups were scattered somewhat, <sup>with</sup> ~~though~~ secondary groups ~~held~~ the highest means around Agree Somewhat.

A limited number of significant differences involving inclusive and traditional system administrators and elementary

classroom teachers compared to secondary regular classroom teachers were found.

**H. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE  
AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SPECIALIST  
TEACHERS**

Findings similar to those in the preceding national analysis were found. The consistent pattern of division between administrators and specialist teachers and regular classroom teachers seen in earlier analyses was not found in these analyses, though there was some suggestion of such a pattern.

## EFFECT ON INCLUDED STUDENTS

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .79

Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

Advocates of inclusive education argue that included students work more strongly when educated with chronological age peers in regular classrooms. Research indicates that social and academic achievement may be equal to that made under traditionally structured special education service delivery systems, or that it might, indeed, be greater, particularly for social development. Items under this issue investigate attitudes of Canadian educators with regard to academic and social progress, self-concept, acceptance by peers, and the future for students with challenging needs.

### A. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Respondents generally held positive views (Agree Generally to Agree Somewhat) on the effect of inclusion on students with challenging needs. Means ranged from 2.52 to 3.10. A pattern of response from university students to inclusive system ~~educators~~ to traditional system ~~educators~~ emerged. Within this larger pattern elementary ~~level~~ respondents had lower means than did their secondary colleagues.

Significant differences were found between university students ~~at the elementary level~~ and traditional system ~~educators~~ <sup>both</sup> ~~as well as~~ <sup>elem</sup> inclusive system secondary teachers. Both university students and inclusive system elementary educators differed significantly from secondary teachers in traditional systems.

### Patterns of Interest

1. Responses were relatively positive and clustered around the Agree Somewhat level.
2. A progression through means of U to E to S was noted.

#### B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR THE THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Few significant differences were found among regions. Those found all involved AUE and both traditional and inclusive system secondary teachers.

A general indication that inclusion was seen as having beneficial effect was apparent with university students being more positive than inclusive system educators, who, in turn, were more positive than were traditional system educators. A <sup>consistent</sup> definite pattern of elementary level teachers being more positive than secondary level teachers was found. These patterns of difference in response were ~~not of sufficient size to achieve significance~~ <sup>did not reach</sup>.

##### Patterns of Interest

1. A relatively consistent progression through means of U to E to S was present.
2. Some indication of a U to I to T progression through means was noted.

#### C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN EACH REGION FOR THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS

No consistent patterns of response were found other than that secondary level educators were not as positive <sup>regarding this issue</sup> ~~in their view~~ ~~of the effect of inclusion~~ as were elementary level educators or university teacher education students.

Both ~~Acadia~~ university student groups differed significantly from secondary educators and inclusive system elementary educators.

Significant differences between university elementary level

students and secondary level educators were noted.

In the ~~York~~ region analysis inclusive system elementary level educators differed significantly from traditional system secondary level educators, and university students differed from inclusive system secondary teachers (UE) and from traditional system elementary teachers (US).

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Some indication, though not nearly an unbroken one, was noted for a progression from U to E to S.

#### D. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

As with other issues around inclusion a ~~pattern of the group~~ <sup>ed</sup> composed of administrators and specialist teachers providing more positive responses than ~~were~~ <sup>did</sup> regular classroom teachers. ~~emerged.~~ University students fell ~~in~~ between these two groups.

A number of significant differences were found. Inclusive system elementary level support personnel differed significantly from all groups of classroom teachers, as did university elementary level students. The university student secondary group also differed from the traditional system secondary <sup>teacher</sup> group.

A second analysis divided the support personnel group into administrator and specialist teacher groups to probe whether <sup>both</sup> ~~each~~, or <sup>only</sup> ~~one~~, of these groups was the source of significant difference.

Both elementary level support groups were found to differ significantly from traditional system secondary classroom teachers, while ~~the~~ inclusive system administrators also differed from ~~the~~ inclusive system secondary teacher group. Further significant differences were found between both ~~of the~~ secondary teacher groups and traditional system elementary classroom



teachers and university elementary ~~level~~ students. Finally, both inclusive system elementary classroom teachers and university secondary ~~level~~ students differed from traditional system secondary teachers.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. A division between support personnel, whether defined as a group or as administrators and specialist teachers, and regular classroom teachers was evident.
2. A pattern of lower elementary than secondary means was seen within the support personnel and the regular classroom teacher groups.

#### **E. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ~~ACADIA~~ REGION REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

The pattern of difference between support personnel and regular classroom teachers, with university students in the middle, was replicated within the ~~Acadia~~ region. A limited number of significant differences were found with one involving inclusive system elementary support personnel and traditional system secondary classroom teachers.

In an analysis dividing support personnel into administrator and specialist teacher groups, both inclusive and traditional system specialist teachers tended to be more positive than both administrators and classroom teachers. In one instance this difference reached significance (inclusive system elementary specialist teachers and traditional system secondary classroom teachers).

#### **Patterns of Interest**

Patterns similar to those for the national analysis between regular classroom teachers and support personnel, however

defined, were seen.

**F. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~CALGARY~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ~~CALGARY~~ REGION REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

The general pattern of support personnel<sup>to</sup>, university students<sup>to</sup>, classroom teachers was repeated within the<sup>s</sup> ~~Calgary~~ region. Traditional system elementary and secondary, plus the inclusive system secondary, groups held the highest means among respondents from all three regions.

Significant differences were found between inclusive system elementary support personnel and both groups of secondary classroom teachers, and between university elementary students and both groups of secondary classroom teachers plus traditional system elementary classroom teachers.

No significant differences were found when respondents were divided into administrators, specialist teachers, classroom teachers, and university students. No patterns of response were found, other than that there appeared to be a tendency for inclusive system respondents to hold lower means than those in traditional systems, and for elementary educators to hold lower means than those in secondary schools.

**Patterns of Interest**

Patterns similar to those in the two preceding analyses were evident.

**G. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~YORK~~ - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITHIN ~~YORK~~ REGION REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS**

Once again the pattern of support personnel holding slightly more positive views of the effect of inclusion on students with challenging needs was evident as was a general pattern of lower

means among inclusive system respondents in both the elementary and secondary educator groups.

Significant differences between groups was not a feature of this analysis.

No significant differences were found when respondents were grouped as administrators, specialist teachers, classroom teachers, and university students. ~~No particular pattern of response for the administrator group as compared to the specialist teacher group was noted.~~

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between support personnel, however defined, and regular classroom teachers was evident.

## EFFECT ON REGULAR STUDENTS

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .87 Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

Arguments of benefit for regular students in inclusive systems are put forward by proponents of inclusion. Though few studies exist in this area, emergent research suggests that such arguments may be valid. Questionnaire items examine whether teachers believe regular students accept peers with challenging needs, whether inclusion draws a disproportionate share of school resources, and whether regular students benefit from inclusion or whether their learning is reduced.

### A. NATIONAL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

Respondents among all groups suggested that regular students benefitted from inclusive experiences. Means ranged from 2.35 (Agree Generally) to 3.35 (Agree Somewhat). Progress of means from lowest to highest was university students, inclusive system respondents, traditional system respondents.

University students differed significantly from all practicing educators except for inclusive system elementary educators. In addition, the latter group differed significantly from the traditional system secondary educator group.

### Patterns of Interest

1. Responses were relatively positive, ranging from the middle of the Agree Generally area to the middle of the Agree Somewhat area.
2. A progression of U to I to T was noted.

**B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR THE THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

Significant differences in this analysis involved university elementary students primarily, though the secondary students were involved as well. Though varying by both region and traditional/inclusive status, the majority of the comparison groups were at the secondary level.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. A general, but not consistent, progression from U to I to T was noted.

**C. REGIONAL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE ~~WITHIN~~ THE THREE REGIONS FOR THE THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS**

Pattern of response for the three groups agreed in terms of proceeding from university students, to inclusive system respondents, to traditional system respondents. This pattern was not invariant, but was almost so. A second pattern was from elementary to secondary level.

University elementary level students in all three regions were routinely significantly different to almost all educator groups. This finding was echoed, though not as strongly, by university secondary level students. In the instance of the ~~Calgary~~ analysis, inclusive system elementary educators differed from secondary level educators.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. A general pattern of progression through U to E to S was apparent.

**D. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Means (all from 2.36 to 2.86) indicated that university students and support personnel agreed that inclusive experience

was beneficial to regular students. Classroom teachers were somewhat in agreement, but with means from 3.09 to 3.46.

University students differed significantly from all practicing educator groups, as did the inclusive system elementary support personnel group. The traditional system secondary support personnel group also differed from the traditional system secondary teacher group.

When the support personnel group was split into administrators and specialist teachers, the same university and practicing classroom teacher groups were significantly different. In addition, inclusive system elementary specialist teachers differed from traditional system elementary and secondary classroom teachers, and from inclusive system secondary classroom teachers.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Means indicated an overall positive view of effect of inclusion on regular students.
2. A division between support personnel, whether defined as a group or as administrators and specialist teachers, and regular classroom teachers was evident.

#### **E. REGIONAL LEVEL<sup>S</sup>- ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE WITHIN EACH REGION FOR REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS, SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Analyses for the three regions between support personnel and regular classroom teachers were quite similar. In almost every instance, support personnel groups and university student groups found inclusive experiences more valuable for regular students than did regular classroom teachers. Elementary level support personnel responses suggested this more so than did ~~responses of~~ secondary support personnel and regular classroom teachers. This was true for both traditional and inclusive system respondents.

These differences rarely attained significance, involving only ~~Calgary~~ and ~~York~~ inclusive system support personnel in comparison with secondary groups when they did so. The university elementary student group, and occasionally the secondary student group, differed from regular classroom teacher groups, ~~with greater frequency.~~

When respondent groups were structured as regular classroom teachers, administrators, specialist teachers, and university students, the university elementary group was found to differ significantly from secondary traditional and inclusive system classroom teachers with good consistency.

No pattern of either the administrator group or the specialist teacher group obtaining consistently lower means than their opposite support personnel group was found. For both the ~~Calgary~~ and ~~York~~ groups traditional and inclusive regular classroom teacher groups tended to have, ~~though not invariably,~~ higher means than other educator groups.

#### **Patterns of Interest**

1. Division between regular classroom teachers and support personnel, however defined, was noted.

## EDUCATIONAL SOUNDNESS OF CONCEPT OF INCLUSION

### Technical Information

Cronbach alpha .81 Factors 1

### Areas of Interest

A controversy within education is whether inclusion is an acceptable and workable educational reform, or whether it is an unacceptable and unnecessary reform. This area is probed through items which require educators to consider whether students of divergent ability should be educated together, or whether separation on the basis of differing ability should be the norm.

#### A. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TRADITIONAL SYSTEM EDUCATORS, INCLUSIVE SYSTEM EDUCATORS, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

On the national level the 1492 respondents in this study supported the concept of inclusion at the Agree Generally to Agree Somewhat levels with means clustered either side of 3.00. The familiar pattern of university student and elementary educator groups obtaining lower means than secondary educators repeated in this analysis.

University students were significantly different from secondary educator groups and the traditional system secondary group. Both the inclusive and traditional elementary groups differed from the traditional secondary group. In addition, the inclusive system elementary and the inclusive secondary groups differed.

#### Patterns of Interest

1. Educator responses fell on the positive side of the response scale and clustered around the 3.00, Agree Somewhat level.
2. A progression from U to E to S was evident.



## B. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG REGIONS FOR THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS

~~This investigation for~~ Differences among regional groups did not reveal any particular patterns of response other than ~~that~~ ~~familiar one~~ that secondary groups tended to be less strong in finding inclusion beneficial than did other groups.

Significant differences were found to fall into ~~the familiar~~ pattern of university students being more positive than secondary educators, most especially those in traditional systems. The only significant difference between practicing educator groups involved AIE and ~~Calgary~~ and ~~York~~ secondary traditional groups.

### Patterns of Interest

1. A rough pattern of progression from U to E to S was noted.

## C. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGIONS FOR THREE PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Analyses within each of the three regions ~~yielded the~~ *indicated* ~~familiar information~~ that university students perceived inclusive education more positively than did inclusive or traditional system educators, and that elementary level respondents were more positively inclined than were their secondary colleagues.

Significant differences involved university student groups, primarily at the elementary level ~~again~~, and secondary level educator groups, primarily those from traditional systems. Those significant differences found between traditional and inclusive systems centred on the inclusive system elementary group and the traditional system secondary group.

### Patterns of Interest

1. A rough pattern of U to E to S was noted.

## D. NATIONAL LEVEL - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REGULAR EDUCATORS,

# SUPPORT PERSONNEL, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

This analysis, too, presented the pattern of support personnel being more positive in reaction to inclusion than their regular classroom colleagues, and of elementary level educators being so relative to their secondary level colleagues.

Significant differences were found for inclusive system ~~elementary~~ and university elementary groups against all regular classroom teacher groups. Additionally, inclusive and traditional system secondary and traditional elementary support personnel differed from traditional secondary classroom teachers. Finally, inclusive elementary classroom teachers differed from traditional system secondary classroom teachers.

## Patterns of Interest

1. Means for administrators/specialist teachers were consistently lower than those for regular classroom teachers.
2. Elementary means were lower than were secondary means within the two larger groupings of regular classroom teachers and administrators/specialist teachers.

## E. REGIONAL LEVEL - ~~ACADIA/CALGARY/YORK~~ - ANALYSES OF VARIANCE WITHIN REGIONS FOR REGULAR EDUCATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, SPECIALIST TEACHERS, AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The support personnel group of administrators and special teachers in all three regions exhibited more appreciation for the soundness of the inclusive education concept than did their regular classroom colleagues. This was almost an unbroken pattern for every group.

A limited number of significant differences were found, the great majority of which involved university elementary level students and traditional system secondary classroom teachers. The inclusive system elementary group ~~also was found to differ~~ <sup>ed</sup> from

secondary educators as well.

Analysis at the level of administrator, specialist teacher, classroom teacher, and university student groupings did not yield additional information of interest.

**Patterns of Interest**

1. Divisions between regular classroom teachers and administrators/specialist teachers were evident in each analysis.
2. Patterns of elementary means being lower than were secondary means were noted in each analysis.