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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research project was to explore the influences during fieldwork on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. An embedded, mixed-methods design was used to examine both qualitative and quantitative data. Preservice teachers completed the Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995) survey before beginning full-time student teaching. This survey measured their attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. In addition, student teachers completed the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) prior to their full time student teaching. During the qualitative, explanatory phase, observational, artifact, and interview data were examined from selected participants in their student teaching practicum. Participants for the qualitative phase were selected based on their initial scores on the Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities survey. Three special educators and three general educators who scored lowest on the scale, indicating negative attitudes about inclusive practices, were chosen to participate in the qualitative exploration. In addition, three special educators and three general educators who scored highest on the scale, indicating support for inclusion, were chosen to complete the qualitative participant group. Finally, after student teaching was completed, all participants were administered both surveys again to determine changes in attitudes responsive to their student teaching experience. Findings indicated that preservice teacher attitudes changed significantly after student teaching and that there were significant differences between special education and general education participants. Although preservice teachers’ self-efficacy
significantly increased after fieldwork, their self-efficacy was not correlated to their attitudes about inclusion. The participants’ attitudes before student teaching accounted for most of their attitudes after student teaching, although the preservice teachers indicated their cooperating teacher was also very influential. Personal experience with individuals with disabilities and type of disability, severity of disability, and age of the student were all influencing factors of the preservice teachers’ attitudes about inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Overall, participants’ attitudes fell along a continuum, with some preservice teachers ambivalent or undecided, while others were negative or positive about inclusive practices.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

“Student teaching represents a potentially intense and valuable learning experience involving a major life transition from student to teacher” (Conderman, Morin, & Stephens, 2005, p. 5).

Rationale

Teachers suggest that their practicum and field experiences were the most powerful influences on their development as educators (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002). In light of this finding, student teaching may provide grounding for many preservice teacher attitudes about important educational issues. The inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom is a significant trend in special education and teacher attitudes towards inclusion have been explicitly linked to successful implementation of inclusive educational programs (Moody, Vaughn, Hughes, & Fisher, 2000). Yet, very little research investigating the relationship of student teaching on the development of preservice teacher attitudes has been conducted (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and none found have investigated the influence of student teaching on preservice teacher attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. The purpose of the current study was to explore the influence of full time student teaching on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion.

Researchers have documented conflicting results in their evaluation of inclusive programs and experts in the field remain divided over the issue of placement for students with special needs (e.g. Kavale, 2002; Villa & Thousand, 2003). The topic of inclusion is controversial even within the professional education community. The fact remains that, all
students, including those with disabilities, have the right to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) as the current law (IDEIA, 2004) states (Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004). This mandate requires that students with disabilities be educated, to the maximum extent appropriate, with their typically developing peers. Therefore, students with disabilities are only to be separated into self-contained settings when they are unable to receive educational benefit even with the use of supplementary services and supports, in the general education classroom (Yell & Katsiyannis). Thus, there is a clear legal and professional preference for the least restrictive environment, which often results in inclusive practices. Inclusion remains a significant trend in special education.

The National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES) reported that, since the first special education law (PL 94-142, 1975) passed in the United States, greater numbers of children with disabilities have enrolled in schools among all age groups and grade levels from pre-school to high school (USDOE, NCES, 2006). According to the “Twenty-Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,” almost half of all students with disabilities spend the majority of their school day in general education environments (US Department of Education [USDOE], 2007). In some disability categories, the reported percentage of students placed in the general education classroom is even greater. For example, during the 2003-2004 school year, 88% of children with language and speech disorders were educated in the general education environment (USDOE, 2007). Furthermore, the past ten years have revealed an increasing trend in all disability categories for placement in inclusive settings (USDOE, 2007). The percentage of students ages 6-21 with disabilities who are educated in the general education classroom for most of their school day was reported to be over 77% currently (USDOE, 2007). Furthermore, 96% of
students with disabilities spend some time in general education classrooms (USDOE, 2007).

Placement in general education settings differs based on disability category as table 1.1 shows:

Table 1.1

*Percentage of Time Students with Disabilities in the United States are Educated Outside the General Education Classroom*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Categories</th>
<th>&lt;21% of the Day</th>
<th>21-60% of the Day</th>
<th>&gt;60% of the Day</th>
<th>Segregated Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Speech Disabilities</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional or Behavioral Disorder</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blind</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Disabilities</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other legislation also exerts influence on inclusive placements. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 mandated accountability in academic outcomes for students with disabilities and emphasized access to general education curriculum standards for all students, including those with disabilities. It is evident therefore, that teachers must be adequately prepared for the instructional challenge of instructing students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

One of the most influential factors in the successful implementation of inclusive practices is the attitude of teachers (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). In fact, teacher attitude is reflected in the teacher’s interactions and attachment or rejection of children with special needs. This relationship is particularly problematic because students with disabilities require intensive instruction through high quality interactions (Moody, Vaughn, Hughes, & Fisher 2000). Furthermore, teachers report widespread concern about their ability to effectively teach students with special needs (e.g. Baglieri & Knopf, 2004; Rea, McLaughlin, & Walter-Thomas, 2002). In Cook’s (2001) study, some teachers rejected the children with special needs because they felt unprepared to help them. While teachers often recognize that accommodations are valuable for students with special needs, they do not often have the skills or the time to implement them (Kavale, 2002). For example, current legislation emphasizes accountability by requiring students with disabilities to participate in high stakes assessment each year and schools to make adequate yearly progress (NCLB, 2001); teachers must therefore cover more curriculum standards than ever before during their school year, leaving little time for extra remediation.

Instructional skills are essential, and teachers must not only *be* prepared, but they must also *feel* prepared to implement those skills with confidence that they have been well-
equipped for the role(s) they will play in their classroom. Self-efficacy beliefs are significant to the overall process of teacher preparation (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Theoretically conceptualized by Bandura (1977), self-efficacy effects teachers’ ability to motivate their students, increase student achievement, and persist in the face of difficulties. However, self-efficacy beliefs are contextually based and therefore they are influenced by the environment (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy may carry tremendous importance; teachers with little perceived self-efficacy often do not expect to be successful under certain conditions and with certain students. They may therefore put less effort into preparation and instruction and give up easily (Bandura, 1997). Because students with disabilities may be more difficult to teach, and the inclusive environment carries contextual challenges such as increased collaboration requirements, more challenging classroom management issues, and greater needs for differentiation of instruction, self-efficacy is an important construct to investigate.

In order for teachers to feel more prepared, and in fact, be more prepared to teach all students, including those with disabilities, high quality teacher education programs are essential. Clearly, adequate training of teachers, both practicing and preservice, is imperative. Multiple studies have provided evidence of the impact teachers have on student achievement. For example, Carlson, Lee, and Schroll (2004) report a study in which outcomes for students in classrooms with ineffective teachers were 39 percentiles less on their annual high-stakes tests than were student outcomes of the most effective teachers in the same district. Furthermore, the sequence of teachers to which children were assigned produced vastly different outcomes and more than one ineffective teacher had a cumulative effect that could be seen up to two grade levels later. Darling-Hammond and Younks (2002)
report that gains in student outcomes and achievement are more a result of their teacher than other variables such as class size. They also indicate that the classroom teacher accounts for much of the variance in test score gains among students. Borman and Kimball (2005) explain that students can be a full grade level behind their peers academically due to just one year of having a poor teacher. Studies with these findings about the impact of teachers methodologically controlled for initial student differences by matching students, using covariant analysis, or otherwise controlling for “nuisance” student variables such as ability.

Clearly, teachers exert tremendous impact on student achievement. Likewise, teacher education programs are vital to the development of skills, knowledge, and attitudes in future teachers. Evidence links teacher education programs and teacher quality. For example, an investigation of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) math and reading scores from 1990-1996 revealed that the strongest influence on students’ scores was teachers who had certification in the field in which they taught from an accredited teacher education program (as cited in Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). In addition, teachers participating in traditional teacher preparation programs reported feeling more prepared to teach than those teachers who did not graduate from such an extensive preparation program (Boe, Shin, & Cook, 2007).

Multiple studies have cited the fieldwork component of teacher education programs as important variables in high quality teacher preparation (e.g. Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum 2003; Wilson, Floden, &Ferrini-Mundy, 2002). Cook and Cook (2004) reported that student teachers usually choose instructional techniques they used based on their master teacher’s recommendation and not what their university teacher said or what research
purported. However, these experiences with mentor teachers appear to vary widely across teacher preparation programs and the most influential teacher preparation and fieldwork programs are those that involve reflection, structure, and consistency with what teachers are learning in their teacher training classes. Wilson, Floden, and Mundy (2002) suggest though that research about field experiences is limited.

While researchers have investigated the attitudes of both preservice and practicing teachers, little work has been conducted that explores the impact of fieldwork on preservice teacher attitudes and perceptions of skills for working in inclusive settings. Research in teacher education seems to indicate that practicum experiences are powerful agents (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Furthermore, teacher education programs that are well designed with a clear vision statement and purpose can change preservice teachers’ attitudes, skills, and beliefs throughout their program implementation (Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum 2003). However, before designing interventions that promote change, it is important to understand the attitudes preservice teachers hold and the shaping process of field experiences. Therefore, this research proposes to investigate the student teaching experience, and specifically, its influence on the attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of field experience, or student teaching, on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion. The following research questions were answered to clarify the impact:
1. Is there a difference within preservice special education, early childhood, elementary education, and secondary education teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom before their full-time student teaching experience and after student teaching?

2. Is there a difference in attitude towards inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom between general education preservice teachers and special education preservice teachers after their student teaching experience? Where do differences lie – between early childhood education and special education, elementary education and special education, or secondary education and special education?

3. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy – are most influential on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion after student teaching?

4. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy - exert the most influence on any change that does or does not occur between pre-student teaching and post-student teaching?

5. How do preservice teachers describe, interpret, and explain their attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom?

6. What do preservice teachers experiencing full-time student teaching identify as factors influencing their attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom?
7. How do the qualitative results explain, corroborate, or contradict results from the quantitative survey research?

Definition of Terms

An operational definition based on the literature in the field is provided for key terms used throughout this research investigation. The purpose is to clarify terms and provide readers with a reference that removes any ambiguity. The terms include: inclusion, inclusive environment, student teaching, attitudes, and self-efficacy.

Inclusion

Although the federal government does not define inclusion, it does mandate in the least restrictive environment requirement that students with disabilities be educated in the setting closest to that of typically developing peers to the maximum extent appropriate (IDEA, 2004). The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the largest international professional organization dedicated to improving the educational success of individuals with disabilities and/or gifts and talents defines inclusion as: “a term used to describe the ideology that each child, to the maximum extent appropriate, should be educated in the school and classroom he or she would otherwise attend. It involves bringing support services to the child (rather than moving the child to the services) and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class (rather than having to keep up with the other students)” (CEC, 2007). This definition will be used in the current study.
Inclusive Environment

The legal mandate for placement of children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment frequently results in inclusive environments in school settings. Although inclusive environments vary along a continuum of more to less inclusive, generally inclusive environments include students with disabilities in a setting with their typically developing peers to the maximum extent appropriate. Inclusive environments include appropriately different degrees of supports and adaptations that promote access to the general education curriculum. In addition, inclusive environments provide opportunity for everyone, including students with disabilities to be actively involved because the environments are set up to promote engagement (CEC, 2007).

Student Teaching

Also termed practicum or field experience, student teaching as defined in the current study refers to the full time placement of preservice teachers in a cooperating school classroom. For the purpose of this study, student teaching was completed during the last semester of preservice teacher’s major studies, that is, the second semester of their senior undergraduate year. Supervision occurred on a regular basis and was conducted by both a faculty member from an institute of higher education and a cooperating mentor teacher with at least three years or more teaching experience and demonstrated teaching effectiveness. All preservice teachers were placed in classrooms that were in their area of emphasis or licensure goals.
**Attitudes**

Attitudes refer to an individual’s prevailing frame of mind or spirit. Therefore, the term covers physical, emotional, and intellectual components that may affect a person’s opinions, beliefs, and actions (Webster, 1987). In the context of the current study, attitudes about inclusion referred to the participant’s perspectives, opinions, beliefs, and actions about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

**Self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy refers to individuals’ perceptions of their own abilities. That is, self-efficacy is the belief that people can produce their own desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Although self-efficacy is certainly influenced by the knowledge and skills people possess, self-efficacy is not about those actual skills or knowledge, but about the way they are perceived by the individual (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 1998). Thus, self-efficacy is not necessarily about what is objectively true, but about what is believed to be true.

**Significance**

This research is significant to the field in a number of ways. Although graduates of teacher preparation programs indicate that their student teaching experience was most powerful in shaping their skills, knowledge, and attitudes, little research has been conducted that investigates that influence (Prater & Sileo, 2004). Specifically, the current study isolated the influence of student teaching, thus controlling for other variables within a teacher education program. By understanding the ways in which student teaching impacts growth in attitude, skills, and knowledge, future researchers and teacher education programs can
intervene to shape the attitudes and thereby skills of preservice teachers in ways that will contribute to successful student outcomes. In addition, the mixed methods design allowed the researcher to probe deeper into the perspectives of the student teachers, framing their attitudes within a broader and richer context. By understanding the attitudes, perspectives, and influences student teachers experience, teacher educators can begin to challenge assumptions, clarify misconceptions, increase collaboration, and select placements and experiences for preservice teachers that predicate change.
It’s the fear of the unknown. I’m not scared of the person, but I don’t know how to handle them…We have not been told what support we will get in our first year out – what sort of things we can draw on. It’s a great unknown. I think if I could find out enough information, then it would be rewarding. It could be frustrating if there is not support and no one to help.
---Preservice teacher (Jobling & Moni, 2004, p. 11)

Students with disabilities are more often included in general education classrooms than ever before (USDOE, 2007). However, teachers, both in general and special education, report feeling unprepared for inclusive environments (Cook, 2001). Furthermore, teacher attitudes are a critical factor in the success of inclusive educational programs (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Thus, it is essential to determine how preservice teacher education and specifically, student teaching, influences those attitudes. In order to inform the design of this research, current literature that investigated preservice teacher attitudes was reviewed. This chapter will provide the theoretical framework that grounded the current study, provide relevant background information about the topic of inclusion and accompanying teacher attitudes, and report on a systematic review of the literature about the attitudes of preservice teachers towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Theoretical Framework

Educational theory provides a way to explain and predict conditions under which learning, growth, and change take place. Therefore, the development of this research was designed with several theoretical underpinnings. These theories include situated cognition,
andragogy, and Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy. At least four assumptions about student teaching are supported by these theories and are as follows: (a) Student teaching occurs in a meaningful context, (b) student teaching provides opportunities to observe models and practice and refine skills, (c) student teaching offers increased responsibility and self-direction, and (d) student teaching gives preservice teachers a valued social role. Each of these themes is expanded upon below.

*Student Teaching Occurs in a Meaningful Context*

Student teaching may be particularly influential because learning occurs in a meaningful context. Situated cognition theorists would agree with this suggestion because as social beings, the best learning takes place in the context of a community of practice according to proponents of situated cognition (Driscoll, 2005). In fact, supporters of situated cognition suggest that if knowledge is taught and not used in context, students do not remember how to use the knowledge later. Adult learning theory, or andragogy, would also emphasize this important point. In contrast to children, who are more subject-oriented to learning than adults, adults typically organize their learning around life problems (Knowles, 1970). While children face delayed application of what they are learning, adult learning allows direct application to life. This problem solving orientation means that adults learn best in a real-life context, according to the andragogical perspective. Andragogy suggests that adults learn best when learning something that helps them in their lives, either by success, volition, value, or enjoyment (Knowles, 1973).

Furthermore, the importance of context is emphasized in Bandura’s (1977) theory of self-efficacy. Bandura postulated that self-efficacy was the assessment of one’s capabilities to
attain a desired level of performance in a given endeavor. However, this assessment is contextually dependent, meaning that it interacts with the environment in what Bandura termed as “reciprocal determination.” Self-efficacy is determined in part by the environment in which it is evaluated and likewise, the environment is effected by self-efficacy determinations. Thus, student teaching supplies important contextual cues for self-efficacy.

**Student Teaching Provides Opportunities to Observe Models and Practice and Refine Skills**

Advocates of the theory of situated cognition would support opportunities to observe models and practice and refine skills because the process of learning involves legitimate peripheral participation or apprenticeship (Driscoll, 2005). That is, learners must belong to a community of practice, have access to resources, and communicate with peers as well as experts so that they are actively engaged in the world of that which they are learning (Brill, 2001). Although it may take time to gain full access to the community (the school setting under which student teachers are practicing) and the learner’s position in the community may change with time, situated cognitive theorists believe that one learns a subject matter (e.g. to teach) by doing what experts in that subject matter do (Brill, 2001). In this way, declarative and procedural knowledge are integrated within a single framework (Driscoll, 2005).

The opportunity for practice and refinement that is available during student teaching would also be supported by andragogy. A key premise in andragogy is that adults are able to better utilize their own experiences in their learning (Knowles, 1973). Adults have an expanding reservoir of experience. As each year of an individual’s life progresses, they have increasingly rich resources for learning. In addition to having their own experience from
which to draw resources for themselves, adults’ plentiful experiences also allow them to contribute to their colleagues and fellow students. Student teaching builds more experience from which preservice teachers can draw in their own teaching careers.

Self-efficacy theorists might suggest that these opportunities to observe models and practice and refine teaching skills would increase self-efficacy. Bandura (1977) believed there were four sources of self-efficacy: (a) mastery experiences, (b) vicarious experiences, (c) verbal persuasion, and (d) physiological arousal. Mastery experiences refer to a person’s previous successes or failures at similar tasks in similar circumstances. Thus, we determine our self-efficacy based on the results of our previous experiences. Vicarious experiences refer to the modeling of others. When people to whom we relate and believe are similar to ourselves model outcomes, we may judge our own self-efficacy in relation to their outcomes. Another source of self-efficacy beliefs is the verbal persuasion of a support provider, mentor, or significant other. Finally, some self-efficacy is dependent on physiological arousal, which is the joy and pleasure or stress and anxiety that experiences induce. Of these four sources of self-efficacy, mastery experiences are believed to be the most powerful. Yet, all four can be experienced during the student teaching experience, making it an influential time in self-efficacy development.

*Student Teaching Offers Increased Responsibility and Self-direction*

Increased responsibility and self-direction would be an important distinction supported by adult learning theory, or andragogy. Andragogy is based on the premise that as an individual matures, their dependency decreases. In fact, advocates of andragogy believe that adult learners have changes in self-concept. They are more self-directed than children
according to Knowles (1970). Adult learning theory assumes that adults have resolved identity formation issues. In light of this, adults have both a greater need and a greater capacity to be self-directing. Adult learning theory believes that for adult learners, it is important that they have shared control of their learning through collaborative partnerships because they are more able to direct their learning than are children (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998).

**Student Teaching Gives Preservice Teachers a Valued Social Role**

A valued social role would be an important component to supporters of andragogy because, while children’s readiness to learn is characterized by their biological development (e.g. Piaget), Knowles (1973) suggests that adults’ readiness to learn is characterized by performance. Specifically, many adults begin their learning experiences in order to perform a social role. In fact, for adults, their life situations create a need for them to know and to learn. Programs that connect the instruction directly to its application may be most helpful to adult learners therefore.

A summary of the role of theory in the current study may be found in the following table.
### Table 2.1

**Role of Theory in the Current Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Application to Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Situated Cognition | 1. Importance of context to learning  
                        2. Learn through active involvement in a community of practice  
                        3. Learn by doing what experts do | Student teaching may be particularly influential because learning occurs in a more meaningful context where preservice teachers have access to experts, resources, and a school community in which to apply that which they have learned. |
| Andragogy       | Adult learners are characterized by four principles that are different from children:  
                        1. Changes in self-concept because they are more self-directed  
                        2. Differences in the role of experiences because they have more background experience from which to draw  
                        3. Variations in readiness to learn where they are ready to learn in order to perform a valued social role  
                        4. Different orientation to learning because they are motivated to learn in order to solve real life problems | Traditional preservice teachers are on the cusp of adulthood and therefore may be characterized by more andragogical approaches. Student teaching requires self-direction and preservice teachers are responsible for their own instructional decisions. In addition, working in the classroom provides them with a social role that may motivate them to learn as well as a variety of classroom “problems” to which they can apply their learning. |
| Self-efficacy   | Self-efficacy is the assessment of one’s capabilities to attain a desired level of performance in a given endeavor. It influences motivation to act, effort, and coping. Sources of motivation include:  
                        1. Mastery experiences  
                        2. Vicarious experiences  
                        3. Verbal persuasion  
                        4. Physiological arousal | Student teachers’ self-perceptions of their effectiveness will influence their confidence to act and their motivation to learn. In addition, their experiences during student teaching may be powerful predictors of their future self evaluations as well as the verbal support of their mentor teacher and university supervisor and the joy or stress they experience during their student teaching placement. |
Although the above framework provided grounding for the current study in theory, background information about inclusion is provided to contextualize the issue of preservice teacher attitudes.

Background Information

Educational access has been a battle for many groups of students. Girls gained access to education during the 1920s, students of color gained access during the Civil Rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s, and children with disabilities gained access in the 1970s (Kavale & Forness, 2000). However, such access often resulted in practices of separateness as illustrated in the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka decision in 1954 that determined that separate was not equal for children of color. In response to the Brown decision, advocacy groups in the field of special education eventually extended its stance against segregation into the field of special education. In fact, Dunn (1968) suggested that segregation was not effective and therefore fewer “special” classrooms (i.e. self-contained classrooms) were called for. The Dunn article became a driving force as educators began studying classroom placement and educational programming for students with disabilities (McLeskey, 2004). Other forces such as the Regular Education Initiative by the secretary of education (Will, 1986), drove educators to consider educational access for children with disabilities beyond the segregated classroom, and into general education environments. First called mainstreaming, and later redefined as inclusion, advocates believed that inclusion was an ethical and moral imperative (Kavale, 2002). For example, Baglieri and Knopf (2004) explained that inclusive education is a right and not something students must earn. In addition, one of the roles of education is to prepare students for the world in which they
live. Current society is increasingly diverse and students must be prepared to embrace such differences as “different” becomes more and more “normal” (Baglieri & Knopf, 2004).

Although inclusive education began in the 1970s and 1980s, it continues to face changing circumstances today. More and more children with special needs are served in general education classrooms for the majority of their instructional day (USDOE, 2007). The law that governs special education is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and its most current re-authorization in which it was renamed Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, or IDEIA was passed in 2004. IDEA requires that all students with identified disabilities in need of special education be served in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for their individual needs. The LRE requirement dictates that students be instructed with their non-disabled peers to the maximum extent possible.

Consequently, local educational agencies (LEAs) must offer a continuum of placement options for students with disabilities. The continuum, as shown in figure 2.1, provides placements that decrease from more to less restrictive depending on children’s individual special educational needs.
For an increasing number of students, their LRE is the general education classroom (Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004). In fact, before a placement decision is made, an IEP team must consider all supports, aids and services available that might accommodate the children's disabilities and allow them to participate in the general education classroom. The feasibility-portability act suggests that the IEP team should always consider whether the special education program could be carried out in the general education classroom (Katsiyannis, personal communication, 2008).

That education for children with disabilities is changing due to increased placement in general education classrooms is unquestionable (USDOE, 2007; Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004; McHatton & McCray, 2007). Huefner (2000) points out that in 1997 the LRE requirement
under IDEA was strengthened to require IEP teams to provide explanation and justification whenever a general education placement was not educational setting for a child with special needs. In the Twenty-Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (USDOE, 2007), states reported that over half of all children with disabilities receive education in the general education environment for at least 51% of the school day. The Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE) (Office of Special Education Programs, 2001) report indicated that 96% of general education teachers report that they have taught or are currently teaching students with disabilities. Yet, general and special education training, settings, and instructional strategies have traditionally been kept separate, particularly in preservice education (Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005). Results from the SPeNSE report also indicate that: (a) fewer than one-third of teachers who had been teaching six years or less had received training in their preservice preparation program related to collaborating with special educations, (b) less than half had received any training in adapting instruction, and (c) one third did not receive any training in managing behavior.

Inclusion is an issue that educators will face now and in the future and most teachers will teach students with disabilities in the general education classroom at some point in time (CEC, 2007). However, enhanced training and preparation may improve attitudes and increase the likelihood of successful outcomes for students in inclusive settings. Research suggests that the attitude of teachers is a critical factor in the effectiveness of inclusive environments (e.g. Antonak, 1980; Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999). Furthermore, attitudinal beliefs may be a strong influence on teachers’ behaviors, affecting
the way teachers interact with their students in an inclusive environment (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) conducted a research synthesis of 28 surveys between 1958 and 1995 that included over 10,000 teachers. In their synthesis, the authors found that teacher attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom were generally favorable. However, their synthesis suggested that attitudes varied “due mostly to the degree of intensity of mainstreaming, and the severity level of students with disabilities who are mainstreamed” (p. 62). Across the surveys, teachers generally supported the idea of inclusion; however the practical realities of instructing students with emotional or behavioral disorders, or severe sensory or intellectual disabilities challenged their views and drew more reluctance to include students with these types of disabilities in the general education classroom. The pressures of time and accountability may contribute to the finding that more special education teachers were more supportive of the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom than general educators (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

Attitudes of practicing teachers have been found to predict or correlate with their classroom practices. Buell et al. (1999) reported that teachers who had more positive attitudes about inclusion also believed they could improve their students’ educational outcomes. In addition, teachers with positive views of inclusion made more adaptations to classroom materials and procedures. Bender, Vial, and Scott (1995) found similar results with the practicing teachers they studied. Those teachers with negative attitudes about inclusion reported less use of research-based instructional strategies for students with disabilities.
Furthermore, practicing teachers overwhelmingly believe their training was inadequate for the inclusive classroom (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Interestingly, both special and general educators who participated in the studies synthesized by Scruggs and Mastropieri reported insufficient preparation. However, teachers did feel that if they had additional preparation, they would better be able to meet the needs of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Teachers felt coursework in their teacher education programs would help increase their awareness, skills, and knowledge for working with students with disabilities. Johnson (2000) found that training in about inclusion that focused on beliefs and attitudes, and the creation of a specific action plan led to increased outcomes for students with special needs. Furthermore, when teachers participated in ongoing professional development about inclusion, they were more willing to teach children with disabilities in the general education classroom, and they were more willing to participate in collaboration between general and special education professionals (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). McLeskey and Waldron suggested that training in instructional strategies to improve the skills of teachers, and providing specific training in the benefits of inclusion was needed in order to promote positive teacher attitudes. According to the SPeNSE (Office of Special Education Programs, 2001) report for example, 99% of practicing teachers who participated in professional development hours related to working with special educators felt successful after the training.

While the studies of practicing teachers’ attitudes are valuable, it is also important to consider how those attitudes developed during teacher education and training (Cook, 2001). Therefore, the study of preservice teacher attitudes is critical (Murphy, 1996). Teacher education programs have historically been discrete, creating a dual system (i.e. one system
for general educator preparation and another system for special education) of preservice teacher education (Jobling & Moni, 2004). More recently, education professionals are advocating for more collaborative programs hoping that the needs of diverse populations such as students with disabilities would be addressed in general education as well as special education (Blanton & Pugach, 2007; Blanton, Griffin, Winn, & Pugach, 1997; Kemple, Hartle, Correa, & Fox, 1994). Indeed, if educators are unprepared for the complex context of today’s diverse classrooms, negative attitudes will likely follow (Jobling & Moni, 2004). Research suggests that “negative attitudes acquired early in one’s career are difficult to change when subsequent experiences are filtered through a negative bias…” (Nel, 1992, p. 23). Thus, if preservice teachers leave their teacher education programs with negative attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, they will be resistant to change in the future and less likely to promote positive outcomes for students with disabilities in inclusive environments (Murphy, 1996).

A systematic review of the literature base regarding preservice teacher attitudes was conducted. Methods used to conduct the review are described, factors that influence preservice teacher attitudes found in the research that met inclusionary criteria for the review are identified, and themes that emerged from the literature review describing preservice teacher attitudes are explained.

Systematic Review of the Literature Pertaining to Preservice Teacher Attitudes

Methods

In order to assure the quality of studies included in this review, work published in peer reviewed journals and dissertations were included. Using a systematic, recursive
procedure, the author searched electronic databases first, including PsychArticles, PsychInfo, Educational Research Complete, and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). For this review, literature was included only if it provided original data on preservice teachers’ attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities in a general education class. A topical search of the factors influencing preservice teacher attitudes was conducted using the following keywords as search terms: student teach*, practicum, field experience*, inclusion, dispositions, attitude*, self-efficacy, preservice, preservice, preservice teacher education, teacher educa* and teachers—training of. Inclusionary criteria was set to include articles from 1996 – 2008. The rationale for this time period was two-fold: (a) to examine research produced after the last comprehensive literature review on teacher attitudes (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996), and (b) in light of the strengthened access to general education requirements in IDEA 1997 and IDEIA 2004. Inclusion in this review was not restricted to experimental studies. Empirical research was included such as survey research, and traditional qualitative and quantitative studies. However, general descriptions with no outcomes, opinion pieces, or recommendation reports were excluded. In addition, studies of preservice teachers were included whereas studies of participants who were practicing teachers were excluded.

Following the database search, the author conducted a hand search of the most prominent journals in special education and teacher education between 1996 and 2008 including: Teacher Education and Special Education, Exceptional Children, and Journal of Special Education. A citation search was used to identify articles that had cited the articles included to that point using the database Web of Science. Finally, references from the articles found through electronic and manual search that met the inclusionary criteria were examined to identify articles that may have been missed through previous search methods. In total, 16
studies met the inclusionary criteria for this review. Of these, three were dissertations and 13 were published in peer-reviewed journals. Of the 13 published in peer-reviewed journals, nine were international studies, and four occurred in the context of the United States. Three of the 16 studies utilized primarily qualitative methodologies, 10 used survey methods, two used an experimental design, and one used mixed methods to answer their research questions.

Factors Influencing Preservice Teacher Attitudes

Research has been conducted that identified some factors that influence preservice teacher attitudes such as type and severity of disability, gender of preservice teacher, informal experiences, the personal beliefs of the preservice teacher, the nature of their teacher preparation program, coursework, field of study, and formal experiences. These factors were identified by the authors of the 16 studies included in this literature review as important influences on preservice teacher attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. A study of these factors is valuable in that it clarifies how attitudes of preservice teachers develop. Furthermore, understanding how the complexity of factors exerts influence on the preservice teacher provides information to teacher preparation programs that may help them intervene to promote desired preservice teacher attitudes.

Severity and type of disability. Two studies identified severity and type of disability as critical factors in the attitudes of preservice teachers. Preservice teachers report more concern about inclusive environments when the disability more severely effects the student’s educational needs (Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; McHatton, & McCray, 2007).
Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden studied 135 preservice teachers in secondary education using a multidimensional scale. The authors created their scale based on 12 items from a technically adequate scale, the Opinions Relative to the Integration of Individuals with Disabilities (ORI). In addition, a Likert scale was used to measure intentions and bipolar adjectives such as anxious or relaxed, worried or self-assured, were included on the instrument. The authors also administered an inventory that measured preservice teachers’ perceptions of their own skills, five items about their confidence in meeting students’ Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) goals, and three open-ended items that asked about their preparation for inclusion and whether they felt anything needed to be changed in teacher preparation programs. The study’s analysis investigated preservice teachers’ general attitudes about inclusion, their emotional reactions to inclusion, and the influences of personal and institutional variables on their attitudes. Findings indicated that preservice teachers were less supportive of the inclusion of students with emotional or behavioral disorders than other disabilities such as autism, learning disability, and mental retardation (Avramidis et al., 2000).

In another study, McHatton and McCray (2007) administered a survey to 161 preservice teachers from both elementary and secondary education. The survey was administered before the participants had received any coursework or training in special education. The authors reported that the preservice teachers in their study were significantly less supportive of the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities, multiple disabilities, or behavioral disorders than other “milder” IDEA disability categories that received significantly more support.
Gender. Five studies investigated gender differences in attitudes about inclusion among preservice teachers, and four found that female preservice teachers were more positive about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom than were male preservice teachers (Avramidis et al., 2000; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005). Using the Preservice Inclusion Survey Soodek, Podell, and Lehman (1998) created as a revision to the Response to Inclusion Survey, Shippen and colleagues (2005) investigated the attitudes of 326 general education preservice teachers. Significant effects for gender, with males being less supportive of inclusion than females, were found both before a survey of exceptionalities course and after the completion of the course. In an international study that included 1,155 teacher education students across 11 campuses, Romi and Leyser (2006) used the ORI and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) to identify preservice teacher attitudes. Romi and Leyser’s results indicated that female preservice teachers were significantly more positive than male preservice teacher education students. In Tait and Purdie’s (2000) study, a 20-item survey instrument was used with 1,626 preservice teacher education students in Australia. The results revealed that female preservice teachers were more likely than males to feel sympathy towards students with disabilities, and less likely to feel embarrassment, which was an indicator of discomfort with disability on the instrument used in the study. However, in contrast to previous studies, no significant differences were found between males and females in a survey study of attitudes toward inclusion by Alghazo, Dodeen, and Algaryouti that was conducted in Jordan and included 597 Arab preservice teachers (2003). Thus, the influence of gender warrants further investigation and may be contextually specific.
Informal experience. The role of previous contact or other experiences with people with disabilities was examined in two studies (Romi & Leyser, 2006; Tait & Purdie, 2000). Romi and Leyser (2006) investigated the role of informal experience, such as experiences at camp, growing up, in their own schooling, and so on, on teacher attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Preservice teachers with more experience working with students with disabilities had more positive attitudes than preservice teachers with little or no reported experience. Their experience did not reduce uncertainties about the best placement for students with disabilities however. An important note to this finding however is that it relied on preservice teachers’ self reports of their experience rather than actual observed experiences. Similarly, in the Tait and Purdie (2000) study, participants who reported having more frequent contact with people with disabilities were less sympathetic, less vulnerable, and less embarrassed about interacting with people with disabilities. Tait and Purdie used the Interaction with Disabled Persons (IDP) scale (Gething, 1994). This scale was designed to measure attitudes of discomfort or comfort associated with interacting with people with disabilities. Sympathy was one factor that reliably loaded on the IDP scale that was associated with positive attitudes. Vulnerability and embarrassment loaded onto the discomfort scale factor however.

Personal beliefs. The personal beliefs of preservice teachers about the nature of knowledge, disability, and philosophy, were identified as influential in four studies. In a study of preservice teachers comparing epistemological beliefs to the attitudes toward inclusion, Silverman (2007) found that preservice teachers had generally positive attitudes. The author administered a survey designed to disclose the preservice teachers’ beliefs about knowledge, or epistemology, and the ORI, to 71 preservice teachers in general and special
education who were attending a large, Midwestern university. The findings indicated that preservice teachers were more positive about inclusion when they had higher epistemological beliefs, such as the belief that knowledge is complex and uncertain, that learning is gradual and effortful, and that learning can be improved upon. Similarly, Cottrell (2007), in her dissertation study, administered a survey designed to uncover philosophical beliefs and the ORI to 124 preservice teachers in an undergraduate teacher preparation program in Oklahoma. The philosophy survey questions were used to classify participants under five philosophical traditions: pragmatism, idealism, existentialism, realism, and reconstructivism. The author described pragmatism as an approach to education that incorporates inquiry and real-life tasks into the instructional design. Idealism was suggested to be a philosophical orientation that believed only in mental realities. Educators with an idealist philosophy believe learners should discover their own knowledge according to Cottrell. Existentialism was explained as the belief that students have full responsibility for creating meaning in their learning environment. A realist philosophy emphasizes scientific investigation, evaluation, and accountability, according to Cottrell. Finally, reconstructivism was clarified as a focus on the need for change and the purpose of learning was to create intelligent, democratic, and humane students. The researcher found that preservice teachers with a reconstructivist philosophy of education were significantly more positive about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom than were preservice teachers who held humanist (i.e. pragmatists, existentialists, or idealists according to Cottrell) or realist philosophies. The findings also revealed that 70% of the preservice teachers sampled held humanist or realist philosophies while only 15% held reconstructivist beliefs.
Personal beliefs about the nature of disability appear to influence preservice teacher attitudes as well. For example, Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden (2000) suggested that preservice teachers view students with disabilities from a medical model or deficit perspective, feeling that there are inherent problems within the child and therefore they believe specialized knowledge is required. Mintz (2007) used a different methodology that resulted in similar findings. In this research, 107 preservice teachers in an introductory course in special education were asked to write the first three words that came to mind when they saw the words “special education needs” and “inclusion.” In the data analysis, responses were coded as either “within child” or “external” descriptors. Their findings revealed that preservice teachers overwhelming considered within child rather than environmental influences suggesting that they felt something was inherently wrong within the child himself.

Thus, it is possible that preservice teachers are influenced by their philosophical, epistemological, and personal beliefs about disability. Teacher education programs that emphasize reconstructivist thinking and higher order views of knowledge may influence more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Furthermore, an emphasis on intervention may clarify the nature of disabilities for preservice teachers so they focus less on an organic or neurological model. Both Cottrell (2007) and Silverman (2007) recommend that teacher preparation programs help preservice teachers reflect on their personal beliefs to improve their understanding of the influence their beliefs exert on their developing attitudes.

Type of teacher preparation program. Two studies were interested in the influence of specific types of teacher preparation programs. Shippen et al. (2005) found that participants
who were enrolled in a dual certification program, in both special education and elementary or early childhood education, were more receptive to inclusion than either special education or general education majors. Kim’s (2006) dissertation study also investigated three types of teacher education programs, unified dual certification programs, discrete dual certification programs, and solely general education certification programs. Unified dual certification programs were defined as a combined model in which general education and special education courses were offered as part of one program with no separation general education or special education certification programs. Discrete dual certification models offered dual certifications for their preservice teachers however general education and special education courses were offered separately. Preservice teachers could choose dual certification or single certification educational programs. Solely general education programs were described as teacher preparation programs at institutions that offered no special education certification program but did offer a general education certification program. The author examined the effect of program type on preservice teacher attitudes towards inclusion and self-efficacy. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference between discrete dual certification programs and solely general education programs. However, preservice teachers from unified dual certification programs were significantly more supportive of inclusion and held higher self-efficacy than students from either of the other program types. In addition, in responding to teaching scenarios, preservice teachers from unified dual certification programs were significantly more likely to consider individual student needs when planning their instruction, provided significantly more adaptations, and suggested significantly more teaching strategies to help the students in the scenarios that were struggling than preservice teachers from either discrete dual certification or solely general education preparation.
program models. Thus, these results provide some research evidence seems to support the current trend toward unifying teacher education programs (Blanton & Pugach, 2004; Blanton, Griffin, Winn, & Pugach, 1997; Kemple, Hartle, Correa, & Fox, 1994).

Coursework. The impact of coursework on the attitudes of preservice teachers is the most researched influence investigated in previous literature. Six studies specifically examined the influence of coursework on the developing attitudes of preservice teachers. Shippen, et al. (2005) examined the influence of coursework on the emotional reactions of 326 preservice teachers enrolled in a survey of exceptionalities course. Students were surveyed about their reactions to presented scenarios about serving students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Seventeen pairs of adjectives describing negative, somewhat negative, neutral, somewhat positive, and positive feelings toward the scenario followed each scenario. The findings revealed a significant effect for time in that all preservice teachers’ attitudes were more positive at the end of the course than they were when the course began.

Shade and Stewart (2001) reported similar findings. In their survey of 122 general education preservice teachers and 72 special education preservice teachers in their undergraduate program, they found that the attitudes of all participants improved after a 30 hour introduction to special education course. The authors suggested that this lent empirical support to the influence of just one course on preservice teacher attitudes and recommended that all states mandate a course requirement. Unfortunately, at the time of Shade and Stewart’s study, 10 states still did not require any course in special education for all of their education majors.

Campbell, Gilmore, and Cuskelly (2003) also investigated the influence of one course on preservice teacher attitudes. In their study of 274 early childhood, elementary, and
secondary education preservice teachers, they implemented a fieldwork assignment requiring students to interview community members about a specific disability, Down syndrome. Their results revealed significant change in the participants’ understanding of Down syndrome, placement of students with Down syndrome, and general attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. After the course, preservice teachers were better able to define Down syndrome and approximate developmental milestones for students with Down syndrome. This was an important change because prior to the course students underestimated the abilities of children with Down syndrome to meet developmental milestones. As future teachers, these lowered expectations may have a detrimental effect on the educational outcomes of their students. Furthermore, the participants were more likely to recommend placement in the neighborhood school for children with Down syndrome after the course, and less likely to recommend a separate special school. However, student teachers continued to recommend placement in classes with younger students rather than age-appropriate inclusive placements. On an overall measure of attitudes that was not specific to Down syndrome, participants showed less sympathy, uncertainty, fear, and vulnerability after the class. Sympathy uncertainty, fear, and vulnerability loaded on the discomfort factor within the scale and so a decrease in these attitudes represents greater comfort about people with disabilities. The participants also reported more coping abilities than before the class. These results seem to reinforce the influence of coursework on the attitudes of preservice teachers although the authors suggest that the most important component of this course structure was the fieldwork interview component.
Jobling and Moni’s (2004) work in Australia confirmed this finding using qualitative methods. The researchers conducted focus group interviews and examined work sample artifacts (which were reflective journals, lesson plans within a mini teaching unit the preservice teachers developed) and final evaluation reflections, from a fieldwork component to their introduction to special education class. Preservice teachers in their study continued to feel unprepared for the challenges of teaching students with disabilities even after completing introductory to special education coursework. However, when a fieldwork assignment was added to the course, to implement a teaching unit with young adults with intellectual disabilities with whom they had worked previously, participants reported more positive feelings about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, more abilities to make necessary instructional and material adaptations, and more overall knowledge about interacting with students with disabilities.

The influence of teacher education program coursework was different in Romi and Leyser’s (2006) study. Their findings indicated that preservice teachers who were in their third or fourth year of study were less supportive of inclusion than preservice teachers in their first or second year. This result was found across 11 teacher education programs in Israel. In Tait and Purdie’s (2000) Australian based study, although there were statistically significant differences in the attitudes of preservice teachers about interacting with people with disabilities after the completion of an introductory special education course, the effect size was small and therefore the changes held little practical import according to the authors.

Field of study. McHatton and McCray (2007) findings indicated that secondary education preservice teachers were more negative about inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms than were elementary education preservice
teachers. Among secondary education majors, preservice teachers in the humanities such as English, psychology, history, and the arts, appear to hold significantly more positive attitudes than math or science majors (Avramidis et al., 2000). Similar findings were reported by Alghazo, Dodeen, and Algaryouti (2003). In their analysis students from the colleges of sciences were more negative about inclusion than students in the humanities or education. In Tait and Purdie’s (2000) study in Australia, the authors also found that preservice teachers whose primary language was not English were more likely to feel embarrassed when interacting with individuals with disabilities than preservice teachers from predominantly English speaking homes.

Shippen, et al (2005) also investigated the levels of anxiety in general education and special education preservice teacher attitudes. Their findings revealed that general educators had the highest levels of anxiety about working with students with disabilities in the general education setting. Romi and Leyser (2006) also reported similar findings in their study of preservice teachers in Israel. Of the 1,155 participants, preservice teachers in special education held more positive attitudes towards inclusion than their general education counterparts. In addition, special education majors scored significantly higher on self-efficacy measures, indicating they were more confident to work in inclusive settings than general education preservice teachers.

**Formal experience.** Experience appears to be an influencing factor in developing preservice teacher attitudes, and particularly their experience in a practicum or fieldwork component of preparation. In an internationally based qualitative study in Ireland that included 41 teachers in practicum settings, Lambe and Bones (2006) analyzed discussions among the preservice teachers. The authors found that preservice teachers who were placed
in settings with children with disabilities for their fieldwork, became *less supportive* of inclusion after their fieldwork was completed. These student teachers reflected on their observations in fieldwork and said that class sizes were too large when students with disabilities were included, there was not enough collaboration, and that the teachers they observed were unprepared for the realities of inclusion. However, in discussing their findings the authors suggested that student teachers’ attitudes depended on how much they liked their field placement. This finding was corroborated by Romi and Leyser (2006) who suggested, based on their findings, that high quality field experiences should be used so preservice teachers could observe successful teachers in inclusive classrooms implement effective instructional strategies. However, student teaching may not involve teaching students with disabilities. In Jobling and Moni’s (2004) study, student teachers rarely saw their mentor teachers working with students with disabilities. Even when these participants did observe an inclusive environment, they reflected that their mentor teacher appeared to have limited knowledge and ability to teach students with disabilities as well. The implication then, is that quality placements are essential during student teaching because of the impact they purport.

Participants in a dissertation study by Moore-Hayes (2008) in Canada concurred that practicum placements were important to preservice teachers’ attitudes. Using the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and two open-ended questions, the author reported on 162 general education preservice and beginning teachers’ self-efficacy. The study revealed that practicum placements were helpful in developing efficacy for inclusion and classroom management (Moore-Hayes, 2008). In fact, these preservice and beginning teachers advocated for extended practicum placements to include students with disabilities.
However, Lancaster and Bain (2007) obtained different implications in their Australian study of 125 elementary and early childhood preservice teachers. These researchers created three levels of preparation with their participants who were elementary and early childhood preservice teachers enrolled in a teacher education course. With one group, participants took an introduction to special education course and completed a fieldwork component of the course where they mentored students with disabilities, tutoring them using a research-based tutoring program. Another group of participants provided support to the teachers in an inclusive classroom while taking the introductory course. The final group took the introductory course without completing any fieldwork component. The researchers hypothesized that the groups working in the field would have higher self-efficacy scores because they would be more confident working with students with disabilities. However, the results of their analysis indicated that, although all three groups of participants’ self-efficacy improved after the introductory course, there were no statistically significant differences among the three groups. In this case, the influence of fieldwork was not significant for self-efficacy of preservice teachers.

Clearly, the issue of attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom is multifaceted. And, while there are some discrepant findings reported in the literature, teacher educators should understand the complexities involved in attitudinal development. In fact, the way multiple factors intersect may best explain a preservice teacher’s attitude.
A convergence of Influential Factors Creates Overall Attitudes of Preservice Teachers

In synthesizing the literature, three themes appear to describe preservice teacher attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom: (a) preservice teachers are generally positive about the idea of inclusion, however, when addressing more specific ideas about inclusion, preservice teachers are less positive, (b) many preservice teachers are ambivalent and undecided about inclusion, and (c) preservice teachers have little confidence when addressing their preparation for inclusion. These attitudes may emerge to the extent that factors as described above exert influence upon their attitudinal development. Thus, the complexity of the issue is that individual preservice teachers develop their attitudes according to their beliefs, demographic variables such as gender and primary language, informal experiences in their daily lives, and experiences within their teacher preparation program. The way in which each of these factors come together, influences the development of their overall attitude. Thus, it is valuable for researchers and teacher educators to consider influencing factors as well as the overall attitudes they develop. In this way, educators can foster desired attitudes of preservice teachers by intervening in those variables that influenced them.

Generally positive attitudes. Research results seem to converge that preservice teachers hold positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms (e.g. Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Silverman, 2007). Jobling and Moni (2004) reported that, although both special education and general education preservice teachers are positive about the ideology of inclusion, they also are apprehensive about working with students with disabilities and have limited knowledge about inclusive practices. In their study in Australia, both groups of
preservice teachers believed students with disabilities would be taught by “special teachers in special classrooms” (p. 9). However, research studies that used more specific questions of preservice teachers, such as their ability to effectively manage classrooms or their instructional skills in working with students with disabilities, resulted in attitudes that were more indecisive or negative (Romi & Leyser, 2006).

Ambivalent or undecided. Tait and Purdie (2000) found that most of their preservice teacher participants felt extreme vulnerability about working with students with disabilities. Many preservice teachers feel ambivalent about the topic of inclusion. In McHatton and McCray’s (2007) work, survey results from both elementary and secondary education majors about their attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom revealed that the majority of participants responded “undecided” on most of the survey questions. Similarly, the majority of preservice teachers in Cottrell’s (2007) dissertation study were undecided about their ability to teach students with disabilities; they were also undecided about inclusive versus special education placements.

Negative about preparation. Participants in Jobling and Moni’s (2004) study expressed much frustration with the lack of preparation for working with students with disabilities and both general education preservice participants and special education participants wished they could have more experiences and classes to prepare them for the reality in schools. They further insisted that such preparation should be practical and not theoretical knowledge and implicated their coursework as giving them only theoretical information. This may lead some preservice teachers to hold more negative attitudes about inclusion as were found in the results of a study by Alghazo, Dodeen, and Algaryouti (2003) of preservice teachers in Jordan and United Arab Emigrates.
Preservice teachers overwhelmingly raise the issue of training and preparation for working with students with disabilities (Avramidis et al., 2000). Cottrell’s (2007) dissertation study of preservice teacher attitudes found that preservice teacher participants had negative attitudes about their classroom management abilities for example. In another dissertation investigating the self-efficacy of preservice and beginning teachers, participants reported on a survey instrument that they felt adequately prepared for teaching, inclusion, and classroom management. However, on open-ended questions, both preservice and beginning teachers in this study cited the need for more preparation for working with students with disabilities, using IEPs, and greater knowledge about disabilities (Moore-Hayes, 2008). The preservice teachers in the study by Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden (2000) also asked for more knowledge, more training, and more experience with students with special education needs.

Preservice teachers, like practicing professionals, lack confidence in meeting the special educational needs of a student with a disability in the general education classroom. Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden (2000) noted in their study that, the more severe the disability, the less likely the preservice teachers felt they would be able to meet the students’ educational needs. The authors state that their findings revealed that preservice teachers feel generally positive about inclusion, but have little confidence in their ability to teach students with disabilities, especially those whose disabilities are more severe. This finding emerges from investigations in self-efficacy as well. For example, in Romi and Leyser’s (2006) study, preservice teachers in both general and special education had more general self-efficacy than personal teaching self-efficacy. The authors suggested that this indicates confidence in teaching in general, however, less confidence about specific instructional situations such as working directly with students with disabilities.
An important implication about lack of confidence is that there appears to be a strong correlation between preservice teachers’ perceptions of their skills and their attitudes towards inclusion (Avramidis et al., 2000). That is, preservice teachers who believe they have more skills for working with students with disabilities have more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Results from a dissertation study that used survey instrumentation to examine the attitudes and self-efficacy of preservice teachers from different types of teacher preparation programs provided evidence to support the correlation between attitudes and efficacy (Kim, 2006). The author ran correlation analyses between an attitudes about inclusion survey and a survey of self-efficacy and found that preservice teachers who had more positive attitudes about inclusion, also had higher self-efficacy scores.

Conclusions

A review of the educational theories supporting the current work and relevant literature revealed the importance of investigating preservice teacher attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. There is an increase in the number of students with disabilities served in general education settings (USDOE, 2007) yet many teachers feel unprepared for the realities of inclusion and negative attitudes may result (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Negative attitudes have been found to effect student outcomes in inclusive environments because teachers make fewer adaptations (Buell et al., 1999), use less evidence-based instructional strategies (Bender, Vial, & Scott, 1995), and foster more positive, collaborative climates (Villa & Thousand, 2003). It is therefore critical to prepare preservice teachers with positive attitudes toward the inclusion
of students with disabilities in the general education environment. Empirical evidence indicates that positive attitudes correlate to higher self-efficacy (Avramidis et al., 2000; Kim, 2006). Higher self-efficacy increases confidence and thus, improved preparation will in turn lead to more positive attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom (Jobling & Moni, 2004).

Research has identified some factors, such as type and severity of disability, gender of preservice teacher, informal experiences, coursework, type of teacher preparation program, field of study, and formal experiences, that influence preservice teacher attitudes. However, several limitations were evident in the research. Although field experiences have been investigated as an influential factor to preservice teacher attitudes, no study has explored the influence of full-time student teaching in the development of preservice attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. In addition, the influence of the mentor teacher during practicum experiences has not been considered in the empirical literature. Furthermore, while considerable survey research has been conducted to identify influential factors in the development of preservice attitudes, little qualitative research has explored the issue.

The current study uses mixed methodology to explore the influence of student teaching on preservice teacher attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. The quantitative phase used valid and reliable instrumentation that measured student teachers’ attitudes before and after their full time student teaching experience, allowing the influence of student teaching to be evident. Proposed factors of the student teaching experience that may influence preservice teachers’ attitudes were investigated including the inclusivity of the environment, and the attitude of...
the mentor teacher. These factors have not been studied in previous research literature. The qualitative phase included in-depth observations of preservice teachers in their student teaching setting, semi-structured interviews to allow the preservice teachers’ own voices to emerge, and analysis of artifacts preservice teachers completed during their full-time student teaching.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

“Mixed methods research provides more comprehensive evidence for studying a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative research alone.”
--Creswell & Plano Clark (2007, p. 9)

The purpose of this chapter is to detail the research procedures and design of the study. The overall research question, what is the influence of student teaching on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards the inclusion of students with special needs, guided the research design. Following, the rationale for the research design, the research questions, and the quantitative and qualitative research procedures are described.

Factors that Informed the Research Design

The current research utilized a mixed methods approach. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed to examine the attitudes of the preservice teachers before, during, and after student teaching. Informing the design decision were the worldview assumptions the researcher brought to the study, and the nature of the research issue being addressed (Creswell, 2009). The researcher’s worldview and assumptions about knowledge, based on culture, experiences, and history, clearly influence the choice of design (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). The current investigation was conducted under a pragmatist paradigm (Driscoll, 2005). Pragmatism views reality as both singular and multiple; there is an objective reality, but it is unreachable so emphasis is placed on “what works” (Driscoll, 2005). Furthermore, pragmatism is pluralistic, incorporating multiple perspectives (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).
Attitudes represent a latent construct because they cannot be seen directly; instead behaviors, choices, and responses manifest underlying attitudes (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). In this examination, survey instrumentation and quantitative data analysis were used to uncover the attitudes of preservice teachers before and after their student teaching experiences. However, survey instruments are only able to measure that which they ask; that is, they may not fully uncover the latent construct of attitudes. The attitudes of student teachers may be further understood, then, by using qualitative data to enrich and explain the quantitative results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Selected participants were sampled to help explain the survey findings and provide more information about their attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Thus, the combinations of qualitative and quantitative analyses provide an in-depth examination of the student teachers’ attitudes. In addition, incorporating a detailed view from selected participants reduces the chance of interpretation errors because the qualitative data provided further information with which to interpret quantitative results.

Mixed Methods Design

An embedded mixed method design was used to answer the research question, how do the qualitative results explain, corroborate, or contradict the results from the quantitative survey research. In an embedded design, one data set plays a supportive role in a study based primarily on the other data set. The primary purpose of this study was to use survey instruments to examine the extent to which student teaching influenced preservice teacher attitudes. A secondary purpose was to gather qualitative interview, observational, and artifact data that explored the role of student teaching for preservice teachers. The
secondary database was collected to explain factors associated with the attitudes of preservice teachers about inclusion, and particularly for participants to explain in their own words the influence of student teaching.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of field experience, or student teaching, on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion. The following research questions were answered to clarify the impact:

*Quantitative questions:*

1. Is there a significant difference within preservice special education, early childhood, elementary education, and secondary education teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion before their full-time student teaching experience and after student teaching?

2. Is there a significant difference in attitude towards inclusion between general education preservice teachers and special education preservice teachers after their student teaching experience? Where do significant differences lie – between early childhood education and special education, elementary education and special education, or secondary education and special education?

3. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy – are most influential on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion after student teaching?
4. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy - exert the most influence on any change that does or does not occur between pre-student teaching and post-student teaching?

Qualitative questions:

5. How do preservice teachers describe, interpret, and explain their attitudes toward inclusion?

6. What do preservice teachers experiencing full-time student teaching identify as factors influencing their attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom?

Mixed methods question:

7. How do the qualitative results explain, corroborate, or contradict the results from the quantitative survey research?

A logic model that graphically displays the overall research design used to answer the above questions can be found in appendix A. In the following section, the participants, instrumentation, and setting for the study are described, followed by the research procedures for the quantitative phase, then procedures for the qualitative phase of the research, and finally data mixing procedures are explained.

Participants

The population of interest in this study was preservice teachers at a mid-sized university in the southeast who were completing their student teaching in Spring, 2009. The sample size reflected 89% of this total population. The participants were selected using a
convenience sampling procedure where all students, and their cooperating teacher, who were participating in their final student teaching experience were invited to participate (Jones & Kottler, 2006). This sampling at one university had two justifications: (a) it controlled for programmatic differences and the wide variability in certification, licensure, and special education categories by state, and (b) it provided for an in-depth investigation of one university's approach to student teaching. The teacher education program is housed within a land-grant university, Clemson University. “Clemson University is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the State of South Carolina for the preparation of educational personnel in South Carolina in Early Childhood Education; Elementary Education; Reading; Special Education; Secondary Education programs in agriculture, English, the sciences, mathematics, modern languages, social studies, and technology education; as well as Counselor Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Leadership” (Clemson University Eugene T. Moore School of Education [ETMSOE], 2007, ¶ 5). In addition, the program in special education is accredited through the International Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Clemson University has the largest four-year undergraduate teacher education program in the state of South Carolina. The field experience office at Clemson University coordinates early field experiences, which are part-time practicum placements, and full-time student teaching experiences. All teacher certification candidates are required to complete early, part-time field experiences during foundation courses in education during their freshman, sophomore, junior, and first semester senior years. In addition, a culminating experience called full-time student teaching is required the last semester of their senior year prior to graduating. Syllabi for the full-time student teaching semester, including the number of hours required in the
field, the number of seminars student teachers were required to attend, and assignment requirements during student teaching can be found in appendix B. In addition, an overall program plan for each certification area of Clemson University’s School of Education is provided in appendix C. The current study sought to evaluate the influence of this final student teaching experience which was in-depth and synthesized all previous fieldwork.

In order to draw meaningful conclusions from the survey data, a minimum number of 30 participants was necessary. This number was obtained by conducting an apriori power analysis using 0.80 as a standard for adequacy (Lenth, 2006). The participants represented 137 cooperating mentor teachers (82% of total population), 28 (100% of total population) special education preservice teachers, and 121 (88% of total population) general education preservice teachers. Of the general education preservice teachers, 16 sought early childhood certification, 36 sought elementary certification, and 69 sought secondary education certification. Within secondary education preservice certification seekers, 18 sought certification in mathematics, 28 in social studies/history, 13 in English and foreign languages, 5 in sciences, 2 in psychology, and 3 in career and technical education. Self reports of ethnicities indicated that 3 African American/Black, 142 Caucasian, 2 Asian, 2 Latino, and 1 Mixed race preservice teachers participated. 31 males and 119 females participated and most participants (N=133) were between 21 and 24 years of age. Demographic characteristics can be found in table 3.1. Categories with zero participants were not included. For example, no students reported an ethnicity of American Indian/Alaskan native, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or Other so those categories are not included in the table.

Table 3.1
### Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 – 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th># Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th># Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Certification</th>
<th># Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of participants for the qualitative component of the study was done through purposive sampling (Jones & Kottler, 2006). Using the initial scores of the preservice teachers on the Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI) survey, that is the score obtained on the ORI before student teaching, preservice teachers were sorted from low score to high score on the numeric list, with low scores representing less support for inclusion, and high scores indicating more supportive attitudes. The special education and general education preservice teacher with the lowest score on the ORI, who agreed to participate, were selected for the qualitative research. In addition, the special education and general education preservice teacher with the highest score on the ORI
who consented were selected as participants. Once selected, numeric codes were matched to names and consent for participation was obtained. Demographic characteristics of the participants for the qualitative research are displayed in table 3.2.

Table 3.2

*Case Study Participant Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Area of Certification</th>
<th>Student teaching setting</th>
<th>ORI Score (Before)</th>
<th>ORI Score (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybil</td>
<td>29+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Resource specialist</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaina</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Resource specialist</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General education classroom with 17-22 students and 1-3 students with disabilities</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General education classroom with 17-22 students and 4-6 students with disabilities</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary Education-Social Studies</td>
<td>General education classrooms with 23-30 students and 1-3 students with disabilities per period</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General education classroom with 17-22 students and 4-6 students with disabilities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General education classroom with 17-22 students and 1-3 students with disabilities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>29+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>General education classroom with 17-22 students and 1-3 students with disabilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

Two instruments and a demographic questionnaire were used for the purposes of this study, the Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities instrument (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995), and the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). A copy of both instruments and the demographic questionnaire can be found in appendix D. Appendix E contains permission letters from the authors.

Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI). The ORI was developed to measure attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. It was created to be used with undergraduates pursuing a degree in special or general education and practicing professionals pursuing initial or recertification in special or general education (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). Thus, it is appropriate to use with preservice student teachers. The ORI is a revision of a previous instrument, the Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming scale by Larrivee and Cook (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). It was revised in order to accomplish three goals: (a) to include more inclusive and contemporary terminology (e.g. person first language), (b) to prevent validity threats such as participants’ tendencies to respond in agreement, and (c) to remove five items that manifested unacceptable psychometric characteristics (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995).

The revised scale contains 25 six-point likert items and can be completed in an average of 20 minutes. Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. In an investigation to determine the technical adequacy of the revised scale conducted with preservice teachers and practicing teachers seeking re-certification, the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability was
calculated at 0.82 and Cronbach’s Alpha of internal consistency was 0.88. Validity was also high for preservice and new teachers (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). Four factors were found to correspond to the overall construct of integration into general education classrooms of students with disabilities: (a) benefits of integration, (b) integrated classroom management, (c) perceived ability to teach students with disabilities, and (d) special versus integrated general education. However, the authors suggested that more research should be conducted to validate the four factor loadings and to validate the scale with more experienced teachers (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995). Because the current study investigates the attitudes of preservice student teachers, the lack of validation with experienced teachers is not problematic. Likert scale, summated survey designs are the most widely used research method to study teacher attitudes (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996) and therefore the use of surveys to uncover the attitudes of preservice teachers and the influence of student teaching is warranted.

*Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES).* The TSES is based on Bandura’s construct of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). The scale measures teachers’ perceptions of their ability to perform important tasks and elements of teaching (Tschanne-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Like the ORI, the TSES was developed to be administered to both preservice and in-service teachers. The technical adequacy of the TSES was reported by Tschanne-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) in three investigations with preservice and in-service teachers as they revised the scale based on each previous investigation until they had technically adequate long and short forms of the instrument. In the current investigation, the long form of the TSES was used. The reported reliability for the overall long form was 0.95. Three factors emerged that explained 51% of the overall variance and their corresponding
Cronbach’s reliability coefficients were as follows: (a) efficacy for student engagement (0.87), (b) efficacy for instructional strategies (0.91), (c) efficacy for classroom management (0.90). However, the authors report that the most authentic measure of self-efficacy for preservice teachers is their total score on the scale, and not an individual subscale score (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Therefore, the total score is used in the current study. Results of studies investigating the validity of the TSES were also positive. Construct validity was evident through correlations between the TSES and other common efficacy scales such as Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Scale ($r=0.48; p<0.01$), and the RAND items ($r=0.35$ and $0.28; p<0.01$). The long form consists of 24 items that participants rate on a nine-point Likert scale.

*Other instrumentation.* Demographic data were also collected from the student teachers and mentor teachers and are shown in appendix F. Items on the demographic questionnaire included: gender, age, ethnicity/race, certification area of interest, type of classroom in which student teaching will be completed, number of students in student teaching placement, number of students with disabilities in student teaching placement, what disability categories are represented in student teaching placement, service delivery for students with disabilities in student teaching placement, what previous instruction they have received about inclusion, their perceived level of preparation for teaching in inclusive settings, and the extent of any previous experiences with individuals with disabilities. These data were collected to provide background information about the participants and contextualize the study outcomes.
Setting

Pseudonyms are used for all names of settings of districts, schools, and classrooms. The preservice teachers in this study completed their student teaching within the context of seven public school districts in the southeastern United States. Details about the seven school districts are described below, based on information collected and reported to the state department of education, and can be found in table 3.3

Andrews School District, at which 22 preservice teachers were placed for student teaching, has approximately 9,173 students in grades K-12 attending 14 elementary, middle, and high schools. Average class size is 22 students per teacher. Student ethnicity is predominantly Caucasian with 87% of the student population reporting white ethnicity, 8% Black, 4% Hispanic, and less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan native, or other. Thirty-six percent of the pupils in Andrews school district qualify for free or reduced lunch. Twenty percent of students in this district attend gifted and talented programming, and 9% receive special education services (language and speech excluded).

Thirteen preservice teachers completed student teaching in Albright School District, which enrolls approximately 2,849 students at six schools. The teacher to student ratio is 20:1 in this district. The reported ethnicities for this district are: seventy-six percent of the pupils are of Caucasian ethnicity, 22% Black, 2% Hispanic, and less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan native, or other. Forty-four percent of students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Twelve percent of the students receive gifted and talented services and 12.9% receive special education services (language and speech excluded).

Twenty-four preservice teachers did their student teaching in Adams School District. The student population in this district is approximately 12,390 and they attend 17 schools
including nine elementary, three middle, two high, one extension campus, one early childhood center, and one academy of the arts. Average class size was 20. Their student ethnicities are: 59% Caucasian, 38% Black, 3% Hispanic, and less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan native, or other. Sixty percent of this district’s students participate in free or reduced lunch. Approximately 11% of students in the district qualify for gifted and talented programming, and 12% of the student population is enrolled in special education services (language and speech excluded).

One student teacher was placed in Cotton School District for student teaching. Cotton School District enrolls approximately 5,897 students at 13 schools. The average class size is reported at 19 students per teacher. In this district, 49% of students are Caucasian, 49% are Black, 1% Hispanic, and less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan native, or other. In addition, 58% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Eleven percent of the student population qualifies for gifted and talented programming and 9.9% receive special education services (language and speech excluded).

Greyson School district, at which 19 student teachers were placed, is the 51st largest school district in the nation with 69,443 students at 90 schools throughout the district. The district reports an average class size of 22. Sixty-two percent of the students in this district are Caucasian, 27% Black, 9% Hispanic, 2% Asian/Pacific Islander, and less than 1% are American Indian/Alaskan Native or other. Approximately 42% of the student population participates in free or reduced lunch. Seventeen percent of students in Greyson school district participate in Gifted and Talented Education, and 11.5% qualify for special education services (language and speech excluded).
The largest group of preservice teachers (N=47) were placed in Oscar School District. Oscar School District enrolls approximately 10,716 students in their 21 elementary, middle, and high schools. The average class size is 21 students. Eighty percent of their student population are Caucasian, 13% Black, 6% Hispanic, and less than 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or other. Fifty-one percent of the student enrollment is eligible for free or reduced lunch. Fifteen percent of students in this district are eligible for gifted and talented programming, and 13% receive special education services (language and speech excluded).

Forty-six preservice teachers completed their student teaching in Park School District. This district serves approximately 16,658 students in their 25 schools. Class sizes are 22 students on average and 40% of the pupils qualify for free or reduced lunch. Eighty-six percent of the students are Caucasian, 10% Black, 3% Hispanic, 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, and less than 1% are American Indian/Alaskan Native or other. Nineteen percent of students in Park School District qualify for gifted and talented services, and 9% receive special education services (language and speech excluded).
Table 3.3

School District Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th># of Preservice Teachers Placed</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
<th>Student Ethnicities</th>
<th>% Free/Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>% In Gifted and Talented</th>
<th>% In Special Education*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9,173</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>87% White 8% Black 4% Hispanic</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>76% White 22% Black 2% Hispanic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12,390</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>59% White 38% Black 3% Hispanic</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,897</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19:1</td>
<td>49% White 49% Black &lt;1% Hispanic</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69,443</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>62% White 27% Black 9% Hispanic</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10,716</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21:1</td>
<td>80% White 13% Black 6% Hispanic</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16,658</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>86% White 10% Black 3% Hispanic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Language and speech excluded

Quantitative Research Procedures

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was obtained from the institutional review board to conduct the study (see appendix G). Following approval, area coordinators of the teacher education programs in special education, early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary education were contacted and their support proffered to begin the study. In addition, the researcher gained support from representatives from the university’s field experiences office. Cooperating with the field experiences office, the researcher explained to the preservice
teachers the purpose of the research, the expectations of participants, and gained consent to participate during the student teachers’ orientation meeting. The researcher provided assurances of confidentiality, no penalty for participation or non-participation, and the voluntary nature of the study. Once permission was granted from each student teacher participant, the researcher administered a paper-pencil version of the ORI, TSES, and demographic questionnaire at the end of the orientation session and collected the completed surveys. To guard against sequence effect response biases, the ORI appeared first in half of the material handouts and the TSES appeared first in the other half. At the end of student teaching, the researcher met with each seminar instructor to administer the ORI and TSES to preservice teachers during their seminar meeting with the same instructions used previously before the student teaching experience.

In addition to survey administration to preservice student teachers, the researcher administered the ORI and the demographic questions to each mentor teacher with whom the student teacher was placed using an electronic format. The field experiences office provided a master list of schools and mentor teachers, and the researcher emailed mentor teachers an information letter that described the purpose of the study, and provided assurance of confidentiality, limited risks, and potential benefits and a link to the survey on www.surveymonkey.com.

Data Analysis Procedures

Each of the quantitative research questions were examined using specific data analysis procedures.
1. Is there a significant difference between preservice special education, early childhood, elementary education, and secondary education teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion before their full-time student teaching experience and after student teaching? This question was answered using the paired $t$-test procedure to determine if there was a significant difference in the attitudes of each subgroup of preservice teachers before and after student teaching (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2005).

2. Is there a significant difference in attitude towards inclusion between general education preservice teachers and special education preservice teachers after their student teaching experience? Where do statistically significant differences lie – between early childhood education and special education, elementary education and special education, or secondary education and special education? Mean scores on the final survey, collected after student teaching, were calculated for preservice teachers in special education. In addition, combined mean scores for early childhood, elementary, and secondary education preservice teachers were calculated to represent general education teachers. A paired $t$-test analyzed whether significant differences existed between special education and general education preservice teachers. In addition, a two-tailed, one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to conduct pairwise differences among the means of special education, early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary education preservice teachers. The first ORI survey score was covaried on the second survey score to adjust for beginning differences in attitudes among the
preservice teachers and to determine significant differences in the attitudes of
preservice teachers between subgroups.

3. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or
self-efficacy – are most influential on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards
inclusion after student teaching? This research question and the question
below, were answered with a multiple regression model, where the dependent
variable – the preservice teachers’ scores on the ORI after student teaching –
was regressed on multiple independent variables (Keith, 2006). The
independent variables of interest were the score of their mentor teacher on
the ORI, their survey scores before student teaching, and their self efficacy
score on the TSES. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were examined
before running the regression analysis to insure the values looked reasonable
with no excessively high or impossible values (Keith, 2006). In addition,
95% confidence intervals around the regression coefficients were calculated.

4. What factors - mentor teacher attitude, attitudes before student teaching, or
self-efficacy - exert the most influence on any change that does or does not
occur between pre-student teaching and post-student teaching? This
research question was also answered with multiple regression analysis using
the same procedures as noted above. To answer this question, the
dependent variable was the amount of change that occurred between the
survey results from preservice teachers prior to student teaching, and their
survey results after student teaching. The mean amount of change was
calculated for special educators and general educators discretely. Then, the
mean change score was regressed on the independent variables of interest: the score of their mentor teacher on the ORI survey, their own score on the ORI before student teaching, and their self-efficacy score on the TSES. In addition, 95% confidence intervals were run around the regression coefficients as well.

Qualitative Research Procedures

Results from a survey may have been inadequate to explain factors associated with attitudes towards inclusion and the change process that occurs during student teaching for preservice teachers. In addition, qualitative research is typically the methodology chosen to study attitudes, beliefs, opinions, and perceptions (Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach, & Richardson, 2005; McDuffie & Scruggs, 2008). Thus, qualitative data were collected and analyzed to provide further interpretation to the survey results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The qualitative component of this mixed methods study provided more detailed information as selected participants helped explain their attitudes towards inclusion, factors that contributed to those attitudes, and the growth process that occurred during student teaching. Thus, the research question in the qualitative phase was how do preservice teachers describe, interpret, and explain their attitudes toward inclusion? A secondary question addressed in this phase was what do preservice teachers experiencing full-time student teaching identify as factors influencing their attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom?

A collective case study methodology was used for the qualitative phase of the study. The case study provided a detailed account and analysis of two bounded cases: (a) generally
positive attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, and (b) generally negative attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) provide support for choosing outliers, such as the most positive and most negative attitudes: “Understanding of why these predictors or results occurred may be the most useful type of information to follow up on in the qualitative phase” (p. 144). Data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews, narrative classroom observations, and work sample artifacts. Data analysis included cross-case analysis, descriptions, themes, and assertions (Merriam, 1998). The voluntary nature of participation was reiterated, any questions from participants were addressed, and informed consent was obtained for all parts of the qualitative phase prior to the beginning of the case study.

**Settings**

A description of the 12 case study classroom settings is described below and can also be found in table 3.4. All names are pseudonyms and (SE) indicates that the participant was seeking certification in special education while (GE) indicates the participant was seeking certification in general education.

*Special education settings.* Six preservice teachers in the case study were seeking certification in special education. The six special education participants completed their student teaching in five different schools across four districts. Three special education participants student taught in elementary schools, two in middle schools, and one in a high school. Cybil (SE) completed her student teaching in Andrews School District. The middle school at which she was placed enrolled 466 students who were served by 30 instructional
staff members. The state department of education gave the school an overall rating of “at-risk” (see explanation of ratings below). The percentage of students receiving special education services was 17.2% (language and speech excluded), 12.1% are enrolled in gifted and talented programming, and 78.8% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch. On high-stakes test results in 2008, 50.7% of all students scored below basic proficiency in English language arts (94.4% of students with disabilities) and 57.5% scored below basic in mathematics (87.5% of students with disabilities).

Elaina (SE) and Mallory (SE) student taught in an elementary school in Park School District. The school enrolls approximately 530 students and there are 35 instructional staff members at the school. The school received an “average” rating from the state department of education on the school’s report card. 17.6% of the students attending the school were served in special education programs (language and speech excluded), 7.6% qualified for gifted and talented programming, and 26% of the student population qualified for free or reduced lunch. On high-stakes tests in 2008, 20.1% of all students performed below basic proficiency in English language arts (75.9% of students with disabilities), and 16.1% scored below basic in mathematics (55.2% of students with disabilities).

Jessica (SE) was placed in Greyson School District for student teaching. Her high school site enrolled approximately 1,349 students and 81 instructional staff members. The school received a “good” rating from the state department of education. Special education programs enrolled 9.8% of the student population (language and speech excluded). In addition, 28.5% in gifted and talented services, and approximately 10% qualify for free or reduced lunch. On 2008 high-stakes assessments, 6.5% of the total student population
scored below basic proficiency in English language arts (35% of students with disabilities) and 10% scored below basic in mathematics (55% of students with disabilities).

Karen (SE) was placed at a middle school in Adams School District. This school had approximately 1,339 students and 88 instructional staff members. The state department of education gave this school a rating of “good.” Special education programs enrolled 13.5% of the students (excluding language and speech). In addition, 25.6% are in gifted and talented programs, and 35% qualify for free or reduced lunch. On high-stakes tests in 2008, 17.3% of students scored below basic proficiency in English language arts (72.4% of students with disabilities) and 17.5% scored below basic in mathematics (73.2% of students with disabilities).

Nina (SE) completed her student teaching in an elementary school in Park School District. The school enrolled approximately 500 students and 33 instructional staff members. The state department of education gave this school a rating of “good.” Special education programs enrolled 7.8% of the students (excluding language and speech). In addition, 15.5% participated in gifted and talented programming, and 18% qualified for free and reduced lunch. High-stakes test results in 2008 indicated that 9.3% of students performed below basic proficiency in English language arts (28.2% of students with disabilities) and 7.6% were below basic proficiency in mathematics (7.7% of students with disabilities).

**General Education Settings.** Six student teachers seeking certification in general education participated in the case study. These six general education placements were in five districts and six schools. Five placements were in elementary schools and one placement was in a high school setting. Amber (GE) completed her student teaching at an elementary
school in Andrews School District. The school enrolled approximately 510 students and 32 instructional staff members. The state department of education gave this school a “good” rating based on the school’s report card. Special education programs enrolled 7.9% of students (language and speech excluded). In addition, 14.4% received services for gifted and talented, and 16% qualified for free or reduced lunch. On high-stakes assessments in 2008, 10.5% of students performed below basic proficiency in English language arts (62.5% of students with disabilities) and 13.1% scored below basic in mathematics (56.3% of students with disabilities).

Andrea (GE) completed her student teaching at an elementary school in Albright School District. This school enrolled 425 students who were served by 33 instructional staff members. The state department of education gave this school a rating of “below average.” Special education programs enrolled 14.0% of students (language and speech excluded). In addition, 7.3% received gifted and talented services, and 29% qualified for free or reduced lunch. On high-stakes assessments conducted in 2008, 25.3% of students performed below basic proficiency in English language arts (62.5% of students with disabilities) and 25.9% performed below basic in mathematics (60% of students with disabilities).

Heidi (GE) student taught in Oscar School District at an elementary school that enrolled approximately 510 students and 38 instructional staff members. This school received a “good” rating from the state department of education on the school’s report card. Special education programs enrolled 4.4% of students were served in special education programs (language and speech excluded). In addition, 26.9% participated in gifted and talented programming, and 20% qualified for free or reduced lunch. On 2008 high-stakes assessments, 9.1% of students (16.7% of students with disabilities) scored below basic
proficiency in English language arts and 9.5% of students scored below basic in mathematics (27.8% of students with disabilities).

Hope (GE) was placed at an elementary school in Greyson School District for student teaching. This school enrolled 583 students and 37 instructional staff members. The state department of education gave this school a rating of “average.” Special education programs enrolled 7.0% of students in this school (language and speech excluded). In addition, 21.6% in gifted and talented programs, and 20% qualify for free or reduced lunch. On 2008 high-stakes assessments, 14.2% of students scored below basic proficiency in English language arts (41.9% of students with disabilities) and 12.9% scored below basic in mathematics (19.4% of students with disabilities).

Marcy (GE) completed her student teaching at an elementary school in Adams School District. The school enrolled 479 students and 40 instructional staff members. The school received a rating of “average” from the state department of education. Special education programs enrolled 12.3% of students at this school (language and speech excluded). In addition, 8.5% are enrolled in gifted and talented programming, and 33% qualify for free or reduced lunch. High-stakes test results in 2008 indicated that 17.8% of students performed below basic in English language arts (53.5% of students with disabilities) and 21.9% scored below basic in mathematics (55.8% of students with disabilities).

Mark (GE) student taught at a high school in Adams School District. This school enrolled 1,738 students and employed 111 instructional staff. The state department of education rated this school as “average.” Special education programs enrolled 19.9% of students at this school (language and speech excluded). In addition, 0% were participating in gifted and talented programming, and 14% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch.
On 2008 high-stakes assessments, 14.2% of students scored below basic proficiency (54.4% of students with disabilities) and 15% scored below basic in mathematics (57.9% of students with disabilities).

The state department of education offers the following definition for overall school ratings:

- **Excellent** — District performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the Performance Goal
- **Good** — District performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the Performance Goal
- **Average** — District performance meets the standards for progress toward the Performance Goal
- **Below Average** — District is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the Performance Goal
- **At-Risk** — District performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the Performance Goal (State Department of Education, 2008, ¶ 3).

While school and district information is valuable in providing contextual information, the classroom settings of each case study participant is also important. Therefore characteristics of each case study participant’s classroom is presented in table 3.4.
## Table 3.4

**Case Study Participants’ Classroom Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Classroom type</th>
<th># of students on caseload</th>
<th># of instructional staff (including teacher, student teacher, and paraprofessionals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cybil (SE)</td>
<td>Middle school self-contained</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaina (SE)</td>
<td>Elementary school self-contained</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica (SE)</td>
<td>High school resource specialist program</td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen (SE)</td>
<td>Middle school self-contained</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory (SE)</td>
<td>Elementary school self-contained</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina (SE)</td>
<td>Elementary school resource specialist program</td>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Education Classroom Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Classroom type</th>
<th># of students on caseload</th>
<th># of students with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber (GE)</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>2 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea (GE)</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>3 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi (GE)</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>2 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope (GE)</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>2 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy (GE)</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>3 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (GE)</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>4 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

The researcher conducted one semi-structured interview with each of the twelve case study participants using an interview protocol (see appendix H). However, due to the nature of qualitative research, the protocol was used in a flexible way in that the researcher modified the order and presentation of the questions as the interview proceeded. The purpose of the interview protocol was to insure that the interview questions were “reasonable, clearly worded, not leading, appropriate and sufficient for exploring domains of interest” (Brantlinger, et al., 2005, p. 202). That is, the researcher modified and added to the interview questions as participants’ perceptions emerged until the data were saturated (Brantlinger, et al., 2005). Each interview was conducted at least four weeks into the student teaching experience, allowing the researcher to probe about the influence of their fieldwork on the preservice teachers’ attitudes. Interviews were conducted individually at a time and place that was most convenient to the preservice teacher. This helped the researcher establish rapport with the participant. Participants were reminded that their answers would be held confidential and the importance of the research was re-emphasized. These interviews provided participants an opportunity to speak openly, while still being guided and focused by the researcher. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes to an hour, were audio-taped, and the researcher noted contextual information during interviews as well, such as body language, vocal tone, paralanguage, and minimal encouragers (Eisner, 1991). Interviews were transcribed verbatim for data analysis, which allowed the researcher to obtain accuracy in the data about preservice teacher attitudes during full-time student teaching.
In addition, the researcher conducted a non-participant observation of approximately one to two hour(s) each, in the classrooms of the 12 case study participants. Table 3.5 provides information about grade level, content area observed, setting, and activities taking place during the observation including the student teacher’s role. The purpose of the observations was to watch the behavioral patterns of the mentor teacher, student teacher, and students in the classroom setting. These observations were important because attitudes and behaviors are not always congruent (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). Field notes from the observations were recorded in narrative form, with descriptive detail, quotes when possible, and included: (a) characteristics of the setting/context, (b) nonverbal communication, (c) interactions between the mentor teacher and student teacher, (d) interactions between the student teacher and students, (e) instruction provided by the student teacher, (f) comments made by the student teacher, (g) responses of students/mentor teacher, and (h) any additional data observed. Field notes were reviewed immediately after leaving each observation to record other important details, and edit for clarity. This process was also helpful in insuring researcher reflexivity.
Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Student Teacher Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cybil (SE)</td>
<td>Self-contained classroom with 6th – 8th grade in small groups</td>
<td>Reading: Scripted instruction in phonics, free writing, editing, and computer time</td>
<td>Support as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaina (SE)</td>
<td>Self-contained Pre-K-K classroom in whole group then small groups</td>
<td>Calendar and Centers: Counting, weather, alphabet, name sharing, emotions, singing, colors, shapes</td>
<td>Lead instructor for whole group, organized centers and each teacher/aide taught one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica (SE)</td>
<td>Resource room for 9th and 10th graders (one 11th grader) with individual help on work</td>
<td>Students working independently on math and ELA work they brought in, teachers walked around to help as needed</td>
<td>Tutored students when they asked questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen (SE)</td>
<td>Self-contained classroom with 6th – 8th grade in whole group</td>
<td>Test taking strategies Self-correcting practice tests in social studies</td>
<td>Support as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory (SE)</td>
<td>Self-contained classroom, K-4th in individual</td>
<td>Individual tutoring on various projects in social studies, writing, &amp; finishing art projects</td>
<td>Lead instructor for individual students in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina (SE)</td>
<td>Resource room with 1st-2nd graders in small group</td>
<td>Reading: Phonics (short “o” sound)</td>
<td>Lead instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber (GE)</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea (GE)</td>
<td>General education 2nd grade in whole group</td>
<td>Math: Workbook page on computation exercises</td>
<td>Support as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi (GE)</td>
<td>General education 3rd grade in whole group</td>
<td>Social Studies/Art: Putting a book of worksheets together about presidents</td>
<td>Support as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope (GE)</td>
<td>General education 5th grade whole group</td>
<td>Reading/Social studies: Watching a video and stopping at various points to discuss and ask questions</td>
<td>Support as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy (GE)</td>
<td>General education 4th grade in whole group</td>
<td>Social studies/related arts: Students were asked how they would feel if certain scenarios happened and called on volunteers to role play</td>
<td>Support as needed and participation in discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (GE)</td>
<td>Library for 10th-11th graders in whole group and individual</td>
<td>Law education/U.S. History: Researching and creating websites for their projects</td>
<td>Lead instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Artifacts in the form of written documents were also collected for analysis. These included student teacher reflection logs, teaching unit plans, short and long-range planning evaluations, lesson observation evaluations, professional development activity logs, and final student teacher portfolio, summary evaluations, and conceptual framework evaluations. The artifacts analyzed were consistent for all participants, however, the content of the electronic portfolios and reflections varied depending on what the student teacher chose to submit and include in their compilation. The purposes of collecting these artifacts were to: (a) look for involvement in activities that promote diversity and inclusion, (b) obtain evidence of differentiation of instruction to meet student needs, (c) investigate any thinking, evidenced in reflective writing, student teachers display about student differences, inclusion, or special educational needs, (d) saturate the data collected for any other instances that may influence preservice teacher attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Artifacts were examined using a component matrix. Contents of each artifact were entered and described in the matrix. At this point a descriptive analysis of the contents of the matrix was conducted to identify similarities, differences, and themes among the case study participants’ work. Further details about the data analysis process can be found below.

Data Analysis

Data analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection in an iterative process (Merriam, 1998). This simultaneous and iterative process allowed the researcher to make adjustments along the way, such as asking another interview question to test an emerging concept. Data analysis followed three steps suggested by Merriam (1998). The first step in
the data analysis process was data preparation. Interviews were transcribed and entered into
the researcher’s computer database, field notes from observations were edited, and all data
were organized chronologically. The next step of data analysis was data exploration and
reduction. The researcher read through all of the transcripts, field notes, and documents,
and reflected on what was important by extracting relevant significant statements. The use
of memos and highlighting recorded this initial process. For example, memos that
summarized the data collected, any ideas that came to mind during reading, problems,
patterns, and questions were written down initially. Important quotes were highlighted.

After this initial analysis the researcher began the third step of data analysis, coding
the data in an iterative process. During coding the researcher assigned words to segments of
text, condensed text into analyzable segments, sorted coded text segments that were similar,
compared and contrasted coded segments looking for patterns, and generated analytic
concepts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). This coding process was similar to the constant
comparative method that originated in grounded theory, although the data were not used to
develop a theory (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). That is, the researcher searched for data where
issue-relevant meanings emerged and coded those instances by interpreting the meanings,
looked for patterns among other data collected, compared units of data deemed meaningful
to generate tentative categories and developed an overall framework (Stake, 1995).

After interviews, observations, and artifacts had been transcribed and coded with
verified codes for each individual participant, cross-case analysis was conducted to examine
similarities and differences among all case study participants. This cross-case analysis helped
reconstruct the multiple viewpoints of preservice teachers.
Trustworthiness

The use of mixed methods research was useful in providing triangulation of research findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Preservice teacher attitudes were examined before, during, and after a full-time student teaching experience through the survey data from all participants before and after student teaching. Interviews, observations, and work samples analysis of the 12 case study participants were conducted during student teaching. A convergence of evidence was gathered from both quantitative and qualitative data. Observational data provided triangulation with interview and artifact data within the qualitative case study (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). When data did not converge, the mixed methods design allowed the researcher to capture alternative and multiple perspectives on the social reality of inclusion.

Another measure of credibility and trustworthiness in the current study was the use of member checks. Participants in the qualitative phase reviewed transcripts of their interviews and the observational field notes collected, and verified the accuracy (Brantlinger et al., 2005). Member checks were sought via email twice during the study, (1) after transcription but prior to analysis and interpretation, and (2) after analyses but prior to completion (Brantlinger et al., 2005). This was important in order to validate the transcript itself as well as the researcher’s interpretations and conclusions.

Finally, trustworthiness of the data was corroborated by peer debriefing and expert review (Brantlinger et al., 2005) and will be explained further in chapter four where findings are presented. The researcher met with colleagues in education who provided critical feedback during all stages of the research process. Colleague debriefing insured that the observational and interview data included thick, rich description (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1994).
In addition, expert review by members specifically in special education was sought. Experts confirmed the findings were grounded in the data and that the data were collected authentically.

Mixed Methods Procedures

Data Mixing

After conducting the quantitative and qualitative phases, the researcher merged the two datasets in order to support, reinforce, refute, and explain the overall findings about the attitudes of preservice teachers about inclusion before, during, and after full-time student teaching. The researcher was thus able to identify the extent to which the quantitative and qualitative data converged or explained the other. In addition, similarities and differences, and any additional information obtained across both kinds of data analysis were identified (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). This data merging was conducted through a matrix comparison (Creswell & Plano Clark). Data from both the quantitative and qualitative phases were entered into the matrix. The researcher then used the matrix to examine similarities and differences among the data.

Validity of Mixed Methods Approach

Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) listed the most important future issues in mixed method research and among the six highest was the validity of mixed methods research. They argue that it is important to consider, not just the validity of the quantitative and qualitative methods, but also the overall validity of a mixed methods study. In the current study, validity of the mixed methods approach was enhanced through several processes: (a)
both the quantitative and qualitative phases included high validity in the way the research was collected, analyzed, and interpreted (see previous discussion), (b) the accuracy with which the researcher drew both inductive and deductive conclusions from the study, (c) consequential validity (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007) was high due to the triangulation of data collected and analyzed, (d) data for both the quantitative and qualitative phases were gathered from the same population sample, and (e) data collection procedures were minimally intrusive. That is, location and scheduling of data collection were at the convenience of the participant to the maximum extent appropriate and when observations were conducted, they were non-participatory and according to participants did not interfere with typical class procedures (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

The purpose of this research was to identify the influence of student teaching on the attitudes of preservice teachers toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. A mixed methods design was used to evaluate the influence, with quantitative survey data explained by qualitative case study analysis. The findings from these methods are described in chapter four that follows.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

“It’s not so scary anymore. I think that’s how I’ve changed since student teaching. I’m still not sure how it would all work but you know it’s definitely moving towards being more comfortable. This semester has helped because you’re seeing things in real life.”

-Hope (general education preservice teacher, p.3)

The purpose of this chapter is to detail the results of the data analysis described in chapter three of this manuscript. These results provide evidence of the attitudes and influencing factors during student teaching of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. This chapter presents the quantitative results first, then qualitative results, and finally the results of the mixed-methods analysis. A discussion of these findings is presented in the final chapter of this manuscript.

Quantitative Results

Quantitative methodology was used to examine differences in attitudes among preservice teachers that occurred after student teaching. In addition, factors that influenced preservice teachers’ attitudes about inclusion were examined. The following describes the findings of data collection and analysis, according to research question, after first guaranteeing the reliability of the instruments used. For all quantitative findings the alpha ($\alpha$) was set at .05, which is standard in education (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).
Instrumentation

Previous measures of reliability were conducted on the instruments used and reported in chapter three of this manuscript. However, a statistical analysis of reliability was conducted for the ORI and TSES to provide assurances of reliability within the context of the current study. Cronbach’s alpha (\( \alpha \)) for the ORI was .855 on the pretest and .839 on the posttest indicating moderately high reliability for the purposes of this study. Cronbach’s alpha (\( \alpha \)) for the TSES was .932 before student teaching and .934 after student teaching, indicating high reliability. Thus, the reliability analysis of both measures used in the current study indicated that the data collected would consistently produce similar results and that the participants’ scores on the ORI and TSES closely match their true score.

Factor analysis was used to define dimensions for the existing measure, the ORI. Although Antonak and Larrivee (1995) reported four factors that corresponded to the overall construct of attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom and these factors were reported in chapter three on methods. However, the authors stated that their factor analysis was preliminary, and while the overall construct measured by the scale was technically adequate, more research on the factors was necessary. Thus, a principal components factor analysis of the ORI was used to answer the question: Is there a single dimension or are multiple dimensions underlying the 25 items used to measure attitudes about inclusion on the ORI. Preservice teachers’ scores on each item on the ORI after student teaching were used in the factor analysis. The dimensionality of the 25 items on the ORI was analyzed using maximum likelihood factor analysis. Although six factors had Eigenvalues greater than one, the scree plot was examined for a more accurate result. See figure 3.1. Based on the plot, four factors were rotated using a
Varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution, as shown in table 4.1 yielded four interpretable factors: (a) benefits and challenges to integration, (b) academics in integrated settings, (c) integrated classroom management, (d) general education structure. Benefits and challenges to integration accounted for 16.59% of the variance, academics in integrated settings accounted for 7.97% of the variance, integrated classroom management accounted for 7.96% of the variance, and general education structure accounted for 6.90% of the variance. The total amount of variance explained by all four factors was 39.41%. In the current study, only the total score on the ORI was used during data analysis, which was appropriate given the high reliability of the measure. However, the factor analysis provides useful information about the dimensionality of the overall scale.

**Figure 3.1**

*ORI Scree Plot*
The following table provides information about the four factors identified as dimensions of the ORI in the current study. Each question from the ORI is provided with the values that loaded on each of the four factors that emerged from the factor analysis.
Table 4.1

Dimensionality of ORI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORI Question Narrative</th>
<th>Factor One: Benefits And Challenges To Integration</th>
<th>Factor Two: Academics In Integrated Settings</th>
<th>Factor Three: Integrated Classroom Management</th>
<th>Factor Four: General Education Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of general-classroom teachers</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students</td>
<td>.476*</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that the student with a disability will exhibit behavior problems in a general classroom</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.412*</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities can be best served in general classrooms</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.621*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students</td>
<td>.514*</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenge of being in a general classroom will promote the academic growth of the student with a disability</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.580*</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will require significant changes in general classroom procedures</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.561*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased freedom in the general classroom creates too much confusion for the student with a disability</td>
<td>.437*</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with students with disabilities</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.540*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities</td>
<td>.657*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities</td>
<td>.458*</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1

Dimensionality of ORI (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORI Question Narrative</th>
<th>Factor One: Benefits And Challenges To Integration</th>
<th>Factor Two: Academics In Integrated Settings</th>
<th>Factor Three: Integrated Classroom Management</th>
<th>Factor Four: General Education Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a general classroom than in a special classroom</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.739*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her social independence</td>
<td>.629*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not more difficult to maintain order in a general classroom that contains a student with a disability than in one that does not contain a student with a disability</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.437*</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities will not monopolize the general-classroom teacher’s time</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.728*</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities</td>
<td>.609*</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in the general classroom</td>
<td>.588*</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.553*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the student with a disability</td>
<td>.710*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the general classroom where possible</td>
<td>.600*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom behavior of the student with a disability generally does not require more patience from the teacher than does the classroom behavior of the student without a disability</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.438*</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special rather than general classroom teachers</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.366*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation in a special classroom has beneficial effects on the social and emotional development of the student with a disability</td>
<td>.506*</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student with a disability will not be socially isolated in the general classroom</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.267*</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Research Question One: Significant Differences Within Groups

Is there a significant difference between preservice special education, early childhood, elementary education, and secondary education teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion before their full-time student teaching experience and after student teaching? The mean for all participants on the ORI before student teaching was 84.81 ($sd= 17.80, \sigma^2 = 316.69$). The mean after student teaching was 90.88 ($sd= 17.78, \sigma^2 = 315.94$). A paired-samples $t$ test was calculated to compare the whole group of preservice teachers mean pretest score on the ORI before student teaching to their mean ORI score after student teaching. A significant increase from before student teaching to after student teaching was found ($t [122] = -4.290, p<.01$). The magnitude of the effect was measured as medium given the Cohen’s $d$ calculated figure of 0.341, indicating a moderate effect.

While this result indicated significant change, it was important to consider within group change. Therefore a paired-samples $t$ test was calculated to compare the special education preservice teachers’ ORI scores before student teaching and after student teaching. The mean on the pretest was 86.28 ($sd= 13.65$), and the mean on the posttest after student teaching was 83.40 ($sd = 16.33$). While a decrease in ORI score was found after student teaching, it was non-significant ($t[24]=.937, p=.358$).

Data from preservice teachers in early childhood education and elementary education were combined due to similarity in programs and small number of preservice teachers majoring in early childhood education (although some of the course work in the program is different, the students in early childhood and elementary education take the same capstone course with the same instructor and syllabus during student teaching semesters). The data therefore are reported both combined and discretely in the analysis below.
A paired-samples $t$ test was calculated to compare early childhood education participants’ ORI scores before student teaching and after student teaching. The mean before student teaching was 86.27 ($sd = 20.133$), and the mean after student teaching was 94.84 ($sd = 17.784$). A significant increase from before student teaching to after student teaching was found ($t [122] = -4.290, p < .01$). The magnitude of this effect was measured with a Cohen’s $d$ calculation. Cohen’s $d$ was 0.451, which indicates a medium effect.

When early childhood education preservice teachers’ scores were analyzed separately with a paired-samples $t$ test, no significant difference was found between the ORI before student teaching and the ORI after student teaching ($t [14] = -2.012, p = .064$). However, elementary preservice teachers increased their ORI scores significantly ($t [44] = -3.980, p < .01$) after student teaching regardless of whether early childhood participants were combined with them or not. The early childhood education preservice teachers’ change should be evaluated with caution because of the small number in the population.

The attitudes of secondary education preservice teachers, as measured on the ORI, were compared before and after student teaching with a paired-samples $t$ test. The mean before student teaching was 82.89 ($sd = 17.53$) and after student teaching was 91.04 ($sd = 17.61$). A significant increase was found after student teaching ($t [52] = -3.811, p < .01$). Cohen’s $d$ was calculated to be 0.464, a medium effect size.
Table 4.2

Paired Samples T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation) Before Student Teaching</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation) After Student Teaching</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>84.81 (17.80)</td>
<td>90.88 (17.78) **</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>86.28 (13.65)</td>
<td>83.40 (16.33)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood and elementary education</td>
<td>86.26 (20.13)</td>
<td>94.84 (17.78) **</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood education</td>
<td>94.20 (17.76)</td>
<td>99.80 (13.27)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary education</td>
<td>82.30 (20.35)</td>
<td>92.37 (19.39) **</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>82.89 (17.53)</td>
<td>91.04 (17.61) **</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.001

Quantitative Research Question Two: Significant Differences Between Groups

Is there a significant difference in attitude towards inclusion between general education preservice teachers and special education preservice teachers after their student teaching experience? Where do statistically significant differences lie – between early childhood education and special education, elementary education and special education, or secondary education and special education? An independent samples t-test was calculated to determine significant differences between special education and general education preservice teachers’ scores on the ORI after student teaching. The mean score for special education participants was 83.92 (sd= 16.47) and the mean scores for general education participants was 92.44 (sd= 17.70). General education preservice teachers’ scores were significantly higher than special education preservice teachers (t [122]= 2.146, p<.05), indicating more positive attitudes about inclusion. The magnitude of the effect was medium, as measured by Cohen’s $d = .498.$
Table 4.3

Independent Samples T-tests for General or Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>ORI after student teaching</td>
<td>83.92</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>ORI after student teaching</td>
<td>92.44*</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.001

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was also conducted to examine differences among certification areas and the results are displayed in table 4.4. The independent variable, certification, included four levels: (a) early childhood education, (b) elementary education, (c) secondary education, and (d) special education. The dependent variable was the preservice teachers’ scores on the ORI after student teaching and the covariate was their score on the ORI before student teaching. A preliminary analysis was conducted to evaluate homogeneity of slopes between the covariate and the dependent variable across groups, an assumption underlying ANCOVA. The results indicated that the relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable did not differ significantly as a function of the independent variable, $F(3,115)=6.462$, MSE=189.907, $p=.992$, partial $\eta^2=.001$. The ANCOVA was significant, $F(3,118)=4.095$, MSE=185.243, $p<.01$. The strength of relationship between certification and the dependent variable was moderate as assessed by a partial $\eta^2$ with the certification factor accounting for 9% of the variance of the dependent variable, holding constant the scores of preservice teachers prior to student teaching.

The means of the ORI scores after student teaching adjusted for initial differences were ordered across certification groups as follows. Special education preservice teachers
had the lowest adjusted mean (M=82.495), secondary education preservice teachers had an adjusted mean of 92.226, elementary education preservice teachers had an adjusted mean of 93.917, and early childhood preservice teachers had the highest adjusted mean (M=94.001) on the ORI after completing student teaching. Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among these adjusted means. Based on the LSD procedure, the adjusted means for special education preservice teachers differed significantly from all other certification areas (i.e. early childhood, elementary, and secondary education) but no other significant differences existed between groups.

Table 4.4

\textit{ANCOVA table}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum Of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>16686.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4171.62</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6924.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6924.05</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Pre ORI)</td>
<td>14026.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14026.60</td>
<td>75.72</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>2275.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>758.61</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>21858.70</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>185.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1054380.00</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>38545.17</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that female participants would score higher on the ORI, indicating more positive attitudes about inclusion, than male participants. The test was not significant on the ORI before student teaching, $t(121) = .654$, $p = .514$, or the ORI after student teaching, $t(122) = -.740$, $p = .461$. 
Table 4.5

*Independent Samples T-tests for Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Participants</td>
<td>ORI before student teaching</td>
<td>86.85</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORI after student teaching</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Participants</td>
<td>ORI before student teaching</td>
<td>84.27</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORI after student teaching</td>
<td>91.40</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.001

*Quantitative Research Question Three: Factors Influencing Attitudes After Student Teaching*

What factors – mentor teacher attitude, inclusivity of setting, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy – are most influential on preservice teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion after student teaching? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well the predictor variables predicted the criterion variables. The predictors were (a) the attitude of the cooperating teacher, as measured by the ORI, with whom the student teacher worked, (b) the self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES, of the preservice teacher before student teaching, (c) the self-efficacy of the preservice teacher after student teaching, and (d) the attitude of the preservice teacher, as measured by the ORI, before the beginning of student teaching. The criterion variable was the attitude of the preservice teacher on the ORI after student teaching. The linear combination of the model was significantly related to the preservice teacher attitude after student teaching, $F(4,86)=14.352, p<.01$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .63, indicating that approximately 40% of the variance of the preservice teachers’ ORI scores after student teaching can be accounted for by the linear combination of predictor variables.

Table 4.6 presents data indicating the relative strength of the individual predictors. Only one of the four predictor variables was statistically significant. Based on these
correlational analyses, one might conclude that the only useful predictor is the preservice teachers’ score on the ORI before student teaching. However, judgments about the relative importance of these predictors are difficult because they are correlated. Therefore, the appropriate conclusion is that the overall model that included all four predictor variables accounted for approximately 40% of the total variance in attitudes of participants after student teaching.

Table 4.6

Strength of Predictors of ORI Scores After Student Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Correlation between each predictor and change score</th>
<th>Correlation between each predictor and the change score controlling for all other predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score on ORI before student teaching</td>
<td>-0.62**</td>
<td>-0.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating teacher attitude</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy before student teaching</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy after student teaching</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05, **p<.001

Quantitative Research Question Four: Factors Influencing Change After Student Teaching

What factors - mentor teacher attitude, inclusivity of setting, attitudes before student teaching, or self-efficacy - exert the most influence on any change that does or does not occur between pre-student teaching and post-student teaching? A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well the predictor variables predicted the criterion variables. The predictors were (a) the attitude of the cooperating teacher, as measured by the ORI, with whom the student teacher worked, (b) the self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES, of the preservice teacher before student teaching, (c) the self-efficacy of the preservice teacher after student teaching, and (d) the attitude of the preservice teacher, as measured by the ORI, before the beginning of student teaching. The criterion variable was the change in
attitude of the preservice teacher on the ORI after student teaching. A change score was calculated by subtracting the score of preservice teachers after student teaching from their score before student teaching. This change score was the criterion variable. The linear combination of the model was significantly related to the preservice teacher change score after student teaching, $F(4, 86) = 6.561, p < .002$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .48, indicating that approximately 23% of the variance of the change score in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of predictor variables.

In table 4.7 indices are presented that illustrate the relative strength of the individual predictors. Only one of the four predictor variables was statistically significant. On the basis of these correlational analyses, one might conclude that the only useful predictor is the preservice teachers’ score on the ORI before student teaching. However, judgments about the relative importance of these predictors are difficult because they are correlated. Therefore, the appropriate conclusion is that the overall model that included all four predictor variables accounted for approximately 23% of the total variance in change score.

**Table 4.7**

*Strength of Predictors of Change Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Correlation between each predictor and change score</th>
<th>Correlation between each predictor and the change score controlling for all other predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score on ORI before student teaching</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>-0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating teacher attitude</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy before student teaching</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy after student teaching</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p&lt;.05, **p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the self-efficacy of the preservice teacher, either before or after student teaching, was not highly predictive of their attitude about inclusion, their score on the TSES was part of the model that explained 23% of their change score and 40% of their attitude on the ORI after student teaching. In addition, a paired-samples t test was calculated to compare the whole group of preservice teachers mean pretest score on the TSES before student teaching to their mean TSES score after student teaching. The mean before student teaching was 6.97 (sd = .894), and the mean after student teaching was 7.53 (sd = .731). A significant increase from before student teaching to after student teaching was found (t [116] = -5.853, p<.01). The magnitude of the effect was measured as medium given the Cohen’s d calculated figure of 0.686, which is a large effect.

In summary, the quantitative results indicated several important findings. (a) The overall attitudes of the preservice teachers significantly changed after student teaching. (b) The attitudes of preservice teachers in special education are significantly different from early childhood, elementary, and secondary education preservice teachers. (c) The attitudes of cooperating teachers were significantly higher than preservice teachers’ attitudes before student teaching, but not after student teaching. However, the cooperating teachers’ attitudes were not significantly predictive of the preservice teachers’ scores on the ORI after student teaching. (d) The attitudes of preservice teachers before student teaching are most predictive of their attitudes after student teaching. (e) The self-efficacy of preservice teachers significantly increased after student teaching; however this was not correlated or predictive of their attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. (f) Preservice teacher attitudes fell along a continuum representing the normal
curve. (g) No significant differences were found by gender or within general education certification areas.

The quantitative findings provide considerable information that is useful in identifying preservice teachers’ attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom and the factors influencing their attitudes. However, the use of qualitative case study methodology helps explain those attitudes and influences further. What follows are the results of the case study analysis. In addition, the ways in which the qualitative and quantitative results converge or diverge are reported.

Qualitative Case Study Results

In this section, the results of the qualitative analysis are organized by research question and themes that emerged to answer each research question. Details about the method of qualitative data analysis can be found in chapter three on methods. Assurances of trustworthiness are discussed below, followed by findings that describe participants’ perceptions of their attitudes about inclusion and the factors they said influenced their attitudes.

Trustworthiness

Multiple measures assured the trustworthiness of the qualitative findings. The methods of data analysis were thorough and rigorous because four iterations of analysis were used to ascertain themes and provide assurances of trustworthiness. During the first iteration, all transcripts were read and important phrases, sentences, and paragraphs were highlighted. These highlighted segments were then analyzed for themes during the second
iteration and each theme was named. The researcher re-examined all transcripts during the third iteration to be certain nothing pertaining to an identified theme was left out. During the fourth and final iteration, quotations from transcripts were re-read to compare with the identified theme to be certain the definitions of themes were accurate and that no information from preservice teachers was missing or misinterpreted. Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that qualitative criteria of quality include credibility, neutrality, confirmability, consistency, dependability, and applicability. Triangulation of the data collected (quantitative, interview, observation, and artifacts) helped guarantee the rigor of the research. Three of these assurances are discussed below: (a) descriptive validity and credibility, (b) interpretive validity and dependability, and (c) confirmability.

Descriptive validity and credibility. The factual accuracy of the data collected from the case study participants was verified through the use of transcription verification and member checks. During transcription verification, an independent research assistant transcribed all recorded interviews verbatim and the researcher verified the transcription, listening to the recording and adding notes such as hesitancies, emotional emphases, and patterns of primacy in the speech. In addition, all case study interview participants were provided a transcript of their interview. They were each asked to check the transcript and verify its accuracy. All participants responded affirmatively, reporting that the transcripts were accurate reports of what they said and communicated.

Interpretive validity and dependability. Interpretive validity refers to the way in which the data collected are understood and portrayed by the researcher. Peer and expert review were conducted to validate the interpretation of the researcher. Two graduate student research assistants in special education were trained in the qualitative coding process and
independently coded all transcripts. Multiple meetings were held during which the researcher discussed agreements among the themes with the research assistants and reached consensus on any disagreements. An expert reviewer was also used. This reviewer was a professional in special education with multiple credentials, having been in the field for over 27 years, and served as a mentor to the researcher. During expert review, 75% of all transcripts were independently analyzed by the expert reviewer and the researcher. During discussion and consensus building, effort was made to insure the original meaning of the participants was upheld.

In addition, dependability was enhanced through the use of researcher reflexivity and bracketing of subjectivities (see Appendix I) which also guaranteed the neutrality of the data analysis. Qualitative research traditionally acknowledges the role of the researcher as a filter through which data are collected, analyzed, interpreted and presented. Because of this, it is important to consider the subjective researcher role and its effects on the research process. By considering the researcher's own assumptions, clarifying the researcher's own belief systems, and reflexively examining self, the researcher is sensitive to the way her role of self shaped the current study (Cresswell, 1997).

**Confirmability.** Confirmability was insured through the use of triangulation. The researcher used multiple data sources: interview transcripts, observation records, and artifacts. Furthermore, multiple informants were chosen as participants in order to gather multiple perspectives and gain a more complete understanding of preservice teachers’ attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Finally, multiple methods were used to confirm or validate research findings including member checks, peer debriefing, and expert review (see above discussion).
Qualitative Research Question One: Case Study Participants’ Explanations

How do preservice teachers describe, interpret, and explain their attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom? Six general education preservice teachers and six special education preservice teachers were interviewed and observed in order to understand their perceptions and attitudes about inclusion. In addition, work artifacts from their student teaching semester were examined. Six of these participants had scored high on their ORI survey prior to beginning student teaching, indicating positive attitudes towards inclusion. Six participants’ scores were low on the ORI prior to student teaching. What follows is an explication of how the preservice teachers explained their attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. To the maximum extent possible, the original words of the preservice teachers were used so that their voices are heard and honored. The following qualitative findings about preservice teacher attitudes will be described: (a) participants’ overall attitudes fell along a continuum of perspectives from less to more positive with varying intensities, (b) preservice teachers used a social justice and altruistic framework to consider inclusion, (c) participants discussed inclusion through the lens of real-life stories about specific students, (d) preservice teachers identified academic, social, and behavioral benefits to inclusion, (e) participants identified various challenges to inclusion, (f) some preservice teachers felt ambivalence and indecision when discussing inclusion, and (g) preservice teachers believed that their perspectives about inclusion depended on the individual child and focused on the need for specialization.

Continuum of perspectives. Many of the preservice teachers expressed positive attitudes about inclusion while others expressed hesitancy, or less positive attitudes. Although
participants were sampled based on their ORI score before student teaching, with six participants scoring high indicating positive attitudes and six scoring low, their interview responses varied widely without pattern to low or high. Below, examples of (a) positive, (b) hesitant or indecisive, and (c) less positive attitudes of preservice teachers are presented.

When asked about their general opinions, nine of the 12 participants said inclusion could be good for students. This was in fact the first question asked during interviews, and the first idea expressed for some participants was positive. According to Alexander (1988) primacy, or that which comes first, may be an indicator of particularly salient and important information. Although the degree to which they were positive varied, all but one preservice teacher had positive opinions about inclusion. Thus, there were both special education and general education participants with positive attitudes. For example, Cybil, a special education preservice teacher said, “I think it’s the best thing they can do for most students…both general education and those with special needs.” Mallory was also a special education participant and she said, “I love it. I think the idea is great. I really think it helps them. They get to interact with their peers.” Andrea, Mark, and Amber provide general education examples about their attitudes. Andrea said, “Overall I think inclusion is great…and so I think that inclusion definitely has a ton of benefits, and it’s very important I think.” Mark felt that, “…if you can include them, you might as well.” Amber’s opinion was that, “…it’s really important for everybody in the classroom, for special education students and regular education students.”

However, for other participants, their first response indicated hesitancy about inclusion. Elaina a special education participant suggested that her attitudes about inclusion could not be answered broadly for all, but depended on each child.
I just think [about] the whole restrictive environment thing. As long as it’s benefiting the child academically and emotionally and socially, then I think inclusion is great. However, I don’t think that inclusion just for the sake of inclusion; that’s not ok. I feel like the whole point of special education is for it to be individualized.

Holly’s first opinion was neither positive or negative. Holly was a general education participant and her first thoughts expressed about inclusion was confusion about what disability categories were best facilitated in general education settings. She said that when she considered inclusion, she thought students with learning disabilities or attention deficit disorder could be included but not students with mental retardation.

Jessica, a special education preservice teacher expressed indecision because she was taught that inclusion was increasingly being implemented and that it was helpful, but she was unsure because she had not been exposed to it very much. Karen, another special education participant expressed caution, “I think it’s a good thing if it’s done the right way. But in some cases it’s not and there’s a lot of students that shouldn’t be in it.” Nina (SE) was also cautious, but her attitude emphasized her discomfort because of lack of experience. She said, “I’m a little uncomfortable with it [inclusion] only because I haven’t had much experience.” Nina’s attitude was similar to Karen’s, “I think it’s great if it can be done correctly.”

Marcy, a general education preservice teacher, expressed a somewhat less positive attitude. Although she said there were certainly benefits for some students in inclusive placements, she also believed that some students with disabilities would be hindered if placed in general education classrooms.
I think it’s [inclusion] definitely a good thing. I’ve seen with some kids an improvement, but I’ve also seen with other kids...a decrease in attention, decrease in motivation, they’re more distracted I think than helped. So I guess it’s kind of a double-edged sword because I’ve seen some kids that have really soared with it [inclusion], and I’ve seen other kids who really actually probably have done worse.

Heidi (GE) expressed the most resistant attitude because of her experience during student teaching. She felt that two of the students in her general education setting were taking teacher time away from the other students because they were dependent on the teachers due to their disabilities. She also felt the students with disabilities needed more help than the general education teacher could provide.

So, overall preservice teachers in the case study interviews expressed a continuum of perspectives from positive to hesitant and resistant. However, the preservice teachers appeared very conscientious about doing that which was right or good and in the best interest of the child when thinking about inclusion. Thus, the framework from which they spoke was an important consideration.

*Social justice, altruistic framework.* One of the specific themes that emerged from these generally positive attitudes was a desire for social justice. Social justice appeared as a desire to live in a fair and just world that upholds individual rights and equality of opportunity. Preservice teachers suggested that inclusion was the right thing to do. In fact, an overall philosophy of altruism was evident among many of the preservice teachers. Altruism, an unselfish concern for the welfare of others (Webster, 1987), manifested itself in the preservice teachers’ focus on the students. It was unclear whether the preservice teachers displayed attitudes of social justice and altruism because of their dispositions; because they
were saying what they believed represented the *correct* thing to say (i.e. social desirability); or a combination of both. However, social justice was an important theme preservice teachers used to describe their positive attitudes.

Cybil, a special education preservice teacher, was emphatic that inclusion was not only beneficial, but she felt it was necessary because,

> We all live together in the big world, and they need to learn how to do that...they need to learn how to speak with each other, how to interact with each other, how to accept each other, and help each other because that’s how we all get through life. They shouldn’t be isolated from each other.

The other participants who spoke about social justice and altruism were all general education preservice teachers. Mark was particularly emphatic and the majority of his interview was ensconced in social justice themes. For example, he said at the beginning of his interview that his attitude about inclusion was positive and the interviewer asked him why. His response was as follows, “Just because you’re not, you’re not leaving people out, even though they might have trouble with it. They’re still part of a bigger picture which I think is the ultimate, like is the one goal.” Later in Mark’s interview, he suggested that his attitude about inclusion was rooted in his goal of becoming a teacher and making a difference in children’s lives.

> I think my positive attitudes about inclusion come from my goals of why, just why I am a teacher. I’m here because I want to make an impact on students’ lives. And to me a student is a student. It doesn’t matter if they’re really strongly disabled or not...I’m still going to give it my all in some shape or form.
Marcy was especially altruistic in her attitudes as she unselfishly suggested that, “it’s difficult but I definitely think it’s worth it because it’s making each kid have an equal opportunity to learn.” Andrea’s view of social justice was that you should not separate children and categorize them.

  You can’t just take a child and say, ‘you’re over here but you’re over here’ just because of who you are – because they’re all children. And so they all should be…have some place or role I think in the classroom as a whole.

For Hope, everyone has special strengths or “gifts” to offer and she believed it was important for general education students to realize this.

  I think a benefit is going to be that the world works where everybody exists together, and so these students are seeing everybody’s different gifts and being able to value. Maybe the person who can’t read as well but has great talent in art or the person who is not so great at math goes out on the playground and is a terrific athlete. They get to see all of that together.

Although social justice was apparent in less than half of the interviews, the emphasis with which it was expressed was a clear cue of its importance (Alexander, 1988). It was clear that case study participants were thinking of students first during interviews.

  Using student stories to explain inclusion. For all of the preservice teachers, stories of actual experiences with students with whom they had worked provided the vehicle through which they shared their overall attitudes. In contrast to using research literature or philosophy to anchor their attitudes about inclusion, the case study participants expressed their views by sharing examples of students they were serving in their internship or had
experienced. Hope (GE), for example, said she felt better about inclusion since her student teaching experience because she saw how accommodations and modifications worked.

I do have two [students with] ADHD and then I have a student who uses a keyboard because his writing fine motor skills are inadequate for him to be able to write. We have students that, in order to help them focus, the teacher wears the microphone that amplifies her voice. We do have one student that has a learning disability. So I see more how it works.

When the preservice teachers discussed positive attributes they believed were associated with inclusion, they told how it helped a particular student. For example, Marcy, a general education participant, suggested that the general education peers and environment was helpful to one of her students both academically and socially.

I know specifically one of the kids that’s [included], he sits beside one of our gifted and talented students. I know that he’s really pulled him up because he helps him a lot and … he asks for help and it really helps him because he can say, ‘okay we’re here in our notebook’ because that’s when he has [trouble with] the organization. It is very overwhelming and he can say, ‘okay we’re here, we’re doing this.’ And so, it really has helped him to be more organized and … stay on-task more. He’s in a group and he’s not just … looking off like ‘what am I doing?’ He stays more focused. I think that’s a definite benefit and then just the peer interaction. I think that’s made him more confident. I think that’s one thing. He has low self esteem and just encouraging him, [through attention from] me or the teacher and then the
other students has really helped him a lot. And … seeing that he feels value
being in a group. So I think that’s been really good for him.

Andrea was a general education preservice teacher and stories about the students in
her student teaching setting predominated her interview. She talked about the ways
the inclusive classroom in which she was teaching helped students. One story for
example, illustrated how Andrea believed that the work of the teachers was
worthwhile.

There’s a girl in our class named [Jessie] and she has an emotional/behavioral
disorder. She gets very angry and has a lot of anger issues. At the beginning
of the semester she struggled a lot. She got really angry and it was horrible.
It got really bad. But we worked with her and talked to her parents and they
did more positive reinforcement things. And slowly but surely she got smiley
faces which is what they get if they’ve had a good day. If she got all of them
for a week, she’d get a prize at home. And so slowly but surely she really
started working on it and made some really big changes. And you wouldn’t
be able to [tell that she has a disability] if you were in the classroom and
observed …, maybe on an off day, [you] might be able to tell who she is, but
you really probably couldn’t because every child has good days and bad days.
And so I definitely [think that] she shouldn’t be in a separate classroom from
everyone else because she’s just as smart.

Mallory, a special education participant, also talked about the importance of peer
models in inclusive settings by sharing student stories. In addition, she shared some
of the positive traits she observed in a general education teacher with a story from her student teaching placement.

I mean, they’ve [typically developing peers] helped him. They help him get focused…I know his teacher is actually wonderful in the fourth grade ‘getting him.’ She picks her fights pretty much. And if he wants the lights off because we’re doing circuits that day and he wanted to see a shadow [then] she was very good on saying: ‘Ok, this is what you have to do so we can do this.’ She [the general education teacher] puts up boundaries and she was very good.

Karen, who was also in special education, similarly expressed the positive characteristics she observed in one of the general education teachers who had students with disabilities in her classroom. She especially focused on the teacher’s attitude.

The general education teacher, she was awesome. She just had a great attitude. Those kids were welcome in the classroom – making them feel they weren’t any different from any of the other students. And they weren’t just separated into one little corner with them. They [were] spread evenly throughout. [For] work [the teacher was] pairing [students] with…some higher functioning students. I think that was good.

Elaina was another special education preservice teacher who used stories to talk about qualities she admired in a general education teacher in inclusive settings. An interesting note about the quote that follows is that during a member check conversation, Elaina said she didn’t agree with what she said about leniency. She
said that she felt all teachers of students with disabilities should not be lenient but should be very diligent. Nevertheless, Elaina used a story to express her attitude by saying “And we’ve been very lucky with the actual kindergarten teacher, she’s very familiar with students with special needs. She’s very lenient with the noises and maybe some of the behavioral [issues].”

Some participants used stories to share some of the challenges of inclusion. In fact, some of the participants with resistant attitudes said they had become less positive because of a particular story. For example, Jessica, a special education preservice teacher, said she hadn’t observed very much inclusion but shared a story about a student she taught in the resource specialist program. Jessica’s point was that the student was in general education for all his classes unless he was in the resource room and she thought it was inappropriate for this particular student.

He’s the only student we have in here who has Autism. Everybody else has disabilities in reading or things like that, but his grandmother insists that he be here for social aspects. That’s what I mean [about inclusion not being a good thing for every student]. He’s doing great socially, well for him he’s really improved, but academically he will just sit there and do nothing…so that’s what I mean by it really depends on the individual student.

Similarly, Heidi, a general education preservice teacher, shared student stories to illustrate why she felt resistant to inclusive practices. In particular, Heidi felt like the students with disabilities with whom she was working during student teaching required too much teacher attention that took time away from other students. She shared this attitude with specific student stories.
And [inclusion is not working] especially for this other child who is being tested [for special education services] right now. I feel like he’s very dependent on the teachers. He needs someone there to be, ‘okay this is what you need to do. Do it now.’ And it’s not, it kind of takes away from the other students sometimes.

Nina, a special education participant, shared her ambivalence with a story that illustrated her indecision about whether her attitude was positive or negative about inclusion. Because Nina’s overall attitude was ambivalent, she suggested that inclusive placements were not beneficial for some students, while she believed inclusive placements were helpful for students who were able to keep up their grade level curriculum.

We have several students and my cooperating teacher is thinking about dismissing a few of them [from special education] just because you wonder…is this [the resource specialist program] really helping them because they’re doing so well. I’m like, could they not get that in, you know, have we taught them enough to where they could do well in the general education curriculum. And several of them I feel like inclusion is going to help them because I feel like they can keep up with general education curriculum at his point.

In addition, examination of artifacts during student teaching revealed examples of student stories in some of the preservice teachers’ reflections about their experience. For example, Hope, a general education participant, shared a story in one of her reflections that helped her understand an individual student better. Although the incident upon which Hope reflected was not about a student with a disability, it illustrates her use of stories in thinking about meeting the needs of all her students.
Something that I had not considered prior to student teaching was the background of the students. I have several students on food stamps. One in particular [student] was misbehaving more than usual. When I asked her what was wrong, she told me that she had not eaten breakfast that day. After giving her a snack and talking about inconsequential things, she calmed down and was able to rejoin the class.

Andrea, another student teacher in general education reflected on a lesson she videotaped to watch back later in which she struggled with classroom management. Her reflection centers around a story about her students.

I went over the new information very quickly and then had the students practicing. During the lesson there was a student laying his head on his desk and so many things going on that I just did not see. I guess there were so many small disturbances, I did not know how to handle them all. Do I just ignore them or take classroom time to deal with the situation? I found that I had my attention directed only to the left side of the class…While I was talking to another student kids were getting paper and [Kylie, a student with ADHD] waved at the video camera and went and talked directly into it. I did not see this, did not deal with it, and I should have.

Mallory, a special education case study participant, used a student story in her reflection notebook to explain how she learned to scaffold her instruction for students with disabilities. This example illustrates how specific stories not only were used to share their attitudes but also their skill development as student teachers.
I struggled a lot with how to teach [my students with disabilities] writing. My college supervisor suggested I try the four-square strategy for writing. The goal of this strategy was to help students develop a five sentence paragraph about any given topic. The four-square approach allowed for scaffolding information to accommodate individual students. One student only received example questions while another was only required to fill in the blanks. Both, however, were able to create a five sentence paragraph by the end of the week. The objective was mastered with both students. This strategy could be used in any classroom with any student and I think it made my teaching better than before.

Benefits of inclusion. All of the preservice teachers identified perceived benefits of inclusion. Most of the benefits could be categorized into academic, social or behavioral. All case study participants suggested benefits to inclusion that were academic, social or behavioral. However, the majority of the benefits seemed to fall into the social category. Heidi and Amber provide examples of general education participants who emphasized the social and behavioral benefits of inclusion. Heidi said, “I feel like it helps socially and it helps them to adapt.” Amber mentioned social benefits and stressed that inclusion builds independence.

I just think for special education students it really... helps them become more independent and it just gives them more opportunities to interact with other students, and the other way around, I think regular education students can learn a lot from them.
Special education preservice teachers also emphasized the social benefits of inclusion. Nina (SE) believed that her student teaching setting did not give students with disabilities enough time with their typically developing peers.

I think that the more time they get to spend with … their non-disabled peers, I think that it’s a good thing. I feel like a lot of problems happen because they get resource two and three periods, so they don’t see their peers a large majority of the day. So it’s not self-contained but it almost is because they’re pulled out so much. So I really think inclusion would help them to be around their peers.

Cybil (SE) also emphasized the social and academic benefits of inclusion. In fact, Cybil pointed to benefits for students with disabilities and their typically developing peers.

I think they [students with disabilities and students without] all learn from each other, academically and socially as well. It’s amazing sometimes what kids can learn. It’s like, ‘you can do that?’ But I mean they learn from each other. I have kids, you know people categorize special education as ‘oh they have a disability’ but they don’t see that, though there may be a disabilities, that doesn’t mean across the board they have no abilities.

Elaina (SE) focused on behavioral benefits of inclusion. She believed that typically developing peers in general education classes modeled appropriate behavior from which her students with disabilities could learn. In addition, Elaina said the different instructional techniques employed by general education teachers may be helpful to students with disabilities.
Well just behaviorally [students benefit]. I know that within my class we have a group of our students that go out [to general education classes] for music and art and a couple go out for regular kindergarten, just like calendar time. And I know behaviorally they really do well when they see how, when you know sitting still was modeled to them by other children in the classroom. And they do really well when they can observe the behaviors and imitate them. And then academically I mean I think my students love to go to art. They love to go to music and being exposed to those just kind of different forms of instruction, different children that maybe they’re not being exposed to on a regular basis. I think they really benefit from it.

Mallory (SE) connects social benefits with academic benefits because she felt the social relationships students with disabilities built with their typically developing peers created models for students with disabilities in academic areas as well.

I think it helps them [the students with disabilities], they get to interact with their peers. … I think they really learn from them [typically developing peers] socially, and I know the child we have here [in the self-contained class] I’ve been in his mainstream class, and they helped him out so much. They understood what was going on.

Karen, a preservice teacher in special education, also reported both social and academic benefits of inclusion. She also suggested that going into general education classroom might help students meet higher expectations than they would in a self-contained setting.

One thing it [inclusion] benefits is socially. It’s good for them to get out and talk to other students because they don’t get to at lunch. We sit with our
[self-contained] class at lunch. And everybody has like 10 minutes of recess time at school but they don’t get it with other [typically developing] students. They have it with just our students. So I think inclusion’s good. And also academically,…a kid will maybe [succeed in inclusive settings] in social studies or science but not in reading. And it’s good for them to get out there and to kind of try things that maybe they don’t think they can do and they find out they can.

Andrea, a general education participant, was emphatic about the benefits of inclusion and she identified academic benefits in particular.

I think inclusion definitely has a ton of benefits and it’s very important I think. I think academically as well. I think the self-contained class struggles because they’re always having to, there’s so many problems that they can only, all they have time for is to deal with those problems. And they don’t have as much time to instruct. And they struggle as well because there are children in that classroom that are all different grades and levels and I think the teacher struggles with how to teach all of them at once while dealing with all of this issues that happen.

These benefits were visible in the work samples and observations of the preservice case study participants as well. Although not a requirement, participants in both general and special education embedded worked social skills through cooperative learning and partner strategies during their instruction. In their lesson plans, goals and objectives were often set, not only in academic content standards, but also in social and behavioral domains as well. For example, Andrea (GE) used a peer-mediated lesson with both a social and academic
objective, “students will improve their cooperation and communication skills while working with a partner to identify rhyming words and create a two to three lined rhyming poem.”

Challenges associated with inclusion. While all twelve preservice teachers identified benefits to inclusion, they also indicated challenges they perceived to be associated with inclusion. Unlike the benefits which could be social, behavioral, or academic, challenges were not categorized in any way. However, participants reflected on challenges associated with behavior, management, general education teacher skills and attitude, student ability levels, and lack of collaboration and communication. In fact, preservice teachers associated challenges with inclusion and reasons they disagreed with inclusion. For example, Heidi (GE) and Karen (SE) expressed resistance to inclusion because of behavioral challenges they perceived from students with disabilities. Heidi worried that the general education teacher would be unable to meet the needs of all the students because of the teacher may have to focus more attention on the students with disabilities.

I think, if there are too many children that need special services and they’re at that end of the spectrum, the extreme end, that it’s really difficult and almost impossible for every student in the classroom to get the education that they deserve. You know because obviously if someone is a behavior problem or not doing the work they should do, then the teacher’s concentrating more on that.

Karen also suggested that students with disabilities may present behavioral challenges. She also considered the skills and training of the general education teachers. “I think mainly…sometimes I think maybe teachers are afraid. They don’t think maybe they can handle my students because that’s not what they were trained to do.” Elaina (SE) also felt
some resistance to inclusion. However, for her, the resistance came from the cognitive challenges the general education classroom would represent for students with disabilities.

I think it gets to a point when there are certain children that I wouldn’t be able to take into a general education classroom just because the information would probably not register with them on a cognitive level, and I don’t think they would have the ability to really understand what’s going on.

Hope (GE) agreed that some students may not be ready for inclusive settings. She was particularly concerned that students with disabilities needed specialized instruction. She also suggested that teachers needed specific training to help them meet the individual needs of students with disabilities.

I think a barrier would be [the student with a disability] getting swept in with the crowd. I think there’s a chance that the child is just going to get lumped in with everybody else and maybe miss things. The classroom [teacher] needs to be definitely diligent. There has to be some training [for teachers].

Heidi (GE) was also concerned about the teacher’s ability to meet the needs of all the children. She suggested that the teacher might be unable to work with the students with disabilities and the typically developing students to the extent they need. “I would say the big challenge is the teacher’s attention because you’re kind of…you have to put the other children on hold for so long so you can redirect.” Thus, for some preservice teachers the challenges associated with inclusion were interwoven with their overall resistance to inclusive practices.

Cybil and Nina were both special education participants and they said inclusion was challenging because teachers should implement inclusive practices the right way. Both Cybil
and Nina shared stories they indicated were poor examples of inclusion. Cybil emphatically said,

I see kids coming back out of the inclusion environment that I think maybe they weren’t prepared well for. And I don’t see them…when I peek in the general education classroom door, I see that they’re still really not included because they’re working with the paraprofessional apart from the rest of the group. So that’s not inclusion. Sometimes I think that even in special education the definition of inclusion is corrupted in a way. Eating lunch in the same room when they’re [students with disabilities] all at one table and the other kids are at other tables, and calling that their general education time…that doesn’t work for me either. So, I think…and the kids aren’t even encouraged to go out on the playground [with their typically developing peers]. They all march back to the [self-contained] classroom while the other kids are out on the playground. So that’s a problem.

And Nina talked about an inclusive situation she observed in her practicum setting that she believed was not what inclusion should be like.

The one experience that I have had with inclusion… is when the special education teacher got grouped only with the special education students and they were still in kind of their own little group so it was like a self contained within a regular education classroom and I was kind of like, this is not how this is supposed to be.
Amber, Mark, Andrea, and Marcy, all general education participants, focused on ways that inclusion is challenging for the teacher. Amber worried about the behavioral challenges students with disabilities may have and the skills of the teacher in managing those behaviors. “I guess it’s [inclusion] just hard, especially, not all teachers exactly know how to do management and how to work with the students, so it’s probably…a challenge for … the classroom teacher.” Mark agreed that there were challenges associated with inclusion, but he believed teachers could overcome such challenges. “I think there are challenges [with inclusion] at some points but I think a teacher who understands can overcome them…if they’re able and willing to. It would be work for them but [it’s important].” Andrea similarly suggested that teachers have the responsibility to teach all children, even under challenging circumstances. In addition, she said that all classrooms have challenges, not solely classrooms with students who have disabilities. “I think there are always challenges but there are challenges in the general education classroom with typically developing children, all the time, so it’s not just those children [with disabilities] that are challenges.” Marcy was more resistant in expressing the challenges for the general education classroom teacher, but like Andrea, she said that teaching typically developing peers was also a challenge.

Inclusion is definitely challenging. It’s not easy by any means. I know a lot of times we’ll have to go look at certain kids’ IEPs because they have very specific requirements of what they have to have or what they don’t have to have. So it is extra work for sure, making sure you have their tests prepared, making sure the materials are prepared, making sure that you stay on top of it.
So it is, it is extra work but I guess in the broad scheme of things, it’s not that much more than what you kind of already have to do for the other kids.

Mallory and Nina, both special education participants, placed the responsibility on the general education teachers. They both suggested that some teachers didn’t have the collaboration skills that would be necessary in an inclusive classroom. For example, Mallory said,

I saw a couple times [in inclusive classes] where teachers just didn’t know what to do. They thought it was disruptive to the other kids, and not fair to the other kids. And then I think you get those teachers that are not willing to change. They’re not willing for that collaboration. They’re unwilling to work together.

Nina (SE) was most concerned about the general education teacher’s attitude about collaboration with special education professionals. She worried that general education teachers might be unwilling to share control of the classroom.

I think a lot of times the general education teachers, I feel like sometimes they almost feel like, you know I’m running this show and so whenever a special education teacher tries to come in, they don’t want to give them part of the class.

Heidi (GE) was also concerned about collaboration. However, she raised an issue about special educators’ collaborative abilities. In particular, Heidi saw an example of poor communication during her student teaching that gave her a negative perspective. She says,
I do feel a little negative about the situation [inclusion] because it’s like, you know the special educator didn’t know who he [the student with a disability] was and then all of a sudden she walks in and says, ‘well this is what you need to do.’ And she hadn’t seen everything that the cooperating teacher had been doing all year and trying. So I guess I do feel a little negative.

While all preservice teachers indicated challenges that were associated with inclusion, only one of the 12 (Heidi (GE)) said that the challenges outweighed the benefits. The other participants reflected various perspectives as the first finding indicated, from positive to resistant. In fact, many suggested that, whether challenges outweighed benefits, depended on each student and each situation.

*Ambiguity and indecision about inclusion and the definition.* Although preservice teachers associated inclusion with specific benefits and challenges, for many, the definition of inclusion was ambiguous. The participants typically indicated that inclusion meant putting children with disabilities in the general education classroom. However, the extent to which a child’s program should be in a general education classroom in order to be classified inclusion seemed unclear to participants. For example, Jessica, a special education participant, wasn’t sure if her resource specialist program would be considered a model of inclusion. She expressed her confusion about how to define inclusion, “I’m kind of lost when it comes to inclusion. I have my assumptions but I probably would say that I’m not comfortable with what it is.” Nina, another participant in special education, seemed to equate the definition of inclusion with co-teaching. She didn’t know other models of inclusion and when asked for her definition of inclusion she said she didn’t know what it really meant. Mark (GE) and Elaina (SE) both asked questions during their interviews. Elaina realized that her own
definition of inclusion might be too narrow and specific to special education. She said, “Well to me inclusion, I always think of a student from a self-contained classroom going into a general education setting. But I know it’s probably broader than that right?” Mark’s definition of inclusion was very broad, and he wondered if that was appropriate. He asked,

It’s just really diverse and very interesting. But I mean just seeing that diversity, I mean inclusion. That’s inclusive in my opinion too even though it doesn’t go with IEPs. Is that inclusion? You’re able to see and hear different views and I think other students learn from other things.

_Individualization._ Many preservice teachers emphasized that their attitudes about inclusion depended on the individual child. For these participants, considering the specific needs of each child was compelling. As Heidi (GE) said, “So for some disabilities, I would say inclusion would be very good or bad, I guess, obviously depending on the case.” The frequency with which this topic surfaced is an indicator of its importance to the preservice participants (Alexander, 1988).

One of the ways participants expressed their focus on individualization was in the benefits they believed inclusion would offer. Marcy (GE) said,

I think the benefits are specific for each one student in the class just because, I think it’s specific for each student. The students I can tell have improved [in the inclusive classroom] has a lot to do with their personality and the ones [students with disabilities] that haven’t improved, it’s just because really if anything, they have [or didn’t have] behavior issues.
The preservice teachers emphasized the importance of making decisions about inclusion based on the needs of each individual child. The participants said that there were some students for whom inclusion might not be appropriate. Jessica (SE) said,

I think it [inclusion] just depends on the student. … I mean there were some of our kindergarten self-contained kids that I believed after working with them for so long, I just didn’t see inclusion would be beneficial for them. They just didn’t get it. It has a lot to do with academics as well as socially. I mean if they’re [the students with disabilities] going to isolate themselves, they’re probably isolating themselves during inclusion as well. So it just depends on the student.

Cybil (SE) agreed with Jessica because she said that for some students, inclusion was inappropriate. This belief was reflected in her emphasis on making decisions about inclusion at the individual level. In particular, Cybil was concerned about the need for small group settings and individualized instruction.

Sometimes we push it so much and if it’s not the right fit for the student you just have to weigh the benefit of being with your peers with the benefit of one-on-one education, or a small group setting where they’re more comfortable maybe or where they learn better.

Elaina (SE) was also concerned about the instructional needs of the students with disabilities. She worried that the student with a disability might not be ready with the behavioral and academic skills necessary for the general education environment. This concern led her to believe that decisions about inclusion must be made at the individual student level because of the skill sets each child possessed. She also believed that, if students
were going to be placed in inclusive classrooms, the child should be prepared and have supports in place. She said,

For a student who is not ready for inclusion the instruction in inclusion would not be specifically tailored for the student. It would not be the type of instruction that they need. Also, I don’t think the behavioral expectations in the general education classroom really would match the behavioral expectations in our self-contained classroom so behaviorally some really aren’t ready. I don’t think they should just be thrown into an inclusion setting at all.

In addition to the emphasis participants placed on deciding about inclusive settings based on each individual child, they also accentuated the need for individualized instruction. Andrea (GE) said that learning about the individual children and their instructional needs was the responsibility of every teacher. She used an analogy of a combination lock. She said,

I definitely think that classroom teachers have probably had those children that they just haven’t been able to figure out what their combination is…every child has a combination that, if you can figure it out, then you can figure out the child. And if you can’t figure it out, then you’re just struggling that entire year.

Mallory was a special education preservice teacher who had a positive attitude about inclusion both before and after student teaching. Yet, even though she expressed her positive attitude, she also stressed the importance of individualizing inclusion decisions.

My goals for inclusion are to do it as much as possible. It’s got to be individualized. You’ve got to base it on the children. I’m in it for the
children. And I want the best for them and I’m going to do whatever it takes to get the best for them, whether it’s inclusion or not.

Participants also said that instruction for students with disabilities needed to be specialized. Hope (GE) said that it was important to implement accommodations and modifications into the general education classroom when including students with disabilities. She said that she had learned a lot about adaptations by watching her cooperating teacher. Amber, another general education participant, was emphatic in her belief that teachers should specialize their instruction for students with disabilities in the general education classroom. “You have to provide material in an appropriate manner, making sure they understand it. Teaching them in a way that is conducive for the special education students to learn.” Amber’s perspective about specialization was similar to Elaina’s (SE) priorities although Elaina believed that such specialization best occurred in self-contained settings. This illustrates how all participants, regardless of whether they were special education or general education participants and whether their attitudes were positive or more resistant, they all emphasized the need for individualization.

During observations, little individualization of instruction was observed. In general education settings it was difficult to differentiate students served in special education from their typically developing peers. While this is a positive characteristic in many ways because the students with disabilities are not stigmatized and are insured access and accountability for the general education curriculum, it can also be problematic if special education services aren’t being adequately provided through appropriate adaptations and supports. A few accommodations and modifications were observed including the use of a study carrel, sound amplification system, and keyboard. Multiple examples were observed of teachers making
decisions about inclusion based on specific student needs. For students in self-contained special education settings this was especially apparent. Instances of one or two students leaving the classroom for one or two periods in general education classrooms illustrated the placement decisions that were made at an individual level.

*Skills and traits of teachers of successful inclusive settings.* Case study participants suggested many qualities they believed would be critical to have in inclusive settings. These skills and characteristics were applied in the context of both general education and special education teachers. General education preservice teachers were the only participants to mention that teachers in inclusive settings should understand disability categories, perhaps because they lacked preparation in special education coursework (see later discussion about preparation). For example, Hope (GE) explained that

> Teachers definitely have to have an understanding of what that particular diagnosis is. Being able to shape the behaviors or the skills that they’re being taught and learning. Overall, teachers need to know what the diagnosis means, what characteristics they show, and then just the best practice techniques in order to help them.

Marcy (GE) agreed with Hope that teachers should understand techniques for how to teach their students. She said that both general education and special education teachers, whether they were teaching in inclusive settings or not, needed to remain up-to-date on best practices in the field. Similarly, Jessica (SE) recommended that teachers should have sets of strategies to use in the classroom that would help students. She said that teachers should have “the ability to blend in and really know your strategies. Be friendly, I mean you don’t want to just be too much their [the students] friend but you want to relate to the kid.” Her
observation that friendliness, or attitude, was important was echoed by other preservice teachers. Hope (GE) said that a patient attitude was important when working in inclusive settings, and Mark (GE) believed that attitude was the most important characteristic of any teacher. “The attitudes of teachers should be positive. If you have a negative attitude it’s just going to destroy the morale of the classroom and destroy the class itself.” Elaina, a special education participant, suggested traits that made a teacher in her student teaching placement particularly effective in inclusive settings. She said, “there are definitely certain skills that our kindergarten teacher has where we take our inclusion kids. She’s very patient, very kind, asks for help, is welcoming, warm, easy to work with, willing, and excited.” Most of the traits she mentioned were about the attitude of the teacher, similar to Mark’s observation of the importance of attitude. Karen (SE) also believed attitude was essential and said, “The general education teacher was awesome because she just had a great attitude. Those kids were welcome in the classroom, making them feel like they weren’t any different than any of the other students.” While Cybil (SE) also mentioned attitude traits, she linked them to instruction by saying, “I think they’d have to have an open frame, an open mind and not expect perfection but not lower their standards necessarily.”

Many of the participants mentioned that attitude was important because teachers in inclusive settings should be able to collaborate well with others. Nina, Mallory, and Karen provide examples in special education. Nina said, “I think that teachers in inclusion need to be able to work with others.” Karen felt some hesitancy about inclusion but had observed a successful inclusion placement that influenced her to think more positively she said. When asked what made the situation successful, she emphasized the collaboration between the special education and the general education teachers.
I think inclusion is a good thing if it’s done the right way. But in some cases it’s not and there’s a lot of students that shouldn’t be in it. And then, maybe the teacher’s collaborating is not very good also. I know last semester I did an inclusion placement and it was awesome because the two teachers, the special education teacher and the general education teacher work great together. And the kids that needed more support they were there. It was good because collaboration is so important.

Mallory focused on the need for special educators to reach out to the general educators in the school and provide resources to help them.

I think teachers need to have collaboration with the general education teachers. The general education teachers need to know they’ll be held accountable. Being there to help in any way and getting them resources and helping them whether you’re in the classroom or not.

Mark, a general education participant, also believed that special educators could provide resources to their general education colleagues. In fact, during his student teaching placement he often sought help from special education professionals. “Use any resource at school like special education teachers or what not. I mean, for my classroom they’re [the special education teachers] two doors down. I’ve asked questions or they’ve come to talk to me. So that’s helped a lot.”

However, Heidi, a general education participant, believed that collaboration was a challenge in inclusive settings. Her experience in her student teaching placement provided an example of collaboration that influenced her opinions. This
incident was shared multiple times during Heidi’s interview and its frequency is an indicator that the incident was particularly salient for her (Alexander, 1988).

I have seen that they [the general educator and special educator] have tried to work together. It was difficult because one of the special educators, she really didn’t see the situation all year. So she kind of said, ‘well try this. Try this. Try this.’ And it was all steps the general education teacher had already tried.

For Nina (SE), Mallory (SE), and Jessica (SE), communication was an important factor of effective collaboration. For example, Jessica said that communication skills were helpful to have in inclusive settings and as Mallory said, “To make things work, communicate in a positive way.” Nina and Jessica both saw examples of effective communication in their student teaching settings that influenced their opinion.

Nina’s example illustrates the active choices her cooperating teacher made in order to communicate well with her general education colleagues.

The special education teacher does contact the general education teachers a lot. They have a weekly newsletter that goes out [to general education teachers] and we get that to let us know what they’re doing in general education. And we also go and talk to them a lot, ‘what are they [the students with disabilities] struggling with? What would be most beneficial to you in the general education classroom for us to help with?’ I think that’s how you solve difficulty is through communication.

Jessica had a preconceived notion that communication would be difficult between general education and special education. However, her student teaching placement
provided an example of effective communication between special educators and
general educators. Unlike Nina’s example in which the special educators initiated
opportunities to communicate with general education, for Jessica, it was the general
education teachers who sought advice from their special education colleagues.

I heard a lot of things about resource [the resource specialist program] and
that you really have to search out the [general education] teachers but here
they, I’ve been taking observations and I have a list of just like daily the
amount of teachers that come in here, or call and send us work. So there’s a
lot of communication from regular education teachers and I think that helps.

Cybil (SE) was the only participant to mention collaboration with other stakeholders. She
emphasized the importance of collaborating with paraprofessionals in inclusive settings.
Cybil previously worked as a paraprofessional and believed their role was central to the
success of inclusive settings.

I think sometimes we overlook the biggest piece of inclusion and making it
work. It’s a team effort and sometimes we forget to include the
paraprofessionals. And who goes in that inclusion classroom with those
kids. And what kind of preparation are we giving them for working in a
classroom?

Clearly, a variety of traits and skills were identified by participants as important to the
success of inclusion. However, the emphasis appeared to be placed on communication and
collaboration. However, during observations conducted in the classrooms of the case study
participants few examples of collaboration or communication were observed. Only during
one observation was there any communication with professionals beyond the classroom
teacher and the student teacher. Nonetheless, during one observation, a special education itinerant teacher taught a social skills lesson while the student teacher and cooperating teacher played a supporting role.

Qualitative Research Question Two: Case Study Participants Describe Influences

What do preservice teachers experiencing full-time student teaching identify as factors influencing their attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom? During interviews, preservice teachers suggested factors that influenced their attitudes about inclusion. These factors included their formal experiences with inclusion, personal experiences, the type, age, and severity of the child’s disability, their teacher preparation including coursework, and their cooperating teacher’s attitude.

Formal experience. One of the most often cited influences for student teachers’ attitudes was experience. In fact, the emphasis placed on experience is a cue to its saliency (Alexander, 1988). The experience to which participants referred was both formalized through their university fieldwork and informal, personal experiences (see below for more discussion of informal experiences). The fieldwork of student teaching appeared to be pivotal to the perceptions of preservice teachers. Karen (SE) stated that she learned new things from being in the real-world school environment. Mallory was a special education participant who completed a practicum experience in a fulltime inclusive setting and also observed a few examples of inclusion in her self-contained setting during student teaching. These experiences helped her understand the practicalities of inclusion. She explained,

I’ve seen inclusion in both my practicum and my student teaching and it works. So I think that I’ve gotten more out of it, out of my experience, than
I have in my classroom. I love the [college] classes and I love the lecture part and it’s taught me a lot of good strategies. But as far as making things work and implementing things, I think it’s more of a practical perspective in the classroom.

Andrea, a general education participant, completed her student teaching in an inclusive setting so she got an opportunity to observe the practical side of inclusion like Mallory. For Andrea, the experienced reinforced her already positive attitude about inclusion. Her setting included three children with emotional/behavioral disorders, two with learning disabilities, and a few children with speech/language impairments or at-risk status. The success she saw these children with disabilities experience in the general education classroom reinforced her positive attitude.

I definitely think student teaching has influenced my opinions. I always had, I always really strongly believed in inclusion for the most part, and I think just being in this classroom reinforces that. If you have a hard experience, I think that can sort of dissuade you, it can make you feel a little anxious to not want somebody, a child in your classroom. But I’ve had such a good experience I feel even more positive about it. But I’ve always really advocated for it so…

Marcy (GE) and Hope (GE) also felt more positive about inclusion after seeing it in practice during their student teaching experience. In fact, Marcy believed that most of her attitude about inclusion was because of her student teaching experience.

I think most of my opinions come from student teaching, just what I’ve seen. I’ve heard about it and I was kind of like, yeah I think it’s a really good idea
Hope’s experience during student teaching changed her attitude about inclusion because she was able to see inclusion in practice. She said,

It’s not so scary anymore. I think that’s how I’ve changed since student teaching. I’m still not sure how it would all work but you know it’s definitely moving towards being more comfortable. This semester has helped because you’re seeing things in real life.

Other preservice teachers said their attitudes changed because of their student teaching experience as well. For Heidi (GE), a negative experience with two students who weren’t successful in the student teaching classroom in which she taught, changed her perspective.

I feel like my feelings are really different before being in this classroom where we had an Autistic child and then we have another one who’s being tested right now. I guess hands-on experience, it would have to be hands-on. Like
actually getting in a classroom, dealing with those children that are in general education classrooms.

However, although Heidi suggests that her attitude changed, her score on the ORI was low before beginning student teaching and remained low after her experience. It is possible then that the survey was not sensitive enough to detect the change that Heidi describes. In addition, her resistant attitude upon beginning student teaching may have affected her response to the situation more negatively than it may have otherwise.

Two students in special education attributed their hesitancy about inclusion to their lack of experience. Special education participants were placed predominantly in either self-contained or resource specialist settings. Few were able to observe or student teach in inclusive classrooms. For Jessica and Nina this affected their attitudes about inclusion.

I’m uncomfortable with inclusion because I haven’t had much experience. I feel like a lot of my experiences with observations and student teaching I have never really had any experience with inclusion. I think it’s one of those things that you have to see it and experience it so you feel more comfortable with it. I almost feel like I wouldn’t be as comfortable with it as I could be because I haven’t had that experience. I would say my attitudes stayed the same after student teaching just because if I had more inclusion experience maybe they would change. It’s hard to say without having experience.

Similarly, Jessica was hesitant to express her attitude about inclusion. Her early fieldwork experience was in a self-contained setting and her full-time student teaching was in a
resource specialist, tutorial program. Her lack of opportunity to see inclusion in the real-world of the school environment affected her reaction.

I haven’t been exposed to that [inclusion] as much. Like, [in practicum] I was in a self-contained kindergarten classroom. I just haven’t experienced it like I’d like to. I don’t know what to say about inclusion. I feel like, to have an opinion about something, you should know about it. And, because I haven’t really observed it, it’s hard for me to have an opinion I guess. Until I’m like, hands-on experiencing it, I have a hard time having the confidence to speak about it if I wasn’t involved in it or observed it.

It is clear then that experience in school settings through fieldwork during practicum or student teaching is important to the attitudes of student teachers. Furthermore, the experience of full-time student teaching appeared influential to their teaching abilities. The observation evaluations of four to six lessons taught by case study participants and the midterm evaluation and final summary report of their student teaching were examined. The student teaching evaluations were scored on a rubric as follows: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) developing, and (3) proficient. There are ten standards in four domains: (1) planning, (2) instruction, (3) environment, and (4) professionalism. At the beginning of student teaching, the mean for all twelve participants was a score of two, developing, across all four domains. However, by the final summary report and last observation evaluation, all twelve participants were scoring a mean of three, proficient, across all four domains. Thus, a pattern emerged that indicated growth over time for all twelve preservice teachers participating in the case study. As Mallory (SE) said,
I knew the basics of inclusion but I really didn’t know how it would work. I think I was completely against resource [classrooms], much less inclusion. But now I’m, I absolutely love it. Because of the practicum, having that experience and seeing it. This can work.

**Personal experience.** Experience was a very powerful theme for the preservice teachers in the case study. The influence of experience was expressed both for formal fieldwork in their preparation program, and also for informal, personal experiences. Andrea (GE), Hope (GE), and Nina (SE) all explained that their informal experiences with family members influenced their attitudes. Hope had a cousin with a disability and her perception of his abilities affected the ways in which she viewed disability.

My cousin, who is now almost forty years old and has two Master’s degrees, his entire K-12 education was spent in self-contained, special education classroom. And, to this day, I could not tell you what his diagnosis is. When you meet him, you realize that socially there’s something just a tad-bit off. But, other than that, intellectually, you would not think there’s anything abnormal. If that guy can do it, I’m thinking that there’s so many kids with disabilities sitting in a general education classroom right now that can do it. I just think that, you know, that there are chances that I don’t want to take away from anybody just because I’m scared of what they might be like in my classroom.

Hope was a non-traditional student in that she was older than the other participants. She also had a husband who worked in special education at a local high school in a self-contained setting. However, she did not raise this relationship during her interview so it is unknown as to whether it was influential. Hope also had two children with Attention
Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder and she suggested that being their mother was also influential to her attitudes.

I have children who, I’ve got two boys and both of them are diagnosed with ADD, and we’ve done different things cuz [sic] I was very resistant to medication. But now, the older one is in the sixth grade. We’ve kind of weaned him off of meds. I did not want stimulants to follow him into middle school and high school. Just giving your children something that has street value kind of sits wrong with me. Luckily we’re at a place where, or his condition is not so severe. And I have seen it to where I don’t know that they could function. I’m not sure how they function in a school setting. I think that there are so many other techniques other than just medication to help those students who, they just can’t sit still. They’re not gonna sit still. There’s no point in yelling at them because they cannot sit still. But you know what? If they sit on the little bouncy ball, and they just sit there and bounce a little bit, and nobody else is being disturbed, then we’re helping everybody—myself, the student, and those around them. So, I think that having that personal experience, probably does influence the way I think about that particular group of students. I know the frustration that can be caused because I deal with it at home. I know that the frustrations that the teachers are telling me, that they have to handle when my child’s in their class. But then I also get to see, what they’re doing to help my child in their class, and also just the degree of difference between, you know, a child who, yes, they’re kind of borderline on that fence of—is he just being a boy, you
know, whatever. I got kids that...they’re just not gonna sit still. They just cannot. So yes. I would think that kind of personal experience makes the difference.

Andrea (GE) also suggested that her family influenced her positive attitudes. However, unlike Hope who had a relationship with a family member with a disability, Andrea’s family influence was the way she was raised to look out for others. In addition, Andrea’s experience working at a camp provided experience that influenced her overall attitudes about inclusion.

I think my positive attitudes come from family settings and also from, I worked at a summer camp for the past three summers and the last two weeks of camp the Muscular Dystrophy Association Camp comes and then also Camp ARC comes. And I’ve worked with both of those camps and I guess I’ve just seen that you know they’re normal. And so seeing that and seeing how in a community they can, if they’re embraced, they just thrive. So I think that’s really changed my perception a lot.

Andrea also shared her own personal experiences in school. She struggled with reading and thus felt empathy with struggling students. She believed that her early struggles influenced her positive attitudes about inclusion.

In first grade I struggled. I think I probably, I really struggled in reading. And so I think being the slower child in my classroom and then having to work really hard to be back on track, I think that, I have empathy for children that have to struggle.
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While Nina also indicated that her family influenced her attitudes about inclusion, it was her experiences working with students with disabilities when she was young that was particularly influential. She said,

My mom actually teaches special education. She’s a teacher’s aide. She’s a paraprofessional at the middle school level. So all through middle school I would go and help with Special Olympics. I would go to her class and help out if it was a day when I didn’t have school and she did. I think a lot of the opinions I formed came from those first years, being in her classroom and listening to the teachers around me.

Like Nina, Karen (SE) participated in Special Olympics. This personal experience helping people with disabilities contributed to her comfort working with special education populations. She said, “I worked a lot with Special Olympics throughout college and that affected my opinions because I knew a little bit about special education just from working at Special Olympics.” Amber (GE) and Cybil (SE) reflected on their experiences working as a paraprofessional with students with disabilities. Both of them suggested that their experience in schools was influential to their positive attitudes. For Amber, the experience working with kids with disabilities was important.

I’ve been an aide in an LD classroom, in a multiple handicapped classroom. I subbed as an aide for two years and I worked one-on-one with students. I was usually the personal aide. I did the extended, which was in elementary school. And then for two years I did the extended high school program and I worked one-on-one with a girl who had Down Syndrome and she was diagnosed Bi-polar and so I’m more compassionate towards that.
Cybil was a non-traditional student teacher because she was older than the other preservice teachers. Her experience as a paraprofessional, like Amber, influenced her opinions. She said,

    I used to be a paraprofessional. And that influenced me to really try to figure out for myself, where do I stand on this [inclusion]. And so I had an open mind as far as I really didn’t have a this is good this is bad definition for it. And even now I really don’t have that. I have a this all depends attitude.

Although Cybil suggested that her attitude was neither positive nor negative, her scores on the ORI were very high both before and after student teaching. In addition, earlier in the interview Cybil said she felt very positive about inclusion. The discrepancy above may be related to the ambivalence preservice teachers feel about inclusion discussed earlier.

For Mark, Jessica, and Elaina, their attitudes were influenced by personal experiences in church. Mark, a general education participant, worked specifically with children with disabilities at his church and he said that made him think about inclusion because his church didn’t separate students with disabilities. He also reflects his altruistic attitude, putting the welfare of the children first, in the following example about his experiences in church settings.

    I volunteer with the youth group and children at my church and they have a special education like type of program. So I’ve led small groups when there’s been a special education student sitting in my group, but they also have a person with them the whole time. So I’ve encountered, I’ve been experienced with groups like inclusion in a church setting. I guess my
attitudes just come from growing up in church and just seeing youths, like I don’t want to see a youth fail.

Elaina (SE) also felt her experiences in church influenced her attitudes. However, her experiences weren’t specifically with children with disabilities like Mark. Instead, she worked with various kids while growing up and believed this influenced her love of children. She said, “I’ve worked with children for a really long time. My mom is in charge of all the children at our church so just helping her all along from childhood helped me know I want to teach little kids.”

Jessica’s church experience was different than Mark and Elaina’s. Jessica, a special education participant, formed an influential relationship with her church youth group director. Her successful relationship with the youth director’s son with Autism built her confidence to work with students with disabilities. She explained,

My first experience was my college leader’s son. That was freshman year of college and I started working with special needs children in the Sunday school classroom there. And that was great. That was my first. I think the church had a huge impact on me. My college leader was a real mentor for my husband and I so we worked really closely with the family and spent a lot of time with them, which meant I spent a lot of time with their son.

The information shared by two preservice teachers was unique from the rest of the participants, and indicator of its saliency (Alexander, 1988). Heidi (GE) and Mallory (SE) said that their lack of experience was influential. In fact, Mallory believed that she should have seen kids with disabilities more than she did when she was in school and believed students with disabilities were excluded from the school culture. This
experience created dissonance for her and influenced her strong preference for inclusive practices.

I don’t remember it being an issue in my high school. I don’t even remember seeing kids from the special class. I just always felt like special education was kind of pushed to the corner and they were really forgotten about. I hate that it happened and it bothers me still today.

Although Jessica (SE) did have personal experiences with her church, she agreed with Mallory that, while she was growing up students with disabilities were excluded. She also believed that students with disabilities were stigmatized when she was in high school and that influenced her attitudes about inclusion.

Heidi also believed her lack of experience influenced the development of her attitudes. Heidi was more resistant to inclusion than the other participants were and remained resistant after student teaching. She believed that more personal experience may have changed her attitudes somewhat.

I went to a private school through elementary school and I don’t, I wasn’t aware of any special education really until maybe high school. And in high school there was some remediation class but I just wasn’t really aware of it I don’t think until now. This possibly influenced me because I was kind of sheltered, kind of lived under a rock before, and now all of a sudden, seeing these different situations. So I’m sure if I had more exposure to it my opinion would probably change.

Type, age, and severity of disability. For many of the participants, their attitude about inclusion was based on how they viewed the type of disability a child exhibited, the severity
of the disability, or the age and grade level of the student. Interestingly, opinions varied in what type or age was most appropriate for inclusion. For example, Mark (GE) believed inclusion was best facilitated in high school while Marcy (GE) and Nina (SE) suggested upper elementary was the best time to begin implementing inclusive practices. Elaina (SE) thought beginning inclusion during early childhood was easiest but Jessica (SE) agreed with Mark that high school was when it worked best.

In addition to differences among preservice teachers about what age would be best for inclusive practices, many suggested that certain types of disabilities were easier to include than others. For example, Hope (GE) said, “what I don’t tend to think of when I think of including students in a general education classroom, is any kind of mental retardation or that type of…I have a harder time visualizing how that fits into the classroom.” Andrea (GE) agreed that students with cognitive deficits might be more challenging to include, but she believe there would be ways to facilitate inclusion for all students.

I don’t think that every child, you know there’s some children that have severe mental disabilities. And so maybe the need to have an aide with them or maybe they need to be in a separate classroom for awhile but maybe an activity that they can participate in.

Nina (SE) insisted that students with learning disabilities were most likely to be placed in an inclusive classroom. Her opinion was that learning disabilities were milder than other special education categories so an inclusive setting was more likely. Her opinion about severity, that milder disabilities were best facilitated with inclusion was common among other participants as well. In particular, Heidi (GE) felt that severity was a central issue. She observed a successful inclusive setting during her early fieldwork but a troubling inclusive
setting during full-time student teaching. She suggested that the difference between the two situations was the severity of needs of the students.

Last semester there were, I think there was a child with a slight disability and it really didn't affect too much of the classroom. And last semester I probably would have said, inclusion I'm all for him [the student with a disability] being in the general education classroom the whole day because it [the disability] was only a social kind of issue and it did help him to be exposed to his peers and to have to deal with those social issues. Whereas [when the disability] it's not so much learning and they're [the students with a disability] on the extreme side so I would say being in a separate classroom would be more beneficial. After student teaching here, I am definitely more aware of the range [of needs/severities]. I would say this [the students in the current full-time student teaching setting] is a lot more severe and this [the students in the earlier practicum setting] is a lot less severe. So just basically I realize that they [the students with a disability in the current student teaching setting] can't learn the way, they can't learn to their fullest ability in the general education classroom.

Karen's attitude about the influence of type or severity of disability was different. She suggested that it was the characteristics of the child's personality that made a difference to the success of inclusion. For example, she said,

I look for whether the student can participate, wants to work. I'm not going to put a student in inclusion that doesn't want to work because they're not going to have as much one-on-one as they would in a special education
classroom. Whether I would do inclusion when I am a teacher depends on the type of class I have.

Overall however, the perception that decisions regarding an inclusive placement depended on the type of disability, the severity, or the age of the child, was widespread.

*College preparation.* Preservice teachers discussed the role their coursework in college played in influencing their attitudes. Most participants said their college courses were helpful but not sufficient. This suggestion came from both general education and special education participants. However, general education preservice teachers were particularly insistent about their lack of preparation. Nonetheless, Mark (GE) believed his one course in special education was helpful. He said, “I took special education my sophomore year and I think just the general knowledge like IEPs of what it was gave me an idea of where to start. So I was more knowledgeable about what I was asking.” Marcy (GE) also had some good experiences in her coursework, particularly because of the modeling provided by her professors.

I had some really good [general education] professors who had a lot of experience with it, and so I guess I could say it really helped me to be really sensitive towards it because I didn’t really, in my experience, I never really had that growing up. But even in our college classroom there were certain people with certain needs and disabilities. And all our professors were very sensitive.
Although Marcy felt good about her college preparation she was hesitant to say she had sufficient training for inclusive settings. She said, “I do feel like I learned a lot at my college but I feel like you can never be too prepared for anything.”

Heidi (GE) felt more unprepared because of what she experienced in her student teaching placement. “I mean, I’ve taken special education class and that didn’t prepare me for what I saw this semester.” Amber (GE) agreed that the coursework did not prepare her for the practical realities she saw in her student teaching classroom. She said, “I didn’t get much out of the one special education class I took. And you’re thrown into the general education classroom and you still have those children in your class. You need to know more about everything.” This was not an uncommon attitude among participants. Although Andrea (GE) had a very positive attitude about inclusion according to her ORI scores and her interview data, she felt she did not have enough training because one course in special education was not enough preparation.

We haven’t talked about it [inclusion] very much in college because I only had one special education course. I wish that I had more instruction on how to work with students [with disabilities], how to help them and make accommodations for them. Because I don’t think that’s talked about as much. So I wish we’d had more instruction on that. It wasn’t talked about a ton.

Hope (GE) also believed she lacked training for inclusive settings. In particular, she believed her coursework focused too much on differentiating lesson plans without providing enough practical knowledge about the characteristics of the students with disabilities or how best to provide appropriate instruction.
The classroom teacher needs to be definitely diligent, but there has to be some training. I know my one education class in special education did not prepare me to give those children what they need. Our coursework is mainly geared towards, this is what you’re going to do to modify your lesson plans for a diverse population. So yes, it’s been talked about but I feel like it’s more for filling in that blank on the lesson plan than it is for really concrete ways of helping those students.

Thus, all participants in general education believed their training was insufficient for inclusion. This belief was not shared by their special education peers. Preservice teachers in special education suggested that they were taught dispositions and strategies in their coursework. For example, Nina (SE) shared the disposition she learned from her coursework.

At the college level they always paint a positive picture and they really encourage inclusion. They tell you what it’s supposed to look like and how it can be beneficial. I think that’s where my attitude, I think it’s good but I’ve just been unable to see it, I think that’s where it comes from, my college classes.

Jessica (SE) agreed, “Well we’ve been taught in school that inclusion is, it’s something that is on the rise I guess. It’s being used a lot, and that it’s helpful to the students.” However, Cybil (SE) provided insight into the caution that she perceived about inclusion from the special education faculty.

We’ve talked about inclusion in almost all of the special education classes, mostly in the positive but also in the cautionary. The courses reinforced my
beliefs in a lot of areas and made me think better of inclusion. But also to make sure it was right for the child and that it was done right because there were a lot of bad stories too.

Jessica (SE) suggested that, while she was well prepared by her college coursework for teaching students with disabilities, she did not feel prepared specifically for inclusive settings. She said, “I don’t feel like I have the preparation for inclusion at all.” This was echoed by Mallory (SE) who believed her preparation was focused more on self-contained placements for students with disabilities. Unlike her other peers in the special education certification program, her feelings were that faculty emphasized self-contained settings. While Mallory had a very positive attitude about inclusion, if she had not experienced the positive examples during her fieldwork she may not have had a positive outlook.

I really think college courses kind of push you toward self-contained, I really do. Because they just said resource is bad. It’s just a homework center. I felt like I was preached to. But then I had a great cooperating teacher and it worked perfectly.

Elaina (SE) also believed she was better prepared for self-contained settings. However, she attributed this to her lack of knowledge in secondary content areas.

If I was an inclusion teacher in a high school I don’t know if I would have the academic skills necessary to help that student progress in a general education classroom. I feel more confident in my abilities in a self-contained classroom than I do a resource or inclusion classroom.

Overall, the special education participants believed they were especially well equipped with behavioral and instructional strategies they could use when working
with students with disabilities. Both Cybil (SE) and Jessica (SE) related their confidence in strategies their professors taught them during their coursework. Jessica said, “In my courses they’ve given us a lot of strategies to pull from. They’ve really taught us a lot. I mean a lot a lot, where I’ve had to remember what we’ve learned and go back and find them.” Cybil agreed,

   Mostly the college has given me the tools I need to say, this is the law. I know what the special education laws are, I know how to test and assess all these tools for CBM techniques and the importance of it. RTI. The professors really know their stuff.

During observations, special education student teachers were observed instructing students in multiple strategies. For example, one student teacher was teaching a small group of three students a four-square writing lesson. In another example, the preservice teacher applied principles of direct instruction to help her students with a phonics lesson and used pictorial cue cards to alert the students to the focus sound. Another preservice teacher taught students a mnemonic strategy for remembering a mathematical process.

   The use of strategies was also evident from both general and special education preservice teachers in their artifacts from the student teaching semester. In multiple lesson plans the use of visual imagery, video, and other technology was applied as a strategy to engage diverse learners. Other strategies such as preferential seating, the use of a variety of assessment measures, pre-teaching, tiered questioning, and small group instruction when needed were evident in lesson plans as well.

Cooperating teacher attitudes. While some student teachers talked overtly with their cooperating teacher about inclusion, others perceived their cooperating teachers’ attitudes
through actions displayed in the classroom. Regardless, most student teachers believed their cooperating teacher had an influence on their attitude after student teaching. Only two student teachers, Mark and Hope who were both general education participants, believed their cooperating teacher did not influence their attitudes about inclusion. For the others, their cooperating teacher had either a positive or negative impact on their own attitudes. Elaina’s relationship with her cooperating teacher helped her to see that inclusion could work for students if the special education teacher took the initiative to get it started with small steps. Elaina was a special education preservice teacher who felt resistant to inclusion but her cooperating teacher helped her change some of her perspective.

My cooperating teacher’s attitude has definitely affected my viewpoints. I’ve been very blessed. She’s wonderful. And she is a huge advocate for our students. She is the one that takes the initiative to originally go to general education for calendar time. So I definitely think, I mean it has made me think so much more positively about what my kids can definitely do in inclusion. That they’re, not only can they go into the general education environment but they can thrive.

For Mallory (SE), it was her relationship with a previous cooperating teacher with whom she worked during her early practicum that influenced her attitude. Prior to working with this cooperating teacher in an inclusive setting, she did not agree with anything except self-contained placements for students with disabilities. However, during her interview she was vehement about the impact her early practicum cooperating teacher had on her attitudes. She became a proponent and advocate for inclusion after that experience. Mallory’s ORI scores were positive both before and after student teaching and she attributed that positive
attitude directly to her cooperating teacher’s influence. Andrea-GE was also very positive about inclusion before beginning student teaching and remained positive after student teaching partly because of the influence of her cooperating teacher. “I think if I’d had a teacher that thought differently [about inclusion] then that probably would have dissuaded me a little bit but I think my teacher has really reinforced what I have always thought.”

One of the ways in which cooperating teachers were influential was in their modeling. Several student teachers said that observing their cooperating teachers work effectively in inclusive settings helped them see how to implement inclusion successfully. For example, Marcy (GE) said that she modeled many of her own lessons after her cooperating teacher’s instruction.

She definitely has influenced me because she does an excellent job including all her students. It’s been good to see ways that she does that in the classroom. Because you hear about how you can do it, but I’ve seen specific ways that she does it. She does a great job of including everyone. It definitely affected me to kind of follow her pattern and do the things that she’s been doing or maybe branch out and do my own. Most of the stuff I’ve done is what she’s already been doing, just kind of continuing that.

Amber (GE) also appreciated the modeling of her cooperating teacher and said it helped her learn how to make adaptations her students might need.

My cooperating teacher was very influential. What she did with those kids was amazing. She was trying to make them as independent as possible. I’ve learned a lot from her. She does a really good job with students who come
into her classroom that have IEPs. She works with them, and she tries to make modifications for all students.

Jessica (SE) believed her cooperating teacher was influential because she modeled effective instruction but also because of the feedback she provided on Jessica’s work. This feedback increased Jessica’s confidence in teaching students with disabilities.

The experience with my cooperating teacher has really helped me grow and to learn and I feel like I’m really comfortable. She’s giving me the experiences I needed right from the start. She showed me how to teach well and [gave me] the critiques that I need so I can work on them

Three participants shared negative influences of cooperating teachers. Heidi was a general education participant and her cooperating teacher’s struggle to provide appropriate instruction for her students with disabilities while still meeting the needs of the typically developing students influenced Heidi’s own resistance to inclusion. Although Heidi never spoke about inclusion specifically with her cooperating teacher, she still felt her influence.

I don’t know [my cooperating teacher’s attitude], I don’t feel like I really know. I know that she would agree with me that the one child [with a disability] isn’t, he can’t be serviced in our classroom to the extent that he needs to be. For one of the students, the Autistic child, he’s excused from some assignments. So that influences me to think he can’t make it in general education.

Cybil (SE) had a stressed relationship with her cooperating teacher during full-time student teaching. She felt her cooperating teacher did not support her growth but rather criticized everything Cybil tried. Nonetheless, Cybil had a positive attitude about inclusion both
before and after student teaching. She contrasts her positive experiences with a previous cooperating teacher and her negative experiences with her current teacher.

I’ve had some awesome positive influence from a previous teacher I worked with in the classroom. In this student teaching placement it’s been a very difficult semester for me. My cooperating teacher’s goal is always inclusion. But then again I see them not on the bus and not in the general education classes. And I saw one come back and the only reason he came back from an inclusion class was because of his behavior but he has no behavior plan. So in my mind that’s not really trying to make it work. My relationship with my cooperating teacher became a negative thing the whole semester and it completely affects my ability to perform my job. I seriously thought about just not teaching.

Nina (SE) spoke about the influence of professional educators in the field beyond her cooperating teacher. She believed that most teachers, whether they were in special or general education, felt resistant about inclusion. This caused her to question what she had been taught in her coursework about the benefits of inclusion.

Normally it’s not a very positive reaction [to inclusion] from other teachers I’ve seen. The school I was at last semester, some of the teachers there, the special education teachers, they didn’t like it so much. A lot of the things I’ve heard from teachers who have been in teaching for awhile are not positive things as far as inclusion. It is hard to see a teacher who has been in education for a long time and see how they feel about it and then you’re thinking, ‘well you know they’ve been in this for a long time.’ And so it kind
of does affect how you feel about things whenever you hear from people who have been in it for so long. And you want to think, ‘well I know it can be better than that.’ But it’s hard because you hear so many negative things about it.

Observational data supported the importance of the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher’s relationship. For example, the student teacher in multiple settings was observed conferring with the cooperating teacher before beginning a lesson or during the time in which they played a support role. In addition, during at least three observations, the preservice teacher sought the advice and opinion of the cooperating teacher after the interview or after the lesson they taught. In each of these examples, the student teacher initiated the interaction and the resulting episode appeared to the observer as a mentoring opportunity that was influential for the student teacher.

Mixed Methods Results

The mixed methods approach used in this research design allowed for triangulation of data analysis and results. The mixed methods research question asked: How do the qualitative results explain, corroborate, or contradict the results from the quantitative survey research?

**Explanation and Corroboration**

Several themes from the qualitative case study provide evidence that helps explain the quantitative results. For example, the overall attitudes of preservice teachers increased significantly after student teaching when measured by the ORI. Case study participants
emphasized the role real-life experience played in the development of their attitudes. All of
the case study participants shared examples of the influence of being in the school setting,
working with students. Consequently, the student teaching experience had an impact on
their overall attitudes measured by the ORI. The same is true for the self-efficacy of the
preservice teachers. Many of them shared feelings of unpreparedness before student
teaching that improved as a result of being in a real-world classroom environment. This was
supported by the quantitative findings indicating significantly improved self-efficacy scores
on the TSES after student teaching. In addition, the quantitative findings indicated
differences between special education preservice teachers and general education preservice
teachers and the qualitative case study also found attitudes and factors specific to either
general education or special education participants, particularly in the area of coursework
preparation. The preservice teachers’ scores on the ORI both before and after student
teaching fell along the normal curve, representing variance in attitudes about inclusion. This
variation in attitudes was also true during case study interviews because some preservice
teachers were very positive, some were ambivalent or undecided, and one was resistant to
inclusive practices. Thus, many of the qualitative and quantitative results provide converging
and supportive evidence.

Contradictions

Some qualitative and quantitative findings did not converge. For example, although
quantitative results did not find significant correlations between cooperating teacher
attitudes and preservice teacher attitudes after student teaching, case study participants
suggested that their cooperating teachers significantly impacted their attitudinal
development. In addition, survey results included variability in attitudes. However, during the case study analysis, few differences in attitude were expressed. The group was in agreement about many of the themes. Also, contrary to the quantitative results that indicated a preservice teacher’s most influential predictor of their attitude after student teaching was their attitude before student teaching, qualitative findings pointed to the role of experience and preparation as being very important to the development of their attitudes.

One of the values of the mixed-methods research design was the ability to determine where quantitative and qualitative data converged or differed. A matrix comparison was used to determine the above supporting or contradicting evidence. Table 4.8 provides evidence of corroborating data.

Table 4.8

Corroborating Evidence from Mixed Methods Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More positive attitudes on ORI after student teaching</td>
<td>Interviews confirmed the usefulness of the student teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-efficacy scores after student teaching on TSES</td>
<td>Case study participants felt more prepared to teach after student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and general education participants were significantly different</td>
<td>Interview themes differed for special and general education case study participants. Special education participants suggested they felt better prepared by coursework than did general education participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some evidence emerging from quantitative and qualitative data did not converge. These findings provide important information however about the attitudes of preservice teachers. Therefore, table 4.9 provides a description of non-converging evidence.
Table 4.9

*Non-Converging Evidence from Mixed Methods Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cooperating teacher’s attitude exerted little influence on the preservice teachers’ attitudes after student teaching when entered in the regression model</td>
<td>Case study participants suggested the cooperating teachers were very influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance in survey responses approximated the normal curve</td>
<td>Although participants were chosen based on their ORI scores, representing most positive and most negative attitudes about inclusion, interview responses were less varying than survey responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes before student teaching were most influential in predicting attitudes after student teaching</td>
<td>Case study participants pointed to experience and preparation and the most influential factors of their attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this research was to uncover the attitudes and influences during student teaching on preservice teachers’ attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. The findings reported in this chapter indicated that a variety of factors contributed to significant change in attitudes after student teaching. The next and final chapter will discuss the implications of the findings for teacher educators and preparation programs. In addition, limitations of the current study will be presented as well as directions for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

“I want to make an impact on students’ lives. And to me, a student is a student. It doesn’t matter if they’re really strongly disabled or not…I’m still gonna give it my all in some shape or form.”
–Mark (general education preservice teacher, p. 4)

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. In particular, the research examined attitudes in the context of full-time student teaching and factors that influenced those attitudes. Using mixed methods analysis, differences and similarities among preservice teachers in general education and special education, changes occurring during the student teaching context, influences on attitudes, and explanatory factors were examined. What follows is a discussion of the findings as they build upon the current literature base. In addition, the research findings are discussed in light of the theoretical framework that underpinned the study. Limitations of the research and implications for the practice of teacher education and future research implications are also included.

This research provides additional value to the literature base on the attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities. Some of the findings support the literature while others provide evidence different from that which has been previously published. This research is also valuable in providing results contextualized within the student teaching experience, something that has not been previously reported in the literature.
Three theories guided the development of this research and the findings supported the theoretical framework to various extents. Some findings are supported by multiple theories while others may not be explained by any of the three theories that originally guided the research. However, the ways in which theory does or does not support the findings provide a useful perspective to explain the results.

The following is a discussion of the links of the current research findings to literature of the field and educational theory and literature. The findings are discussed from an integrative process. That is, the findings from the mixing process are discussed so that quantitative and qualitative findings are linked. Findings that are explained by both quantitative and qualitative data are presented first and then findings that emerged solely from the qualitative case study are presented. Thus, rather than discussing isolated quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research questions separately, important discussion points from all of the findings are developed. After integrating all of the findings, the four quantitative research questions resulted in findings that can be explained and supported by qualitative findings. Thus, seven integrated observations are discussed first: (a) the overall attitudes of preservice teachers changed after student teaching, (b) preservice teachers seeking certification in special education were significantly different from preservice teachers in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education certification areas, (c) cooperating teachers’ attitudes were significantly higher though not highly correlated to preservice teacher attitudes, (d) the attitude of the preservice teachers before student teaching was significantly predictive of their attitude after student teaching, (e) the self-efficacy of preservice teachers increased however was not correlated to their attitudes about inclusion, (f) preservice teacher attitudes fell along the normal curve, ranging along a
continuum from less to more positive about inclusion, and (g) no significant differences
were found by gender or general education certification area. In addition, four additional
findings emerged from the qualitative case study and will be discussed: (a) preservice
teachers’ philosophies about social justice and altruism influenced their attitudes about
inclusion, (b) preservice teachers express ambivalence and indecision about their attitudes
towards inclusion, (c) personal experience was a very influential factor for the preservice
teachers, and (d) participants suggested that their attitude about inclusion depended on the
type and severity of disability and the age or grade level of the student.

Integrated Discussions

Integrated Discussion One: The Overall Attitudes of Preservice Teachers Changed After Student Teaching

The quantitative findings indicated that a significant change occurred for the overall
group of preservice teachers who participated in the current research. Although, for the
sub-group of participants in special education a non-significant decrease took place, as a
whole group, the change that occurred after student teaching represented movement toward
more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general
education classroom. A qualitative finding, the role of experience, supported the statistical
change that occurred for participants during case study data analysis. Both general education
and special education teachers emphasized the role that experience played in shaping their
attitudes. In fact, many preservice teachers were very clear in their statements and adamantly
indicated that the classrooms in which they student taught, and the students with whom they
worked changed their attitudes. Therefore, it is the student teachers’ own words during
interviews, combined with the theory and literature base, that perhaps provide the most authentic explanation of the increase in positive attitudes that occurred after student teaching.

*Literature links.* Previous literature also links experience to positive attitudes about inclusion. For example, Jobling and Moni (2004) suggested that preservice teachers’ attitudes are reflective of their positive or negative experiences in schools. In their qualitative study, 13 preservice teachers in Australia were provided, during their teacher preparation coursework, with experiences in classrooms with students with disabilities. Results indicated that participants that worked with students with disabilities in positive situations became more positive about inclusion, felt more capable, and viewed disability from a less deficit model. Those participants in Jobling and Moni’s study that had limited experience or worked with students with disabilities in schools with little or no support gained little knowledge, skills, or positive attitudes about teaching students with disabilities. This parallels what the case study participants in the current study expressed. All of the participants who saw successful examples of inclusive environments became more positive after student teaching, while a negative experience resulted in less positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Lambe and Bones (2008) reported that the challenges faced in the reality of the classroom setting decreased the preservice teachers’ support for inclusion. Their qualitative study in Ireland examined discussions among fifteen student teachers placed in schools for students with disabilities. While it is unclear whether these participants were general or special education student teachers, they were all in the post-graduate certificate program in education at the university. One of the findings for the majority of preservice teachers in
their study was that teaching students with disabilities in schools was harder than they had expected. In the current study, most case study participants suggested that their classroom placements provided helpful models of inclusion. However, like Lambe and Bones’ participants a few preservice teachers in the case study did not observe inclusive settings at all and were hesitant to express their support for inclusion. In addition, one participant experienced a setting in which students with disabilities struggled in the general education classroom and this seemed to influence her resistant attitude. On the other hand, positive experiences with students with disabilities in the general education classroom helped some case study participants in the current study see how inclusion can work well. Campbell et al. (2003), in their Australian study of 274 general education preservice teachers surveyed before and after formal instruction and fieldwork in special education, also found that fieldwork was the most important component of coursework that resulted in more positive attitudes about inclusion. The quantitative results that indicated change after student teaching, and the qualitative emphasis on the importance of experience gained during student teaching both support Campbell et al.’s findings about the importance of fieldwork.

Special education preservice teachers did not shift significantly from their ORI scores before student teaching and what little change did occur was toward less positive attitudes about inclusion. These findings are unlike those of Shippen et al. (2005). In their study, Shippen and colleagues investigated the perceptions of 326 (29% special education, 46% general education and 21% dual certification areas) preservice teachers in the United States about inclusion before and after an introductory course in special education. Their results indicated that, while all participants became slightly more positive about inclusion, preservice teachers in dual certification and special education certification programs changed
the most. Shippen et al. attributed the special educators’ more significant change in receptivity to inclusion to their deeper knowledge of special education policy and legal requirements. In the current study, student teachers in special education did report greater knowledge and better preparation in special education content. Yet that did not appear to influence more positive attitudes about inclusion according to their ORI scores because participants emphasized their experiences during fieldwork. The current study investigated attitudes before and after student teaching while Shippen and colleagues investigated change after coursework so that difference may contribute to the discrepant findings of the current study special educators.

The findings also differ from Romi and Leyser’s (2006) results which reported more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom among special education preservice teachers than those in general education. Their study was conducted in the context of 11 colleges of education in Israel with 664 general education participants and 289 special education participants. Romi and Leyser, like Shippen et al., attribute special educators’ positive attitudes with better preparation. In their study, Romi and Leyser found that special education preservice teachers had higher teaching efficacy therefore felt more confident to teach students with disabilities in any setting, including inclusive settings. Quantitative results of the current study were different because special educators did not report more positive attitudes after student teacher than general educators. However, this difference in attitudinal outcomes of special and general education participants may be explained by the case study interview results. At least two special education participants reported feeling unprepared for inclusive placements, though well prepared for more restrictive settings. In addition, interview findings indicated that special
education participants also felt the influence of experience on their attitudes. Frequently, special education preservice teachers in the current study said they felt uncomfortable about inclusion because they had not experienced an inclusive setting during their preparation. Some special education participants reported seeing little inclusion because they were placed in resource specialist programs or self-contained settings for all of their previous field experiences and student teaching placements. This lack of formal experience with inclusion influenced their attitudes. The preservice teachers appeared hesitant in their support for inclusive practices as a result. Yet, student teachers in special education who did experience inclusion during their practicum placements attributed their positive attitudes to experience, like the participants in Jobling and Moni’s (2004) study that experienced fieldwork with students with disabilities and became more positive about inclusion.

*Theoretical links.* Various theoretical considerations could also help to explain the change in attitudes after student teaching. For example, the opportunity to observe models and practice to refine their skills may have increased perceptions of their ability to manage the special needs of students with disabilities in the general education setting. The theory of situated cognition (Brill, 2001) suggests that belonging to a community of practice provides access to resources and experts. The context of student teaching provides a community of practice that then may help preservice teachers practice and refine their skills by learning the procedural and declarative knowledge of teaching students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Likewise, Bandura’s (1977) conception of self-efficacy would suggest that the student teaching experience would improve the self-efficacy of the student teachers because it provides them with mastery experiences. Mastery experiences are previous successes or
failures at similar tasks in similar circumstances (Bandura, 1977). During student teaching, preservice teachers engage in instructional practices they may use in their future careers as practicing teachers. Thus, their success during student teaching in the teaching behaviors of the profession may contribute to a student teacher’s perception of their ability to meet the needs of the students with disabilities in the general education classroom. This then may have influenced their attitudes after student teaching.

However, these theories are somewhat insufficient explanations. Although the finding that student teachers’ self-efficacy scores increased after student teaching supports the above theories, there is a lack of correlation between self-efficacy and attitudes about inclusion measured by the ORI. This finding suggests that, although situated cognition and self-efficacy theory may explain the improved TSES scores after student teaching, they do not fully explain the change to more positive attitudes about inclusion that occurred after student teaching.

During case study interviews, participants explained that the practical perspective of the classroom added value to their preparation beyond coursework and therefore influenced their attitudes about inclusion. Preservice teachers who were not placed in inclusive settings for fieldwork were hesitant to judge inclusion at all because they hadn’t observed it. This may be particularly well explained by the theory of situated cognition. Situated cognition recognizes the importance of context to learning and this seems to be how preservice teachers talked about the influencing factors of their attitudes. That is, context was very important to their discussion, both about what influenced their attitudes and in their perspectives about inclusion’s place in school.
Thus, the importance preservice teachers placed on experience may explain the change from before student teaching to after student teaching. The important role experience plays during teacher preparation warrants careful consideration, particularly given the research literature that suggests that those attitudes formed early are more resistant to change (Nel, 1992).

Integrated Discussion Two: Preservice Teachers Seeking Certification in Special Education Were Different From Preservice Teachers in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Certification Areas

Another finding with significant implications for teacher preparation was that special education preservice teachers held significantly different attitudes about inclusion than general educators. Although special education participants were significantly different from general educators, no differences were found among general educators. These findings are similar to previous reports in the literature, although typically special education participants are significantly more positive about inclusion than general education participants. This was not found in the current study.

Literature links. In Scruggs and Mastropieri’s (1996) review of the literature examining the attitudes of practicing teachers about inclusion, findings suggested that special educators held more favorable attitudes about inclusion than general educators. The findings of the current study differed. Preservice teachers in special education scored lower on the ORI after student teaching than their general education peers. This may be due to differences between preservice and practicing teachers. Scruggs and Mastropieri’s (1996) review of the literature focused solely on practicing teacher attitudes. They found that the
pressures of time and accountability impacted the attitudes of general education teachers. This may not apply to preservice teachers.

Preparation differences may have exerted differential influences for special educators and general educators in the current study. Previous research reported that general education and special education preservice teachers in blended or dual certification programs were more positive about inclusion than those in discrete programs (Kim, 2006; Shippen et al., 2005). Kim (2006) investigated the attitudes and self-efficacy of 110 participants from eight teacher education programs in the United States offering either dual certification blended programs or discrete general education programs. The results indicated that participants from dual certification blended programs were significantly more positive about inclusion and had higher self-efficacy for teaching students with disabilities than participants from discrete preparation programs. However, the current study was conducted in the context of discrete special and general education programs of study (see Appendix C). Thus, the finding that a significant difference existed between special and general education participants may be partially explained by the separate preparation programs.

Another finding was that some special education participants in the case study reported feeling prepared to teach students with disabilities and suggested various strategies and skills they learned in their college coursework; however, none of the general education case study participants reported that they felt similarly well prepared. The finding that special education preservice teachers felt well prepared is contrary to other research (e.g., Romi & Leyser, 2006). Romi and Leyser found that special education participants in their study in Israel supported segregated special education placements because they believed general educators and special educators lacked sufficient skills for teaching students with
disabilities in the inclusive classroom. The apprehension that general education preservice teachers expressed supports Shippen et al.’s (2005) findings that general education preservice teachers had higher levels of anxiety about working with students with disabilities. General education preservice teachers in the current study concurred; they suggested in interviews that teachers didn’t have the skills necessary to manage the academic, social, and behavioral challenges of the students and they also reported that they personally felt unprepared for teaching students with disabilities, having had just one course about special education early in their program of study. Special education preservice teachers said they felt very prepared for self-contained settings. However, they felt less prepared for inclusive settings. Perhaps then, the difference in attitudes after student teaching could be at least partially attributed to the specific programs of study of general education and special education participants.

Regardless of whether coursework prepared them well for teaching students with disabilities (as was the case for special education participants) or insufficiently, experience and knowledge that is specific to the inclusive setting is necessary in order to promote positive attitudes about inclusion.

Another explanation for the differences between special education and general education preservice teachers after student teaching may be the importance they placed on individualization and specialized instruction. Although both general and special education participants recognized the individual needs of students with disabilities, special education preparation may emphasize the need for specialization more. For example, special education case study participants were concerned that some students, when pushed into the general education classroom, would not receive the one-on-one or small group instruction from which they would benefit. Special education preservice teachers saw few examples of
students with disabilities working in general education classrooms. For most participants, when they did see an example of students with disabilities included in the general education classroom, it was only for a short period of time, such as a thirty minute music class. Thus, there may have been few models of small group or individualized instruction with accommodations and modifications taking place in the general education classroom. This lack of experience with inclusive practices may have influenced the attitudes of special education participants, particularly given the importance all case study participants placed on seeing inclusion in real life situations.

Theoretical links. Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) would support the finding that special education participants’ attitudes were significantly different from general education participants’ attitudes about inclusion. Bandura emphasized the role of context in the development of self-efficacy. In light of the fact that contextual variables, such as placement in a self-contained or resource specialist classroom for student teaching, varied more for special education participants than general education participants, differences would be expected. The theory of situated cognition could also provide some explanation of the difference in attitudinal change after student teaching between special education and general education. Special education student teachers included in the case study reported fewer opportunities to observe models of inclusion or become part of a community of practice (Driscoll, 2005) to develop positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.
Integrated Discussion Three: Cooperating Teachers’ Attitudes Were Significantly Higher Though Not Highly Correlated to Preservice Teacher Attitudes

The current study also investigated the attitudes of cooperating teachers with whom the student teachers were paired. In the analysis of the cooperating teachers’ attitudes, findings indicated that overall, both general education and special education cooperating teachers had significantly more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. However, although a correlation between the cooperating teachers and the preservice teachers would be expected if one was influential or predictive of another, their attitudes were not highly correlated to the attitudes of the student teachers according to statistical analysis. Nonetheless, both general education and special education case study participants agreed on the critical role their cooperating played on their developing attitudes. Thus, it is possible that the use of a survey instrument was not sensitive to the influence of the cooperating teacher.

Literature links. Little research has been conducted in special education about the role of the cooperating teacher or the experience of student teaching. Jobling and Moni’s (2004) results indicated that general education student teachers seldom observed their cooperating teachers working with students with disabilities. In the current study, general education case study participants spoke about having seen their cooperating teachers working with students with disabilities and that this influenced their attitudes. However, non-participant observations were conducted in the case study classrooms and few interactions occurred between teachers and students with disabilities. Nonetheless, it’s important to interpret the observational data cautiously because only one observation was conducted for one to two hours and this was a limited amount of time that may not have been indicative of overall
practices in the classroom. Many of the special education student teachers in the current study also indicated that watching their cooperating teacher work with students with disabilities influenced their own attitudes. Borko and Mayfield (1995) conducted a study in which they observed four middle school preservice teachers and the relationship they shared with their cooperating teacher. The researchers conducted extensive field observations of conferences between the cooperating and preservice teacher. Their results found that some cooperating teachers took an active role in mentoring their preservice teachers, while others took an observatory role. In addition, there were large differences among cooperating teachers in the depth and specificity with which they conducted conferences with the student teacher. Borko and Mayfield’s results have important implications for the current study in light of the influence the cooperating teacher exerted on the preservice teacher’s attitude.

While the attitudes of the cooperating teachers were not examined extensively because the purpose of this research was to investigate the developing attitudes towards inclusion of preservice teachers, the fact that the cooperating teachers’ overall ORI scores were significantly higher than the scores of the preservice teachers provides preliminary evidence of the influence of more experience and training. In fact, the positive attitudes demonstrated by the cooperating teacher supports research about the attitudes of practicing teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom synthesized by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996). Their findings indicated that practicing teachers held generally favorable attitudes about inclusion.

Participants who represented positive attitudes about inclusion explained that the positive attitude and effective instruction of students with disabilities their cooperating teachers modeled influenced their own positive views of the inclusion of students with
disabilities in the general education classroom. Some general and special education participants reported that their attitudes became more positive as a result of their cooperating teachers’ positive attitude. Other participants in general and special education were hesitant because they perceived their cooperating teacher as either lacking initiative and follow through, or unsuccessful in meeting the needs of the students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Thus, the influence of the cooperating teacher appears to be evident in the attitudes of preservice teachers in both general and special education.

In addition, the cooperating teachers were particularly influential on the instructional practices of the preservice teachers. Some participants suggested that much of their instruction was modeled after what their cooperating teacher did when they taught. This was noted in observations as well. Modifications and accommodations that preservice teachers implemented were the same as those their cooperating teacher used, such as fewer words on spelling lists or study carrels around student desks. This was more apparent in observations in general education classrooms. In special education preservice placements, most settings were self-contained or resource special programs so only small group instruction was observed. However, in these placements as well, student teachers used many of the instructional practices modeled by their cooperating teachers. It has been clear in previous research that positive attitudes are correlated to instructional practices that result in improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities (Buell et al., 1999). Therefore, the modeling by cooperating teachers, who scored higher on the ORI overall than did preservice teachers, of instructional practices may be useful to preservice teachers.

Theoretical links. Self-efficacy theory would explain the influence of the cooperating teacher because of three elements to self-efficacy identified by Bandura (1977): (a) mastery
experiences, (b) vicarious experience, and (c) physiological arousal. Mastery experiences occur when cooperating teachers help the preservice teacher teach a successful lesson. This then increases their self-efficacy. Vicarious experiences are widespread during student teaching as the preservice teacher observes and learns from the cooperating teacher’s modeling. This also influences the cooperating teacher’s perceptions. Finally, the physiological arousal that comes from teaching a successful (or unsuccessful) lesson would influence the preservice teacher’s perceptions of their cooperating teacher, their self-efficacy, and their attitudes about meeting the needs of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Self-efficacy theorists would also suggest that the verbal persuasion, encouragement, and critique by the cooperating teacher would increase the student teacher’s self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). This was confirmed in case study interviews where the cooperating teacher’s feedback to the student teacher was influential.

Integrated Discussion Four: The Attitude of the Preservice Teachers before Student Teaching Was Significantly Predictive of Their Attitude after Student Teaching

The results of the regression analysis indicated that the attitudes of preservice teachers was most predictive of their attitude after student teaching. It seems then, that attitudes developed before student teaching and during coursework in their teacher preparation program are important to attitudes after student teaching.

Literature links: Murphy’s (1996) discussion in a general education journal may help to explain this finding as well by suggesting that, if preservice teachers have negative attitudes about inclusion, they will be resistant to change later. Participants confirmed the importance of coursework during case study interviews. Previous research also identifies
coursework as influential to attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. For example, Shippen, et al. (2005) found that the emotional reactions of their 326 general and special education participants in the United States were more positive when reading scenarios about students with disabilities in the general education classroom after one course in special education. Similarly, Shade and Stewart (2001) examined the attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom of 72 special education and 122 general education undergraduate majors after a 30 hour survey of special education course. Their results revealed significant change towards more positive attitudes after the course for all participants.

However, only one general education case study participant suggested that their coursework was helpful to their understanding of teaching students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Most general education participants said they lacked preparation and felt their training was insufficient. Campbell et al.’s (2003) findings offer an explanation. These researchers investigated the influence of one course on the attitudes about inclusion of 274 Australian general education preservice teachers. This course provided formal instruction about individual differences, atypical development and disability, and inclusive education, but also incorporated fieldwork in the community. The authors found that all participants held more favorable attitudes towards both disability and inclusion after the course and fieldwork. However, the authors indicated that the fieldwork component accounted for most of the change. They determined this because the fieldwork centered around one disability category, Down Syndrome. On the post survey, participants showed more positive and accurate views of Down Syndrome, which in turn led to more
positive views of disability and inclusion in general. Thus the fieldwork component was particularly important to the attitudinal change that occurred. Jobling and Moni’s (2004) results provide similar evidence because their 13 Australian special and general education participants reported feelings of being unprepared for teaching students with disabilities, even after completing an introductory to special education course. However, when fieldwork was added to the course requirements, their participants reported greater ability to make the necessary instructional and material adaptations for students with disabilities. Thus, for general education preservice teachers, it seems that more than early coursework is necessary to foster positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

This feeling of lack of preparation was not as strongly emphasized for special education preservice teachers. Instead, special education coursework seemed to be influential to their attitudes. In fact, some special education participants suggested that their attitudes about inclusion were predominantly a result of what their college courses had taught them. Greater amounts of coursework in special education concepts may contribute to this finding and this hypothesis would find support from the results of Kim’s (2006) results from a study of preservice teachers from different types of teacher preparation programs. Those students from dual certification or blended programs had more positive attitudes about inclusion. They also took more courses in special education content than their general education peers, lending support for the hypothesis that more coursework in special education contributes to better preparation. In addition, Johnson (2000) reported that among practicing teachers, attitudes about inclusion were more positive after attending
professional development about inclusion. This finding suggests that training does improve attitudes.

Theoretical links: Although the theories that underly this research do not explain the role of coursework well because of their emphasis on the student teaching experience, Nel’s (1992) research suggested that negative attitudes that begin early are difficult to change. This phenomenon gains support from the current findings that preservice teachers’ attitudes that were acquired early were most predictive of their attitudes after student teaching.

Integrated Discussion Five: The Self-Efficacy of Preservice Teachers Increased However Was Not Correlated to Their Attitudes About Inclusion

Although the overall self-efficacy of the preservice teachers increased after student teaching, this was not well correlated or predictive of their overall attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms. The increase in self-efficacy is well explained by the theoretical framework of the current study. In addition, previous literature has reported increases in self-efficacy after coursework or fieldwork. However, the lack of correlation or predictive power is an important finding.

Literature links. This finding is contrary to the work of both Kim (2006) and Moore-Hayes (2008) who found that self-efficacy not only increased after practicum experiences, but also correlated to their attitudes about inclusion. The findings of Kim’s study revealed that, while there were no significant differences between types of teacher preparation programs in self-efficacy, the participants’ self-efficacy scores did correlate to their attitudes about inclusion. Preservice teachers with higher self-efficacy also had more positive attitudes about inclusion. Moore-Hayes compared teachers who had been practicing for
three years or less with preservice teachers and investigated their self-efficacy. In particular, Moore-Hayes was interested in participants’ self-efficacy for challenging teaching situations, such as inclusion of students with disabilities. Her findings indicated that efficacy for inclusion among all participants, including general educators, was "slightly more than adequate" (p. 99) and that there were no differences between practicing teachers and preservice teachers. This is an important consideration to the current study. Self-efficacy increased after student teaching so it would follow that practicing teachers would have higher self-efficacy than preservice teachers. Moore-Hayes’ findings that practicing and preservice teachers were not significantly different on measures of self-efficacy imply that self-efficacy is an elusive construct and because it does not correlate well to attitudes about inclusion, self-efficacy should be interpreted cautiously. Lancaster and Bain’s (2007) results also point to the complexity of the issue of self-efficacy. In their study of 125 Australian early childhood and elementary general education preservice teachers, self-efficacy for teaching students with disabilities improved after one course in special education, regardless of whether fieldwork was included or not. In addition, although their participants’ self-efficacy increased, the majority of preservice teachers indicated they needed more preparation for working with students with disabilities.

Previous research has found that training and professional development often result in more positive attitudes about inclusion (Johnson, 2000; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). The results of the current study offer evidence of this because preservice teachers’ attitudes were significantly more positive after the student teaching, which is a form of training. In addition, the self-efficacy of participants increased after student teaching. However, the finding that efficacy and attitudes were not correlated provides contrary findings. The
training preservice teachers received during their teacher preparation program, especially student teaching, did increase their self-efficacy, however their attitudes about inclusion were not correlated. Clearly, more research is necessary and teacher preparation programs should use caution when interpreting the results of their training and preparation.

**Theoretical links.** Self-efficacy theory would provide some explanation of why the self-efficacy of the participants increased after student teaching. According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy is contextually dependent; the environment is an important factor to the development of self-efficacy. In addition, the opportunity to practice and receive feedback about their skills, should build self-efficacy according to Bandura. It is true that preservice teachers in the current study gained experience and practice throughout the semester. Therefore, their self-efficacy increased. However, the link to attitudes about inclusion is not as specific and is not supported by the quantitative regression analysis or the qualitative case study comments by general education preservice teachers and some special education participants who continued to feel unprepared to teach students with disabilities in inclusive settings.

*Integrated Discussion Six: Preservice Teacher Attitudes Ranged From Positive to Resistant About Inclusion*

The overall attitudes of the participants fell along a continuum from negative to very positive. Quantitative findings indicated that their scores on the ORI distributed along the normal curve, with some preservice teachers scoring well below the mean, some far above the mean, and most clustering around the mean. Qualitative findings also indicated a range of attitudes including positive, hesitant, and resistant.
Literature links. This finding of variance among the attitudes of preservice teachers affirms previous research. Other researchers have reported generally positive attitudes (e.g. Avramidis et al., 2000; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Silverman, 2007). Avramidis and colleagues investigated the attitudes of 111 general education preservice teachers in a post graduate education program in the United Kingdom (UK). Their findings indicated that the mean scores of their participants were high, indicating positive attitudes about inclusion in general. Shade and Stewart’s United States study of 122 general education and 72 special education preservice teachers enrolled in a survey of special education course found that the attitudes of their participants were positive about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom after the course. In Silverman’s study, 71 general and special education preservice teachers in the United States exhibited overall positive attitudes about inclusion, particularly those participants with higher epistemological views of knowledge. Romi and Leyser, who investigated the attitudes about inclusion of 1155 general and special education preservice teachers in Israel, found that their participants had positive attitudes about inclusion in general, though they were concerned about classroom management and instructional skills. Romi and Leyser’s participants, though generally positive, also recommended placement for students with disabilities in special schools. Thus, their findings appear to be mixed.

However Alghazo et al. (2003) reported negative attitudes about inclusion among the 597 general education preservice teachers in his research conducted in Jordan. Alghazo et al. did not provide discussion of his findings, but did report other research that also found negative attitudes among preservice teachers (e.g. Berryman, 1989; Vitello, 1991 as cited in
Alghazo et al., 2003). The links between the literature and the current findings may be representative of the variation that can be found among preservice teacher attitudes.

In addition, previous research has found that preservice teachers become less positive when addressing specific situations (Romi & Leyser, 2006). For example, in Romi and Leyser’s study, both special and general education preservice teachers answered survey questions that were about inclusion in general more positively than questions that asked what placement was best for a student with a cognitive disability. Though this particular example could be attributed to the type of disability, other examples provide evidence of the phenomenon of specificity. Similarly, the preservice teachers in the current study used specific student stories to discuss their perspectives about inclusion. The use of specific student stories is similar to the specificity of items that engender more negative responses. That is, when preservice teachers were asked more general questions, they endorsed inclusion; however, when presented with a specific student scenario, the results are more mixed. This was also true in the way participants in the current case study used student stories to share their ideas about inclusion.

**Theoretical links.** There is little application of the theoretical framework of the current study to the diverse attitudes found in the preservice teachers about inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. However, the consideration of multiple factors associated with attitudes results in a multiplicity of ideas. The way all of the influencing factors converged for each of these participants resulted in the diverse attitudes they produced.

In the same way that participants in the literature held more resistant attitudes when responding to specific scenarios about inclusion than when talking about inclusion in
general, participants in the current study used many real-life stories from their experiences to explain their attitudes about inclusion. In many ways, the theoretical framework of andragogy might explain their use of real-life stories in discussion their attitudes about inclusion. Andragogical theory suggests that adults orient their learning around real-life problems (Knowles, 1973). In addition, andragogy describes how life situations create a need to learn for adults, and stories about situations encountered may help student teachers define and refine their attitudes about inclusion.

Integrated Discussion Seven: No Significant Differences Were Found By Gender or General Education Certification Area

Statistical analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between males and females or early childhood, elementary, and secondary education certification areas. In addition, case study participants did not cluster in groups by certification areas as expected. These findings indicate the complexity of such demographic variables and suggest the importance of context specific research.

Literature links. Similar to findings reported by Alghazo et al. (2003) who found no differences between genders, the current study did not find significant differences between male and female preservice teachers. In addition, there were no differences in the current study between secondary education and early childhood/elementary education preservice teachers or secondary education specialization areas. Previous research has reported differences in certification areas. McHatton and McCray (2007) investigated the attitudes of 128 general educators in elementary education and secondary education in the United States and found that elementary education majors had significantly more positive attitudes about
inclusion than secondary education major. Avramidis et al. (2000) and Alghazo et al. (2003) found that secondary education preservice teachers who specialized in the sciences were more negative than those that specialized in humanities. The current study found no significant differences in gender or general education certification area; these may be contextual factors that require investigation at individual teacher preparation program sites. No theory in the theoretical framework of the current study provides explanation of this variable because the three theories focused on the student teaching experience.

While the use of mixed methodology produced several integrated findings discussed above, the qualitative case study allowed for more probing into the attitudes and influences identified by participants. Therefore, four findings emerged from the qualitative analyses that are not integrated with the quantitative data. These findings are presented below and include: (1) preservice teachers’ philosophies about social justice and altruism influenced their attitudes about inclusion, (2) preservice teachers express ambivalence and indecision about their attitudes towards inclusion, (3) personal experience was a very influential factor for the preservice teachers, and (4) participants suggested that their attitude about inclusion depended on the type and severity of disability and the age or grade level of the student.

Qualitative Discussions

Qualitative Discussion Point One: Preservice Teachers’ Philosophies About Social Justice and Altruism Influenced Their Attitudes About Inclusion

Case study participants used a framework of social justice or altruism as they talked about their attitudes about inclusion during interviews. This was particularly true for general
education preservice teachers. Indeed, for one participant, these themes dominated the interview.

*Literature links:* The general education student teachers’ advocacy of social justice parallels the reconstructivist philosophy Cottrell (2007) describes. Cottrell administered two surveys, one about attitudes towards inclusion and one about educational philosophy, to 124 general and special education preservice teachers in the United States. Her findings indicated that preservice teachers hold various philosophies as follows: 49.2% humanism, 20.29% realism, 15.3% reconstructionism, 12.1% progressivism, 4% idealism. Those participants who held reconstructionist philosophies had more positive attitudes about inclusion. In the current study, those participants who discussed themes of altruism and social justice were generally positive about inclusion. Social justice and altruism align well with reconstructivist philosophies. Therefore, this finding may provide support for Cottrell’s (2007) findings that students with reconstructivist philosophies are typically positive about inclusion.

*Theoretical links.* In addition, andragogical theory may explain the positive attitudes associated with altruism, social justice, and reconstructivism. Proponents of andragogy suggest that adult learners are more ready to learn when performing a valued social role. For preservice teachers, the student teaching experience may emphasize the social role of teaching. Prioritizing a valued social role may help preservice teachers act upon their social justice and altruistic goals.
Qualitative Discussion Point Two: Preservice Teachers Express Ambivalence and Indecision About Their Attitudes Towards Inclusion

One of the most often reported attitudes among preservice teachers is ambivalence about inclusion. Participants in the current study said they were unsure about inclusion.

Literature Link. Similar findings were reported McHatton and McCray (2007) whose participants were predominantly undecided about inclusion. McHatton and McCray found that both elementary and secondary participants in their study of general education teachers’ attitudes about inclusion were undecided about many of the survey questions. The authors suggest that increased efforts should be made to prepare general education teachers for inclusive environments and foster favorable dispositions about inclusion.

Theoretical links. Andragogy suggests that adult learners are more self-directed and seek increased responsibility compared to children (Knowles, 1970). However, most preservice teachers are on the cusp of adulthood, not yet fully actualized adults, but in the process of becoming more adult-like in their behaviors. Thus, resolution of their opinions, dispositions, and attitudes may require some ambivalence as is exemplified in their attitudes about inclusion. It may be appropriate for preservice teachers to feel indecisiveness as they struggle to more fully form their adult identity.

Qualitative Discussion Point Three: Personal Experience Was a Very Influential Factor for the Preservice Teachers

Personal experience was important to the case study participants’ attitudes about inclusion. Many of the case study participants in both general education and special education said that their experience with people with disabilities was a strong factor influencing their attitudes. The personal experiences were diverse; participants reported
camp, church, family, and school experiences. However, though varied, all experience were reported as influential for preservice teachers.

**Literature links.** Romi and Leyser (2006) also reported results that indicated the influence of informal experiences. In their study, of 1155 special and general education preservice teachers in Israel, those participants with more experience were more positive about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. These findings were based on self reports from the participants who reported either none/very little experience, some experience, or much/very much experience. Tait and Purdie (2000) reported similar findings. Tait and Purdie sampled 1,626 general education preservice teachers in Australia. They compared attitudes about inclusion among undergraduate and post-graduate students using a survey that measured both desirable and undesirable emotions experienced by participants when interacting with people with disabilities. Their results indicated that, while most participants experienced vulnerability as the predominant emotion, those who had daily contact informally with people with disabilities were more likely to experience positive emotions than those participants who had infrequent or no contact.

**Theoretical links.** Situated cognition may provide explanation about the role of informal experience by emphasizing the importance of context. Situated cognition theorists advocate the use of knowledge in context, such as when preservice teachers work with people with disabilities in informal contexts like church or camp. Thus, the participants who had informal experience were better able to utilize the contextual variables they learned from their experience, possibly producing more positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.
Qualitative Discussion Point Four: Participants Suggested That Their Attitude About Inclusion Depended on the Type and Severity of Disability and the Age or Grade Level of the Student

Many student teachers suggested that the type of disability, age of the student, and severity of needs were important to their attitudes about inclusion. This finding supports previously reported literature about type and severity of disability. However, there has been little research investigating the role of the age or grade level of students. Thus, the findings of the current study provide important information and emphasize the importance of teaching strategies for inclusive settings across age, type and severity of disability categories.

Literature link. In their literature synthesis, Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) reported similar findings from multiple studies with practicing teachers. Attitudes among both practicing and preservice teachers vary depending on the severity of disability, age or grade level of the child, and type of disability. Both Avramidis et al. (2000) and McHatton and McCray (2007) found that the general education preservice teachers in their work in the UK and the United States were more supportive of inclusion for students with mild disabilities and less supportive of students with emotional/behavioral disorders or more severe disabilities. Interestingly, participants in the current study varied in the advocacy of inclusion for students of various ages and grade levels. Some preservice teachers spoke about the need for inclusion for older children, and some preservice teachers suggested that inclusion was best for younger children. An interesting pattern to this discussion was that general education preservice teachers seemed to believe inclusion was best for older students and special education preservice teachers suggested it was best for younger students. However, this generalization should be interpreted cautiously because only four preservice teachers altogether discussed age of students. Preservice teachers also suggested that certain
disabilities were better suited for inclusion, such as a learning disability, while other categories like mental retardation were more difficult. Likewise, some participants suggested that inclusion was only beneficial for students whose needs were less severe.

Overall, evidence indicates that experience is a strong predictor of attitudes towards the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, while other influences may be more inconsistent or contextually based. Variables such as field of study, cooperating teachers’ influence, self-efficacy, and gender warrant continued study and consideration. It is particularly important to understand the pivotal role teacher preparation plays in preservice attitudes that may be ambivalent and undecided. What follows are limitations to the current study as well as implications for teacher education programs and further research.

Limitations

The characteristics of this study which define its boundaries (i.e. delimitations) included characteristics of participants, institution, and educational program. More specifically, the participants were all student teachers from the same teacher preparation program, therefore, the study is bound by the process of student teaching found in traditional, senior year undergraduate education students. Furthermore, the work was fixed in scope to students attending a research institution of higher education in the southeast United States. In addition, the study is specific to students in a discrete teacher preparation program, that is, general education students undertook a different program of study than did special education students. The programs of study involved previous practicum work therefore the results are restricted to students whose preparation involved multiple
practicum experiences culminating in a full time student teaching experience. In addition, case study participants were selected based on high and low scores on the ORI and therefore may be different from others not included in the case study analysis.

There are a few limitations that should be considered. The data relied on self reports. Thus, only the preservice teachers’ perceptions of their attitudes and self-efficacy are reported and no correlation between perception and actual, objective truth can be drawn. However, perceptions are inherently important to an investigation of attitudes and thus are a valuable consideration (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). In addition, the researcher did not control for different sequences with participants’ programs of study prior to their student teaching experience. Although the researcher made every effort to insure participants felt free to be open in discussing their true attitudes, some influence may have been exerted by the researcher’s identity (see subjectivity statement in Appendix I) and social desirability. Participants may have chosen answers on the survey or responded to interview questions in ways that they viewed as more socially acceptable (Henninger, 2009). Social desirability response bias was reduced during survey administration by neutralized administration in a large group setting that impersonalized responses. In addition, participants were assured during both survey and interview administration that their confidentiality would be protected so that their response was not associated with them personally. However, social desirability bias remains a limitation due to the nature of the research topic. In addition, Participants may have known the researcher’s attitudes because of a guest lecture they heard or a class they took from the researcher.

Finally, the research was limited to one semester within a teacher training program. Therefore, no longitudinal data were drawn. Whether changes occurred during participants
first years of teaching, or the impact of their attitudes and efficacy during their actual
teaching careers cannot be determined until future research is conducted.

Implications for Teacher Education

The findings of this study provide insights for faculty and staff in teacher preparation
programs and there are several implications to consider. The results of this study emphasize
the importance of student teaching and fieldwork because of their influence on the attitudes
of preservice teachers. Thus, teacher preparation programs should carefully consider the
settings in which special education and general education preservice teachers are placed. For
special education student teachers, it would be important to provide high quality placements
in a variety of settings; including at least one fieldwork experience in an inclusive setting
would seem important given the results of the current study. The context in which the
current study was conducted lacked numerous high-quality inclusive placements. This may
be problematic for other geographic areas as well (Cook, Cameron, & Tankersley, 2007). For
general education preservice teachers, teacher preparation programs should carefully
consider the inclusivity of the setting in which they place student teachers. The results also
indicated that the quality of the placement is particularly important. Student teachers who
saw poor implementation of inclusion, were hesitant in their attitudes towards inclusion.
Romi and Leyser (2006) and Lambe and Bones (2006) found similar results in their work
with preservice teachers.

In addition to the quality of the setting in which student teachers are placed, the
match between cooperating teacher and preservice teacher is important to consider. In light
of the influence of the cooperating teacher preservice teachers indicated in the case study,
teacher preparation programs could use the match between cooperating teacher and student teacher to promote positive attitudes about inclusion. Likewise, cooperating teachers with more resistant attitudes towards inclusion should be carefully matched because of the influence they may exert. This would be the case for preservice teachers in both general and special education. The implication then is that by matching positive cooperating teachers carefully, teacher preparation programs may be able to shape more positive attitudes about inclusion in their student teachers.

Another way teacher educators can use the results of this study is to provide extended practicum placements for their preservice teachers when possible. Because of the finding that student teaching exerts influence on the attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom, extending the amount of experience, either through frequency (more fieldwork placements) or time (longer placements) may help teacher preparation programs create greater impact. Enhancing attitudes and skills for inclusive settings is a critical responsibility of teacher preparation programs so the fieldwork components require careful consideration in light of the significance it purports in the current findings.

Another implication for faculty in teacher preparation programs is that diverse settings during fieldwork may be helpful for preservice teachers. Both general and special education participants placed tremendous importance on the role of experience in developing their attitudes. It follows then that the more experiences with different settings, particularly experiences in inclusive K-12 settings, the more prepared preservice teachers will feel and more positive attitudes may result. As mentioned above, the quality of these placements is very important also.
Although the participants in this study significantly changed to more positive attitudes after student teaching, their attitudes before student teaching were most predictive of the change that occurred and their final attitudes. In addition, special education participants did not change significantly. A critical implication of this finding is that early preparation is also pivotal. Participants in the current study suggested that coursework during their preparation program was an influencing factor. Findings from multiple studies previously reported this influence as well (e.g. Shippen et al., 2005; Shade & Stewart, 2001; Campbell et al., 2003; Jobling & Moni, 2004). Furthermore, because of the persistence of attitudes developed early in teacher training programs, including formal and informal experiences in their early coursework may be critical to developing long-term positive attitudes about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom for preservice teachers. For example, coursework could include service-learning projects that give preservice teachers the opportunity to interact with students with disabilities. Service-learning projects combine service objectives and learning objectives so that meaningful community service is integrated with instruction and reflection (Learn and Serve Clearinghouse, n.d.). Opportunities to work with individuals with disabilities during service-learning projects might include participating in Special Olympics, Challenger athletic programs, or tutoring opportunities for example. These activities might provide valuable informal personal experience that would be influential to preservice teachers.

Coursework throughout the preservice teacher’s program should be carefully designed to maximize their influence. Given the role severity and type of disability play in the minds of preservice teachers, teacher educators should consider their presentation of material about the inclusion of students with significant disabilities in the general education
classroom during coursework. In addition, preservice teachers appear to value real life experiences. Therefore, teacher preparation programs should consider the use of case studies, videos of actual inclusive classrooms, and real-life examples in the presentation of their content to the maximum extent possible.

Implications for Research

There is much yet to be learned about the developing attitudes about inclusion of preservice teachers. Research investigating the student teaching experience is substantially lacking. While this dissertation sought to add to the literature base about preservice teacher attitudes about inclusion during the student teaching semester, there are multiple directions for future research in this area. In addition, the current study did not investigate the role of personal beliefs in philosophy, epistemology, or view of disability. Previous research (e.g. Silverman, 2007; Cottrell, 2007; Mintz, 2007) has reported that these are influencing factors so further research into their impact is justified.

The influence the student teaching setting exerts warrants further investigation. The setting was important to the student teachers because it provided experience for them. Experience with inclusion emerged as a crucial influence on student teacher attitudes, and particularly the formal experience of fieldwork components of the student teaching programs. Research should seek to evaluate the quality and multidimensionality of the practicum settings as well as influence of setting. The classrooms in which preservice teachers completed their student teaching were very influential so it would be important to consider the extent to which the environment supports principles of high quality inclusive practices. In addition, ethnographic views of the student teaching setting might provide a
more in-depth view of the student teacher’s relationship with the cooperating teacher, the roles the student teacher plays in the classroom, and the experiences the student teacher has during practica working with students with disabilities in the general education classroom. These are important variables but would require the researcher to spend more time in the classroom context.

Previous research has indicated that teachers with positive attitudes about inclusion implement better instructional practices, improve student outcomes, and make more adaptations for their students with disabilities (Buell et al., 1999; Bender et al., 1995). It would therefore be important for researchers to follow preservice teachers into their teaching careers. Examination of what happens to attitudes as teachers move through induction and into the future years would add to the literature base. Furthermore, discovering whether the influencing factors change during induction would be helpful.

More research investigating the influence of the cooperating teacher is warranted. The relationship between the preservice teacher and the cooperating teacher is important to consider and future research needs to be conducted in this area to further the results of the current study. In addition, the roles the cooperating teacher plays may help researchers understand how the cooperating teachers exert their influence specifically. Teacher preparation programs may consider professional development in mentoring for the cooperating teachers, given the influence they exert. Research should consider the best practices in implementing these professional development opportunities specifically considering attitudinal development about inclusion.

The findings of this study are specific to the context in which it was conducted. This research was conducted at one university and its results are particular for that program.
Previous research has reported mixed findings (e.g. Alghazo, et al., 2003; Tait & Purdie, 2000) that may be contextual specific and much of the previous research about attitudes towards inclusion recently has been conducted in an international context. Each specific teacher preparation contains contextual variables, such as faculty attitude, or the blended or discrete nature of the general and special education certification programs, that influence the attitudes of their teacher graduates. Therefore, it is important for future research to consider other programs and contexts. In addition, studies with larger sampling designs would increase the generalizability of findings in important ways. Furthermore, because context appears to be so critical in this work, each teacher preparation program should consider studying the influencing factors and attitudes of preservice teachers in their specific programs.

Finally, there are methodological considerations for future research. The vast majority of research conducted about the attitudes of preservice teachers uses survey methodologies. The results of this study indicate that there are ways that qualitative inquiry added to or differed from the survey findings. There were also indications that the survey instruments, though technically adequate, were not sensitive to everything the preservice teachers experienced during student teaching. Thus, research utilizing other methodologies is warranted.

Conclusion

This dissertation research adds to the literature base by exploring the attitudes of preservice teachers about the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. In addition, influencing factors, including the role of student teaching, on the
attitudes of preservice teachers was investigated. Findings indicated that field experience was influential and resulted in more positive attitudes about inclusion. The cooperating teacher, formal and informal experiences, and teacher preparation coursework were influencing factors for student teachers’ attitudes. Overall, preservice teachers held a variety of perspectives about inclusion, including positive, hesitant or ambivalent, and resistant, attitudes. Institutions of higher education should carefully consider their teacher preparation programs to maximize their use of influencing factors and facilitate the development of positive attitudes in their preservice teacher populations.
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Dissertation Logic Model
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Course Syllabi

_Syllabus for EDEC 484: Directed Teaching in Early Childhood Education and EDEL 481: Directed Teaching in Elementary Schools_

**Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus**

Spring 2009 Semester

**Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:**
August 24, 2007 – December 14, 2007 - Fall Semester
January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at seminars scheduled by Dr. Seal Wilson and the Office of Field Experiences.

**Mission Statement.** The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

**Academic Integrity Policy.** “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

**Accommodations to Students with Disabilities.** It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

**Professor:** Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor
Course prerequisites:  
1. Admission to the professional level of your education program  
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours  
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

Required Text/Materials:  
Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

Technology Required:  
As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

Course Description:  
This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

Standards Addressed:  
All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

Instructional strategies employed:  
Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

Field Experience:  
A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

Attendance Policy:  
Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

Exit Survey:  
All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.
Objectives:

A. **ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)**

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies**

11. **Caring: Beliefs** – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. **Caring: Actions** – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. **Capable: Knowledge** - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. **Capable: Practice** - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. **Connected: Communication** - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. **Connected: Integration** - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

198
**Assessment Strategies Employed:** Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following **Documented Evaluations** (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The **Consensus Mid-term Evaluations** are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. **Long-Range Plan** (APS 1) - by US  
B. **Unit Plan** (APS’s 2-3) - by US  
C. **8 Formal Lesson Observations** (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT  
D. **Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities** (APS 10) - by CT  
E. **Consensus mid-term evaluation** - by US & CT  
F. **Consensus final evaluation** - by US & CT  
G. **Portfolio Evaluation** - by US

**Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:**

**A. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 **Developing:** Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

**B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 **Developing:** Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.

**C. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)**
The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 65 - 70)

**Final Grade Scoring Rubric:**

**Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 58 - 60):**
Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>108 - 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>96 - 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B  The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C  The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C  The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this
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student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D  The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or belowaverage capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

F  The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching: It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher: The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement
and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of
growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious
consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on
various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments,
requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some
degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class.
   It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The
   University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be
   reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for
dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal
   concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a
   teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards
   of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or
   otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with
   Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual
   lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and
   use it for professional purposes only.
7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the
   participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers,
   and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with
   faculty standards.

10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty
    meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when
    feasible.
11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.

13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

15. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

16. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:

January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at scheduled seminars

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Robin Fish
Clinical Faculty, Special Education
And assigned University Supervisor (see student teaching assignment)

Location: 229 Holtzendorff Hall  Office Hours: Monday – Friday
Phone: (864) 656-6968 by appointment
Email: fishre@clemson.edu
**Course prerequisites:**
1. Admission to the professional level of your education program
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5
4. Successful completion of major area requirement

**Required Text/Materials:**
Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

**Technology Required:**
As required by your CT or US in your individual school.

**Course Description:**
This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

**Standards Addressed:**
All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

**Instructional strategies employed:**
Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

**Field Experience:**
A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

**Attendance Policy:**
Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district for which they are assigned. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is required and will not be counted as one of the excused absences. If a student must be absent due to emergency situations (sickness or death in the family), the student must notify (a) the school, (b) the mentor teacher and (c) the university supervisor before the school day begins at 8:00AM. If the student teacher is in full take-over on the day of an absence, lesson plans should be at the school not later than 7:45AM on the day of the absence. **Any absence for which the student teacher does not notify the school and the US by 9:00 AM is unexcused. Final grades will be lowered by 4 pts for each unexcused absence, except in extenuating circumstances such as extended illness.** Attendance will also be considered in the professionalism portion of the final observation summary. Please note that additional points may be deducted in this section for professionalism.

**Exit Survey:**
All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and
improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers **can not** graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.

**Objectives:**

**A. ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)**

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

**B. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies**

11. **Caring: Beliefs** – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. **Caring: Actions** – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. **Capable: Knowledge** – demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. **Capable: Practice** – demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. **Connected: Communication** – demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. **Connected: Integration** – demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.
Assessment Strategies Employed: Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following Documented Evaluations (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The Consensus Mid-term Evaluations are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. Long-Range Plan (APS 1) - by US (EDSP 495 instructor will assist with instruction)
B. Unit Plan (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C. 7 to8 Formal Lesson Observations (APS’s 2-9) 3 to 4 by US, 4 by CT
D. Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities (APS 10) - by US
E. Consensus mid-term evaluation - by US & CT
H. Consensus final evaluation - by US & CT
I. Portfolio Evaluation - by EDSP portfolio team

Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:

B. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)

3 Proficient: Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 Developing: Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 Unsatisfactory: Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)

3 Proficient: Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 Developing: Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 Unsatisfactory: Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.
C. **Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)**

The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Filling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 65 - 70)

---

**Final Grade Scoring Rubric:**

**Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 58 - 60):**

Scores from the **Final Summary Evaluation** and the **portfolio/presentation** will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>116 - 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>107 - 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>106 – 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A grade of less than C will result in the student teacher not being recommended for SC teacher certification.

A  The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B  The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C  The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C  The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the
University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D  The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or below average capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

F  The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching: It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher: The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the
other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments, requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.
10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.

13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

17. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

18. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

EDSEC 447

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:
January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at seminars scheduled by Dr. Michelle Cook for EDSEC 457, Secondary Science Capstone Seminar

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor

Location: 100 Tillman Hall
Phone: (864) 656-5095
Email: hmillar@clemson.edu

Office Hours: Monday – Friday 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
Website URL: http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/fieldexperiences/
Course prerequisites:  1. Admission to the professional level of your education program
   2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours
   3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

Required Text/Materials:  Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

Technology Required:  As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

Course Description:  This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

Standards Addressed:  All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

Instructional strategies employed:  Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

Field Experience:  A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

Attendance Policy:  Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

Exit Survey:  All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.
Objectives:

A. ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies

11. Caring: Beliefs – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. Caring: Actions – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. Capable: Knowledge - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. Capable: Practice - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. Connected: Communication - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. Connected: Integration - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

Assessment Strategies Employed: Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following Documented Evaluations (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The Consensus Mid-term Evaluations are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. Long-Range Plan (APS 1) - by US
B. Unit Plan (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C.  **8 Formal Lesson Observations** (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT
D.  **Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities** (APS 10) - by CT
E.  **Consensus mid-term evaluation** - by US & CT
J.  **Consensus final evaluation** - by US & CT
K.  **Portfolio Evaluation** - by US

**Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:**

**C. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 **Developing:** Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

**B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 **Developing:** Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.

**C. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)**

The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 61-66 )
Final Grade Scoring Rubric:

Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 54-57):
Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

Note: On the Final Summary Evaluation, students must perform at a level of developing or better on nearly all of the key elements within each domain to pass the student teaching internship. Specifically, students scoring unsatisfactory on more than one key element within a domain with require a remediation plan and subsequent re-evaluation.

Remediation Plan: Students in jeopardy of not meeting this requirement will be identified by the university supervisor at least 10 days prior to the end of the student teaching internship. The university supervisor and science education faculty will determine an appropriate remediation plan to address the unsatisfactory element(s). The student will complete the remediation plan and be re-evaluated before the completion of the student teaching internship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>108 - 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>96 - 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR
The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or below average capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching: It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.
**Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher:** The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments, requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.
10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.

13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

19. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

20. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:

January 12, 2008 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required for EDSEC 454, Secondary English Capstone
Seminars and the Student Teacher Seminar hosted by the Office of Field Experiences.

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor

Location: 100 Tillman Hall       Office Hours: Monday – Friday
Phone: (864) 656-5095           8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
Email: hmillar@clemson.edu       Website URL: http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/fieldexperiences/
Course prerequisites:  
1. Admission to the professional level of your education program  
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours  
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

Required Text/Materials:  
Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. 
Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

Technology Required:  
As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

Course Description:  
This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

Standards Addressed:  
All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

Instructional strategies employed:  
Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

Field Experience:  
A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

Attendance Policy:  
Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

Exit Survey:  
All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.
Objectives:

A. ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies

11. Caring: Beliefs – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. Caring: Actions – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. Capable: Knowledge - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. Capable: Practice - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. Connected: Communication - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. Connected: Integration - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

Assessment Strategies Employed: Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following Documented Evaluations (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The Consensus Mid-term Evaluations are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. Long-Range Plan (APS 1) - by US
B. Unit Plan (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C. 8 Formal Lesson Observations (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT
D. Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities (APS 10) - by CT
E. Consensus mid-term evaluation - by US & CT
L. Consensus final evaluation - by US & CT
M. Portfolio Evaluation - by US
N. NCATE Professional Teaching Standards for Secondary English-CT, US, Capstone Seminar Professor & Student Teacher

Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:

D. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3

3 Proficient: Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 Developing: Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 Unsatisfactory: Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10

3 Proficient: Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 Developing: Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 Unsatisfactory: Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.

C. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies
The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10).

Final Grade Scoring Rubric: 147 Total Points

Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching:
Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation and the NCATE Professional Standards for Teaching English will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>132-147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>117-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>103-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>88-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>87 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B  The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C  The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C  The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D  The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or belowaverage capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.
The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: **ALL** Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

**Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching:** It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- **Ethical and professional behavior.**

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

**Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher:** The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments, requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.
1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. **The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.**

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.

10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.

13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.
14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

21. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

22. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:
January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at seminars scheduled by the Office of Field Experiences and seminars scheduled by Dr. Sarah Mathews for EDSEC 458, Secondary Social Studies Capstone Seminar.

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor

Location: 100 Tillman Hall
Phone: (864) 656-5095
Email: hmillar@clemson.edu

Office Hours: Monday – Friday
8:00 AM – 4:30 PM

Website URL: http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/fieldexperiences/
Course prerequisites: 1. Admission to the professional level of your education program  
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours  
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

Required Text/Materials: Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

Technology Required: As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

Course Description: This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

Standards Addressed: All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

Instructional strategies employed: Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

Field Experience: A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

Attendance Policy: Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

Exit Survey: All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.
Objectives:

A. **ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)**

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies**

11. **Caring: Beliefs** – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. **Caring: Actions** – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. **Capable: Knowledge** - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. **Capable: Practice** - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. **Connected: Communication** - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoken, written and digital).
16. **Connected: Integration** - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

**Assessment Strategies Employed:** Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following **Documented Evaluations** (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The **Consensus Mid-term Evaluations** are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. **Long-Range Plan** (APS 1) - by US
B. **Unit Plan** (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C. 8 Formal Lesson Observations (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT  
D. Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities (APS 10) - by CT  
E. Consensus mid-term evaluation - by US & CT  
O. Consensus final evaluation - by US & CT  
P. Portfolio Evaluation - by US  

Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:  
E. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)  

3 Proficient: Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.  

2 Developing: Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.  

1 Unsatisfactory: Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.  

B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)  

3 Proficient: Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.  

2 Developing: Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.  

1 Unsatisfactory: Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.  

C. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)  
The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 65 - 70 )
**Final Grade Scoring Rubric:**

**Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 58 - 60):**
Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>108 - 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>96 - 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B  The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C  The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C  The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D  The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or belowaverage capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student
decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

F  The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching: It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher: The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments,
requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.

10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.
13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

23. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

24. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:
August 25, 2008 – December 12, 2009 - Fall Semester
January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at seminars scheduled by the Office of Field Experiences.

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor

Location: 100 Tillman Hall
Phone: (864) 656-5095
Email: hmillar@clemson.edu

Office Hours: Monday – Friday
8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
Website URL: http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/fieldexperiences/
Course prerequisites: 1. Admission to the professional level of your education program
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

Required Text/Materials: Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore.
Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

Technology Required: As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

Course Description: This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

Standards Addressed: All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

Instructional strategies employed: Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

Field Experience: A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

Attendance Policy: Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

Exit Survey: All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.

Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI): All modern languages student teachers must schedule and complete a telephonic Oral Proficiency Interview with Language Testing International (web site: www.languagetesting.com) during the student teaching semester. The scores from the OPI will be turned in to your university supervisor. This is a course
requirement. You cannot receive a grade for student teaching (or graduate) until a copy of your OPI score report is provided to your university supervisor.

Objectives:

A. ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies

11. Caring: Beliefs – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. Caring: Actions – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. Capable: Knowledge - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. Capable: Practice - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. Connected: Communication - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. Connected: Integration - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

Assessment Strategies Employed: Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following Documented Evaluations (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The Consensus Mid-term Evaluations
are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not
be factored into the final grade:

A. Long-Range Plan (APS 1) - by US
B. Unit Plan (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C. 8 Formal Lesson Observations (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT
D. Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities (APS 10) - by CT
E. Consensus mid-term evaluation - by US & CT
Q. Consensus final evaluation - by US & CT
R. Portfolio Evaluation - by US

Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:

F. ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)

3 Proficient: Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 Developing: Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 Unsatisfactory: Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

B. ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)

3 Proficient: Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 Developing: Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 Unsatisfactory: Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.

C. Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)
The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 65 - 70)
Final Grade Scoring Rubric:

Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 58 - 60):
Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>108 - 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>96 - 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B  The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C  The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C  The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D  The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or below average capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student
decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

**F** The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

**Special Note:** ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

**Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching:** It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

**Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher:** The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments,
requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.

10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.
13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

25. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

26. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Directed Teaching – Student Teaching Syllabus

Spring 2009 Semester

Class Meetings/Days/Times/Locations:

January 12, 2009 – May 1, 2009 - Spring Semester
Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 3:30 PM (adapted to each individual school schedule)
Locations: Assigned Public Schools
Seminars: Attendance is also required at seminars scheduled by the Office of Field Experiences and seminars scheduled by Dr. Che for EDSEC 456, Secondary Mathematics Capstone Seminar

Mission Statement. The mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve.

Academic Integrity Policy. “As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we can not earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.”

Accommodations to Students with Disabilities. It is the University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodations. If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations, you must notify the Office of Field Experiences in writing when submitting your request for Student Teacher placement.

Professor: Mr. Bill Millar, Coordinator
Office of Field Experiences
And assigned University Supervisor

Location: 100 Tillman Hall
Phone: (864) 656-5095
Email: hmillar@clemson.edu

Office Hours: Monday – Friday
8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
Website URL: http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/fieldexperiences/
**Course prerequisites:** 1. Admission to the professional level of your education program  
2. Completion of at least 95 semester hours  
3. A minimum cumulative grade-point ratio of 2.5

**Required Text/Materials:** Student Teacher CD purchased from the University Bookstore. 
Other materials as required by your mentor teacher.

**Technology Required:** As required by your mentor teacher in your individual school.

**Course Description:** This course provides students with an opportunity to learn to teach under the direction and guidance of certified, experienced Classroom Teachers and University Supervisors. This experience provides opportunities to incorporate theory with practice, coupled with real world training, for learning in a diverse global environment.

**Standards Addressed:** All standards in the Clemson University School of Education Conceptual Framework and all ADEPT Performance Standards are addressed during the student teaching experience.

**Instructional strategies employed:** Student Teachers will utilize the accumulation of their undergraduate coursework under the direction of their mentor teacher to instruct their students within ADEPT guidelines and state standards.

**Field Experience:** A field placement in a public school classroom is required for this course.

**Attendance Policy:** Students are to adhere to the calendar of the individual school and school district. No more than 3 absences are allowed. Absences are reserved for illness or approved professional activities. UPREP attendance is highly encouraged and will not be counted as one of your excused absences. Therefore, you will have three excused absences plus a day to attend UPREP.

**Exit Survey:** All student teachers are required to complete the Eugene T. Moore Teacher Certification Program Exit Survey. The critical data from this survey will be used to evaluate and improve our teacher certification programs. **Student teachers must complete this survey to receive a grade for student teaching. Student teachers can not graduate if they do not receive a grade for student teaching.**
Objectives:

A. **ADEPT Performance Standards (APS’s 1 – 10)**

1. develop and maintain appropriate long-range plans for the semester
2. develop and maintain appropriate short range plans of instruction
3. exhibit skill in planning assessments and using the data gathered
4. establish and maintain high expectations for learners
5. use a wide variety of instructional strategies to facilitate learning
6. provide appropriate content for the learner
7. monitor, assess, and enhance learning
8. maintain an environment that promotes learning
9. manage the instructional environment (classroom) for a full school day over an extended period of time (minimum of two (2) weeks)
10. fulfill professional responsibilities

B. **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK Teaching Dispositions and Competencies**

11. **Caring: Beliefs** – demonstrate commitment to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
12. **Caring: Actions** – demonstrate actions in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all, sensitivity to developmental, social, and cultural differences, and encourages a democratic culture.
13. **Capable: Knowledge** - demonstrate knowledge about the foundations of education, and about his/her specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
14. **Capable: Practice** - demonstrate that he/she can apply his/her knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.
15. **Connected: Communication** - demonstrate effective communication through a variety of representations (spoke, written and digital).
16. **Connected: Integration** - demonstrate the ability to synthesize his/her knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

**Assessment Strategies Employed:** Student Teachers will be evaluated in accordance with ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) and Conceptual Framework (CF) standards and the evaluation and grading rubric shown below for the following Documented Evaluations (US=University Supervisor/CT=Classroom Teacher). The **Consensus Mid-term Evaluations** are used only to provide the student with feedback on his/her performance to date. It will not be factored into the final grade:

A. **Long-Range Plan** (APS 1) - by US
B. **Unit Plan** (APS’s 2-3) - by US
C. **8 Formal Lesson Observations** (APS’s 2-9) - 4 by US, 4 by CT
D. **Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities** (APS 10) - by CT
E. **Consensus mid-term evaluation** - by US & CT
S. **Consensus final evaluation** - by US & CT
T. **Portfolio Evaluation** - by US

**Evaluation and Grading Rubrics:**

G. **ADEPT Performance Standards 1-3 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Contains all key components indicated in the handbook, is on time, and each area meets expectations and shows competent research and preparation. Documentation is free of errors and is professional in appearance. Overall, objectives and assessments are clear as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

2 **Developing:** Component parts may be represented, but may not be complete or on time. There is evidence of research and preparation. Documentation contains errors. Objectives and assessments are represented, but may require clarification as to the value to the learner and the criteria for assessing learning.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Work is incomplete or non-existent, late, full of errors, is unprofessional in appearance, and does not meet requirements.

B. **ADEPT Performance Standards 4-10 (See Page 7)**

3 **Proficient:** Competencies are demonstrated appropriately in all areas and enhance the teaching/learning process.

2 **Developing:** Competencies are demonstrated at a satisfactory level in some areas. Improvement is needed to enhance the teaching/learning process.

1 **Unsatisfactory:** Competencies reflect poor instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism and deter the teaching/learning process.

C. **Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies (See Page 7)**

The following student teacher products will be evaluated to provide input for scores for the six components of the Conceptual Framework Teaching Dispositions and Competencies – long range plan, unit plan, eight formal teaching evaluations, portfolio/presentation, and student teacher Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities plan/activities (APS10). (see level 4 evaluation rubric on pages 65 - 70)
Final Grade Scoring Rubric:

Final Grade Calculations for Student Teaching (see form on pages 58 - 60):

Scores from the Final Summary Evaluation and the portfolio/presentation will be combined to compute the student’s final grade. The following scale will be used to assign student grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>108 - 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>96 - 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>72 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>71 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A The “A” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for excellent teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her outstanding success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did his/her student teaching, and to recommend him/her without reservation to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

B The “B” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for above average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her above average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

C The “C” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates capabilities for average teaching to such a degree that those who supervised his/her work are willing to predict his/her average success in teaching the subject or grade in which he/she did student teaching and to recommend him/her to a prospective employer. This student will be recommended for certification.

OR

C The “C” student may also be one who demonstrates some but not all of the capabilities for teaching. This student, after consultation with the Classroom Teacher, the University Supervisor, and the Coordinator of Field Experiences has elected to pursue a non-certification track. This student will not be recommended for certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

D The “D” Student Teacher is one who demonstrates very few or belowaverage capabilities for teaching. This student did not elect to pursue a non-certification track. This Student Teacher will not be recommended for state certification. If this student
decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

F

The “F” Student Teacher is one who, in the judgment of those who supervised his/her work demonstrates so few or so many unacceptable capabilities as to be completely ineffective as a teacher. This student will not be awarded any graduate or undergraduate credit for his/her student teaching and will not be recommended to a prospective employer or for state certification. If this student decides to pursue certification at a future date he/she understands that further remediation and experience would be required for re-entrance into student teaching.

Special Note: ALL Student Teachers must have taken the Specialty Area Exam(s) (Praxis II) and the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for their major (administered by Educational Testing Services) and have scores on file in the HEHD Academic Advising Center in order to receive a grade for student teaching. Any student who fails to take the required tests and fails to have scores on record in the advising center prior to the end of student teaching will receive a grade of incomplete (I). The incomplete grade can only be changed to a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) when the required test scores are received. No student can graduate with a grade of incomplete (I) for student teaching.

Grounds for Dismissal from Student Teaching: It is expected that Student Teachers will show steady progress toward satisfactory levels in all objectives during the student teaching experience. Cause for removal from student teaching will be based on consistent deficiencies in any of the following areas:

- Effective teaching (instruction and planning);
- Classroom management;
- Content knowledge;
- Ethical and professional behavior.

Student Teachers can be removed at the request of the University Supervisor, the Classroom Teacher, the Cooperating School and/or the Coordinator for Field Experiences.

Professional Expectations of the Student Teacher: The Student Teacher is placed in a rather demanding role. He/she is a student on the one hand and a teacher-adult on the other. Understanding this precarious status, we expect the Student Teacher to assume the adult role; however, we also recognize that the Student Teacher may need encouragement and guidance in this direction at times. If at any point, the Student Teacher shows lack of growth or willingness to learn with regard to the expectations set forth below, serious consideration will be given to his/her dismissal from student teaching.

Students should be aware that different supervisors may place different emphasis on various aspects of teaching. Student Teachers are responsible for the assignments,
requirements, and instructions given by their supervisor though they may differ to some degree from what students at another school are doing.

1. The Student Teacher is to call the Classroom Teacher if he/she cannot attend class. It is highly recommended that the call be made the night prior to the absence. The University Supervisor should also be called. If the Classroom Teacher cannot be reached, the Principal should be contacted. Excessive absences may be cause for dismissal.

2. The Student Teacher is expected to place school duties ahead of personal concerns and accept responsibilities that are a necessary part of the profession.

3. The Student Teacher should strive to exemplify the attitudes and actions of a teacher rather than those of a student.

4. The Student Teacher must conform to school rules and policies and local standards of behavior. There will be absolutely no personal involvement, romantic or otherwise, with any student in their assigned school or in any school connected with Clemson University.

5. The Student Teacher must plan work weekly in advance of the date the actual lesson is to occur, and secure approval from the Classroom Teacher.

6. The Student Teacher must safeguard all personal and confidential information and use it for professional purposes only.

7. The Student Teacher is expected to avoid unfavorable criticism of the participating school, the Classroom Teacher, and the community.

8. The Student Teacher is expected to be cooperative at all times with pupils, teachers, and administrators.

9. The Student Teacher is expected to dress appropriately and in keeping with faculty standards.

10. The Student Teacher is expected to attend professional meetings such as faculty meetings, PTO meetings, and County or District Teachers meetings when feasible.

11. The Student Teacher is expected to take an active part in extracurricular activities.

12. The length of the Student Teacher’s day is expected to correspond with that of the Classroom Teacher. The Student Teacher is not expected to participate in “extra” activities for which the Classroom Teacher is paid a stipend.
13. The Student Teacher is expected to attend seminars with the University Supervisor or at Clemson University.

14. The Student Teacher is to turn in reports and do all paperwork assigned to the Classroom Teacher. This work must be completed with the same proficiency and efficiency as demonstrated by the Classroom Teacher.

27. The Student Teacher cannot receive compensation for any services rendered during student teaching.

28. The Student Teacher is expected to complete the university requirement of hours for a full semester. The Classroom Teacher should notify the University Supervisor should a student violate any of these standards.
Appendix C

Program Plans

Clemson University
Early Childhood Education
Bachelor of Arts
Curriculum Plan 2008-2009

The Early Childhood Education curriculum prepares students for teaching positions on the prekindergarten and primary levels (Pre-K-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESHMAN YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 105</td>
<td>ENGL 103</td>
<td>Accelerated Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 173</td>
<td>AAH 210</td>
<td>Intro to Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 101</td>
<td>MTHSC 117</td>
<td>Math for Elementary Sch Tchr I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement</td>
<td>COMM 150 or</td>
<td>Intro to Human Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science Requirement</td>
<td>COMM 250</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOPHOMORE YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 220</td>
<td>EDF 301</td>
<td>Principles of American Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 103</td>
<td>EDF (CTE) 315</td>
<td>Technology Skills for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 118</td>
<td>EDF 334</td>
<td>Child Growth &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math for Elementary School Tchr II</td>
<td>PSYCH 201</td>
<td>Introduction to Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Lit) Requirement</td>
<td>Music Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science Requirement</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology in Society Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNIOR YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE 310</td>
<td>EDEC 300</td>
<td>Foundations of Early Childhood Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 336</td>
<td>EDEL 321</td>
<td>P.E. Methods for Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 302</td>
<td>EDEL 458</td>
<td>Health Ed Methods for Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 370</td>
<td>EDSP 468</td>
<td>Early Intervention for Infants and Children with Special Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Writing Requirement</td>
<td>READ 458</td>
<td>Early Literacy: Birth-Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENIOR YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 400</td>
<td>EDEC 484</td>
<td>Directed Teaching in Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 420</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC 450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 459</td>
<td>TOTAL HOURS: 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two semesters (through 202) of the same foreign language are required. Spanish is recommended.
[1] One biological sciences and one physical science course, each with laboratory, must be selected.
[3] Must be taken in the fall semester of the junior year.
[5] Must be taken concurrently during the fall semester of the senior year.

Figure C-1: Program Plan for Early Childhood Education
The Elementary Education curriculum prepares students for teaching on the elementary school level (grades 2–6).

### FRESHMAN YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 103 World Regional Geography</td>
<td>ED 105 Orientation to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 122 History, Tech &amp; Society</td>
<td>ENGL 103 Accelerated Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 101 Essential Math &amp; Informed Society</td>
<td>MTHSC 117 Math for Elem Teachers I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHSC 108 Intro to Physical Science</td>
<td>PHSC 107 Intro to Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement¹</td>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOPHOMORE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 109 Intro to Life Science</td>
<td>ED F 302 Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 301 Principles of American Ed</td>
<td>ED F (CTE) 315 Technology Skills for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 118 Math for Elem Teachers II</td>
<td>ED F 334 Child Growth &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Lit) Requirement²</td>
<td>ED SP 370 Intro to Special Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 150 Intro to Human Communication or</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Not-Lit) Requirement³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 250 Public Speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUS 210 Music Appreciation or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 MUSIC 400 Music in Elem Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUNIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTE 310 Designing Creative Instruction</td>
<td>ED EL 321 P.E. Methods for Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 322 Responding to Emergencies or Group Initiatives</td>
<td>ED F 309 Classroom Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTM 317 Group Initiatives</td>
<td>ENGL 304 Business Writing or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED EL 458 Health Ed Methods for Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>ENGL 312 Adv Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Requirement¹</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 385 Children’s Literature</td>
<td>3 READ 480 Teaching Reading Grades 2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SENIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED EL 401 Elem Field Experience</td>
<td>ED EL 481 Directed Teaching in Elem School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED EL 451 Elem Methods in Science Teaching</td>
<td>ED EL 482 Elem Methods in Math Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED EL 452 Elem Methods in Math Teaching</td>
<td>ED EL 487 Teaching Social Studies in Elem School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED EL 488 Teaching Language Arts in Elem School</td>
<td>ED F 425 Instructional Technology Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>READ 461 Content Area Reading Grades 2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹2 semesters of same language, 200 level or above
²Select from ENGL 212, 213, 214, or 215
³Select from AAH 210, HUM 301, HUM 302, or THEA 210
⁴Recommended selections are ED 405, ED EL 311, ANTH 201, PSYCH 201, SOC 201 or SOC 202

Figure C-2: Program Plan for Elementary Education
# Clemson University
## Special Education
### Bachelor of Arts

**Curriculum Plan 2008-2009**

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Special Education prepares students to teach individuals with mild disabilities in grades K-12. The curriculum is designed to meet the competencies outlined by the Council for Exceptional Children for beginning special education teachers. Students completing the program receive instruction and practical experiences that lead to Multi-Categorical Special Education Certification in South Carolina.

### Freshman Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 105</td>
<td>ENGL 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 101</td>
<td>GEG 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 122</td>
<td>MTHSC 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sophomore Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDF (CTE) 315</td>
<td>EDF 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 301</td>
<td>EDF 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 370</td>
<td>EDF 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 118</td>
<td>COMM 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Lift) Requirement[9]</td>
<td>COMM 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Junior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 458</td>
<td>EDEL 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 372</td>
<td>EDEL 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 374</td>
<td>EDSP 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 468</td>
<td>EDSP 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Writing Requirement[3]</td>
<td>Educational Assessment of Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Disabilities[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDF 425</td>
<td>EDSP 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 492</td>
<td>EDSP 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 493</td>
<td>EDSP 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 496</td>
<td>EDSP 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed Teaching[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Communication and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the Resource Teacher[14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours: 123**

---

[1] Two semesters (through 202) in the same modern foreign language or American Sign Language are required.
[2] Three science courses, with labs, from the “University GED” list composed of both biological and physical sciences, 6 hours of which must be a two-semester sequence. PHIC 101 and 102 and BIOL 109 are recommended.
[4] MTHSC 117 or 122, OR BIOL 103.
[5] Must be taken concurrently during the spring semester of junior year.
[7] Must be taken concurrently during the spring semester of junior year.
[8] Must be taken concurrently during the spring semester of junior year.
[9] ED SP 406, 407, 454, and 456 must be taken concurrently during the fall semester of junior year.
[10] ED SP 405 and 408 must be taken concurrently during the spring semester of the senior year.

---

Figure C.3: Program Plan for Special Education
# Curriculum Plan 2008-2009

**Teaching Area: Biological Sciences**

**Bachelor of Science**

## Freshman Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 103</td>
<td>BIOL 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 105</td>
<td>BIOL 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 110</td>
<td>BIOL 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 101</td>
<td>CH 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 150</td>
<td>ED 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 106</td>
<td>ENGL 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15-16 credits

## Sophomore Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH 201</td>
<td>BIOSC 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 122</td>
<td>ED 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 207</td>
<td>PHYS 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 209</td>
<td>ED 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry or Genetics Requirement$^1$</td>
<td>PHYS 210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 credits

## Junior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOSC 461</td>
<td>BIOSC 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 302</td>
<td>BIOSC 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 327</td>
<td>ED F 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 314</td>
<td>Technical Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant or Animal Diversity Requirement$^1$</td>
<td>Plant or Animal Diversity Requirement$^1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 credits

## Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED SP 370</td>
<td>EDSEC 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 427</td>
<td>EDSEC 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 103</td>
<td>Secondary Science Capstone Seminar$^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 498</td>
<td>Art &amp; Humanities (Non-Lit) Requirement$^1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 credits

---

**Total Semester Hours: 123 - 125**

---

$^1$ ENGL 212, 213, 214, or 215

$^2$ One lecture and associated laboratory must be completed for both Biochemistry (BIOCH 301/302 or 305/306) and for Genetics (GEN 300/301 or 302/303)

$^3$ BIOSC 441, 443, 446, or 470

$^4$ One lecture and associated laboratory must be completed for both Plant Diversity (BIOSC 204/308 or 305/309) and for Animal Diversity (BIOSC 302/306 or 303/307)

$^5$ To be taken the semester prior to EDSEC 447 and 457. EDSEC 427, & READ 498 must be taken concurrently.

$^6$ Offered fall semester only

$^7$ See General Education Requirements

$^8$ EDSEC 447 and 457 must be taken concurrently. Offered spring semester only

---

Figure C-4: Program Plan for Secondary Education: Sciences
# CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

## SECONDARY EDUCATION

### TEACHING AREA: ENGLISH

#### BACHELOR OF ARTS

**CURRICULUM PLAN 2008 – 2009**

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education is available to students preparing to teach English, mathematics, modern languages (French and Spanish), and science on the secondary school level (grades 9–12). The Bachelor of Science degree is offered to students planning to teach science, social studies, (economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology). The teaching field should be selected as early as possible so that appropriate freshman and sophomore courses may be taken. Each curriculum requires a major concentration in the teaching field.

Specific courses and sequences have been designated to meet requirements for those planning to teach. Students who have elective courses in the teaching area should consult their advisors prior to scheduling these courses. The professional education courses should be completed in sequence.

### FRESHMAN YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM 150 Intro to Human Comunication</td>
<td>ENGL 190 Introduction to English Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 105 Orientation to Education</td>
<td>ENGL 212 World Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103 Accelerated Composition</td>
<td>HIST 172 The West and the World I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 103 World Regional Geography</td>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 101 Essential Math for Informed Soc.</td>
<td>Natural Science Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 301 Principles of American Education</td>
<td>BIOSC 200 Biology in the News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 213 British Literature</td>
<td>ED F 302 Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW (ENGL) 301 Great Books of West World</td>
<td>ED F 315 Technology Skills for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 173 The West and the World II</td>
<td>ENGL 214 American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 102 World Religions</td>
<td>ENGL 310 Critical Writing about Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 361 History of England to 1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 362 Britain since 1688 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 365 British Cultural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 335 Adolescent Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td>ENGL 304 Business Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 324 Practicum in Secondary English</td>
<td>ED F 314 Technical Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 385 Adolescent Literature</td>
<td>ENGL 401 Grammar Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 400 The English Language</td>
<td>British Literature Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SP 370 Introduction to Special Education</td>
<td>ED F 425 Instructional Technology Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 424 Teaching Secondary English</td>
<td>EDSEC 444 Teaching Intern. in Sec. English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 411 Shakespeare</td>
<td>EDSEC 454 Secondary English Capstone Sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 485 Composition for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 498 Secondary Content Area Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|TOTAL HOURS - 123                         |                                      |

1Two semesters (through 202) of the same modern foreign language are required.
2See General Education Requirements.
3ENGL 398, 399, 425, 426, 427, 459, or 463
4ENGL 335, 416, or 440
5ENGL 390, 397, 407, 408, 414, 415, 416, 418, 444, or 464
6ENGL 350, 353, (HUM) 456, 482, or 483
7ENGL 357, 450, (COMM) 451, 452, or 453
8EDSEC 424 and READ 498 must be taken concurrently during fall semester of senior year.
9ED F 425, EDSEC 444 and 454 must be taken concurrently during spring semester of senior year.

---

Figure C-5: Program Plan for Secondary Education: English
## CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
### SECONDARY EDUCATION
#### TEACHING AREA: SOCIAL STUDIES (History)
##### BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

**CURRICULUM PLAN 2008 - 2009**

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education is available to students preparing to teach English, mathematics, modern languages (French and Spanish), and science on the secondary school level (grades 9–12). The Bachelor of Science degree is offered to students planning to teach science, social studies, (economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology). The teaching field should be selected as early as possible so that appropriate freshman and sophomore courses may be taken. Each curriculum requires a major concentration in the teaching field. Specific courses and sequences have been designated to meet requirements for those planning to teach. Students who have elective courses in the teaching area should consult their advisors prior to scheduling these courses. The professional education courses should be completed in sequence.

### FRESHMAN YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 105 Orientation to Education</td>
<td>ANTH 201 Introduction to Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103 Accelerated Composition</td>
<td>BIOSC 300 Biology in the News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 101 Introduction to Geography</td>
<td>ENGL 214 American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 122 History, Technology, and Society</td>
<td>GEOG 103 World Regional Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 101 Essential Math. for Informed Soc.</td>
<td>PSYCH 201 Introduction to Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science Requirement¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOPHOMORE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON 211 Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>ECON 212 Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 302 Educational Psychology</td>
<td>ED F 315 Technical Skills for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 101 History of the United States</td>
<td>HIST 102 History of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 172 The West and the World I</td>
<td>HIST 173 The West and the World II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO SC 101 American National Government</td>
<td>PO SC 102 Intro. to International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 201 Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>Teaching Major²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUNIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED F 301 Principles of American Education</td>
<td>COMM 150 Intro. to Human Communication OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 335 Adolescent Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td>COMM 250 Public Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 328 Practicum in Secondary Soc. Studies</td>
<td>ENGL 312 Advanced Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Major³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SENIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED F 425 Instructional Technology Strategies¹</td>
<td>EDSEC 448 Teaching Intern. in Sec. Social Studies¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SP 370 Introduction to Special Education</td>
<td>EDSEC 458 Sec. Social Studies Capstone Seminar¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 428 Teaching Secondary Social Studies³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 498 Secondary Content Area Reading¹</td>
<td>Teaching Major⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL HOURS - 124

¹ See General Education Requirements
² See Advisor. Select from HIST 299, 300, and 400-level courses in History. Must include at least three hours each in U.S. history, European history, and nine hours in non-Western history. HIST 313 is recommended for those planning to teach in South Carolina.
³ ED F 425, EDSEC 428, and READ 498 must be taken concurrently. Offered fall semester only.
⁴ EDSEC 448 and 458 must be taken concurrently. Offered spring semester only.

---

**Figure C-6: Program Plan for Secondary Education: Social Studies/History**
### CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
### SECONDARY EDUCATION
### MODERN LANGUAGES (French OR Spanish)
### BACHELOR OF ARTS

#### CURRICULUM PLAN 2008-2009

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education is available to students preparing to teach English, mathematics, modern languages (French and Spanish), and science on the secondary school level (grades 9–12). The Bachelor of Science degree is offered to students planning to teach science, social studies, economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. The teaching field should be selected as early as possible so that appropriate freshman and sophomore courses may be taken. Each curriculum requires a major concentration in the teaching field. Specific courses and sequences have been designated to meet requirements for those planning to teach. Students who have elective courses in the teaching area should consult their advisors prior to scheduling these courses. The professional education courses should be completed in sequence.

#### FRESHMAN YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 105 Orientation to Education</td>
<td>GEOG 103 World Regional Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103 Accelerated Composition</td>
<td>HIST 172 The West &amp; the World I OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 101 Essential Math. for Informed Society</td>
<td>ENGL 173 The West &amp; the World II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Non-Lit.) Requirement†</td>
<td>HIST 173 Arts &amp; Humanities (Literature) Requirement†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement†</td>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science Requirement†</td>
<td>Math. or Natural Science Requirement†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOPHOMORE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED F 301 Principles of American Education</td>
<td>ED F 302 Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Tech. in Society Requirement†</td>
<td>ENGL 314 Technology Skills for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 314 Social Science Requirement†</td>
<td>ENGL 316 Writing &amp; International Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Major†</td>
<td>Teaching Major†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### JUNIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM 150 Intro to Human Communication OR</td>
<td>Advanced Social Science Requirement†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 250 Public Speaking</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Requirement†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 334 Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>Teaching Major†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 335 Adolescent Growth and Development</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Major†</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SENIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED F 425 Instructional Technology Strategies†</td>
<td>EDSEC 412 Directed Student Teaching in Secondary School Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SP 370 Introduction to Special Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 425 Teaching Sec. Modern Languages†</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 498 Secondary Content Area Reading†</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Major†</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HOURS = 121**

---

Figure C-7: Program Plan for Secondary Education: Modern Languages
Clemson University  
Secondary Education  
Teaching Area: Mathematics  
Bachelor of Arts  
Curriculum Plan 2008-2009

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education is available to students preparing to teach English, mathematics, modern languages (French and Spanish), and science on the secondary school level (grades 9-12). The Bachelor of Science degree is offered to students planning to teach science, social studies, economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. The teaching field should be selected as early as possible so that appropriate freshman and sophomore courses may be taken. Each curriculum requires a major concentration in the teaching field.

Specific courses and sequences have been designated to meet requirements for those planning to teach. Students who have elective courses in the teaching area should consult their advisors prior to scheduling these courses. The professional education courses should be completed in sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESHMAN YEAR</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 105</td>
<td>MTHSC 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103</td>
<td>MTHSC 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 106</td>
<td>PHIL 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYS 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Language Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature Science Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOPHOMORE YEAR</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON 200</td>
<td>ED F 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 211</td>
<td>ED F 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 102</td>
<td>MTHSC 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 206</td>
<td>MTHSC 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 250</td>
<td>Intro. to Mathematical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (Literature) Require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science &amp; Tech. in Society Require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Awareness Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNIOR YEAR</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED F 301</td>
<td>ED F 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 326</td>
<td>ED SP 570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 314</td>
<td>EDSEC 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 302</td>
<td>MTHSC 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 400</td>
<td>MTHSC 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Probability</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENIOR YEAR</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM 250</td>
<td>EDSEC 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED F 425</td>
<td>EDSEC 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSEC 426</td>
<td>MTHSC 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHSC 453</td>
<td>MTHSC 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 498</td>
<td>Secondary Content Area Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL HOURS – 124

1Two semesters (through 202) in any modern foreign language or American Sign Language are required.
2See General Education Requirements.
3CP SC 111, 111, or 120.
4ENGL 212, 213, 214, or 215.
5ED F 425, EDSEC 426, and READ 498 must be taken concurrently prior to directed teaching. Offered fall semester only.
6EDSEC 446 and 456 must be taken concurrently. Offered spring semester only.

Figure C-8: Program Plan for Secondary Education: Math
Appendix D

Instrumentation

**Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Beliefs</th>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D-1: Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>M²</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complete their assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retraining of general-classroom teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understanding and acceptance of differences among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is likely that the student with a disability will exhibit behavior</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problems in a general classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students with disabilities can be best served in general classrooms.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detriment of the other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The challenge of being in a general classroom will promote the</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic growth of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Integration of students with disabilities will require significant</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes in general classroom procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increased freedom in the general classroom creates too much</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confusion for the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General-classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The presence of students with disabilities will not promote</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more rapidly in a general classroom than in a special classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social independence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is not more difficult to maintain order in a general classroom that</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contains a student with a disability than in one that does not contain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students with disabilities will not monopolize the general-classroom</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher’s time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in the general</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>General-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>function in the general classroom where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The classroom behavior of the student with a disability generally does</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not require more patience from the teacher than does the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom behavior of the student without a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special rather than</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general classroom teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Isolation in a special classroom has beneficial effect on the social and</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional development of the student with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The student with a disability will not be socially isolated in the</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D-2: Opinions Relative to Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI)
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Permission Letters

You are welcome to use the TSES instrument. You might contact one of my doctoral students, Heather Dawson, who is working on an efficacy for teaching students with disabilities scale. Her e-mail is:

dawson.282@gmail.com

Anita

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Professor
Educational Psychology & Philosophy
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

phone: 614-488-5064
fax: 614-292-7900
e-mail anitahoy@mac.com

http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy

Richard F. Antonak
to me
Ms. Huber,

I am attaching a copy of the ORI, the scoring key, and a letter granting permission to use the scale in your research. Best wishes for success.

Richard

Richard F. Antonak
Vice Provost for Research
University of Massachusetts Boston
Richard.Antonak@umb.edu
Voice: 617-287-5600
FAX: 617-287-5616
Appendix F

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your gender?
   a. male
   b. female

2. In what age group do you belong?
   a. 17-20
   b. 21-24
   c. 25-28
   d. 29 or older

3. With what ethnicity/racial group do you identify?
   a. African American/Black
   b. White/Caucasian
   c. Asian
   d. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   e. Hispanic/Latino
   f. American Indian/Alaskan Native
   g. Mixed
   h. Other (please specify)

4. In what area will you obtain your primary certification to teach?
   a. Early Childhood Education
   b. Elementary Education
   c. Middle Grades Education
   d. Secondary Education (please specify content area):

   ______________________________________
   e. Special Education (multicategorical)

5. In what type of setting are you student teaching?
   a. General education or inclusive (collaborative) classroom
   b. Resource specialist program
   c. Self-contained special education classroom
   d. Other (please describe):

   ______________________________________

6. How many students are in your classroom (or on your caseload) in your student teaching placement?
   a. 10 or fewer
   b. 11-16
   c. 17-22
   d. 23-30
   e. More than 30
7. How many students with disabilities (have IEP documents) are in your student teaching classroom?
   a. 0
   b. 1-3
   c. 4-6
   d. 7 or more

8. What are the disabilities of the students in your student teaching classroom (if any)?
   Circle all that apply.
   a. Emotional/behavioral disorder
   b. Sensory impairment (hearing or vision impairment)
   c. Learning disability
   d. Intellectual disability (mental retardation)
   e. Multiple disability
   f. Orthopedic impairment
   g. Language and/or speech impairment
   h. Autism spectrum disorder
   i. ADHD
   j. Other health impairment
   k. Other (please describe): ____________________________
   l. Unknown

9. The students with disabilities in your student teaching placement receive instruction in
   _____ your student teaching classroom only
   _____ special education (resource or self-contained) and your student teaching classroom
   _____ other (please specify): ____________________________

10. Indicate the source(s) from which you have received training on inclusion.
    a. College course work (list classes): ____________________________
    b. Professional conferences/meetings
    c. Workshops/in-service meetings, etc. at local school
    d. Other (please specify): ____________________________

11. How well has your college training program equipped you for the reality of teaching in an inclusive setting?
    a. Very prepared
    b. Somewhat prepared
    c. Somewhat unprepared
    d. Very unprepared

12. What previous experience (if any) do you have with individuals with disabilities (describe)?
Appendix G

Institutional Review Board Documentation

From: Rebecca Alley <RALLEY@exchange.clemson.edu>
Date: Tue, 16 Dec 2008 09:06:34 -0500
Conversation: Validation of IRB2008-386 entitled "The Influence of Student Teaching on Preservice Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusion and Self-Efficacy"
Subject: Validation of IRB2008-386 entitled "The Influence of Student Teaching on Preservice Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusion and Self-Efficacy"

The Chair of the Clemson University Institutional Review Board (IRB) validated the protocol identified above using Exempt review procedures and a determination was made on December 16, 2008, that the proposed activities involving human participants qualify as Exempt from continuing review under Category B1, based on the Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46). You may begin this study.

Please remember that no change in this research protocol can be initiated without prior review by the IRB. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, complications, and/or any adverse events must be reported to the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) immediately. You are requested to notify the ORC when your study is completed or terminated.

Attached are documents developed by Clemson University regarding the responsibilities of Principal Investigators and Research Team Members. Please be sure these are distributed to all appropriate parties.

Good luck with your study and please feel free to contact us if you have any questions. Please use the IRB number and title in all communications regarding this study.

Sincerely,
Becca

Rebecca L. Alley, J.D.
IRB Coordinator
Office of Research Compliance
Clemson University
223 Brackett Hall
Clemson, SC  29634-5704
ralley@clemson.edu
Office Phone: 864-656-0636
Fax: 864-656-4475
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting Description:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Notes</th>
<th>Body Language/Physical Reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are your views about inclusion?</td>
<td>a. Probe further – if participants suggest that it can be good ask in what ways is it beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Probe further – if participants suggest negativity, ask what are some barriers to inclusion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What experiences, classes, stories, etc. have influenced your opinions about inclusion?

3. Since being in your student teaching placement, have your views about inclusion changed?
   a. If they have changed – How have they changed?
   b. What do you think contributed to the change?
4. What knowledge and skills are needed to be effective in inclusive teaching?

5. Do you feel you have these?

6. How do you perceive your mentor teachers’ attitude towards inclusion?

7. How inclusive do you believe your student teaching setting is/is not?
8. Is there anything else you’d like to say?
Appendix I

Researcher Subjectivities

“Writing the dissertation involves the mutual tasks of both becoming and belonging.”
-Kamler & Thomson, 2008, p. 508

There is no question that this research involved my own personal beliefs and subjectivities. As Peshkin (1988) states, it is rather difficult, or impossible to lay aside one’s own frame of reference. It therefore entered into my research; I believe in every area from the literature review to the discussion of results. I have learned that it is most helpful to become aware of my own subjectivities, to flesh them out, so that they can both contribute to my work as a researcher, and so that they do not “accidentally” influence my work. Therefore, the purpose of this statement is to bracket my own subjectivity.

I have taught in self-contained settings and inclusive settings through co-teaching. My clear preference is for inclusive placements. This bias had to be repeatedly bracketed throughout this work. While I believe in the continuum of placement options, I think that the placement of students with disabilities in the general education classroom provides numerous benefits to all students and stakeholders. I also believe that the implementation of inclusive practices is done less often and with less quality than it could be and so I advocate for more inclusive placements. In light of my strong opinion about inclusion, I assume that all educators and preservice educators also have opinions about the topic. I firmly support the CEC standard #5 that requires that “special educators foster environments in which diversity is valued” (CEC, 2003, p. 8). I believe that what we choose to teach makes visible our values and therefore we must carefully choose. I believe in the celebration of differences. I encourage the normalization of uniqueness, that is, that special becomes
normal. I believe that through challenge comes great strength. These beliefs will color the way I ask my questions, analyze my data, and report/discuss my results.

When I think of themes of inclusion, my first reaction is an emotional one. I have never known what it is like to have decisions made for me because of my ability or disability, skin color, my education level, or my income status. Because I have not experienced it, I cannot know how it feels. My imaginations about this make me a subjective observer rather than a participant when it comes to some issues of inclusion. While I might feel thankful not to have to struggle against the tide of inequity, what I actually feel is left out. I have long regarded the culture of Africans, African Americans, Hispanic or Latino ethnic groups as richer than my own, the work of the laborer more productive than my education, the perseverance of those with special needs or disability stronger than my own, and the creativity of low income families greater than my own. I am shamed by this admission, but it must be clear in order to understand the subjectivity I bring to my work. I do know how it feels to be marginalized. That is, I know how it is to be a disempowered, disenfranchised, and trodden upon journeyer of this world.

I am an idealist, an optimist, and romantic. I believe it was these qualities that led me to this work, the field of special education. For I am a special educator and I proudly belong to the Council for Exceptional Children. This identity permeates my everyday choices and decisions as I see my life through a special educator’s lens. Special educators are both passionate and compassionate. We advocate for children of all ages. For us, the classroom is a sanctuary, and we will do whatever it takes to make this a safe place for all who enter. CEC members do not just teach; they teach, read, fight for justice, protect the innocent and vulnerable, and collaborate – not just in our jobs but as a way of life. We know more
acronyms than are contained in a bowl of alphabet soup. We know the difference between LD, SLI, EBD, and LRE. We know that inclusion is not mainstreaming in the same way that carob is not really chocolate. We share the thrill of teaching a child to read, and the joys in getting kicked in the shin. Our skills are innumerable, as are those of all teachers, but our greatest skill is our ability to see individuals within an amalgamated class, yet also develop a community that is a family; sometimes more than a family. Every year CEC members congregate to one great convention; one that few miss more than once. Here, heroes share their successes, and the invincible sometimes melt down because here is where we all understand one another in a way outsiders cannot. Special educators who become CEC members are active voices; not content to just watch, or teach in isolation, but striving for more than that which is within their own walls. Our houses, purses, cars, and closets are full of a strange mix. We have play-dough (for Joey with Autism) next to a walkman (for Lisa with a Learning Disability). We collect milk pints, egg cartons, and bread tags as if they are gold. Our students are our greatest treasure, and walls, filing cabinets, and desks proudly display the notes, dried leaves, and rocks shared with us.

Another experience that relates to my own subjectivity in my research was teaching pre-service teachers in California. Southern California is an incredibly diverse community and the students in my classes at the university seemed to thirst for strategies to work with such diverse populations. This was an expectation in my classes, a given, and there was no question about the need for such education. Every lesson involved some form of modification, accommodation, or creative strategy for including diverse populations. I wonder if this experience will influence my receptiveness to those students who feel a little hostile towards including students with disabilities in the general education classroom.
My theoretical beliefs fall in line with such theorists as Vygotsky and Bandura. I believe in developmentally appropriate practices and therefore consciously choose work to include in my classroom that will match, and perhaps stretch, the developmental profiles of my students. I believe that we construct our own learning through the choices we make and I advocate for our teaching practices to do the same. I believe we learn from the modeling of those we admire as much as we learn from our own choices. I believe that we must include culture into our every subject because our students learn through their cultural foundations. This subjectivity statement is continually evolving. It is formative, not summative, so throughout the weeks and years to come, I will continue to add to it, change it, and reflect on the ways in which my subjectivities influence my research.
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