Teacher Efficacy: Moving Towards Inclusive Practices

by

A thesis submitted to the
School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Faculty of Education

Memorial University of Newfoundland

October 2015

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

ABSTRACT

The current study presents data about beliefs on teacher efficacy related to inclusive practices. Data was collected from teachers employed in two districts within the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, during the 2012-2013 school year. Perceived teacher efficacy to teach in inclusive classrooms was measured by the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale developed by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin, (2012). Under investigation were teacher perceptions of their ability to implement inclusive practices, to work with parents and other professionals, to work with students with special education needs, and to deal with disruptive behaviours in the classroom. Also explored was whether any significant differences existed in Newfoundland and Labrador teachers' perceptions of their ability to implement inclusive practices based on teacher age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and/or whether the school they worked in was in a rural or urban area. Two hundred and sixty two teacher participants (59 men and 203 women) in the K-12 school system took part in the study. Overall, the results showed that the teachers surveyed believe their practice is effective in an inclusive setting. Teacher participants reported no differences in efficacy of overall inclusive practice, efficacy of using inclusive instructions, and efficacy in collaboration. However, managing disruptive behaviour was shown to be an area where male and female teachers differed in their reported self-efficacy of practice. Male participants reported higher efficacy in managing disruptive behaviours in the classroom than female teachers. The findings suggest there may be a need for further teacher education and/or professional

development opportunities related to managing disruptive behaviours in the classroom.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my mother, Mrs. Rita MacDonald (1928 – present). My

mother inspired me to continue my education and to raise awareness of issues concerning

students with special education needs in our community.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I: Why Study Inclusion?

Introduction

This study was inspired by my own experiences as a teacher in Newfoundland and Labrador (NL), Canada. Early in my education career, which began in 2007, I participated in teacher in-service training to address changes being implemented in the inclusion model adopted by the Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Education. In the same year, the provincial government's Department of Education released a summative report entitled *Focusing on Students: The ISSP & Pathways Commission Report* (Philpott, 2007a). This report generated much discourse amongst my colleagues. As teachers, we knew we were moving towards the practice of full inclusion, but the path was going to prove challenging. As a new teacher, I was interested in the experiences of my colleagues. I started as a substitute teacher (in elementary, intermediate and high school classrooms) which provided me the opportunity to interact with staff in various schools. I also moved about from different communities, some rural and others urban. The staffroom discourse on inclusion was intense and I had difficulty separating the factors influencing the debate. I was overwhelmed by individual opinions, school and community variables, and comprehending the systemic problems under reform. This study investigated whether there were teacher related demographic factors that could be influencing the discourse on inclusion amongst my colleagues. My overall sense was that teachers in rural Newfoundland and Labrador believed they were capable of teaching students with diverse needs, but that more senior teachers were less content with changes in inclusive practices. As a result, I wanted to study inclusion and consider the impact of

the following variables on inclusive practises: age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and whether the school they worked in was in a rural or urban area. In addition, for the purpose of this research, teachers' perceptions of efficacy of will include efficacy in   using inclusive instructions, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing disruptive behaviour.

Chapter one introduces the topic, gives the purpose of the current study, presents the historical background and discusses the reform of educational practices. It also spotlights relevance of the study in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, gives the theoretical framework for this research project, and notes the importance of studying inclusion. Chapter two provides a literature review of research on inclusive practices based on the scope of the area of inclusion under investigation. This chapter highlights the challenges, teacher attitudes, resources and supports, collaboration, management of disruptive behaviour, teacher training and continued professional development. Chapter three outlines the methods used to recruit participants for the study gives an overview of the participants, and discusses the methods to be used to analyse the data. Chapter four presents the results, and reports on statistical significance. Chapter five provides a discussion of the results noting the relevance to current research findings, considers the limitations of the study, and recommends areas of concern to be addressed in the future.

Purpose of Current Study

Despite the debate and the inherent challenges, a global shift in thinking about methods schools use in responding to the needs of diverse learners has occurred. Nowhere is this more evident than in this country, where public schools across Canada accept all diverse learners. Teachers must be able to teach students with diverse needs (Hutchinson, 2007). With diverse learners in mind, the main objective of the current study was to survey teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador by exploring their efficacy of inclusive practices. It is believed that the investigation of variables impacting inclusive education in this province may inform a plan of action to improve teacher efficacy and thus improve student experiences (Philpott, 2002; Philpott, 2007a; Philpott & Dibbon, 2008). The investigation of inclusive practices included teacher perceptions of efficacy of using inclusive instructions, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing disruptive behaviour. Survey data was analyzed to determine whether any significant differences existed in Newfoundland and Labrador teachers' perceptions of their ability to implement inclusive practices relative to demographic variables such as: age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and whether the school they worked in was in a rural or urban area. More specifically, I set out to investigate whether Newfoundland and Labrador teachers' perceptions of their ability to implement inclusive practices differed in any of the following ways:

1. Do teachers in rural areas report higher efficacy of inclusive practices than their colleagues in urban centers?

12

2. As the years of teaching experience increase does efficacy of inclusive practices increase?

3. Does the gender of the teacher make a difference to efficacy of inclusive practice?

4. Does the school district in which the teacher is employed make a difference to efficacy of inclusive practices?

It is anticipated that teacher responses will reveal an understanding of the efficacy of Newfoundland and Labrador teachers in inclusive classrooms. In addition, any significant findings based on demographic variables can be used to inform professional development opportunities designed to address the significant area(s) of concern.

The History of Inclusion

The Inclusion Education Team of The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) informs us that that our modern use of the term inclusion has evolved from practices of providing special education to children with disabilities and children experiencing difficulty learning (UNESCO, 2005). Special education itself has an interesting history and as Kauffman (1981) argues, the history of accommodating learners with diverse needs is thought to parallel the development of social, anthropological, and psychological systems of contemporary societies. This history tends to be understood as a range of services that have been provided to supplement within the general classroom and/or in a completely separate learning environment. As UNESCO points out, the practice of accommodating learners has been scrutinized not only for its effectiveness, but also through the lens of human rights. UNESCO advocates that all individuals are entitled to overcome the barriers that exclude

them from unlocking their full potential. Accessing education is seen as the key to progress for individuals (UNESCO, 2005).

It is from this human rights perspective that Philpott (2007b) concluded that literature on the topic of inclusive education could be viewed as a strong philosophy. While the literature continues to reflect considerable debate on topics of inclusive practises regarding student diversity, it is not confined to specific settings. Rather, the inquiry extends to a global context with a long history. Internationally, societies are being challenged to transform and to celebrate diversity (Brazil Ministry of Education, 2008; European Agency, 2010; Fouilhoux, 2008; International Bureau of Education, 2015; Kauffman, 1981, UNESCO, 2005). For developed countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, there has also been an increase in policies and legislation related to inclusive education (Kuyini & Desai, 2007; Wu-Tien, Ashman & Yong-Wook, 2008; Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012).

Worldwide, one of the most noteworthy inquiries on inclusive practices was the World Conference, which was convened in Salamanca, Spain in 1994. Participating in the four-day conference held June 7-10, 1994, were over 300 representatives from 92 governments and 25 international organizations. The challenge for the representatives was to engage in discourse on the policies needed for the promotion of inclusive education. If schools were to serve all children, including those with special needs, service could not be interpreted as merely placing students in a school. Policy to promote the quality of education was believed to be critical. As a result, The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education was drafted to guide the policy, principles and practice of special education in schools. Commonly referred to

as The Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994), it was the catalyst for reform of education practices on a global scale (UNESCO, 2005).

Redefining Inclusion

Children with special education needs have the right to be included in the regular classroom (Porter, 2008). In fact, many Canadian educators have advocated for the rights of children with special education needs (Baglieri & Shapiro, 2002; Carrington, Tymms, & Merrell, 2008; Elkins, vanKraayenoord & Jobling, 2003; Hausstätter, 2007). The inclusion of students with special education needs is becoming mainstream practice in all Canadian provinces. On March 30, 2007, the Canadian Association of Statutory Human Rights Agencies (CASHRA), a convention of 80 nations, including Canada, signed the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Porter, 2008). Porter stresses that in Article 24 of the signed convention document, nations agreed to provide appropriate inclusive education for students with disabilities. Canada's participation and signature of the convention document brings a worldwide concern back to the responsibility of Canadians. Porter maintains that Canadians need to purge the education system in Canada of segregation and discrimination in order to develop a vision that is meaningful to all students and the community at large.

As Sokal and Katz (2015) point out, Canada was at the forefront of passing legislation thirty years ago when the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms granted rights to persons with physical and mental disabilities. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms legally mandates the right to benefit from an education without discrimination. It is the suitability of the education opportunities provided to individuals

that is sometimes questioned by critics. As Brackenreed (2008) stressed, the Charter

calls upon ministries of education to ensure that all citizens receive public education that

is appropriate to their needs. However, defining needs and appropriate measures to

achieve them can prove elusive across provinces.

Depending on the province, national legislation may be upheld through Provincial

Acts that allow students with diverse needs to have the right to receive their schooling in

the general education setting with their peers. The Canadian Council on Learning (CCL)

published a report indicating that only a small minority of students in Canada attend

special schools, most attend the regular public school (Canadian Council on Learning,

n.d.). Henteleff (2010) expands on the notion of the legal right to access education by

arguing that curriculum access must be "meaningful" to special education students.

Meaningful is further quantified by the argument that accommodations must be specific

to the need of students' on an individual basis. That is, some students require a physical

accommodation, while others require accommodations to improve learning. Henteleff

acknowledges that it is not sufficient to meet some needs and not others; or to think one

solution can be implemented to meet the needs of everyone. This sentiment is echoed in

the definition of inclusive education provided by United Nations Educational, Scientific

and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which included in the scope of inclusion, not just

students who were differently-abled but many diverse needs including children from

migrant families, children in fragile states or conflict areas, indigenous children, or

children with HIV/AIDS.   In fact, all children with any diverse need are included under

the umbrella of inclusive education as defined by The United Nations Educational,

Scientific and Cultural Organization. Overall, UNESCO promotes inclusive education as

a vision of education that is fluid and dynamic as it responds to change to meet the diverse needs of all children by including them and educating them in a meaningful context. The foundation of this vision is the belief that it is the responsibility of the regular school system to educate all children. UNESCO maintains that for education ministries to deliver a high standard of education to children all countries must embrace/envision the broader context and welcome diversity in the population they serve (UNESCO, 2005).

It is also within this global shift in thinking that Philpott (2007b) investigated the influence of cultural aspects of inclusive education by exploring the experience of aboriginal learners in Canadian schools. Philpott stressed that the worldwide movement to make the general classroom inclusive also represents a move away from the medical model of disability that once guided special education services. The conviction is that a more contemporary model of inclusive education will empower teachers and students. Philpott noted that an important factor in meeting the needs of diverse students rests upon the knowledge and skills of individual teachers. Teachers must be empowered to identify the needs of students and to differentiate instruction to meet those needs. Philpott challenges us to understand how the shift to inclusive practices occurred and to engage in discourse to consider the implications for all Canadians (Philpott, 2007a, Philpott 207b; Philpott & Dibbon, 2008; Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010; Philpott, Nesbit, Cahill, & Jeffery, 2004).

Sokal and Katz (2015) also redefine inclusion beyond the academic paradigm. They suggest that inclusion is meaningful when all students are welcome to participate in all experiences offered at a neighbourhood school. Their focus shifts beyond

achievement in academics to include the social experiences encountered during the schooling experience. For students with special education needs, the social experience of schooling has often been restricted to excessive interactions with mostly adults. That is, there has been a tendency for the social world of some students with special needs to be confined to interactions with teaching staff and student aids rather than with their same aged peers. In effect, Sokal and Katz advocate for social inclusion as well as academic inclusion. Again, it is not sufficient to merely place students in a public school and allow the school culture to exclude them from social interactions with their peers, or social events in the community.

As the history of inclusion continues to evolve stakeholders constantly voice concerns and celebrate successes to shed light on educational endeavours. The redefining of inclusion is well stated by Slee and Allan (2001) when they claimed that inclusion means focusing on all students, not just disabled or students with learning difficulties. The belief that, in the broad context, one must see inclusion as a social movement promoting the needs of all students is progressive. Spratt and Florian (2015) echo the same sentiment when they advocate for a classroom environment where teachers believe that every child contributes to the classroom in a meaningful way. Their belief is that it is detrimental to all students when the status of any individual is undermined or undervalued. Thus, in contemporary times, discourse on inclusive practices in schools continues to be fuelled by the themes of social justice and the desire to create an inclusive school culture as well as debate about the quality of education delivered to students.

The province of Newfoundland and Labrador does not have legislated policy on inclusive education, however, it does have an *Inclusive Education Initiative*. The lack of

policy to guide inclusive practice is considered to be an issue across Canada. At the

federal government level, Canada does not have a Federal Department of Education.

Educational services in Canada are administered at the provincial government level.

While provinces in Canada may collaborate, each is independently responsible for their

own curriculum, financing and delivery of education services to students. At the

provincial level, the ministries are expected to follow practices that are not in conflict

with federal and/or provincial laws. It is the elected school boards in each jurisdiction

that are mandated to practice within the education acts, regulations and directions set

forth by its own provincial ministry of education. Given the lack of federal directives,

there are many variations in inclusive practices at the provincial level which prove

problematic but also effective in meeting each province's special education needs

(Brackenreed, 2008).

Historically, segregation of students with disabilities was entrenched in the

history of schooling children with disabilities. In the past, Newfoundland and Labrador

was known to have used a delivery model for special education that was categorical, and

contributed to segregating students based on their special education needs. As Edmunds

(2003) noted students receiving special education tended to receive their instruction in

separate or specialized classes. It was common to have students removed from

classrooms to receive instruction for an entire curricular subject. Inclusion in the regular

classroom was secondary to receiving pullout instruction which was considered to be the

best practice to meet students' academic needs.

The commission report released in June of 2007 entitled *Focusing on Students:*

The ISSP & Pathways Commission Report offered a review of the existing model of

inclusive education and was instrumental to the transformation of the education system in Newfoundland and Labrador (Philpott, 2007a). Following the commission report, Newfoundland and Labrador's Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (EECD) recognized the need for both school and community environments to be inclusive. At the school level, the Department's current goal is to prepare students for full participation at the school and community through shared school experiences that do not segregate or discriminate based on differences (Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2015).

To reach the goal of providing inclusive education for all students, in March of 2009, EECD announced its new Inclusive Education Initiative. Overall, the EECD aspires to offer a safe and caring environment where everyone is accepted and included (EECD, 2015). The government recognized that schools would have to do more than educate people about topics related to inclusion (i.e. bullying, differentiated learning, etc.), and that all stakeholders would have to live by example and demonstrate attitudes and practices that reflected inclusive beliefs (EECD, 2015). As a result, each year since 2009, education staffs in at least 30 Newfoundland and Labrador schools have received six phases of training in inclusive practices. The first stage of developing an inclusive program was to address teacher beliefs and values concerning inclusive schooling (EECD, 2015). Other phases were related to (1) the use of the Index for Inclusion (a tool used by schools to determine their current level of inclusivity based on three scales: culture, policies, and practices), (2) differentiated instruction, (3) collaborative teaching models, and (4) development of annual action plans. In addition, throughout the phases, schools were given access to district level itinerants (a district staff position) to support

development and practice of inclusive education (EECD, 2015). This phase-in approach will be completed the end of the June 2016. That is, the Inclusive Schools Initiative adopted by EECD consisted of six phases to be implemented over a six year period with the first phase beginning in 2009-2010 and the final phase being introduced in the current school year (2015-2016).

Theoretical Framework

Recognizing that teacher beliefs regarding their efficacy in inclusive education contribute to the success and/or failure of students (Edmunds, 2003; Evans & Lunt, 2002; Fukuchi, 2008; Porter & Smith, 2011) ,this study investigated teacher related factors impacting inclusive teaching practice in Newfoundland and Labrador. Guided by the research of Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012), the study focused on perceptions of efficacy in the following areas: 1) teacher's perceptions of their ability to implement inclusive practices, 2) teacher's perceptions of their ability to work with parents and other professionals as they relate to the current inclusive education initiatives, and 3) teacher's perceptions of their ability to work with students with special education needs and to deal with disruptive behaviours in the classroom. In addition, possible demographic variables affecting teachers' perceptions of efficacy were examined.

As noted in the introduction, this study was also inspired by my own experiences as a teacher in Newfoundland and Labrador. Early in my education career, which began in 2007, I participated in teacher in-service training to address changes being implemented in the inclusion model adopted by Newfoundland and Labrador. Upon further reflection, the inspiration for this study is actually deeper rooted in an

autobiographical theoretical framework or my personal experiences as a student. My frame of reference of students with special education needs dates back to my own schooling in the 1970s and 1980s. During my public school years, NL schools were based on religious denominations and I was enrolled in a Catholic school. By junior high, school was further restricted by gender, that is, I was enrolled in a Catholic school for girls only. The majority of the teaching staff was Catholic Nuns. Within that educational setting, students were also sorted into their classes by ability. My frame of reference became a classroom with same-gendered, advanced ability students. I was vaguely aware that somewhere in the school was a classroom of students referred to as "remedial." I assumed these students struggled to learn, that the subjects that I achieved excellence in without much effort. When I returned to public school in 2007, twenty years after my own high school graduation, the educational setting had transformed. Schools were inclusive as religion, gender, and ability were no longer the determinants for placing students in specific classrooms.

I was inspired by the philosophy of inclusion. The social justice advocate in me was thrilled that schools were embracing diversity. I had always resented being separated from my twin brother, from students of other religions and from learners who were different from me. The sameness of the "one size fits all" approach for students with special needs was so restricted; the lack of variety was boring. I felt emancipated. It was a new adventure and I was excited to start teaching. I ignored the initial grumblings of staff rooms, and teacher complaints about what was wrong with inclusion. I had just graduated from a university program that included courses about students with exceptionalities. I thought I knew what differentiated learning was. I was going to

sweep into the classroom and provide differentiated instruction and it would be a win-win for teacher and student.

It was not long before I too was grumbling in the staff room. I was upset that I was set up to fail my students not in the literal sense with failing grades but with failing to deliver the education they deserved. I understood immediately what was wrong with inclusion. It was that class size had not been adjusted to compensate for the time it takes to support each student (Elkins, van Kraayenoord, & Jobling, 2003; UNESCO, 2008; Fouilhoux, 2008), the next week I felt it was that I didn't have the preparation time to modify the curriculum (Adamowycz, 2008, Elhoweris, & Alsheikh, 2010), the following week it was that I didn't know enough about how the brain was impacted by disorders (Winzer, 2005; Alberta, 2015, LD Online, 2015). Week by week, I had a new theory about the challenges of inclusion and a related new incentive to satisfy my thirst for knowledge. I studied the scholarly literature on syndromes (Winzer, 2005), on disabilities (Grenier, 2007; LD Online, 2015; Winzer, 2005;), on the multi-cultural dynamics (McLeod & Krugly-Smolska, 1997), on social-economic status (McLeod & Krugly-Smolska, 1997). I looked at sexual orientation literature (GLSEN, 2015) and literature on English as a second language (McLeod & Krugly-Smolska, 1997). Any factor I encountered in the classroom I spent my evenings researching. Then, when I was given students with hearing impairments (one child had cochlear implants), I even tried to learn sign language. Eventually, the harsh reality set in. I could not conquer all the challenges and was becoming a generalist – a jack of all trades, master of none; I was frustrated.

Some relief came with the realization that other teachers were also struggling with similar career demands. As Brackenreed (2008) noted, teachers left the profession for

many reasons but the most commonly cited reason was due to stress and frustration from demands of the classroom and lack of supports (Brackenreed, 2008). Unlike many of Brackenreed's research participants, I was not ready to quit teaching but I was struggling.

The "advanced ability" teacher was failing to excel and to meet students' diverse needs, I felt that I had mastered nothing and was becoming increasingly frustrated. I left the classroom and switched to different roles, first as a counsellor and then as an assessor. The expectations in those roles were clear, attainable and I believed I wasn't failing anyone. Although I felt more successful, ironically, I missed teaching.

It has been a challenging academic exercise as I tried to understand all the elements of and implications of inclusion that had eluded me. I realized that the literature on topics under the umbrella of inclusion is as diverse as the individuals the research strives to represent and that there will always be advantages and disadvantages to debate on numerous topics. Therefore, for the current project, I chose to work within a frame of reference which I could understand. I would survey my colleagues and uncover a problem that could be clearly defined, recommend a solution and hope to make a difference for even one student, or for one teacher. Survey, Question, Read, Research, Review, Reform! I dubbed it my SQ4R method, borrowed from the Catholic Nuns who told us that in order to be good students we had to SQ3R – *Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review* when we started a new chapter in a textbook. The belief underlying my research study was grounded in the philosophy that social justice should prevail. The education system cannot continue to fail the students, nor can it fail the teachers. The education system must be fair; it must meet the needs of diverse learners, and the needs of the teachers that serve them. The standard is high; inclusion is an interaction of

elements that have yet to be defined in measurable constructs. Week by week, as inclusion evolves we will solve a piece of the puzzle and be closer to a win-win for students and teachers. This study is one piece of a puzzle, a puzzle so immense I cannot estimate the number of pieces in it or when it will be completed. If it proves to be an infinite journey, the merit will be in the gradual improvements and the lives touched along the way.

Importance of Study

Given that a teacher's satisfaction with their profession impacts the delivery of curriculum to students (Edmunds, 2003; Brackenreed, 2008), it is important to study teacher perceptions of their efficacy to teach in inclusive settings. Researchers have investigated teacher workload and have linked work related stress to some of the challenges inherent in inclusive education (Naylor, 2001; Edmunds, 2003; Brackenreed, 2008). Naylor (2001) remarked that while teachers expect the career to be challenging, the excessive hours of work and the demands beyond the role of teaching also negatively impacts teacher well being. While being effective as a teacher in an inclusive educational setting entails multifaceted challenges, many educators embrace the belief that all students, even those without special needs or exceptionalities benefit from inclusive schooling.   An inclusive school culture allows typically achieving students the opportunity to embrace diversity and develop a sense of responsibility for themselves and others (EECD, 2015; Loreman, McGhie-Richmond, Barber, & Lupart, 2009). This sentiment is echoed by Katz (2013) who insists that social and academic gains are realized through inclusive education.

Teaching in Canada means choosing to teach in inclusive settings. In the classroom, teachers fulfill more than an educational role in the schooling of learners. Teachers are often the first to observe academic or behavioural problems exhibited by students. On a daily basis, teachers identify students' needs and are often the first to discuss behaviours with parents or relevant agencies (Porter, 2008). Therefore, it is important to study within the local context to identify whether there are factors specific to a community that may be impeding inclusive practices or contributing to teacher workload stress. In 2003, Edmunds conducted a survey of teachers in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador. The survey results found no differences in teachers' perceptions of inclusion even though both provinces had different policies and practices around inclusion. While all teachers were reported to have positive attitudes toward inclusion in general, the survey revealed that teachers felt unprepared to teach students with special needs. Of particular interest, was that Nova Scotia teachers reported being confident that their efforts would produce overall positive effects and beneficial classroom dynamics whereas in Newfoundland and Labrador, teachers were not confident they were efficacious in inclusive settings.

For many years, researchers in Newfoundland have been exploring inclusive education (Philpott, 2002; Philpott, 2007a, Philpott 207b; Philpott & Dibbon, 2008; Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010; Philpott, Nesbit, Cahill, & Jeffery, 2004). The current study helps to explore whether teacher related demographic differences of Newfoundland and Labrador teachers explain teacher efficacy of inclusive practices. That is, are there any significant differences in reported efficacy of inclusive practice related to variables such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching

area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and rural or urban area. As a result of this study, it is hoped that the province will consider its findings and will address any significant problem areas through teacher education and/or professional development opportunities.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Overview

To address the issue of teachers' beliefs and values, a literature review was conducted on teacher attitudes towards inclusion. The following literature review attempts to provide a summary of the empirical research on inclusion as it relates to teacher attitudes, beliefs and perspectives towards inclusive classroom practice. This review includes literature from Canada, the United States, Europe and other countries. It is important to note that while the growing body of global research on inclusive education covers parameters including culture, policies, practices, gender, race, disability, poverty, social class and many others, this review limited the search parameters to keywords and phrases related to teachers and inclusion. Specific keywords used that related to teachers were: teacher attitudes, teacher perceptions, teacher efficacy, teacher views, teacher beliefs, teacher perspectives, teacher self-efficacy. Key words around inclusion were: disabilities, learning disabilities, special education needs, learning differences, exceptionalities, mainstreaming, inclusive practice and pedagogy, inclusion policy, culture, and integration. One obstacle in reviewing the findings was that the vast amount of literature on topics related to the inclusion was overwhelming.

Benefits of Inclusion

As noted by the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (European Agency) (2010) there are a number of reasons used to justify inclusive education. The primary reasons cited are usually educational, social and/or economical

in nature. From an educational perspective, schooling that is inclusive is considered best practice to benefit all children. In addition to the academic education, children receive the social benefit of interacting with a diverse population of children. Social diversity creates a socially just culture and is thought to deter prejudice and discrimination. Economically, it is suggested that inclusive schools are cost efficient when compared to alternate schools that specialize based on the nature of the diverse needs (European Agency, 2010).

Understanding the Challenges

Given the advantages above, there remain a number of primary concerns educators have expressed regarding inclusive practises. A literature review conducted by the European Agency summarized the primary concerns of educators as the need for: (1) widened participation to increase educational opportunity for all learners, (2) increased education and training in inclusive education for all teachers, (3) an organizational culture and ethos that promote inclusion, (4) support structures organized so as to promote inclusion, (5) flexible resourcing systems that promote inclusion, (6) policies that endorse inclusion, and (7) legislation that supports inclusion (European Agency, 2010). Consistency in inclusive terminology has also been identified as a concern of educators (European Agency, 2010; Philpott, 2007b, Sokal &Katz, 2015).

As will be demonstrated throughout the literature review, aside from a legal right, there is a cultural element to inclusion. At the school level, the school administrator is believed to set the tone for the cultural elements influencing inclusion. When the school culture is lead by administrators supportive of inclusion, all individuals feel a sense of

belonging. Therefore, it is important that school principals endorse practises that help all staff and students to realize their individual potential and feel valued assets to the school community (EECD, 2015). According to Mitchell (2014) there are numerous obstacles to implementing inclusive education including: class size, negative attitudes, focus on examinations, lack of supports, rigid teaching methods, assessment dominated by a medical model, lack of parent involvement, and, insufficient inclusive policies.

The European Agency's effort raises the point that different nationalities are using various terminologies to debate inclusive education. In fact, the definition of inclusion does vary across stakeholders with no consistency in the specific factors impacting education services.   To discuss any topic when parties are not clear on the construct being discussed is problematic (European Agency, 2010). The notion that the variation in terminology adds to confusion is well documented (European Agency, 2011; Philpott, 2007b, Sokal &Katz, 2015).

Collaboration has been identified as a challenge. The International Conference on Education held in Geneva November 25-28, 2008 by UNESCO the world's representatives from Ministries of Education, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society members has opened participation to include partners including researchers, practitioners, and representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (International Bureau of Education, 2015).

Negative attitudes towards people with disability have been heavily researched as a major hindrance to effective inclusion. Within the European context, research from the United Kingdom was reviewed as an example of national literature on inclusive practices.

In the United Kingdom, improving attitudes towards people with disabilities is a key priority of the National Disability Authority (NDA) in Dublin, Ireland. The key findings of a 2006 literature review carried out by the NDA revealed attitudes towards people with disabilities related to worldviews, employment, and education. The NDA findings revealed that: (1) young people with disabilities attach great importance to being treated sensitively and the same as anyone else, including being listened to and having their views and experiences treated as authentic, (2) schools can actively engage in challenging negative societal attitudes to disability, and (3) teachers' attitudes towards students with disabilities have a significant impact on their educational experience (National Disability Authority, 2006).

It is not surprising that the National Disability Authority findings draw attention to the continual existence of claims of discrimination identified by researchers. Highlighting discrimination against diverse students remains problematic. The concern is that while the law may mandate that children with disabilities attend public schools, the law may not ensure that these children will be accepted and treated fairly (NDA, 2006). Overall, the NDA literature is focused on the prejudiced attitudes experienced by students with disabilities. Their report cites research showing that inclusion fails to result in positive outcomes when there are overt and subtle messages laced with prejudice and discrimination inherent in classroom dialogues.

Teacher Attitudes on Inclusive Practices and Instruction

Attitudes towards inclusive practice may be positive, negative, or neutral. Common sense would suggest that it is difficult to thrive in a classroom under the

leadership of a teacher with negative views towards students with diverse needs.   It is not surprising that a review of the literature by Bhatnagar and Das (2013) found that a positive teacher attitude about inclusive practice was correlated with a positive attitude towards educational programming and ultimately results in successful implementation of learning outcomes. Barco (2007) also supports the notion that teacher attitude is the best predictor of success in inclusive classrooms. When the teacher's approach is one of acceptance and support for the student with diverse needs, this positive attitude is believed to translate into practices that are inclusive as well.

However, even educators with positive attitudes towards the diverse student, can have negative attitudes towards the documentation needed to support the student. Yet, consistently, many researchers claim that amongst the stressors described by teachers, the practice of inclusion has proven stressful (Brackenreed, 2008; Edmunds, 2003; World Health Organization, 2011). The most stressful factors related to inclusive practice were those perceived as impacting the time it takes to deliver instruction, time spent on additional paperwork, demands to participate in extracurricular activities and conflicts on an interpersonal level. Other stressors identified included more functional or administrative activates such as workload, time management, lack of general support, and insufficient teacher preparation (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brackenreed, 2008; Edmunds, 2003; Fouilhoux, 2008; Jordan, Schwartz & McGhie-Richmond, 2009).

In 2011, The World Health Organization reported that attitudinal barriers were a critical factor. The organization reported that when stakeholders (i.e. teachers, administrators, or individuals in general) have negative attitudes towards inclusive education, children are impacted. In particular, there is concern that some teachers may

believe that they are not obligated to teach a child with a disability (World Health Organization, 2011). Similarly, in the United Kingdom, the research presented the results of focus group interviews carried out with teachers to explore the limits to inclusion. With respect to attitudes and beliefs held by staff in schools, research found that teachers' responses included concerns relating to 1) children with emotional and behavioural difficulties, 2) children with learning difficulties who might lower the school's score in competitive national tests, 3) the belief that the needs of some children are too complex to be supported, 4) reluctance to take responsibility for students with special education needs, 5) fears about careers of teachers in special schools, and 6) lack of evaluated practices to demonstrate the value of inclusion (Evans & Lunt, 2002).

Fukuchi (2008) took a proactive approach when asking the essential question: "What motivates teachers?" as a means of understanding teachers' experience with inclusive education. The research findings indicated that teacher perspectives included: (1) the need for networking with parents because a parent's strong beliefs and passion for inclusive education can prove to inspire teachers, (2) the need to increase networking between teachers at different grade levels (i.e. junior to senior high collaboration), (3) that teamwork amongst teachers reinforces cooperation, (4) acknowledging that the majority of teachers are motivated by the awareness of being a pioneer, teachers found it exciting to discover something new such as learning Braille, or new teaching methods, (5) understanding that teachers are motivated by technology, therefore adequate accommodating equipment and flexibility are essential in inclusive education, and (6) that institutional support motivates teachers with availability of training workshops being a strong enabler of inclusive education (Fukuchi, 2008, p. 94).

From the above comments we can see that some teachers continue to struggle with the concept of inclusion on a variety of levels. In fact, there is a large collection of studies that focus on creating more positive teacher attitudes (Avaramidis & Norwich, 2002; Baglieri & Shapiro, 2012; Barco, 2007; Fukuchi, 2008; Hsien, 2007; Topping & Maloney, 2005). Newfoundland and Labrador teachers have expressed concerns that they are not addressing the needs of students with disabilities through inclusive practices in the regular classroom (Philpott, 2007b, Edmunds 2003). Newfoundland and Labrador teachers are not alone in their expression of concern. In 2007, The *MacKay Report on Inclusive Education* found that New Brunswick's parents, teachers and students had concerns about inclusive practices. MacKay concluded that schools in New Brunswick were at a critical stress point and on the verge of a necessary change in practices (MacKay, 2007). Mackay has advocated for alternative methods to provide educational services to students. The current study also highlights concerns around the methods teachers are using (i.e. inclusive practices), specifically this study explores: inclusive instruction, collaboration, and managing disruptive behaviours.

Jordan, Schwartz and McGhie-Richmond (2009) noted deficits in information on how to develop the skills needed to be effective as a teacher in an inclusive classroom. Part of the challenge has also been identifying how changes in teacher beliefs translate to changes in their teaching practices. Their research describes teachers as being either "interventionist" (able to consider the learner in terms of how they best learn) or "pathognomonic" (focused on the pathological characteristics of the learner) in their perspectives. Teachers with "pathognomonic perspectives tend to attribute internal, fixed and unreachable characteristics to their students with special education needs and

34

consider these characteristics as beyond the teachers' expertise and therefore beyond their help" (p. 538). Interventionist teachers "express the view that they have responsibility for instructing all their students and are responsible for reducing barriers to access for those students with disabilities and special needs" (p.538). Regardless of the teachers' perspective, the shift to inclusive practice has added to the duties of all classroom teachers.

Resources and Supports

The correlation between professional development and teacher attitudes shows that supports and professional development nurtures positive change in teachers' attitudes (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). Edmunds (1999) also argued that the attitudes about inclusion are developed by the quality and quantity of guidance and direction provided by teachers. However, studies reveal that schools are not equal in the type and amount of supports they provide to meet the special needs of students. Different school districts allocate resources to assist in-service teachers based on policy, funding and a variety of factors (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Evans & Lunt, 2002; Leatherman, 2007). Teachers in special education must be backed up by the organization with all the infrastructure and equipment needed to be effective (Fouilhoux, 2008). It is critical that teachers take advantage of professional development courses and that school administrators should be trained to lead the professional development of teachers in their schools (Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010).

When the use of supports would be beneficial, there are still teachers who do not seek additional supports and resources. Avaramidis and Norwich (2002) noted that for

inclusive practice to be successful, teachers must advocate on behalf of students with special education needs. As a result, educators need to ask administrators and special service providers for additional resources and assistance in the classroom. Research has established that from a teacher's perspective, it is difficult to facilitate inclusion of students with diverse needs in the classroom if support remains a challenge. For example, the type of support can include: social workers, paramedics, and specialist teachers (such as those able to use sign language). Teachers' perspectives for resources and supports focused on concern over their ability to deliver specialist services including speech therapy and services and supports to children with severe hearing problems and emotional and behavioural difficulties whose needs are not being addressed adequately by schools to overcome significant obstacles (Evans & Lunt, 2002).

One critical support that may be found in some classrooms is additional staffing in the form of educational assistants or aides. Even when supports are provided, there are sometimes further implications that need to be considered. It is common for schools to avail of assistants to help students with special needs. These assistants are adult workers (not certified teachers) and they have ample time to interact with the student one-on-one. Of concern is the fact that having an adult beside a student may actually interfere with the student's interaction with other school children. To truly be included in the social culture of a school the child with special needs must have the opportunity to develop friendships with peers. It is plausible that being closely monitored by an assistant interferes with social integration. There is a need to survey students' experiences of having an assistant (also referred to as a paraprofessional, teacher aide, student assistant etc.) to determine

whether the practices of the assistant interfere with social inclusion at the peer level (Katz et al, 2012).

Sokal & Katz (2015) have also expressed concern with the resources and programs used to address the mental health of students. It is believed that the traditional academic curriculum is insufficient to meet students' needs. In addition to the regular curriculum, they believe there is a need for social-emotional educational outcomes to support the mental health of school children. They advocate for the addition of inclusive resources on topics of mental health to be used with the entire school population. A study by Skårbrevik (2005) in Norway noted that many print resources are not even available in the Norwegian language. Therefore, there is a need for Norway to provide funding for producing educational materials for students. .

Collaboration

Collaboration, or teamwork, is generally understood as the action of working with someone to produce or create something. To provide services to students, teachers collaborate with students and parents on a daily basis. In "My school, my family, my life: Telling it like it is" the researchers, Lewis, Parsons and Robertson (2007), spoke directly to the need to give parents and students a voice in education reform. They reported that children with special needs are most concerned with being treated the same as their peers and want to be seen, heard, believed and treated with compassion. The National Disability Authority's senior researcher, Frances Hannon, also echoes the need for literature to report inclusive education experiences from the perspective of the student rather than from educators delivering the service (NDA, 2008).

In the province of Ontario, Canada, the Ministry of Education has responded to teachers' perspectives on parent involvement. Ontario implemented a Parent Engagement Policy in 2010 (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010), the goal of which was to increase parent involvement around inclusive education. Parent participation on school councils and committees and collaboration with teachers is encouraged throughout the policy. Promotion of inclusion is approached as a joint effort between school staff and parents (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009).

Internationally, collaboration between parents and teachers is gaining attention of all educators concerned with inclusive teaching practice (reference). Research across the globe indicates that collaboration should not be limited to teachers and support staff but that parents, students and youth organizations should also be included in the implementation of inclusive educational practices. This belief is grounded in the perspective that the voice of those who experience education is needed to inform effective inclusive education policies (Fouilhoux, 2008).

In addition, teachers must collaborate with, teachers must also collaborate as needed with government departments, community members, community agencies and organizations and a variety of other stakeholders. Teacher attitudes and beliefs towards the barriers to inclusive education included reporting difficulties that local education authorities experience with: (1) the management and organization of support services, (2) reluctance of health services to organize to support inclusion, and (3) lack of clear policy direction from senior management (Lunt & Evans, 2002, p.7). The need to collaborate with stakeholders in addition to parents and students is critical to facilitate change in policy. Porter and Smith (2011) also investigated multiple perspectives regarding the

roles of stakeholders in the implementation of inclusive practices and advocated for continued inquiry and policy change in this area.

Managing Disruptive Behaviour

Managing disruptive student behaviour is a well established area of concern in the discourse on inclusive practice (Flem, Moen & Gudmundsdottir, 2004; Gibbs & Powell, 2012; MacFarlane & Woolfson, 2013; McGhie-Richmond et al., 2013; Naylor, 2001; Stoutjesdijk, Scholte, & Swaab, 2012). Educators have a tendency to find that children with challenging behaviours are the most difficult to include in the regular classroom (Evans & Lunt, 2002). This was also the finding of Edmunds (2003) when teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador were surveyed: "teachers were almost exclusively concerned about "how I could properly manage the child" and/or "help those children be better behaved" within their classrooms" (p. 43).

Research also indicates that teacher attitudes towards inclusion may relate to the type and extent of the student's disability (Naylor, 2001; Stoutjesdijk, Scholte & Swaab, 2012; McGhie-Richmond et al., 2013). Avramidis and Norwich (2002) report that physical disabilities are more accepted than cognitive or behavioural disabilities. They note that it is often the case that as the student's behavioural challenges increase in severity and are perceived as less manageable and more disruptive in the classroom, teacher attitudes toward inclusion become more negative and they are less likely to favour inclusion (Idol, 2006). Naylor's study of teacher workload reported that students with behavioural problems negatively impact the teacher's ability to provide instruction to all the other students in the classroom (Naylor, 2001).

A study by Stoutjesdijk, Scholte, and Swaab (2012) investigated the special needs of children with emotional and behavioural disorders (EBD) who receive inclusive education at regular schools. It was found that support, teacher training, and a productive parent–professional partnership would be critical to building success for children with EBD. The researchers challenged educators to advocate for children with emotional and behavioural disorders. They were concerned that the typical classroom setting was not always the most appropriate learning environment for children with certain emotional and behavioural disorders. They concluded, that in some individual cases, the symptoms experienced by the child should dictate the setting in which the child is placed. However, the researchers also recognized that, at times, children with emotional behavioural disorders are placed in atypical settings that are also too restrictive. They emphasized the challenge but importance of establishing a reliable/valid process for the assignment of students with EBD special needs to educational settings that will best meet their individual needs (Stoutjesdijk, Scholte, & Swaab, 2012).

Additional research by MacFarlane and Woolfson (2013) examined teacher perceptions of students presenting with emotional and behavioural disorders. Their study considered the relationship between teacher attitudes and teacher behaviour toward children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. They found that as teachers became more senior in their careers, they were less willing to be assigned placement with students experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Of particular interest was the influence of school administration (i.e. particularly school principals) on promoting inclusion of students with emotional and behavioural difficulties in schools (MacFarlane and Woolfson, 2013). In addition, Stoutjesdijk, Scholte, & Swaab (2012) reported that

increasing teacher in-services by school administration regarding EBD improved

teachers' attitudes towards inclusive practise for this population. MacFarlane and

Woolfson (2013) cautioned that prior to offering teacher in-service, "investigation of the

determinants of teachers' attitudes and behaviour and their relative importance is crucial

for improving teaching practices, initial teacher education and professional development

opportunities for effective inclusion of children with special needs … particularly those

with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties" (p.51).

Literature on specific disorders also adds support to the need to address the

efficacy of teaching practices for students with symptoms of a behavioural nature

(Harding 2009; MacFarlane & Woolfson, 2013; Stoutjesdijk, Scholte, & Swaab, 2012).

A review by Harding (2009) recognizes the difficulty for a classroom teacher of

simultaneously managing the behaviour of the student with autism and the behaviour of

classmates. Harding explores both school culture and the roles and expertise of the

stakeholders providing supports including the teacher, instructional assistants, parents

and school administrators. In addition, behaviour management of all students must also

allow for the delivery of effective instruction. Although implementation of behaviour

modification is the primary function of the teacher aides, there is a tendency for the

teacher's authority to take precedence in the classroom. Further complicating matters

could be divergent views of parents. Harding (2009) also emphasizes the important role

of the school principal who must be able to mediate and resolve disputes between

students, teachers and parents.

In the course of investigating teacher attitudes, efficacy in managing disruptive

behaviour has been measured by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) using the Teacher

Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale (Malinen, Savolainen, & Xu, 2012; Park, Dimitrov, Das, & Gichuru, 2014; Sharma, Shaukat & Furlonger, 2015; Shaukat, 2013). The TEIP is an instrument to measure perceived teacher efficacy on three factors: efficacy in using inclusive instruction, efficacy in collaboration and efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviours. The TEIP scale items were selected based on congruence with the construct being explored (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012). With respect to disruptive behaviours, their scale defines the construct of disruptive behaviour as being measured by the following items: 1) I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour, 2) I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or nasty, 3) I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom when it occurs, 4) I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom, 5) I am able to get children to follow classroom rules, 6) I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive. The need for educators and researchers to continue to define, measure, and reform practices in order to effectively manage behaviour in inclusive settings has been recognized (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012).

Teacher Education

Katz, Porath, Bendu, and Epp (2012) acknowledge that the debate has shifted from debating inclusion as a philosophy to debating issues within the practice of inclusion that have remained problematic. In other words, the current focus is not about debating whether schools should be inclusive but how to perfect the practice of being inclusive. The complex issues under review include: how to help teachers prepare to manage an inclusive classroom, keep their teacher education current and become better

informed about necessary supports and resources as well as best practices for collaboration with stakeholders (Bennett, 2009).   On the topic of teacher education courses it has been recognized that while the extensiveness of the present-day school curriculum has increased dramatically, the length of teacher education courses has not increased to adjust for rapid growth in the school curriculum. However, one notable change is that most jurisdictions in Canada and/or United States are requiring that teachers gain registration to practice teaching (Forlin, Loreman, Sharma & Earle, 2009).

In the area of teacher training, universities have been changing their teacher education practices in response to the changing needs of students (Nougaret, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2005). There is also evidence that teacher registration requirements in contemporary society are changing to mandate courses on inclusion or as a minimum, require outcomes related to inclusion as mandatory in teacher preparation programmes (Alberta Education, 2009). For example, in Western countries such as New South Wales and Queensland, Australia, it is a mandatory requirement for all teachers to complete a subject in special or inclusive education (Subban and Sharma, 2006).

Advocating on behalf of new teachers, Dee (2011) states that new teachers are at risk of succumbing to the demands and stressors of the teaching profession. For that reason, it is argued that teacher education programs need to better prepare pre-service teachers. Such programs need to teach pre-service teachers the following skills: how to adapt curricular lessons and make necessary, accommodations, and modifications. These teacher skills are needed to meet the diverse needs of students. It is also argued that teacher training should always aim to promote emphasis on the individual child and strengths of the child rather than focusing on deficiencies (Fouilhoux, 2008). Essentially,

this view maintains that more positive attitude focused on what an individual can achieve, is far more beneficial to the learner than emphasizing what an individual is not capable of achieving.

The same sentiment had been put forth in 2003, when Edmunds conducted a comparative study in two Canadian provinces (Nova Scotia and Newfoundland). Teacher training was perceived as a critical area of concern. Deficits in teacher ability (i.e. the knowledge, skills and/or confidence to plan and make instructional adaptations to curriculum) was noted to be a major contributor to the quality of teaching students with special education needs. Substantial literature was cited by Edmunds to support the claim that classroom teachers have not been adequately prepared to modify curriculum to meet the needs of students with special learning needs (Edmunds, 2003). An Australian study of pre-service (student) teachers by Carroll (2003) examined teachers' negative attitudes towards inclusive practice. The researcher suggests that teacher training programs do not sufficiently prepare teachers to meet special education needs. Lack of preparation contributes to teachers' reports of feelings of discomfort, fear, uncertainty, vulnerability, and an inability to cope (Carroll, 2003; Kern, 2006).

It is believed that inclusion training for educators does have favourable effects on the attitudes of pre-service teachers towards (Mock & Kauffman, 2002; Dee, 2011) but has little effect on teachers' perceptions of preparedness to teach in inclusive classrooms. Hausstätter (2007) found that teachers expected their training to guide their interventions as special education teachers. Yet, Hausstätter's findings emphasised that it may also be the case that bias inherent in the teacher training program itself may impede the goal of working towards an inclusive education. Therefore, it is crucial that teacher education

44

programs undergo a review to insure they are free of any element of prejudice or stereotyping of students with special education needs.

The National Disability Authority (NDA) (2008) literature review also highlighted a need for intervention in the form of training to improve attitudes towards disabilities (National Disability Authority, 2008). Even teachers with positive attitudes towards inclusion report the need for this training. Leatherman (2007) conducted a study of teacher perceptions of teachers who had self-proclaimed positive views of inclusion. Leatherman found that teachers have a tendency to agree that the inclusive classroom is best practice, but often report the need for more training in how to meet the diverse needs of students in their classrooms. Beyond the classroom level, Canadian literature notes the efforts of school boards to provide diversity training programs within schools. For example, in Ontario, The Greater Essex County District School Board has developed a training program called "Diversity Matters" as part of its New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP). "Diversity Matters" is a mandatory one-day workshop that consists of four modules specifically designed to help teachers meaningfully address challenges in diverse classrooms (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009). Ontario is not the only Canadian province concerned about teacher training on inclusion. Alberta, Canada has also added inclusive education curriculum programs for teacher education (Alberta Education, 2009). However, an analysis of the literature on inclusive education reveals that the inclusive curriculum training improves Alberta teachers' attitudes towards inclusive practice but shows little impact on how prepared pre-service teachers believe they are for actually teaching in an inclusive setting (Loreman, McGhie-Richmond, Barber, & Lupart, 2009) Concerns remain that the training is heavily weighted in theory,

and provides little opportunity to practice the skills being taught (Peebles & Mendaglio, 2014). Similar to Canada, Brazil also uses teacher training as an indicator of efficacy to teach special education (Brazil Ministry of Education, 2008). Putting theory into practice to improve the nature of teacher education programs has emerged as a common theme in the literature. While acknowledging the value of practical experience, Hamman, Lechtenberger, Griffin-Shirley, and Zhou, (2013) caution that new teacher training must not be limited to collaboration with other teachers. The researchers maintain that for teacher training in inclusive practices to be meaningful more exposure is needed to the classroom setting. Suggestions for post secondary institutions to improve teacher training include: increasing field experience hours, considering the characteristics of the cooperating teachers with whom teacher candidates are placed, and proactive partnering with local school districts. Continued mentoring of new teachers by senior teachers committed to inclusive practices is also recommended (Spratt & Florian, 2015). Clearly, teacher training is an area that does not conclude with graduation from a post secondary institution. As the next section demonstrates, being a teacher involves dedication to lifelong learning in the profession.

Continued Professional Development

As discussed in the teacher education section above, many contemporary societies have begun to mandate that teacher education programs include courses on inclusive practice. The need to continue to develop teacher skills through continued professional development has often been an integral part of the profession. Professional development for in-service teachers has a similar history of challenges to those experienced by pre-service teachers.

Researchers have recognized that in spite of efforts to provide preservice teachers with systematic and differentiated teaching tools to meet the diverse needs of students, teachers have not felt adequately prepared to teach in inclusive settings (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brackenreed, 2008; Mock &Kauffman, 2002). Edmunds (2003) acknowledged that attitudes and confidence levels for inclusive practice were impacted by teacher preparation. In spite of differences in teacher reports, Hsien (2007) argued that research supports the development of a unified teacher preparation program. The same argument is echoed in literature on differentiation as all teachers are expected to be prepared to teach diverse populations of students. Thus, reform in teacher education is needed to ensure all teachers are prepared for the challenges of the modern classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2011; Santangelo & Tomlinson, 2012). So, while progress has been made (as per the preceding teacher education section) continued professional development remains an area of concern.

For teachers who earned teacher registration prior to the implementation of inclusion courses in their post-secondary education programs, professional development on inclusive practices is a critical source of knowledge. As Sokal and Katz (2015) noted in a Canadian study "Until recently, many certification standards did not include required courses related to inclusive education" (p.49). Therefore, some general classroom teachers have not taken courses on topics relating to inclusion. Even more experienced teachers who have prior experience with diverse students believe that there is a need for more lifelong learning opportunities to better prepare them for teaching students with disabilities (Sokal and Katz, 2015). In 2003, Edmunds argued that teacher concerns for preparedness to teach in inclusive settings are not being addressed. Fouilhoux (2008) notes that teacher unions continue to advocate for training to support teachers' ability to

meet the diverse needs of students. For teachers already in the workforce, access to ongoing professional development is needed to facilitate the successful implementation of inclusive education. The World Health Organization (WHO) also cites inadequate training and support for teachers of learners with disabilities as being problematic. The WHO maintained that there is a shortage of teachers with the competency to successfully meet the needs of children with disabilities (World Health Organization, 2011). Kalyva (2010) argued that teachers' knowledge of learning disabilities, autism, and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder is limited, yet they are often asked to participate in the diagnostic process. At this point in time, there are concerns that the challenges inherent in inclusive practice is undermining teacher's sense of professional ability, that is, teacher's believe they are failures as teachers (Edmunds, 2003).

Necessary professional development competencies have been identified. To improve teacher access to professional development designed to meet the needs of diverse learners some researchers have developed training programs. For example, Katz (2013) encourages teachers to explore methods outlined in Universal Design for Learning (UDL), that is, a set of principles for curriculum development that give all individuals equal opportunities to learn. Rather than focus on specific course development, Philpott, Furey, and Penney (2010) argue that there are six focus areas in which teachers need professional development training. These areas include professional development for: (1) inclusive policy, (2) diversity, (3) nurturing positive attitudes, (4) evidence-based teaching strategies (5) collaborative teaching, and (6) meaningful teaching (Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010, p. 43). While recommendations from the literature on the nature of professional development vary, there is consistency across the literature in the

48

identified need for additional training for both pre-service and practising teachers to meet the demands of the profession.

On an international level, research consistently supports the claim that teachers are the critical element in the successful implementation of inclusive schooling (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Brazil Ministry of Education 2008; European Agency, 2010; Evans & Lunt, 2002; Kuyini & Desai, 2007). Without doubt the teacher, as a leader in the classroom, has the potential to influence many classroom factors (Fouilhoux, 2008). Fouilhoux argues that teachers and their unions must continue to advocate for inclusive practices. This research indicates several teacher perspectives and beliefs including: (1) inclusion is not a new goal for teachers, (2) teachers are concerned and have pointed out that inclusive education has not been given adequate attention, (3) schools in some countries are not well prepared to deal with integration, (4) teachers are concerned that 72 million children are still out of school and do not even have a chance for any education, (5) teachers share specific concerns about teachers' professional support and working conditions, (6) concerns about the increase in recruitment of unqualified teachers in many countries, (7) in cases where mainstream education cannot be inclusive enough, teachers are concerned that special needs education remains a necessity (p.103).

To summarize, the literature review findings it appears that reform of teaching practice often stems from discourse on the barriers teachers face in the classroom. In the case of inclusion, a key factor has also been the need to positively alter the attitudes of teachers towards students with special education needs. As in the general population, the process of addressing the stereotyping and prejudice towards people with disabilities

proves to be a challenging process. Researchers continue to motivate educational reform.

The conclusive findings within this literary review suggest that five main themes emerge:

1. Training: Improving Teacher Training of Pre-Service Teachers

2. Professional Development: Improving Teacher Education In-service Teachers

3. Classroom Environment: Improving necessary working conditions

4. Collaboration: Increasing teamwork and collaboration with parents and students

5. Resources: Special Education Services and Supports

Developing strategies to implement a plan of action can start with teachers but must

include the voice of all stakeholders of the educational system. The focus of the literature

presented here highlights teacher attitudes towards inclusion as a whole. Future reviews

could examine the research for additional patterns and themes. For example, themes may

emerge from: curriculum area, grade level, specific disabilities, severity of disability,

teachers' age and/or gender, students' age and/or gender, or even by cultural differences.

The number of variables impacting attitudes is complex. Norwich (2013) argues that we

are not just debating the theoretical issues but also the practical challenges of putting

theory into practice. While research shows there are universal experiences, a proactive

school will participate in the process of engaging in discourse relevant to its own

population and culture.

Chapter III: Methodology

Quantitative Research

The current study is quantitative in nature and uses a cross-sectional survey

design. There were several reasons, for choosing a cross-sectional survey design as the

best method of collecting data to address the research problem being investigated at this time. Cross-sectional survey designs allow for the collection of data at one point in time. Such designs are frequently used in education to examine current attitudes, beliefs, opinions, or practices by having participants rate their agreement or disagreement with a statement (Creswell, 2012; Denzin &Lincoln, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Giardina & Denzin, 2013; Smeyers, 2015).

In survey research it is critical to obtain a sample population as large as possible to be confident the characteristics of the target population and sample will be similar. Creswell recommends a sample size of approximately 350 participants for a survey based study (Creswell, 2012). The current sample of 262 teachers represents nearly 10% of teachers in the two school districts surveyed (Western School District and Eastern School District in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador). As noted by Creswell, web-based questionnaires are popular; therefore, the researcher chose a web-based format. Such questionnaires use a form of survey design that allows participants to complete questions on a computer with internet access. The data from the survey is immediately made available to the researcher. Several software programs can be accessed from providers such as Qualtrix or Survey Monkey (Creswell, 2012). This researcher availed of survey software from Survey Monkey. The advantage of using a web-based format was that data was gathered quickly; the survey questions were easily entered into a user-friendly form by the researcher and were easily accessed by teachers through a link sent from their school principal. Given the extensive use of and familiarity the Web by many teachers, using a web-based design can prove advantageous (Creswell, 2012). While it is often the case that web-based surveys have a tendency to produce low response rates, the

51

current response was 6.36% of the teacher population surveyed. A web-based format was believed to be the most effective, efficient and economical means this researcher could have used to survey the sample population of teachers.

The current cross-sectional design allowed for demographic comparisons across groups. The survey questions included background or demographic questions that could examine the personal characteristics of teachers in the sample. As a result, comparisons could be made between teachers based on any of the following characteristics: age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and whether the school was in a rural or urban area. Thus the current study could examine any differences between a numbers of participant groups. For example, data from male and female teachers, as well as data from teachers with bachelor degrees and master degrees could be compared. The advantage of collecting the demographic data using a cross sectional design allowed for a measure of community needs of educational services (i.e. the specific needs of the population under study) (Creswell, 2012; Denzin &Lincoln, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Giardina & Denzin, 2013; Smeyers, 2015). Identifying a problem at a community level can inform more specific planning to resolve concerns. In the current study for example, the data comparison between rural and urban schools would allow for the identification of any differences in teachers' beliefs of their ability to collaborate relative to whether their community was rural or urban.

As Creswell suggested, questions in the cross-sectional survey can be used to obtain individual, personal, attitudinal or behavioural information. The current cross-

sectional survey design also allowed for exploration of teacher beliefs (i.e. attitudes) on the behaviours explored by the non-demographic questions on the survey. Non-demographic data questions in the current study were originally published by researchers Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) as the *Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale (TEIP)*. The TEIP sorted statements into four scales. The four scales are (1) Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices, (2) Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions, (3) Efficacy in Collaboration, and (4) Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour. Each scale included statements that required the teacher respondent to Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, or Strongly Agree.

It is difficult to design a good survey instrument. The process of developing the survey is complex and challenging (Creswell, 2012; Fowler, 2013; Smeyers, 2015) and is outside the current researcher's area of competency. For this reason the instrument design used by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012) was used with the permission of Loreman (Loreman, personal communication, March 6, 2012).

The final justification for using cross-sectional survey design was that this form also allowed for open-ended comments at the end of the survey. The drawback of relying solely on an open-ended form is the time consuming nature of categorizing the responses into themes or numerical formats for meaningful analysis (Creswell, 2012; Denzin &Lincoln, 2005; Giardina & Denzin, 2013). In the current survey, 28 teachers availed of the opportunity to provide additional comments which were analyzed according to themes. The advantage of providing a comment section was that the survey would allow teachers to opportunity to offer additional information based on their own personal experience and insights.

53

Participants

In 2012, there were approximately 6000 teachers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador working in five different geographical regions referred to as districts (Labrador, Western, Nova Central, Eastern, and Conseil Scolaire Francophone) (Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2015a). All districts were invited to participate in the study but only two school districts approved this researcher's request to invite teachers to participate in the research project. As a result only teachers from Western School District and Eastern School District participated in the survey. From September to October of 2012, two hundred and sixty two teacher participants (59 men and 203 women) employed as teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, took part in the study. There were one hundred and seventeen teacher participants from Western School District and one hundred and forty five teacher participants from Eastern School District. In 2012, there were 1,032 teachers employed in Western School District and 3,089 teachers employed in Eastern School District. The survey population represents 262 of those 4,121 teachers (i.e. 6.36%).

As noted, appropriate ethical permission was gained from two school districts: Western School District and Eastern School District. The remaining school districts declined approval and chose not to participate in the study. In September of 2012, a recruitment request was sent to all school principals in Western School District and Eastern School District inviting teachers in those district schools to participate in the survey. The recruitment request was sent through an e-mail containing a hyperlink to the survey on Survey Monkey, an online site that stores data on an American server

(MacDonald, 2013). When completing the survey, teachers were asked to give informed consent before they could answer the survey questions (see Appendix C for the recruitment e-mail and consent form). Teachers who volunteered to participate completed the survey between September – October, 2012 and data was readily available to this researcher in electronic format.

Ethics

The proposal for the current research project was submitted to the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR) at Memorial University in Newfoundland and Labrador. Since the study involved research with human subjects (i.e. teachers) the researcher was required to obtain appropriate approval from the proper authority at the school board level prior to the collection of the data. The ICEHR also required that participants clearly understood that participation in the survey was not a job requirement and that the school board(s) would not know which teachers did or did not participate in the study (ICEHR personal communication, June 13, 2012). No identifying information was requested or provided on the surveys and access to the data was limited to the research team conducting the administration and/or analysis, all of which had signed confidentiality agreements. All ethical concerns of the ICEHR were addressed including the process of obtaining and/or withdrawing consent to participate in the study. This study made every attempt to comply with the ethical standards for conducting research with human subjects.

Description of Survey Instrument

All the items on The *Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale (TEIP)*
developed by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin, (2012) were used as the basis for the survey
instrument used in this study.   The TEIP is an 18-item survey instrument that is
designed to help understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine
classroom activities in creating an inclusive classroom environment. Specifically it
measures three constructs (1) perceptions of teaching efficacy in using inclusive
instruction where Inclusive Instruction refers to strategies that promote the inclusion of
all learners; (2) perceptions of teacher efficacy in working with parents and other
professionals, referred to as Efficacy in Collaboration; and (3) self-perceptions of
teaching efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviours, referred to as Efficacy in
Managing Behaviour (Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin, 2012). The TEIP has been
internationally validated. Consent to use the TEIP was obtained from Tim Loreman,
Professor Faculty of Education, Concordia University College of Alberta (Loreman,
personal communication, March 6, 2012).

The TEIP (Appendix A) original questionnaire was used and demographic
questions were added to capture data on teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador
(Appendix B). Newfoundland and Labrador teachers were asked to identify their: age,
gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary,
elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students
diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and whether the school they worked in was in
a rural or urban area. The additional demographic questions in the survey instrument
increased the number of research questions to twenty-eight compared with eighteen
questions and response prompts of the original TEIP survey (Appendix B).

Each of the demographic characteristics was treated as an independent variable in this study. Demographic information included: age, gender, years of teaching experience, highest level of education, teaching area (primary, elementary, intermediate, high school), years of teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities, school district, and whether the school was in a rural or urban area. Each of the four scales was treated as dependent variables in this study. For the purpose of analysis the scales were: (1) Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices, (2) Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions, (3) Efficacy in Collaboration, and (4) Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour.

Scales

The original TEIP scale questions used a six point Likert scale with the responses: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree. For the purpose of this study the same six point Likert scale responses were presented after each scale question.

The first scale *Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices* consisted of all questions related to efficacy in the survey instrument (Appendix A). The second, third and fourth scales (*Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions*, *Efficacy in Collaboration*, and *Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour* respectively*)* consisted of six questions each (Appendix E).

Reliability of Measures

The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale (TEIP) was used as the basis for the instrument used in this study. The TEIP is an 18-item scale developed on a sample

of 607 pre-service teachers selected from countries including Canada, Australia, Hong Kong and India. Higher TEIP scale scores indicate higher efficacy in implementing inclusive practices. The overall TEIP scale consists of three sub-scales: efficacy in using inclusive instructions, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing behaviour. The developers report the following alpha coefficients based on Canadian measures: The 18-item TEIP scale had high reliability in terms of the alpha coefficient ($\alpha = 0.88$). The alpha coefficients for the three sub-scales were 0.97 for efficacy in using inclusive instructions, 0.86 for efficacy in collaboration, and 0.88 for efficacy in managing behaviour (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012). The TEIP has been cited by various researchers (Malinen, Savolainen, & Xu, 2012; Park, Dimitrov, Das, & Gichuru, 2014; Sharma, Shaukat & Furlonger, 2015; Shaukat, 2013) and has been validated internationally.

Analysis of Data

Use of ANOVA

An analysis of variance was conducted to inform interpretation of the data. There are several strengths to using an ANOVA. An ANOVA helps determine effect size. Using a statistical software program, analysis of variance would produce statistical results for main effects and interaction effects. Main effects are the influences of each independent variable on the outcome (Creswell, 2012; Denzin &Lincoln, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Giardina & Denzin, 2013; Smeyers, 2015). As Creswell (2012) noted, statistical significance and the strength of the difference between the two means is an important measure to determine. An ANOVA is able to calculate significance and the range of acceptable scores (confidence intervals), and can quantify the strength of the difference

between two means or two variables by determining an effect size. For analysis of variance (ANOVA), effect size (eta 2) is measured using the percentage of the variance due to the variable under study (Creswell, 2012).

Use of Thematic Data Analysis

As recommended by the developers of the TEIP, collecting information in the form of open-ended questions to improve the interpretation of the scale data is beneficial (Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012). Edmunds (2003) also noted the usefulness of "purposefully solicit[ing]" written comments about the issues using carefully framed research questions. As a result, in addition to completing the scale questions, teachers were given the opportunity to provide spontaneous comments at the end of the survey (see Appendix D). Overall, 28 of 262 participants availed of the opportunity to make comments. Of the 28 comments, 16 teacher comments provided data for interpretation; the remainder were statements of appreciation (i.e. thank-you for the opportunity to participate).

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) discuss thematic analysis of data as an inductive analysis strategy. Overall, a qualitative research study demands that the data be analyzed to provide answers to research questions. Findings are inductively derived from the data in the form of a theme. Essentially, the researcher identifies recurring patterns (i.e. themes) derived from the data. Broad themes tend to emerge from data sets. (Few more sentences re thematic analysis, how do broad themes emerge from narrow themes/generalizations? Interpretation of the themes leads the researcher to an understanding of the participants' perceptions of the phenomenon of interest (Creswell,

59

2012; Denzin &Lincoln, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Giardina & Denzin, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Smeyers, 2015). Guided by the research questions, the current researcher used the themes reflected in the TEIP scales to label themes based on two to four key words that captured the core variables under investigation. Additional themes were derived based on two to four keywords from categories in the literature review on inclusion. Since the four scales contain key words (practices, collaboration, behaviour) comments were sorted by those broad themes. Statements within the scales and/or literature review also contained key words such as collaboration, resources, and professional development. Therefore, using a key word thematic approach, teacher comments were sorted into the following themes: Inclusive Practices, Resources and Supports, Collaboration, Professional Development, and Managing Disruptive Behaviours. In addition, there were comments related to possible limitations of the study.

Chapter IV: Results

The TEIP scale results, demographics and the open-ended comments of participants are presented in this section. As noted in the methodology section of this paper, the scale items were investigated by use of statistical software to determine the analysis of variance (i.e. ANOVAs were used). The open-end comments were analyzed by categorizing the responses into themes for meaningful analysis.

Demographic Analysis

As shown in Table 1, of the two hundred and sixty two teacher participants, 59 were male and 203 were women. The majority of the surveys were answered by females (77.5%) and the majority of responses were from the Eastern School District (55.3%). The majority of the surveys were completed by teachers aged 41 through 50 years old (45.8%) and the majority of teachers reported they have 11-20 years of teaching experience (36.3%). Overall, the majority of teachers reported their highest level of education was a Master's/Doctorate Degree (54.2%) and the majority were from a rural area (66.4%) and spent most of their time teaching in an Elementary school (34.7%).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=262)

Demographic variable		N	Percent
Gender	Male	59	22.5
	Female	203	77.5
Age	20-30	47	17.9
	31-40	71	27.1
	41-50	120	45.8
	Over 50 years	24	9.2

Years of experience	0-5	34	13
	6-10	55	21
	11-20	95	36.3
	Over 20 years	77	29.4
Highest level of education	Bachelor's degree	120	45.8
	Master's/Doctorate degree	142	54.2
Teaching area you spent most of your time teaching	Primary	46	17.6
	Elementary	91	34.7
	Intermediate	50	19.1
	High school	75	28.6
Current school district	Western district	117	44.7
	Eastern district	145	55.3
Geographic location	Urban	88	33.6
	Rural	174	66.4

An alpha level of .01 was used for all analyses. As Creswell (2012) notes, a significance level (or alpha level) is a probability level that reflects the maximum risk that observed differences are due to chance. Setting the alpha level of .01 (1 out of 100 times the sample score will be due to chance) represents an extremely low risk that differences in the data set are due to chance. Four scales were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The four scales were (1) Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices, (2) Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions, (3) Efficacy in Collaboration, and (4) Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour. The mean of each scale is reported in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Descriptive data for dependent variables used in the data analysis.

Scales	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min-Max	Skewness
TEIP	262	88.40	9.04	18-108	-0.155
Efficacy to use inclusive instructions	262	30.24	2.96	6-36	-0.182
Efficacy in collaboration	262	29.32	3.69	6-36	-0.376
Efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviour	262	28.84	3.67	6-36	-0.293

Each scale was analyzed for the following variables: gender of teacher (male, female), age of teacher (20-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61+), highest level of education attained by the teacher (Bachelor's degree, master's degree, Doctorate degree), years of teaching experience (0-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31+), teaching area of expertise (Primary, Elementary, Intermediate, High School), school district (Western District, Eastern District), school community (urban, rural). Since only two participants indicated they held doctorate degrees their data was added to the participants with master's degrees. Thus, the variable highest level of education attained by the teacher was designated as either bachelor's degree, or master's degree (which included the two participants with doctorate degrees).

Scale Data Analysis

The first scale *Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices* consisted of all questions related to efficacy in the survey instrument, it had high internal consistency with a Cronbach alpha of .90. Scores ranged from 18 to 108. Higher scores indicated higher levels of efficacy. The second scale, *Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions* had high internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .79. Scores ranged from 6 to 36. Higher scores indicated higher levels of efficacy using inclusive instructions. The third scale *Efficacy in Collaboration* had high internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .79. Scores ranged from 6 to 36. Higher scores indicated higher levels of efficacy using collaboration. The fourth scale, *Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour* had high internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .79. Scores ranged from 6 to 36. Higher scores indicated higher levels of managing disruptive behaviour.

Further analysis revealed the internal consistency levels (i.e. Cronbach alpha) for the current study in comparison to Canadian and Australian data as reported by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012). Reliability coefficients for the four scales are noted in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Reliability Coefficients N=262: Teacher efficacy for inclusive practices scale

Scales	Number of items	Alpha Newfoundland and Labrador	Alpha Canada	Alpha Australia
TEIP	18	0.90	0.88	0.91
Efficacy to use inclusive instructions	6	0.79	0.97	0.78
Efficacy in collaboration	6	0.79	0.86	0.81
Efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviour	6	0.79	0.88	0.83

Note: Canadian and Australian data comes from (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012)

The first scale, *Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices* was investigated using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA calculated on gender of teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .37$, $p = .544$; age of teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 2.35$, $p = .073$; participants' years of teaching experience revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3,257) = 2.60$, $p = .054$; highest level of education attained by the teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = 4.20$, $p = .041$; teaching area of expertise revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 1.10$, $p = .349$; school district revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .17$, $p = .684$; school community revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .001$, $p = .982$. That is, all means for the variables analyzed in the Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices scale showed no significant differences. The

demographic variables for the scale *Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices* are presented

in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Demographic and Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices (TEIP).

Demographic variable		N	Mean	SD	MS	*F*	*p*
Gender	Male	59	89.03	9.14	30.158	0.368	.544
	Female	203	88.22	9.02	81.90		
Age	20-30	47	86.09	7.75	188.73	2.346	.073
	31-40	71	88.46	10.12	80.45		
	41-50	120	88.55	8.86			
	Over 50 years	24	92.00	7.99			
Years of	0-5	34	87.24	6.85	208.046	2.583	0.054
	6-10	55	86.27	9.02	80.583		
	11-20	95	88.40	9.32			
	Over 20 years	77	90.47	9.30			
Highest level of	Bachelor's degree	120	87.17	8.86	339.293	4.204	.041
	Master's/Doctorate	142	89.45	9.10	80.707		
Teaching area	Primary	46	86.93	8.86	89.816	1.101	.349
	Elementary	91	88.97	8.15	81.603		
	Intermediate	50	87.24	9.26			
	High school	75	89.39	9.96			
Current school	Western district	117	88.66	8.80	13.590	0.166	.684
	Eastern district	145	88.20	9.25	81.960		
Geographic	Urban	88	88.39	9.30	0.044	.001	.982
	Rural	174	88.41	8.89	82.012		

The second scale, Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions was investigated using a

one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA calculated on gender of teacher

revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .576$, $p = .449$; age of teacher

revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 1.24$, $p = .294$; participants' years of

teaching experience revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3,257) = 1.56$, $p = .200$;

highest level of education attained by the teacher revealed the analysis was not

significant, $F(1, 260) = 1.00$, $p = .318$; teaching area of expertise revealed the analysis

was not significant, $F(3, 258) = .631$, $p = .596$; school district revealed the analysis was

not significant, $F(1, 260) = .923$, $p = .337$; school community revealed the analysis was

not significant, $F(1, 260) = .554$, $p = .457$. That is, all means for the variables analyzed in

the Efficacy to use Inclusive Instructions scale showed no significant differences. The

demographic variables for the scale *Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions* are presented

in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Demographic and Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions.

Demographic variable		N	Mean	SD	MS	*F*	*p*
Gender	Male	59	29.98	3.00	5.045	0.576	0.449
	Female	203	30.32	2.95	8.757		
Age	20-30	47	29.85	2.55	10.848	1.244	0.294
	31-40	71	30.13	3.43	8.718		
	41-50	120	30.26	2.83			
	Over 50 years	24	31.25	2.72			
Years of teaching	0-5	34	30.44	2.06	13.592	1.559	0.200
	6-10	55	29.60	3.21	8.720		
	11-20	95	30.17	2.98			
	Over 20 years	77	30.70	3.06			
Highest level of	Bachelor's degree	120	30.04	2.88	8.750	1.001	0.318
	Master's/Doctorate	142	30.41	3.02	8.743		
Teaching area	Primary	46	29.83	2.91	5.537	0.631	0.596
	Elementary	91	30.43	2.81	8.780		
	Intermediate	50	30.00	3.02			
	High school	75	30.43	3.14			
Current school	Western district	117	30.44	2.81	8.075	0.923	0.337
	Eastern district	145	30.08	3.07	8.745		
Geographic	Urban	88	30.43	3.12	4.852	0.554	0.457
	Rural	174	30.14	2.88	8.758		

The third scale, Efficacy in Collaboration was investigated using a one-way

analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA calculated on gender of teacher revealed

the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .716$, $p = .398$; age of teacher revealed the

analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 1.88$, $p = .134$; participants' years of teaching

experience revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3,257) = 2.59$, $p = .053$; highest

level of education attained by the teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1,$

$260) = 3.31$, $p = .070$; teaching area of expertise revealed the analysis was not significant,

$F(3, 258) = 2.01$, $p = .112$; school district revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1,$

$260) = 1.23$, $p = .268$; school community revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1,$

$260) = .000$, $p = .985$. That is, all means for the variables analyzed in the Efficacy in

Collaboration scale showed no significant differences. The demographic variables for the

scale *Efficacy in Collaboration* are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Demographic and Efficacy in Collaboration.

Demographic variable		N	Mean	SD	MS	*F*	*p*
Gender	Male	59	28.97	3.76	9.777	0.716	0.398
	Female	203	29.43	3.68	13.660		
Age	20-30	47	28.64	3.65	25.350	1.877	0.134
	31-40	71	29.17	4.08	13.509		
	41-50	120	29.39	3.57			
	Over 50 years	24	30.79	2.89			
Years of teaching	0-5	34	28.76	3.73	34.847	2.593	0.053
	6-10	55	28.38	3.50	13.440		
	11-20	95	29.44	3.63			
	Over 20 years	77	30.08	3.80			
Highest level of	Bachelor's degree	120	28.88	3.67	44.721	3.306	0.070
	Master's/Doctorate	142	29.70	3.68	13.526		
Teaching area	Primary	46	29.04	3.28	27.168	2.014	0.112
	Elementary	91	29.95	3.23	13.488		
	Intermediate	50	28.40	4.03			
	High school	75	29.36	4.13			
Current school	Western district	117	29.04	3.70	16.775	1.230	0.268
	Eastern district	145	29.55	3.68	13.633		
Geographic	Urban	88	29.32	3.90	0.005	0.000	0.985
	Rural	174	29.33	3.60	13.698		

The fourth scale, Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour was investigated using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA calculated on gender of teacher revealed the analysis was significant, $F(1, 260) = 9.04$, $p = .003$; age of teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 2.81$, $p = .040$; participants' years of teaching experience revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3,257) = 2.38$, $p = .071$; highest level of education attained by the teacher revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = 5.83$, $p = .016$; teaching area of expertise revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(3, 258) = 1.90$, $p = .130$; school district revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = 1.82$, $p = .179$; school community revealed the analysis was not significant, $F(1, 260) = .406$, $p = .525$. That is, all means for the variables analyzed in the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour scale showed a significant difference for gender. On average, male teachers ($M = 30.08$, $SD = 3.59$) and female teachers ($M = 28.48$, $SD = 3.62$) differ significantly on the efficacy of managing disruptive behaviours, $F(1, 260) = 9.04$, $p = .003$. Males scored higher on their ratings for managing disruptive behaviour in the classroom compared to their female colleagues. The demographic variables for the scale *Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour* are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Demographic and Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour.

Demographic variable		N	Mean	SD	MS	*F*	*P*
Gender	Male	59	30.08	3.59	118.041	9.039	0.003
	Female	203	28.48	3.62	13.059		
Age	20-30	47	27.60	3.14	37.009	2.806	0.040
	31-40	71	29.17	3.64	13.187		
	41-50	120	28.91	3.68			
	Over 50 years	24	29.96	4.21			

		N	Mean	SD		F	p
Years of teaching	0-5	34	28.03	2.78	31.516	2.375	0.071
	6-10	55	28.29	3.55	13.271		
	11-20	95	28.79	3.91			
	Over 20 years	77	29.69	3.69			
Highest level of	Bachelor's degree	120	28.25	3.51	76.993	5.826	0.016
	Master's/Doctorate	142	29.34	3.74	13.216		
Teaching area	Primary	46	28.07	3.41	25.328	1.901	0.130
	Elementary	91	28.60	3.46	13.323		
	Intermediate	50	28.84	3.78			
	High school	75	29.60	3.92			
Current school	Western district	117	29.18	3.67	24.409	1.819	0.179
	Eastern district	145	28.57	3.66	13.419		
Geographic	Urban	88	28.64	3.44	5.478	0.406	0.525
	Rural	174	28.94	3.78	13.491		

Teacher Comments: Data Analysis

Twenty eight participants availed of the opportunity to make comments. Of the 28

comments, 16 comments provided data for interpretation; the remainder were statements

of appreciation (i.e. thank-you for the opportunity to participate). Using a key word

thematic approach to sorting the teacher comments, the comments were sorted into

themes based on characteristics of the scales (i.e. inclusive instruction, collaboration,

disruptive behaviour) and patterns in the literature review (Creswell,2012; Merriam &

Tisdell, 2016). Themes for analysis included: Inclusive Practices, Resources and

Supports, Collaboration, Professional Development, and Managing Disruptive

Behaviours. In addition, there were comments related to possible Limitations of the study

so these are presented as well. When a teacher made a comment that contained

information on two themes, each theme was considered separately.

Comments on Inclusive Practices

Teacher comments cannot be considered to be explanations for the quantitative data. However, spontaneous comments provide additional data on teacher perspectives and convey that several teachers have strong feelings about the areas questioned (Edmunds, 2003). Some of the comments addressed issues that were not questioned by the TEIP. For example, one teacher commented about the learning environment (i.e. setting). As the teacher explained, *"I am not convinced that inclusive practices are the be[s]t for all students in all subjects. I have seen many instances when a child would benefit more from a setting other than the regular classroom." (Teacher #10).* Edmunds (2003) also found that some teachers believe that the regular classroom is not always the best placement depending on the student and the subject being taught. Often, debate usually pivoted around the poor implementation of inclusive practices rather than opposition to including students with regular needs in the regular classroom (Walter-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin & Williams, 2000).

Another variable introduced in the current study through teacher comments was the age of the student. One teacher felt that *"… inclusionary practices are more easily seen and implemented in the primary class. As the student progresses through school, getting older and physically "bigger" certain challenges may arise especially with behavioural difficulties. I feel confident in Primary implementing Inclusion however I may not feel that same confidence in Intermediate or senior high."(Teacher #12).*

Comments on Resources and Supports

On the theme of Resources and Supports, several comments related to staffing the classroom with Instructional Resource Teachers (IRT) and /or Student Assistants. Comments included:

"I strongly feel that much of the responsibility of children with needs is left to the classroom teacher with little and certainly not enough support. By support I mean, having an extra set of hands and not having someone else make suggestions as to what to do. In many cases classroom teachers know what needs to be done in order to meet the needs of the many children but there is no time available for one teacher to get to all of the children and meet all of their needs." *(Teacher #7)*

"The issue or problem area for classroom teachers usually relates to lack of support from the system (child doesn't qualify for IRT support time). It is often a major challenge to offer some students accommodations while trying to manage the other 25 students in the room. An extra pair of hands is often needed but is never, or is sporadically provided." *(Teacher # 21)*

"The time required to carry out the plans in a busy classroom is a problem. If there were only one child in a class with a disability it would be different, but there are usually several and their needs can overwhelm the class. The level of student assistant and other supports is not adequate to meet the needs of the children with disabilities or their classes." *(Teacher # 11)*

"Teachers need more IRT time to effectively implement the inclusion model. It's also important to note that pull out programs are still sometimes best, but seems to be greatly frowned upon by the board. Personally, I am not near as efficient as I would like to be in the inclusive classroom. There are a lot of balls to juggle, and I haven't found that balance yet. " (Teacher # 34)

"In dealing with students with disabilities, it is important that the teacher has adequate support in the classroom. Not all students, especially behaviour issues, are having their needs met due to the lack of support given in staffing. Also, team teaching in an inclusive environment only works if all involved with the student is involved and supportive of the process of inclusion. For some senior teachers, this is still a slow process."(Teacher #22)

"More special services support is needed (waiting for months on end to receive more support time that is greatly needed is not right) and the teacher allocation formula for smaller schools should not be the same as in larger schools."(Teacher # 23)

In Newfoundland and Labrador, the role of an Instructional Resource Teacher (IRT) shares some common responsibilities of the classroom/subject teacher: "Although some roles are common to classroom/subject teachers and instructional resource teachers, it is important to acknowledge that both teachers bring areas of expertise from their respective fields which complement each other and enrich the teaching/learning environment" (Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2015b, p1). The role of classroom teachers and IRT teachers differ from the role of Student Assistants: "Student assistants are provided to school

districts to support teachers in meeting the physical, personal care and behaviour management needs of students with severe needs." (Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2015c, p1).

Overall, the teacher comments on resources and supports suggest that some teachers feel additional staffing of IRT and student assistants is needed to support inclusive practices in the classroom. It may be that the criterion for availing of IRT support is too restrictive, that is, only students with severe needs qualify for IRT supports. Thus, it is problematic when there are high numbers of students with mild to moderate needs demanding extra help from the classroom teacher.

Comments on Collaboration

Comments on collaboration with staff echoed the concern that resources and supports are needed for effective collaboration to occur. The following comments on collaboration referenced the need for more adult staff to assist in the classroom, or to collaborate with:

"If we are to meet the many varied needs we need more hands present in the classroom and not just on a consult basis. It's no good for someone to be consulting me on what I should be doing, when there is no more time/help to actually do it. We already have lots of people advising us what we should be doing but we need help doing it."(Teacher # 7)

"I feel most classroom teachers would agree that today's classrooms need more support than they are presently receiving. Possibly more team teaching, planning, and of course more planning time with colleagues." (Teacher # 21)

"I feel the questions do not take into account school/district resources, and teacher time. For example, I strongly agree that I am capable of working with other professionals, but I have very seldom had the opportunity to do so." (Teacher #16)

Comments on Professional Development

The theme of professional development was an area that did not elicit many teacher comments. One teacher commented on the need to make the information provided in professional education more specific to individual student differences:

"I feel the biggest issue with inclusion in the classroom is that teachers are not provided with adequate education in providing optimal support to students with special needs. Too often there is only a quick professional development session in which a blank/generic view is given. However, each child is unique as is disability. Because of this many teachers are not able to provide exactly what each child requires."(Teacher # 15)

Comments on Managing Disruptive Behaviours

The theme of managing disruptive behaviours elicited teacher concerns that children without disabilities or special needs are negatively impacted when teachers must attend to the needs of children with disruptive behaviours. Comments included:

"Having a disruptive or needy child only makes the situation more difficult. If there is a disruptive child then the teacher has to stop everything and attend to that situation."(Teacher # 7)

"It is also a problem when behaviours interfere with learning and these behaviours are not necessarily those of the children with the diagnosed disability."(Teacher # 11)

"I feel that because of inclusion that some schools are becoming completely focused on behaviour and not academics. Children with pervasive needs are impacting the way teachers have to teach to the point that all their time is taken up with dealing with the severe behaviour and classroom management and losing valuable time to actually teach the curriculum. Children who do not have special needs are suffering and are not getting a quality education because of inclusion."(Teacher # 14)

While the investigation of student attitudes was outside the purpose of the current study, it is interesting to note that Katz, Porath, Bendu, and Epp (2012) stressed that all students need self-awareness of their abilities, knowledge of how ability is assessed, and an understanding of the roles of staff working with students.

Comments on Limitations of the Study

Teachers also commented about limitations of the current study. While the TEIP was validated by the developers, there concern was expressed about self-reporting and inflated self-ranking. As a teacher explained, *"The questions are set up in a way that it seems teachers are rating themselves. I can't see why someone would agree that they are not good at their job (since your questions are essentially asking interviewees if they feel they are doing their job properly)…We all try our best don't we? And if we do not, we are not likely to admit this to someone else."(Teacher # 42).* Barker, Pistrang & Elliott (2005) note that while the self report data gives the perspective of an individual, self report data

can have the potential to be invalid. Validity is a concern, because individuals may deceive themselves or others.

Another teacher expressed concern about the wording of survey questions:

 "… the questions sometimes used the word 'able' and other times the word 'confident'. I wonder how using two words rather than one will affect the survey results since no standard definitions were provided."(Teacher # 38).

Chapter V: Moving Towards Inclusion

Discussion

The research questions guiding this study were: (1) Do teachers in rural areas report higher efficacy of inclusive practices than their colleagues in urban centers? (2) As the years of teaching experience increase does efficacy of inclusive practices increase? (3) Does the gender of the teacher make a difference to efficacy of inclusive practice? and (4) Does the school district in which the teacher is employed make a difference to efficacy of inclusive practices? Based on the current study, the answer to each research question was "No." The data from the current survey indicates that with the exception of a significant correlation between teacher gender and management of disruptive behaviour; no significant correlations were found between demographic variables and the four TEIP four scales (i.e. (1) Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices, (2) Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions, (3) Efficacy in Collaboration, and (4) Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour). That is, teachers in rural areas are not more efficacious than their urban colleagues, teacher seniority, gender and age do not make a difference to efficacy of inclusive practices, and neither does highest level of education, teaching area, nor the district in which a teacher is employed. More specifically, the participants in this study showed no significant differences in Efficacy of Overall Inclusive Practices, Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions, or Efficacy in Collaboration for the following variables: gender of teacher, age of teacher, level of education attained by the teacher, years of teaching experience, teaching area of expertise, school district, or school community.

77

Similarly, the participants show no significant differences in Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour for the following variables: age of teacher, level of education attained by the teacher, years of teaching experience, teaching area of expertise, school district, or school community. The only significant finding was that the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour differed significantly between males and females. Male teachers reported being more efficacious in managing disruptive behaviour. This finding was not anticipated; as such it was not discussed as a research question for this study.

The remainder of this discussion will focus on the significant finding that male teachers in this survey differ from their female colleagues on managing disruptive behaviour. Efficacy beliefs are a challenging area of research (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). While male teachers' self-perceptions of efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviours differ significantly from female teachers' self perceptions of efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviours, this finding does not mean male teacher are better at managing disruptive behaviours compared to female teachers. It is their belief that they are able to manage disruptive behaviour. Individual review of each of the items on the Managing Disruptive Behaviour Scale may provide further insight.

The first item of the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour Disruptive scale was: *I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour*, this item does not address what the actual expectations of individual teachers were. The construct measured teachers' belief in their ability to communicate expectations. The focus of a study by Hayes, Hindle and Withington, (2007) on strategies for developing positive behaviour management, challenged teachers to increase verbal positive feedback to students. Verbal statements by teachers influenced outcomes from students. While teachers self

78

report that their delivery of expectations is clear, having students' rate teachers' ability to set clear behaviour expectations may better inform understanding of teachers' efficacy in managing disruptive behaviour.

Teachers' responses to the second item of the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour scale, *I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy*, may have been influenced by differences in intervention styles used by teachers to calm disruptive or noisy students. Research on the influence of intervention style on classroom aggression has found that teacher confidence is related to students' responses to interventions, particularly when their responses to interventions are negative (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002). It was also found that interpretation of behaviour in the workplace in general tends to be influenced by disciplinary measures taken by management. For that reason it is likely that the process of teacher interpretation of efficacy and evaluation by others (students, colleagues, school administrators) guides the teachers' intervention practice for managing disruptive behaviours (Lawrence & Green, 2005; Flem, Moen & Gudmundsdottir, 2004).

Reupert and Woodcock (2011) studied Canadian and Australian pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various behaviour management strategies and found that teachers used strategies they felt most confident with which were low level, initial corrective strategies rather than more intrusive strategies. This finding is of interest for the current study as there may be gender differences impacting strategy use as well. That is, males may feel more confident using intrusive strategies compared to females.

The third item of the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour scale was: *I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom before it occurs*. Being confident in the ability to prevent undesired behaviour may be impacted by teacher experience. The survey did not define or give examples of the types of behaviours that exemplify disruptive behaviour. It is possible that there are differences between male and female teachers' expectations, classification and tolerance of undesired behaviours. For example, compared to males, do females have higher expectations of appropriate behaviour in the classroom?

It may be that male teachers are more tolerant of disruptive behaviours. How teachers perceive violence in the classroom is also relevant to all items on the Efficacy of Disruptive Behavior Scale. Information about the student population was not obtained with respect to the number of behaviour incident reports or the severity of the disruptive behaviour reported.

It is possible that prior exposure to a violent incident may have impacted teacher feelings of efficacy to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom. Lawrence and Green (2005) completed a study of teachers' perceptions of classroom aggression through exposing teachers to an account of a violent incident. Their findings "illustrated the importance of differing interpretations of the same aggressive event" (p.599). Differences were reported between judgments of preservice and practicing teachers but teacher gender differences were not examined. It may be that female teachers have more negative perceptions of their ability to prevent disruptive behaviour if they have experienced an aggressive event. Contextual influences on teachers, such as personal

80

exposure to violence (in the classroom or another environment), was not investigated during the current study.

The fourth item of the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour scale was: *I am able to get children to follow classroom rules*. This item may be influenced by the extent to which teachers served as role models as well as student's attitudes towards teachers. A study by Carrington, Tymms and Merrell (2008) entitled "Role models, school improvement and the 'gender gap'—do men bring out the best in boys and women the best in girls?" found that students' achievement was not influenced by teacher gender. However, student behaviour as a contextual issue was not explored by the role model hypothesis of Carrington, Tymms and Merrell. Regardless of teacher gender, it is possible that one of the background factors underlying disruptive behaviour may be the student's own attitude towards the teacher. A poor relationship between teacher and student could negatively influence children's willingness to follow classroom rules. The current study did not survey the students' like or dislike of the teacher participants in this study.

The final item of the Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour scale was: *I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive*, does not capture data on whether individual teacher participants had been victims of threats or physical violence which could have impacted female teachers' lower feelings of efficacy. A national study by McMahon et al (2014) examined findings of the American Psychological Association's Task Force investigating violence directed against teachers in classrooms reported that eighty percent of U.S. teachers claimed to have been victims of threats or physical violence. It may be the case that there is a difference in the rate of

violence against male teachers compared to female teachers. Another possible factor affecting teachers' confidence when dealing with students who are physically aggressive may be that female teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador are less likely to report their insecurities or inability to deal with disruptive behaviours in the classroom.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are limitations within the current study that may prevent generalizing the findings across all teaching staff in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. This data set is not a representative sample of the total population of teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador. The study was limited to two school districts (i.e. Western School district and Eastern School District) with a smaller representation from Eastern School District. The final number of participants was 262 or only 6.36% of the total population and therefore may not represent inclusive practices of the approximately 6000 teachers employed in this province. Although the survey link was sent to all school principals in both districts, it is unknown how many school principals actually forwarded the invitation to their school staff members. Some principals may have been more influential than others in encouraging teachers to participate in the study. There is also a possibility that the school principals who encouraged completion of the survey knew this researcher as a prior staff member as the researcher had teaching experience in both of the school districts surveyed. In addition, the individual school names were not identified in the survey; therefore it is possible that the respondents may be representative of a cluster of teachers from a select few schools.

It may also be argued that the sample size of the male population was a limiting factor as there were only 59 men compared to 203 women in the current study. While there were fewer males than females in the sample, underrepresentation of males is consistent with the teaching profession in general in this province which is predominately female. Although statistical comparisons in this study took sample size into account, it would be worthwhile to repeat this study with a sample population more evenly distributed across gender. As well, data for this study was only collected from September – October which could have been a busy time of year for teachers and thus affected the response rate.

Although the TEIP Scale identified several critical factors affecting teacher feelings of efficacy about inclusive practises, implications of the differences between the norming sample of preservice teachers and this study's practising teacher participants requires consideration? In addition, qualitative analysis was largely limited to the TEIP scale topics. It is possible that reliance on characteristics of the scales (i.e. inclusive instruction, collaboration, disruptive behaviour) could have limited generation of themes and richer analysis.

Self-efficacy is a complex area of study, the factors considered for self-efficacy of inclusive practices in this study do not account for the many additional factors that may be contributing to a teacher's sense of self efficacy. Future studies could explore in greater depth more specific reasons for teacher gender differences in feelings of efficacy towards students' behavioural issues. For example, there are also contextual concerns (student and classroom characteristics) that may have impacted the ratings on the separate scales. Some characteristics may include, but are not limited to: behaviour management

strategies, teacher expectations, student attitudes towards teachers, and teacher role models. The current survey did not investigate class size, varying abilities of students in the classrooms, or how principals assigned students to teachers. The nature of classroom characteristics and specific student characteristics as they contribute to behaviour incidents and teachers perceptions of efficacy require further examination. Further investigation of specific teacher and community characteristics associated with student acts of physical aggression against teachers would better inform the gender differences in the findings of the current study.

It is also possible that there were more students with diagnosed conduct disorders or behavioural disorders such as oppositional defiant disorder in classrooms lead by female teachers which could have contributed to female teachers lowered sense of efficacy for inclusive education. Future surveys could collect data on class size and the number of students with diagnosed exceptionalities related to disruptive behaviour.

The results of the study were based on cross-sectional survey design and analysis of inclusive practices at only one point in time (i.e. the 2012-2013) school year. Given that Newfoundland and Labrador is in the final stages of implementing changes to inclusive practices through the Inclusive Education Initiative, future studies could collect longitudinal data to track any changes in teachers' feelings of efficacy as they move towards provincial inclusive initiatives.

Conclusions

A growing body of literature within education continues to investigate various factors affecting inclusive practice. It is difficult to change existing teaching practices,

particularly when significant improvements are needed to implement inclusive education goals (Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012). With no consistent inclusion policy across Canadian provinces, differences in the models of service delivery for students with diverse needs are likely to continue. For teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador, the current findings support the belief that teachers are efficacious in the overall practice of inclusive education. Were there any overall scales or scale items where teachers rated their efficacy higher?

The present study also suggests that males are more confident than females in their ability to manage disruptive behaviours in the classroom. The reported difference between males and females for managing disruptive behaviour is interesting and warrants further investigation. In general, the study's findings raise awareness that there is a need to further support female teachers as they face the challenge of managing disruptive behaviours. Classroom management strategies coupled with opportunities to practice them effectively may increase female teacher reports of efficacy to manage disruptive behaviours. Directing more emphasis on developing teachers' behaviour management skills through professional development opportunities may warrant consideration.

Also of interest was that teacher comments related to resources and supports which suggest that some teachers feel additional staffing of IRTs and student assistants is needed to support inclusive practices in the classroom. This area requires further investigation. It may be that the criterion for availing of IRT support is too restrictive, that is, only students with severe needs qualify for IRT support. This is problematic when there are high numbers of students with mild to moderate needs demanding extra help from the classroom teacher. As the province of Newfoundland and Labrador

reviews the success of the Inclusive Education Initiative, attention to both theory and practice will be crucial.

References

Alberta. Alberta Education. (2009). Setting the direction for special education in Alberta:

    a review of the literature. Retrieved from

    http://education.alberta.ca/media/1082132/settingthedirectionliterature%20review

    _english.pdf

Alberta. Alberta Education. (2015). Understanding medical and disability information:

    strategies that work. Retrieved from

    http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/inmdict/html/medicaldisabilityinformation.p

Adamowycz, R. (2008). Reforming education: Is inclusion in standardization possible?

    Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 68, 1–15.

Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: a

    review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17*(2),

    129-147. doi:10.1080/08856250210129056

Baglieri, S., & Shapiro, A. (2012). *Disability studies and the inclusive classroom:*

    Critical practices for creating least restrictive attitudes. New York, NY:

    Routledge.

Barco, M. J. (2007). *The relationship between secondary general education teachers'*

    self-efficacy and attitudes as they relate to teaching learning disabled students in

    the inclusive setting (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from

http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ theses/available/etd-04052007-131310/unrestricted/MJBARCO.pdf

Barker, Pistrang & Elliott (2005, January 28). Self-Report Methods (Chapter 6). In *Research methods in clinical psychology: An introduction for students and practitioners*, (2nd ed.). [Advanced Uncorrected proof]. Retrieved from http://www.wiley.com/legacy/wileychi/barker/supp/excerpt.pdf doi:10.1002/0470013435.ch6

Bennett, S. (2009). Including students with exceptionalities. In *What works? Research into practice* (Research monograph #16, 1–4). Retrieved from http://www2.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/Bennett.pdf

Bhatnagar, N., & Das, A. (2013). Attitudes of secondary school teachers towards inclusive education in New Delhi, India. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *14*(4), 255-263. doi:10.1111/1471-3802.12016

Brackenreed, D. (2008). Inclusive education: Identifying teachers' perceived stressors in inclusive classrooms. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, *18*(3), 131-147.

Brazil. Ministry of Education (2008). *The development of education inclusive education: the way of the future.* Retrieved from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE_2008/brazil_NR08.pdf

Canadian Council on Learning. (n.d.). Access and barriers to educational services for Canadian children with disabilities by Kohen, Uppal, Khan & Visentin, Health

Analysis and Measurement Group, Statistics Canada. Retrieved from

http://www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/OtherReports/201009KohenUppalKhanVisent

inFullReport.pdf

Carrington, B., Tymms, P., & Merrell, C. (2008). Role models, school improvement and

the 'gender gap'—do men bring out the best in boys and women the best in girls?

British Educational Research Journal, *34*, 315–327.

doi:10.1080/01411920701532202

Carroll, A. (2003). Impact of teacher training in special education on the attitudes of

Australia preservice general educators towards people with disabilities. *Teacher

Education Quarterly*, *14*, 39-60.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating

quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Darling-Hammond (2011). Quality teaching: What is it and how can it be measured?

Retrieved from

https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/events/materials/ldhscopeteacher-

effectiveness.pdf

Dee, A. L. (2011). Preservice teacher application of differentiated instruction. *The

Teacher Educator*, *46*, 53–70. doi:10.1080/08878730.2010.529987

Denzin, K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London,

UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Edmunds, A. L. (1999). Classroom teachers are not prepared for the inclusive classroom.

Exceptionality Education Canada, *8*(2), 27-40.

Edmunds, A. L. (2003). The inclusive classroom - can the teachers keep up? a

    comparison of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland & Labrador teachers' perspectives.

    Exceptionality Education Canada, *13*(1), 29-48.

Elhoweris, H., & Alsheikh, N. (2010). UAE teachers' awareness & perceptions of testing

    modifications. *Exceptionality Education International, 20,* 37-48.

Elkins, J., van Kraayenoord, C. E., & Jobling, A. (2003). Parents' attitudes to inclusion of

    their children with special needs, *Journal of Research in Special Educational*

    Needs, 3(2), 122-129.

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. (2010). *Teacher*

    Education for inclusion international literature review, Odense, Denmark.

    Retrieved from http://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/TE4I-

    Literature-Review.pdf

Evans, J., & Lunt, I. (2002). Inclusive education: are there limits? *European Journal of*

    Special Needs Education, *17*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1080/08856250110098980

Flem, A., Moen, T., & Gudmundsdottir, S. (2004). Towards inclusive schools: a study of

    inclusive education in practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*,

    19(1), 85-98. doi:10.1080/10885625032000167160

Forlin, C., Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Earle, C., (2009). Demographic differences in

    changing pre-service teachers' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusive

    education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *13*(2),195–209.

Fouilhoux, M. (2008). Learners and teachers: A contribution by education international. In United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Defining an inclusive education agenda: Reflections around the 48ᵗʰ session of the international conference on education.* Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001868/186807e.pdf

Fowler, F. J. (2013). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Fukuchi, K. (2008). What made it possible? A dialogue between a learner and his teacher. In United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Defining an inclusive education agenda: Reflections around the 48ᵗʰ session of the international conference on education.* Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001868/186807e.pdf

Giardina, M. D., & Denzin, N. K. (2013). *Global Dimensions of Qualitative Inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Gibbs, S., & Powell, B., (2012). Teacher efficacy and pupil behaviour: The structure of teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of pupils excluded from school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 564–584.

Grenier, M. (2007). Inclusion in physical education: from the medical model to social constructionism. *Quest, 59*(3), 298-310. doi:10.1080/00336297.2007.10483554

Hamman, D., Lechtenberger, D., Griffin-Shirley, N., & Zhou, L. (2013). Beyond exposure to collaboration: preparing general-education teacher candidates for inclusive practice. *The Teacher Educator*, *48*, 244–256.

Harding, S. (2009). Successful inclusion models for students with disabilities require strong site leadership: autism and behavioural disorders create many challenges for the learning environment. *The International Journal of Learning*, *16*(3), 91-103.

Hausstätter, R. S. (2007). Students' reasons for studying special needs education: challenges facing inclusive education. *Teacher Development*, *11*(1), 45-57. doi:10.1080/13664530701194629

Hayes, B., Hindle, S., & Withington, P. (2007). Strategies for developing positive behaviour management. Teacher behaviour outcomes and attitudes to the change process. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *23*,161–175. doi:10.1080/02667360701320861

Henteleff, Y. M. (2010). Students with learning disabilities and the right to meaningful access to education, *Education and Law Journal*, *20* (1), 1-16.

Hsien, M. (2007). Teacher attitudes towards preparation for inclusion-in support of a unified teacher preparation program. *Post-Script: Postgraduate Journal of Education Research, 8*(1), (1444-383X), 49-60.

Hutchinson, N. L. (2007). *Inclusion of exceptional learners in Canadian schools*. Toronto, ON: Pearson Canada.

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*(2), 77-94.

International Bureau of Education (2015). International Conference on Education. Retrieved from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/areas-of-action/international-conference-on-education-ice/the-conference.html.

Jordan, A., Schwartz, E., & McGhie-Richmond, D. (2009). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*, 535–542.

Kalyva, E. (2010). Special education: What do Greek teachers know about learning disabilities, autism, and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder? In J.H. Stone & M. Blouin (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Rehabilitation.* Retrieved from http://cirrie.buffalo.edu/encyclopedia/en/article/263/

Katz, J. (2013). The three block model of universal design for learning (UDL): engaging students in inclusive education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*(1), 153-194.

Katz, J., Porath, M., Bendu, C., & Epp, B. (2012). Diverse voices: middle years students' insights into life in inclusive classrooms. *Exceptionality Education International, 22*(1), 2-16.

Kauffman, J. M. (1981). Historical trends and contemporary issues in special education in the United States. In J. M. Kauffman & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), Handbook of special education (pp. 3-23). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kern, E. (2006). *Survey of teacher attitude regarding inclusive education within an urban school district.* (Psychology Dissertations, Paper 70). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.pcom.edu/psychology_dissertations/70

Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2007). Principals' and teachers' attitudes and knowledge of inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching practices in Ghana. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 7*(2), 104–13.

Lawrence, C., & Green, K., (2005). Perceiving classroom aggression: the influence of setting, intervention style and group perceptions. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *75*, 587–602.

LD Online (2015). The Educator's guide to learning disabilities and ADHD. Retrieved from http://www.ldonline.org

Leatherman, J. M. (2007). I just see all children as children: teachers' perceptions about inclusion. *The Qualitative Report*, *12*(4), 594-611.

Lewis, A., Parsons, S., & Robertson, C. (2007). My school, my family, my life: Telling it like it is a study detailing the experiences of disabled children, young people and their families in Great Britain in 2006. Retrieved from http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/631/1/Lewis_drc2_2005.pdf

Loreman, T., McGhie-Richmond, D., Barber, J., & Lupart, J. (2009). Parent perspectives on inclusive education in rural Alberta, Canada. *Exceptionality Education International*, *19*, 21-36.

MacDonald, C. (2013). Teacher efficacy: Moving towards inclusive practices survey

    instrument on Survey Monkey. Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com.

MacFarlane, K., & Woolfson, L. M. (2013). Teacher attitudes and behaviour toward the

    inclusion of children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in

    mainstream schools: an application of the theory of planned behaviour. *Teaching*

    and Teacher Education, *29*, 46-52.

MacKay, A. W. (2007). Connecting care and challenge: tapping our human potential.

    Education Law Journal, *17*(1), 37-104.

Malinen, O., Savolainen, H., & Xu, J. (2012). Beijing in-service teachers' self-efficacy

    and attitudes towards inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*,

    526-534. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.004

McGhie-Richmond, D., Irvine, A., Loreman, T., Cizman, J. L., & Lupart, J. (2013).

    Teacher perspectives on inclusive education in rural Alberta, Canada. *Canadian*

    Journal of Education, *36*(1), 195-239.

McLeod, K.A., & Krugly-Smolska, E. (Eds.). (1997). Multicultural education: A place to

    start: Guideline for classrooms, schools and communities diversity in Canada.

    Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT). Retrieved from

    http://www.caslt.org/Print/rep5ep.htm

McMahon, S. D., Martinez, A., Espelage, D., Rose, C., Reddy, L. A., Lane, K., …
Brown, V. (2014). Violence directed against teachers: results from a national
survey. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*, 753–766. doi:10.1002/pits.21777

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and
Implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mitchell, D. (2014). *What really works in special and inclusive education : Using
evidence-based teaching strategies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mock, D. R., & Kauffman, J. M. (2002). Preparing teachers for full inclusion: is it
possible? *The Teacher Educator*, *37*(3), 202-215.

National Disability Authority. (2006). Literature review on attitudes towards disability.
Retrieved from http://issda.ucd.ie/documentation/nda/nda06-literature.pdf

Naylor (2001). BC Teachers Federation BCTF research report. Retrieved from
http://bctf.ca/uploadedfiles/publications/research_reports/2001wlc02.pdf

Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood
Development (2015). *Inclusive Schools.* Retrieved from
http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/k12/inclusion.html

Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood
Development (2015a). *Education Statistics – General Information*. Retrieved
from http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/publications/k12/stats/#1213

Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood

    Development (2015b). *Inclusive Schools: Roles of Teachers in Inclusive Schools.*

    Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/k12/inclusion.html

Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Education and Early Childhood

    Development (2015c). *Student Support Services - Frequently Asked Questions*.

    Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/faq/studentsupportservices.html

Norwich, B. (2013). *Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living

    with uncertainty*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Nougaret, A. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. (2005). Does teacher education

    produce better special education teachers? *Exceptional Children*, *71*, 217–29.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2009). Realizing the promise of diversity: Ontario's

    equity and inclusive education strategy 2009. Retrieved from

    http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/policyfunding/equity.pdf

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010). Parent's in partnership: A parent engagement

    policy for Ontario schools. Retrieved from

    https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/parents/involvement/PE_Policy2010.pdf

Park, M., Dimitrov, D. M., Das, A., & Gichuru, M.(2014). The teacher efficacy for

    inclusive practices (TEIP) scale: dimensionality and factor structure. *Journal of

    Research in Special Education Needs*, *15*(2), 97-105.

    doi:10.1111/14713802.12047

Peebles, J., & Mendaglio, S. (2014). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms: introducing the individual direct experience approach. *LEARNing Landscapes*, *7*(2), 245-257.

Philpott, D. F. (2002). A critical analysis of Newfoundland and Labrador's model of special education management. *International Journal of Disability, Community and Rehabilitation, 1*(3). Retrieved from http://www.ijdcr.ca/VOL01_03_CAN/articles/philpott.shtml

Philpott, D. F. (2007a). Focusing on students: The final report of the ISSP/Pathways Commission. St. John's, NL: Queen's Printer.

Philpott, D. F. (2007b). Assessing without labels: culturally defined inclusive education. *Exceptionality Education International*, *17*, 3-34.

Philpott, D. F. & Dibbon, D. (2008). The evolution of disability studies amidst school reform in Newfoundland and Labrador: a global perspective on local practice. *The Morning Watch, 36*(1-2), 1-30. Retrieved from http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/fall08_vol12.html

Philpott, D. [F]., Furey, E., & Penney, S. C. (2010). Promoting leadership in the ongoing professional development of teachers: responding to globalization and inclusion. *Exceptionality Education International, 20,* 38-54. Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/eei/vol20/iss2/5

Philpott, D. F., Nesbit, W., Cahill, M., & Jeffery, G. (2004). Supporting learner diversity in aboriginal schools: the emergence of a cultural paradigm of inclusion. In W.C. Nesbit (Ed.), *Cultural diversity and education: Interface issues* (pp. 51-75). St. John's, NL: Memorial University.

Porter, G. L., (2008). Making Canadian schools inclusive: a call to action. *Education Canada, 48(*2), 62-64.

Porter, G. L., & Smith, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Exploring inclusive educational practices through professional inquiry*. The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Reupert, A. & Woodcock, S. (2011). Canadian and Australian pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various behavior management strategies. *International Journal of Educational Research, In Press 1-11*, 1-31.

Santangelo, T., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2012). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: an exploratory investigation. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(4), 309-327. doi:10.1080/01626620.2012.717032

Skårbrevik, K.J. (2005). The quality of special education for students with special needs in ordinary classes. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 20*(4), 387-401. doi:10.1080/08856250500268601

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Education Needs, 12*(1), 12-21.

Sharma, U., Shaukat, S., & Furlonger, B. (2015). Attitudes and self-efficacy of pre-service teachers towards inclusion in Pakistan. *Journal of Research in Special Education Needs, 15*(2), 97-105. doi:10.1111/1471-3802.12071

Shaukat, S. (2013). Impact of demographic variables in the development of prospective teachers' efficacy beliefs towards inclusive practices in the context of Pakistan, *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences, 3*(3), 484-508. doi:10.15405/FutureAcademy/ejsbs(2301-2218).2012.3.9

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: a reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11*(2), 173-192. doi:10.1080/09620210100200073

Smeyers, Paul (Ed.) (2015). *International handbook of interpretation in educational research* [electronic resource]. Retrieved from http://download.springer.com.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca

Sokal, L. & Katz, J. (2015). Oh, Canada: bridges and barriers to inclusion in Canadian schools. *Support for Learning, 30*(1), 42-54. doi:10.1111/1467-9604.12078

Spratt, J., & Florian, L. (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: from learning to action. Supporting each individual in the context of 'everybody'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 89-96.

Stoutjesdijk, R., Scholte, E. M., & Swaab, H. (2012). Special needs characteristics of

    children with emotional and behavioural disorders that affect inclusion in regular

    education. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 20*(2), 92–104.

Subban, P., & Sharma, U. (2006). Primary school teachers' perceptions of inclusive

    education in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Special Education,*

    21(1), 42-52.

Topping, K. & Maloney, S. (Eds.), (2005). *The Routledge Falmer reader in inclusive*

    education. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer /Taylor and Francis Group.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994). *The Salamanca*

    statement and framework for action. Retrieved from

    http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF - France

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2005). *Guidelines for*

    inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all. Retrieved from

    http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001402/140224e.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2008). *Defining an*

    inclusive education agenda: Reflections around the 48th session of the

    international conference on education. Retrieved from

    http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001868/186807e.pdf

Walter-Thomas, C., Korinek, L., McLaughlin, V. & Williams, B. (2000). *Collaboration for inclusive education: Developing successful programs*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Winzer, M. (2005). *Children with exceptionalities in Canadian schools*. Toronto, ON: Pearson.

World Health Organization. (2011). Education. In *World Report on Disability* (chap. 7). Retrieved from http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/chapter7.pdf

Wu-Tien, W., Ashman, A. & Yong-Wook, K. (2008). Education reforms in special education. In C. Forlin & M-G. J. Lian (Eds.), *Reform, inclusion & teacher education: Towards a new era of special education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 13–29). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix A: TEIP

Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale
The 18 items on the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin, (2012) was administered in its entirety:

<u>Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale</u>
This survey is designed to help understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities in creating an inclusive classroom environment.

Please circle the responses which best represent your opinion about each of the statements.

1 Strongly Disagree (SD)	2 Disagree (D)	3 Disagree Somewhat (DS)	4 Agree Somewhat (AS)	5 Agree (A)	6 Strongly Agree (SA)

Item	Statement	SD	D	DS	AS	A	SA
1	I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in teh classroom before it occurs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with learning disabilities are accommodated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g. itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g. aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance based assessment, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B: TEIP with Demographic Questions

TEIP with Demographic Questions

#	Question/Response
1	I CONSENT to participate in this study and I have read and understood what this study is about and appreciate the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the research project understanding the risks and contributions of my participation, that my participation is voluntary, and that I may end my participation at any time: I consent, I do not consent.
2	Please SELECT the range (in years) your teaching experience currently meets: 0-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31+.
3	Please SELECT the age range (in years) you currently fall into: 20-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61+.
4	Please SELECT your highest level of education attained: Bachelor Degree, Masters Degree, Doctorate Degree.
5	Please SELECT your gender: male, female.
6	Please SELECT your teaching areas (if you teach in more than one area, select the area you spend the majority of your time teaching in): Primary, Elementary, Intermediate, High School.
7	Please indicate the range (in years /months) of your teaching experience with students diagnosed with disabilities: years/months.
8	Please SELECT your current school district from the list below: Labrador, Western, Nova Central, Eastern, Conseil Scolaire Francophone.
9	Please SELECT whether your school is in an urban area (school is located in a city) or a rural area of Newfoundland and Labrador (school is located in a town or small community): urban/rural.
10	I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
11	I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
12	I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree
13	I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
14	I can assist families in helping their children do well in school: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
15	I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
16	I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
17	I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom before it occurs: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
18	I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
19	I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
20	I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with learning disabilities are accommodated: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
21	I am able to get children to follow classroom rules: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
22	I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g. itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
23	I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g. aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
24	I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
25	I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance based assessment, etc.): Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
26	I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
27	I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.
28	I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree, Strongly Agree.

Appendix C: Recruitment and Informed Consent

Recruitment E-mail and Consent for Principals

From: corrine.macdonald@mun.ca

Dear Principal,

My name is Corrine MacDonald and I am a graduate student at Memorial University. I am currently working on my Master of Education Thesis Project entitled *Teacher Efficacy: Moving towards Inclusive Practices*. Throughout my research, a quick survey will be available on-line for teachers at
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/_INCLUSION_SURV .

I would greatly appreciate your consent to bring this project to the attention of your teaching staff by distributing the survey link via staff e-mail. Your action of forwarding the survey link to your staff will be accepted as consent of your decision to bring this survey to your teachers attention. It is entirely up to the individual teacher to decide to participate in the survey. The survey link contains the *Informed Consent Form for Teachers*. I have copied the consent form information below for your interest.
Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Corrine MacDonald

Informed Consent Form

Title: *Teacher Efficacy: Moving towards Inclusive Practices.*
Researcher: Corrine MacDonald, Graduate Studies Student, Faculty of Education,
Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, A1C 5S7.
Telephone: 709-283-2081 E-mail: corrine.macdonald@mun.ca
Dr. Sharon Penney, Faculty of Education, Office ED 5031, Memorial
University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, A1C 5S7. Telephone 709-864-7556 E-mail: scpenney@mun.ca

You are invited to take part in a research project entitled *Teacher Efficacy: Moving towards Inclusive Practices.*
This form is part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. It also describes your right to withdraw from the study at any time. In order to decide whether you wish to participate in this research study, you should understand enough about its risks and

benefits to be able to make an informed decision. This is the informed consent process. Take time to read this carefully and to understand the information given to you. Please contact the researcher, *Corrine MacDonald*, if you have any questions about the study or for more information not included here before you consent.

It is entirely up to you to decide whether to take part in this research. If you choose not to take part in this research or if you decide to withdraw from the research once it has started, there will be no negative consequences for you, now or in the future. There are two ways to withdraw from this study (1) You may withdraw from the study at any time by exiting from the survey at any point by closing the internet window, and (2) At the end of the survey, there is a comment section that allows you to enter in your own words a request to withdraw your consent.

Introduction
As part of my Master of Education thesis, I am conducting research under the supervision of Dr. Sharon Penney, Faculty of Education, Office ED 5031, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, A1C 5S7. Telephone 709-864-7556 E-mail: scpenney@mun.ca

I am administering an on-line survey that is designed to help understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities in creating an inclusive classroom environment.

Purpose of study:
Teacher responses on this survey will reveal a better understanding of how prepared Newfoundland and Labrador teachers believe they are able to work effectively in inclusive classrooms. Findings can be used to create professional learning programs designed to address areas of interest to teachers.

What you will do in this study:
As a participant you will answer some general demographic questions and 18 questions related to inclusive education. Individual names are not requested or recorded. All entries are anonymous.

Length of time:
It is estimated that the survey can be completed in approximately five to ten minutes.

Withdrawal from the study:
Any data collected up to a point of a participant's withdrawal will be destroyed and will not be used in the report. There are no consequences to the participant should he/she decide to withdraw from the study.

Possible benefits:
Participation in this study will allow participants to reflect upon their teaching practice. Findings will inform of possible factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities in creating an inclusive classroom environment.
The study findings will add to the collection of literature on inclusive education in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Possible risks:
No potential risks of being in the study have been identified by this researcher.

Confidentiality vs. Anonymity

There is a difference between confidentiality and anonymity: Confidentiality is ensuring that identities of participants are accessible only to those authorized to have access. Anonymity is a result of not disclosing participant's identifying characteristics (such as name or description of physical appearance).

Confidentiality and Storage of Data:
a. Individual teachers do not submit their names during the survey. Participant data will be numbered; individuals will only be referred to by occupation as a 'teacher' in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

b. Data collected from the Survey Monkey Website will be stored electronically in the Researcher's Memorial University email account which is password protected. Data will be kept for five years as per Memorial University's policy on Integrity in Scholarly Research. After 5 years the data will be deleted.

c. The on-line survey company, *SurveyMonkey,* is hosting this survey and is located in the United States and as such is subject to U.S. laws. The US Patriot Act allows authorities access to the records of internet service providers. Anonymity and confidentiality, therefore, cannot be guaranteed. If you choose to participate in this survey, you understand that your responses to the survey questions will be stored and accessed in the USA. The security and privacy policy for the web survey company can be found at the following link: (e.g. http://www.SurveyMonkey.com/monkey_privcy.aspx). Please note that you will not be asked to submit your name during the survey.

Reporting of Results:
The data collected is being used to write a thesis for my Master of Education program at Memorial University of Newfoundland. A summary of the findings will be reported as information collected from a sample of Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers across the province.

Sharing of Results with Participants:
Once the final thesis has been approved it is available for viewing through Library Services at MemorialUniversity. The Centre for Newfoundland Studies in the QEII Library is the depository for Memorial University theses and honours dissertations.

This researcher intends to invite the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers Association to publish the project findings in the NLTA Bulletin (see http://www.nlta.nl.ca/bulletins).

Questions:
You are welcome to ask questions at any time during your participation in this research. If you would like more information about this study, please contact: Corrine MacDonald, Graduate Studies Student, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, A1C 5S7. Telephone: 709-283-2081 E-mail: corrine.macdonald@mun.ca.

ICEHR Statement:
The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research (such as the way you have

been treated or your rights as a participant), you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Consent:
Your continuation with the on-line survey through Survey Monkey means that:
- You have read the information about the research.
- You have been able to ask questions about this study.
- You are satisfied with the answers to all your questions.
- You understand what the study is about and what you will be doing.
- You understand that you are free to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason, and that doing so will not affect you now or in the future.
- You understand that any data collected from you up to the point of your withdrawal will be destroyed.

If you proceed with the survey, you do not give up your legal rights and do not release the researchers from their professional responsibilities.

I have read and understood what this study is about and appreciate the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

☐ I agree to participate in the research project understanding the risks and contributions of my participation, that my participation is voluntary, and that I may end my participation at any time.

A copy of this Informed Consent Form may be printed from the on-line website for your records.

Researcher's Disclaimer:
I have explained this study to the best of my ability. I invited questions and gave answers. I believe that the participant fully understands what is involved in being in the study, any potential risks of the study and that he or she has freely chosen to be in the study.

Appendix D: Teacher Comments

The comments provided by teachers were as follows:

Inclusive Practices

I am not convinced that inclusive practices are the bet for all students in all subjects. I have seen many instances when a child would benefit more from a setting other than the regular classroom. (Teacher # 10)

I believe inclusionary practices are more easily seen and implemented in the primary class. As the student progresses through school, getting older and physically "bigger" certain challenges may arise especially with behavioural difficulties. I feel confident in Primary implementing Inclusion however I may not feel that same confidence in Intermediate or senior high. (Teacher # 12)

Some of the aspects discussed above rely on time available to the teacher as well as ability. For example, giving alternate explanations, alternate assessments, meeting with other teachers. Many rural teachers have to plan for multiple classes in one hour, planning alternates on top of that can be very demanding. Time should be allotted for this, inclusionary practices benefits all students. (Teacher # 37)

Over the years the public school system across Canada has switched back and forth between inclusion and pull out. It would be useful to ask why and look at the findings over the past 30 to 40 years. What can we learn from past experience in this area? (Teacher # 38)

Respect and acceptance are the underlying piece of the puzzle essential to ensure the inclusion of all students. Far too often, teachers feel that a disability (the label) means that students don't need expectations. High expectations for all students are needed if we are to truly foster inclusion in our schools. High expectations that are "fair" does not mean that they are "equal." (Teacher # 36)

Resources and Supports

I strongly feel that much of the responsibility of children with needs is left to the classroom teacher with little and certainly not enough support. By support I mean, having an extra set of hands and not having someone else make suggestions as to what to do. In many cases classroom teachers know what needs to be done in order to meet the needs of the many children but there is no time available for one teacher to get to all of the children and meet all of their needs. (Teacher # 7)

The issue or problem area for classroom teachers usually relates to lack of support from the system (child doesn't qualify for IRT support time). It is often a major challenge to offer some students accommodations while trying to manage the other 25 students in the room. An extra pair of hands is often needed but is never, or is sporadically provided. (Teacher # 21)

The time required to carry out the plans in a busy classroom is a problem. If there were only one child in a class with a disability it would be different, but there are usually several and their needs can overwhelm the class. The level of student assistant and other supports is not adequate to meet the needs of the children with disabilities or their classes. (Teacher # 11)

Teachers need more IRT time to effectively implement the inclusion model. It's also important to note that pull out programs are still sometimes best, but seems to be greatly frowned upon by the board. Personally, I am not near as efficient as I would like to be in the inclusive classroom. There are a lot of balls to juggle, and I haven't found that balance yet. (Teacher # 34)

In dealing with students with disabilities, it is important that the teacher has adequate support in the classroom. Not all students, especially behaviour issues, are having their needs met due to the lack of support given in staffing. Also, team teaching in an inclusive environment only works if all involved with the student is involved and supportive of the process of inclusion. For some senior teachers, this is still a slow process. (Teacher # 22)

More special services support is needed (waiting for months on end to receive more support time that is greatly needed is not right) and the teacher allocation formula for smaller schools should not be the same as in larger schools. (Teacher # 23)

Collaboration

If we are to meet the many varied needs we need more hands present in the classroom and not just on a consult basis. It's no good for someone to be consulting me on what I should be doing, when there is no more time/help to actually do it. We already have lots of people advising us what we should be doing but we need help doing it. (Teacher # 7)

I feel most classroom teachers would agree that today's classrooms need more support than they are presently receiving. Possibly more team teaching, planning, and of course more planning time with colleagues. (Teacher # 21)

I feel the questions do not take into account school/district resources, and teacher time. For example, I strongly agree that I am capable of working with other professionals, but I have very seldom had the opportunity to do so. (Teacher # 16)

Professional Development

I feel the biggest issue with inclusion in the classroom is that teachers are not provided with adequate education in providing optimal support to students with special needs. Too often there is only a quick professional development session in which a blank/generic view is given. However, each child is unique as is disability. Because of this many teachers are not able to provide exactly what each child requires. (Teacher # 15)

Managing Disruptive Behaviours

Having a disruptive or needy child only makes the situation more difficult. If there is a disruptive child then the teacher has to stop everything and attend to that situation. (Teacher # 7)

It is also a problem when behaviours interfere with learning and these behaviours are not necessarily those of the children with the diagnosed disability. (Teacher # 11)

I feel that because of inclusion that some schools are becoming completely focused on behaviour and not academics. Children with pervasive needs are impacting the way teachers have to teach to the point that all their time is taken up with dealing with the severe behaviour and classroom management and losing valuable time to actually teach the curriculum. Children who do not have special needs are suffering and are not getting a quality education because of inclusion. (Teacher # 14)

Limitations of the Study

The questions are set up in a way that it seems teachers are rating themselves. I can't see why someone would agree that they are not good at their job (since your questions are essentially asking interviewees if they feel they are doing their job properly)…We all try our best don't we? And if we do not, we are not likely to admit this to someone else. (Teacher # 42)

I noticed the questions sometimes used the word 'able' and other times the word 'confident'. I wonder how using two words rather than one will affect the survey results since no standard definitions were provided. (Teacher # 38)

Appendix E: Second, Third and Fourth Scale Descriptions

The second scale, *Efficacy of using Inclusive Instructions* was comprised of six questions. These items included 1) I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught, 2) I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students, 3) I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with learning disabilities are accommodated, 4) I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups, 5) I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance based assessments, etc., 6) I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused.

The third scale *Efficacy in Collaboration* was comprised of six questions. These items included 1)I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school, 2) I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities, 3) I can assist families in helping their children do well in school, 4) I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g. itenerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities, 5) I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g. aids, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom, 6) I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.

The fourth scale, *Efficacy in Managing Disruptive Behaviour* was comprised of six questions. These items included 1) I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour, 2) I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or nasty, 3) I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behaviour in the classroom when it occurs, 4) I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom, 5) I am able to get children to follow

classroom rules, 6) I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.