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Abstract

The subjects in this study were 129 general educators from elementary schools in Virginia. These subjects all had at least one student with learning disabilities in the classroom. A researcher-developed, three part survey was used to collect the data. The survey examined relationships among factors influencing teachers' decisions to make accommodations and the actual accommodations that were employed in the classroom.

The results revealed several accommodations which were frequently implemented in the classroom by the general educators. These teachers often gave oral tests to students with learning disabilities, allowed the students to work in pairs, and individualized the assignments for their students with learning disabilities.
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Factors Affecting the Adaptations Made
By General Educators for
Students with Learning Disabilities in
the Regular Classroom

Perhaps the fastest growing trend in American education today is the issue of including students with learning disabilities in the regular education classroom. This process is known as inclusion. With this fairly new program comes many concerns, especially from the regular education teachers. Of particular concern for teachers is how they are going to make the appropriate accommodations and modifications which are needed by students with learning disabilities.

These accommodations must be made to benefit each student individually according to his or her disability, but they should not disrupt the flow of the class lessons. This is a large demand to place on regular education teachers, many of whom have little or no training in making accommodations for students in special education. Unfortunately, many regular education teachers also feel they lack preparedness to teach students with learning disabilities. In addition, they lack opportunities to collaborate with special education teachers, and consequently they make infrequent and unsystematic use of adaptations (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995b). Sadly, many students
with learning disabilities do not succeed in regular education classrooms because large-group instruction is usually the norm (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995a). Students with learning disabilities tend to succeed when instruction takes place individually or in small groups. Therefore, it is important for general educators and special educators to work together to create appropriate learning environments for these students.

**Definition of Inclusion**

The terms inclusion and mainstreaming are often used synonymously, but they are actually quite different. Mainstreaming is the selective placement of special education services in regular education classrooms, presuming the students will be able to keep up with the other students in the class (Brucker, 1994). Inclusion is the commitment to educate each child in the regular education classroom. Inclusion does not require the student to keep up with the other students in the classroom (Brucker, 1994). A growing number of schools and school districts educate students with learning disabilities in regular education classrooms, rather than pull-out classrooms (Putnam, Spiegel & Bruininks, 1995).

**Concerns of Regular Education Teachers**

Regular educators report accommodations for students with learning disabilities as time-consuming, difficult to implement, disruptive, and detrimental to the potential
progress of the students without disabilities. Such accommodations bring needless attention to those students with disabilities, and do not help prepare the students for the real world (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995b). The primary concern for regular education teachers is that they lack the knowledge, skills, and confidence they need to plan and make accommodations for students with learning disabilities.

Many regular education teachers are not prepared to teach students with a wide range of needs in their classroom (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1993). Teachers often are required to adhere to a strict curriculum; therefore, they are not allotted the needed flexibility to provide accommodations for students with learning disabilities. Necessary materials and technology are not readily available for many teachers, thus, presenting another problem. Furthermore, communication among teachers, specialists, parents, and principals is often not adequate to provide students with learning disabilities with an effective program (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1993).

Factors That Influence Teacher Planning

Many factors influence teachers’ planning, making accommodations even more troublesome. Teacher-related factors include the teacher’s beliefs and attitudes about planning in general, as well as specific planning for adaptations for students with learning disabilities.
Environment-related factors include demands for complete content coverage and the need to adhere to the curriculum guide. Furthermore, teachers sometimes may want to make adaptations but are not able to do so because of budget, class size, or access to materials. Student-related factors concern the students' interests in the subject matter, the teacher's use of different learning strategies, the students' motivation, and the students' response to the teachers' adaptations. Students usually prefer teachers who make adaptations to help them understand better, but they do not appreciate obvious accommodations that single them out in the classroom (Schumm, Vaughn, Haager, McDowell, Rothlein & Saumell, 1995).

A second area of concern of regular education teachers is that they feel special education teachers are great sources for assistance, but human resources are quite limited (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995a). This indicates the tremendous need for special education teachers and regular education teachers to communicate as often as possible. Through this collaboration, the special education teachers may suggest various ways to provide the necessary adaptations of lessons, variations of lesson plans, and other accommodations needed for their students with learning disabilities.
What Students with Learning Disabilities Can Expect

Previous studies reported that students with learning disabilities can expect several things from their regular education teachers. For instance, teachers are not likely to develop an IEP for them to follow. Teachers at the elementary level are more likely to plan individual assignments, provide alternative materials, and utilize individualized assessments more so than secondary teachers. Teachers are more likely to apply adaptations that will benefit the social adjustment of the student rather than academic adaptations. Teachers will often use adaptations that are beneficial to the entire class as well as the individuals with learning disabilities (Schumm et al, 1995).

According to a study by Baker (1995), regular education teachers are very willing to make accommodations for students with learning disabilities in their classes. They do not view this as a disturbance, but as a beneficial activity for every student in the class. For instance, a third grade teacher in Virginia reported that she does not make accommodations for one particular student with learning disabilities, rather she makes modifications with every student in mind. She may modify a test by rearranging the components, or highlight certain important details in a classroom discussion. She reported these simple modifications are beneficial to each student in the class, with or without learning disabilities.
When special education teachers systematically adjust the nature of student programs in response to the individual, their students learn more reliably and dramatically more as compared to the curriculum without any accommodations. However, many teachers already have activity, instruction, and management "routines" that exist through the school year. These routines help to keep the class orderly, efficient, and structured, but may also limit the ongoing change and flexibility, which is necessary for instructional adaptations (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Phillips, & Karns, 1995). Routine adaptations made by regular education teachers involve variations in materials, grouping arrangements according to achievement level, and the goals teachers establish at the beginning of the year (Fuchs et al, 1995).

Many teachers are in favor of making accommodations for students with learning disabilities; however, they feel the adaptations are more desirable than they are feasible (McIntosh, Vaughn, Schumm, Haager, & Lee, 1994). The adaptations that teachers feel are more feasible are those related to the social or motivational well-being of the students. These adaptations require little adjustment to their instruction or to the curriculum. They rated three adjustments as the most feasible: providing reinforcement and encouragement; establishing a personal relationship with the mainstreamed students; and involving the students with
learning disabilities in whole-class activities. The least feasible adaptations include: adapting regular education materials, using alternative materials, and providing individualized instruction for those students with learning disabilities (McIntosh et al, 1994).

Another study conducted by Schumm and Vaughn in 1995 investigated the perceptions and planning practices of general education teachers. They found that 98% of K-12 teachers rated their knowledge and skills for planning for their regular education students as excellent or good. However, only 39% of the teachers rated their planning to include students with learning disabilities as excellent or good (McIntosh et al, 1994). These teachers also reported an overall positive feeling about their students with learning disabilities in their classroom, and over 75% reported that they would be willing to participate in an in-service to improve their ability to accommodate the mainstreamed students. In comparison with elementary teachers, middle and high school teachers made fewer adaptations and were less positive about the benefits of mainstreaming for both mainstreamed students and regular education students (McIntosh et al, 1994).

In 1990, Baker and Zigmond conducted a study of an elementary school to determine the extent to which accommodations were made for students with learning disabilities. They found that math and reading were large-
group, teacher-directed, and textbook-based instructional formats. Very little differentiation was reported in instructional grouping, or assignments for students with learning disabilities, suggesting that these students would not fare well here if a total inclusion program was adopted (McIntosh et al, 1994).

Testing Accommodations for Students with Learning Disabilities

Testing of students with learning disabilities has also become quite an important issue which should be addressed at all levels of the education system. When states required that students pass a minimum competency test in order to get a high school diploma, teachers became concerned about how these tests would be modified for students with learning disabilities (Thurlow, Ysseldyke & Silverstein, 1995). Accommodations can be made for most tests in the areas of presentation, test setting, response format, and timing. For test presentation, students with learning disabilities may be given a braille edition, the use of magnifying equipment, a large-print edition of a test, oral reading of instructions, signing of directions, and other various interpretations of the directions. The test setting may be adapted as well, such as a student taking the test alone in a test carrel, with small groups, at home, or in the special education class (Thurlow et al, 1995).

In response to the test questions, the students may
mark the response in the actual test book, use a template for response, point to the response, use a typewriter, or receive assistance and interpretation with the responses. The timing of a test may be extended, there may be more breaks during the test, or there may be extended testing session over several days (Thurlow et al, 1995).

Many policy and legal considerations deal with accommodations made for students with learning disabilities. The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (i.e., due process and equal protection clauses) play a large role in the testing of students with disabilities. For instance, the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees equal educational opportunity and due process when state action may adversely affect an individual (Thurlow et al, 1995). Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states, "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States...shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied benefits, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (Thurlow et al, 1995). Section 84.42b(3) states that an institution receiving federal funds "shall assure that: admissions tests are selected and administered so as best to ensure that, when a test is administered to an applicant who has a handicap that impairs sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the test results accurately reflect the applicant's aptitude
or achievement level or whatever other factor the test
purports to measure" (Thurlow et al, 1995). Therefore,
Section 504 mandates that admissions tests for students with
learning disabilities be validated and reflect the
applicant's aptitude and achievement rather than any
disabilities extraneous to what is being measured (Thurlow
et al, 1995).

The Importance of Collaboration

Peer collaboration is very important between the
general educators and the special educators in order for
inclusion to work effectively. Collaboration helps the
teacher better understand the nature of students' problems
exhibited in the classroom. Collaboration may also help
teachers consider how changes in their own teaching routines
can increase success in the performance of students with
learning disabilities. In addition, peer collaboration may
help teachers to utilize certain interventions specific to
each individual student (Pugach & Johnson, 1995).

Training Regular Education Teachers

Unfortunately, many regular education teachers tell
their students with learning disabilities to try harder,
when they actually are trying as hard as they can. This is,
perhaps, because many general educators do not utilize an
individual curriculum for their students with special needs
(Roberts & Mather, 1995). These students are known as
curriculum casualties, or students who are unable to adapt
to instruction and a curriculum that moves too fast and demands too much of their existing skills (Simmons, Fuchs & Fuchs, 1991).

In order for inclusion to be successful, teacher education programs must enable teachers to plan for, and accommodate students with learning disabilities within their usual planning for the class as a whole. Therefore, teachers need specific strategies to use when planning in their classrooms (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995b). For effective teacher education, Schumm and Vaughn have recommendations based on five stages of instruction. The first stage is awareness, or a general familiarity with the strategies. The second stage is knowledge of the pros and cons of certain adaptations. The simulation of an accommodation is important, and may be practiced on a colleague. The practice stage involves the teacher actually trying it out in the classroom, and lastly, the teacher must learn to incorporate the accommodations into the daily routine (1995b). Teacher-education programs should also include the development of routines that meet the educational needs of both the students with learning disabilities and the high-achieving learners in the class. Finally, education programs must include opportunities for regular and special education teachers to work collaboratively (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995b).
Recommendations for Inclusion

School systems should establish a policy for participation in the IEP meetings as well as the implementation of the IEP for students with learning disabilities. An effective collaborative environment should also be established. The environment should include a reasonable class size, reasonable paperwork assignments for teachers, appropriate physical environments (e.g., noise levels), appropriate technology and materials, and flexibility in determining the adaptations to the curriculum to be made. Teacher in-service programs should be provided and required of all teachers to give them necessary skills to make adaptations effectively for the students with learning disabilities in their classroom (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1993).

Statement of Purpose

Due to the recent popularity of inclusion, it is crucial for general educators to make adaptations for students with learning disabilities in their classrooms. It is necessary for teachers to learn to accommodate for the individual and unique needs of these students. Unfortunately, many general educators believe that making such adaptations is quite difficult to do. They feel they lack training, lack the essential expertise regarding learning disabilities, and the time it takes to provide accommodations. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to
determine which factors affect the general educators' ability to plan and make necessary adaptations for students with learning disabilities in the classroom.
Method

Subjects

The subjects in this study consisted of public school general education teachers in grades K-6 who had at least one student with learning disabilities in their classroom. A random sample was collected from 10% of the school districts in Virginia.

Procedure

A letter was sent to the appropriate administrative office in order to request permission to conduct the study (See Appendix A). The letter was mailed to the school divisions randomly selected from the Virginia Education Directory. After permission was obtained, a letter was sent to the principals of the selected schools explaining the study (See Appendix B). A questionnaire was then mailed including a letter of explanation regarding the study (See Appendix C). A stamped, self-addressed envelope was also included. The teachers and principals were assured that the surveys would return directly to the researcher, guaranteeing anonymity and confidentiality.

Instrument

The factors that influence general educators' adaptations for students with learning disabilities were determined by a researcher-developed, three part survey (See Appendix D). The first part of the survey contained questions pertaining to demographic information. The second
part consisted of a four-point Likert response scale to ascertain the degree to which types of accommodations are used. The third part of the survey contained questions to determine the degree to which certain factors may inhibit general educators from making accommodations and adaptations. Participants responded to these questions on a four point Likert type scale. The assigned values were Always=1, Usually=2, Sometimes=3, and Never=4. The survey was field tested among other education students at Longwood College prior to mailing.

Data Analysis

The factors that influence the adaptations made by regular educators were assessed using descriptive statistics. The demographics were reported in percentages and means. The means and standard deviations were computed for the Likert scale data. Correlations were computed between the factors influencing the educators' decisions to make adaptations and those accommodations that were used by educators, and between the factors, the accommodations, and demographic information.
Results

A random sample of 10% of school divisions in Virginia was obtained. A total of 235 surveys were mailed to the elementary schools, and were distributed by the principals to the appropriate educators. Of the surveys mailed, 130 surveys were returned for a response rate of 55%. One survey was discarded because it was inappropriately filled out, but the remaining 129 were usable.

Of the 129 respondents, 97.7% were female, and 2.3% were male. The educators' mean length of time teaching was 14.38 years. The mean number of students with learning disabilities in each classroom was 3.2.

For item number one on part II (accommodations) of the survey, the data showed a mean rating of 1.76. In other words, these educators usually make accommodations for their students with learning disabilities. Educators at the first grade level reported "always" most frequently (mean=1.47). Educators at the sixth grade level reported "always" the least frequently (mean=2.5). The data also showed that educators almost always present material or assignments in oral and written directions (mean=1.34). Additionally, the educators reported that they usually (mean=1.70) involve the students in small group work (See Table 1).

Means were recorded regarding the factors that influence educators' decisions to make accommodations. The data indicated lack of time is usually an influential factor
Furthermore, educators reported lack of knowledge was sometimes a factor in making accommodations (mean=3.08). However, the data also showed that lack of training in special education is only sometimes a factor (mean=3.10). Also, the requirement to follow a strict curriculum guide is sometimes a factor in accommodating students with learning disabilities (mean=3.28) (See Table 2).

Correlation coefficients were calculated among the accommodations that were made by general educators. In addition, correlation coefficients were calculated among the factors influencing the educators’ accommodation decisions. A positive correlation was found between teachers who make accommodations for their students with learning disabilities, and those teachers who gave oral tests ($r=.36$, $p<.05$). This suggested that many teachers who made adaptations often used oral tests for their students with learning disabilities. A positive correlation was also found between the ratings of teachers who made accommodations for their students and those teachers who individualized the assignments for their students ($r=.40$, $p<.05$). This implied that many of the teachers who made adaptations frequently individualized the students’ assignments.

In addition, a positive correlation was found between educators who made accommodations for their students and
those teachers who allowed the students to work in pairs (r=.36, p<.05). This suggested that educators often allowed students to work in pairs as a type of accommodation.

Correlation coefficients were also calculated among the factors influencing general educators decisions to make accommodations. A strong correlation revealed the educators' lack of knowledge and lack of training in the field of special education to be influential factors (r=.73, p<.05). This implied that both the lack of knowledge and lack of special education training frequently influence the educators' decision to make accommodations (See Table 3).

Correlation coefficients were also calculated between the accommodations made by educators and the factors that influence the educators' decisions to make accommodations. However, no significant relationships were found. This was a surprise to discover that the accommodations made by the educators were not affected by the factors.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors that affect the adaptations made by general educators for students with learning disabilities in the classroom. Schumm and Vaughn (1995) found that teachers often allow students with learning disabilities to participate in small group work in the classroom. In the present study similar results were found. The mean response of educators showed that small group work was usually an accommodation that was employed in the classroom.

A few inconsistencies were found between the present study and previous research. For instance, the previous studies revealed that educators often feel they have a difficult time making adaptations because they lack the flexibility in their schedules or curriculum guides needed to provide adequate accommodations. However, this study found 96.2% of the respondents to have the needed flexibility to make adaptations. This study also determined that 59.5% of the educators were not required to adhere to a strict curriculum guide.

Another inconsistency involved the teachers' knowledge and expertise in special education. Previous research indicated that educators often admit their lack of knowledge and skills to be a factor inhibiting their ability to make adaptations. Conversely, the participants in this study reported that this is only sometimes an influential factor
This study had several limitations. A significant limitation was the small sample size due to the moderate percentage of returned surveys. To avoid this, a tracking system could have been utilized to determine which schools did not respond. The researcher then could have called the schools as a reminder. This may have increased the return rate, and consequently, the sample size. The fact that the instrument was a researcher-developed survey was another limitation because there was no reliability or validity that could be determined. In addition, the researcher cannot be sure that each respondent actually utilized each of the accommodations that were reported on the survey. The researcher would have to observe each educator directly to obtain that information. A final limitation is that generalizations to middle and high school settings cannot be made because this study only investigated elementary school settings.

Due to the recent popularity of inclusion programs in school divisions, the amount of research on the subject is also increasing. For additional studies, the researcher recommends a larger sample size and direct observation of the educators in the classrooms. This would provide a more realistic idea of which accommodations are actually implemented in the classrooms. Additional studies should also be conducted across the middle and high school levels.
to provide a broader view of the adaptations made for students with learning disabilities.

Involving students with learning disabilities into inclusion settings is an important area of study. Perhaps further research may help to bridge the many gaps in knowledge surrounding this issue, and prove inclusion to be a success.
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Appendix A
Letter of Request for Permission
to Research
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a graduate student pursuing my Master's Degree in Special Education at Longwood College. I am writing to request permission to survey educators within your school district in order to complete research for my thesis. More specifically, I will be surveying educators of levels K-6 who have students with learning disabilities in their classroom. No names of school divisions, schools, or teachers will be disclosed.

Your permission is greatly appreciated. Please return this letter by in the envelope provided.

I __________ grant/ do not grant permission to Allison K. Hoke to conduct research in __________ school district.

Your time is greatly appreciated.
Sincerely,

Allison K. Hoke
Longwood College
Graduate Student
Appendix B
Letter to Principals
Dear Principal,

I am a graduate student pursuing my Master's Degree in Special Education at Longwood College. I have obtained permission from the school division to distribute surveys among elementary school educators in the district. I assure you the survey will not take more than five minutes of their time.

It would be greatly appreciated if the surveys could be distributed to teachers of grades K-6 who have at least one student with learning disabilities in the classroom.

Your time and consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Allison K. Hoke
Longwood College
Graduate Student
Appendix C
Letter to Teachers
Dear Educator,

I am a graduate student at Longwood College pursuing my Master’s Degree in Special Education. I am interested in how regular education teachers plan and make accommodations for the students with learning disabilities in their classes.

I have enclosed a survey containing questions relating to the factors which may or may not influence making adaptations for students with learning disabilities. I assure you the survey will take less than five minutes of your time. Your participation in this study is voluntary but greatly appreciated. Your confidentiality and anonymity is completely guaranteed. Please return the survey directly to me in the envelope provided by Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Allison K. Hoke
Longwood College
Graduate Student
Appendix D
Survey of Regular Educators
Adaptations Survey

I. Please choose the most appropriate answer.

1. Are you __ male __ female?

2. How long have you been teaching? _____________

3. Which grade level do you teach?
   ___ Kindergarten  ___ 3rd Grade
   ___ 1st Grade    ___ 4th Grade
   ___ 2nd Grade    ___ 5th Grade

4. How many students with learning disabilities are currently in your classroom? ______

5. Is it mandatory that you follow a strict curriculum guide for all students?
   ___ yes  ___ no

6. Do you have flexibility to accommodate for the students with learning disabilities in your class?
   ___ yes  ___ no

7. Do you attend the IEP meetings for the students with learning disabilities in your class?
   ___ yes  ___ no
   If yes, how many have you attended within the last year? _____

8. Do you utilize the IEPs in planning accommodations for the students with learning disabilities?
   ___ yes  ___ no
II. Please answer using
Always=1
Usually=2
Sometimes=3
Never=4

How frequently do you:
1. Make accommodations for your students with learning disabilities? 1 2 3 4
2. Tape record a test for a student? 1 2 3 4
3. Allow a student to have an oral test? 1 2 3 4
4. Present material/assignments using both oral and written directions? 1 2 3 4
5. Allow a student to mark test answers directly in the test booklet? 1 2 3 4
6. Allow a student take a test alone? 1 2 3 4
7. Involve the students in small group work? 1 2 3 4
8. Allow the students to work in pairs? 1 2 3 4
9. Provide the students with manipulatives? 1 2 3 4
10. Provide alternative materials to a student? 1 2 3 4
11. Individualize the assignments? 1 2 3 4

III. Using the same scale, how often are the following a factor in making accommodations for students with learning disabilities in your class?
1. Lack of time. 1 2 3 4
2. Lack of expertise/knowledge of learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4
Always = 1
Usually = 2
Sometimes = 3
Never = 4

3. Lack of training regarding students with learning disabilities.
   1 2 3 4

4. Budget.
   1 2 3 4

5. Lack of communication between general and special educators.
   1 2 3 4

6. Requirement to follow strict curriculum guide for all students.
   1 2 3 4

7. Excessively large class size.
   1 2 3 4

8. Lack of technology.
   1 2 3 4
Tables
Table 1

Mean Ratings of Accommodation Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape record</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral test</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark on test</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test alone</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in pairs</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulatives</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give materials</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. assign.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communic.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Relationship Between Accommodations Made and Factors Influencing General Educators' Decisions to Use Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of accommodation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral test</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized assignments</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in pairs</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05