|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Article citation** | **Main question(s)** | **Research Type** | **Analysis** |
| **(1)**  Muccio, L., Kidd, J., White, C., & Burns, M. (2014). Head start instructional professionals’ inclusion perceptions and practices. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 34(1), 40-48. | **Research Question 1:**  What are Head Start instructional professionals’ perceptions of the needed facilitators for the successful inclusion of children with disabilities?  **Research Question 2:**  What are Head Start instructional professionals’ perceptions of the availability of facilitators for the successful inclusion of children with disabilities?  **Research Question 3:**  In what ways do Head Start instructional professionals provide access, participation, and supports for children with disabilities? | Mixed Method  (Survey design and Observation -Case study | Quantitative data from cross-sectional survey instrument Supports Scale for Preschool Inclusion (SSPI) and to analyze the data of the Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP) |
| **(2)**  Sinclair, E. (1993). Early identification of preschoolers with special needs in Head Start. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 13(2), 184-201. | **This research study did not have research questions.**  Research was conducted on 159 preschool students (of the total enrollment of 900) between 1989 and 1992 to learn about the individual assessment services provided by the Head Start Diagnostic Team | Quantitative | Cluster analysis techniques |
| **(3)**  Odom, S. L., Buysse, V., & Soukakou, E. (2011). Inclusion for young children with disabilities: *A quarter century of research perspectives. Journal of Early Intervention*, 33(4), 344–356. | **This research paper did not have research questions. It reviewed research perspectives of children with special needs in inclusive settings in the last quarter century. Since the passage of PL 99-457 of 1975.** | Quantitative and qualitative studies were reviewed | Quasi-experimental and descriptive research  Quality Inclusive Experiences Measure (QIEM)  Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP) |
| **(4)**  Odom, S. L., & Diamond, K. E. (1998). Inclusion of young children with special needs in early childhood education: The research base. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 13(1), 3–25. | **This research paper did not have research questions. It reviewed the recent empirical literature that underlies inclusive practices.** | Quantitative and qualitative studies were reviewed | Developed a conceptual framework using Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory |
| **(5)**  Warash, B. G., Markstrom, C.A., Lucci, B. (2005). The early childhood environmental rating scale-revised as a tool to improve child care centers. *Education*, 126(2), 240-250. | **Research Question 1:**  Will the total scores on the ECERS-R improve after the initial improvement plans are reviewed with the Directors who in turn inform the teachers?  **Research Question 2:**  Will each of the seven sub-scale scores improve after the initial ECERS –R scores and individual improvement plans are reviewed with the directors who inform the teachers? | Quantitative study | Experimental research design was used to obtain answers to the research questions. |
| **(6)**  Soukakou, E. (2012). Measuring quality in inclusive preschool classrooms: Development and validation of the inclusive classroom Profile. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly.* 27(3), 478-488. | **This research paper did not have research questions. It reviewed the development of the Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP), an assessment tool to measure inclusive practices of early childhood education preschool classrooms.** | Mixed Method – Qualitative and Quantitative | Survey data and  observations  Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP) |
| **(7)**  Peterson, A. C., Wall, S., Jeon, H., Swanson, E, M., & Eshbaugh, E., (2013). Identification of disabilities and service receipt among preschool children living in poverty. *The Journal of Special Education*. (47)1, 28-40. | **Research Question 1:**  What was the prevalence of specific disability indicators among low-income children between ages 3 to 5 years?  **Research Question 2:**  What were the relations between having a disability indicator and specific family characteristics?  Continued on page 3  **Research Question 3:**  What were the relations between having a disability indicator and receipt of specialized services?  **Research Question 4:**  What was the continuity between specialized services  during the infant–toddler years (Part C services) and the  preschool years (Part B services)? and  **Research Question 5:**  Was the receipt of Part B services during the preschool years predicted by the incidence of specific disability indicators during the infant– toddler period? | Quantitative study  Longitudinal study between 1996 2004 | Experimental design |
| **(8)**  Eiserman, D.W., Shisler, L., Healey, S., (1995). A community assessment of preschool provider’s attitude toward inclusion. *Journal of Early Intervention.* (19)2, 149-167. | **Research Question 1:**  What are preschool providers' beliefs regarding the inclusion of children with diverse special needs in regular classrooms?  **Research Question 2**:  To what extent do preschool providers perceive themselves able to serve children with diverse special needs in regular  classrooms?  **Research Question 3:**  What are preschool providers' perceived needs associated with providing inclusive services?  **Research Question 4:**  What are preschool providers' behavioral choices when given an opportunity to gain access to information and participate  in the actual development of inclusive preschool options? | Quantitative  Research  A sample of 220 providers using stratified sampling procedure was selected | Survey data of  Attitude Towards Mainstreaming Scale-Revised (ATMS-R) |
| **(9)**  Buysse, V., Hollingsworth, L. M., (2009). Program quality and early childhood inclusion. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. (29)2, 119-128. | **This research paper did not have research questions. It discussed the importance of the connection between early childhood program quality and professional development.** | Qualitative and quantitative studies were discussed. | Observations  Data  Survey |
| **Article citation** | **Main Questions** | **Research Type** | **Analysis** |
| **(10)**  Brown, H, W., Odom, L, S., Li, S., Zercher, C., (1999). Ecobehavioral assessments in early childhood programs: A portrait of preschool inclusion. *The Journal of Special Education.* (33)3, 138-153 | **Research Question 1:**  Do children with and without disabilities participate in different group arrangements and different peer group compositions during various activities within in inclusive preschool programs?  **Research Question 2:**  Do children with and without disabilities participate in different activities within in inclusive preschool programs?  **Research Question 3:**  Given common preschool activities, are the initiators of those activities different from children with and without disabilities within in inclusive preschool programs?  **Research Question 4:**  During common preschool activities, do children with and without disabilities exhibit nonsocial and social behaviors within inclusive preschool programs?  **Research Question 5:**  During common preschool activities, do teachers exhibit different adult behaviors inclusive preschool programs? | Qualitative Research  112 children enrolled in 16 inclusive preschool classrooms in CA, MD, TN, and WA  Purposing sampling method was used | Observation data from time sampling |
| **(11)**  Gallagher, P. A., & Lambert, R. G. (2006). Classroom quality, concentration of children with special Needs, and child outcomes in Head Start. *Exceptional Children*, *73*(1), 31–52. | **Research Question 1:**  Under what circumstances does inclusion work optimally to benefit all children and families?  **Research Question 1:**  What constitutes quality in classrooms of children with special needs?  **Research Question 2:**  How resources should best be used for the optimal benefit of all young children and their families? | Mixed Method – Qualitative and Quantitative  Longitudinal Study conducted over a 5 year period  This sampling procedure was followed in each of two consecutive academic years, resulting in a total sample of 96 classrooms and 960 children  Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was used to test for the association between classroom quality indicators and the scores on each outcome measure.  The Adaptive Social Behavior Inventory  (ASBI; Hogan, Scott, & Bauer, 1992), a teacher  rating scale, was used as a measure of the children’s  social functioning in the classroom.  The Family and Child  Experiences Survey (FACES) Parent Interview) was used  as the principal data source for collecting family variables  The Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programs: Research Edition II was used to assess quality in Head Start classrooms. | The results of this study indicate that children  with special needs tend to be rated lower than  their peers on positive social functioning measures  by both their teachers and their parents…  Independent assessors, employed in the administration of a measure of emergent  literacy development, found that the children  with special needs scored lower than their typically  developing peers on those measures, as well  (p.43)  Results of this study also point out the importance  of the distribution of children with special needs  within classrooms across programs, as well as the  importance of training and support for classroom  teachers. Placement of children with special needs  across programs in classrooms is thus an important consideration  (p.45). |
| **(12)**  Ramey C.T., Ramey S. L., (1998) Early intervention and early experiences. *American Psychologist.* 53(2), 109-120. | Does Early Intervention Alter Development?  This paper discussed the development of the  biosocial developmental contextualism framework which derives from social, ecology, developmental systems theory, developmental epidemiology, and developmental neurobiology*.* | This integrative perspective predicts that fragmented, weak efforts in early intervention are not likely to succeed,  whereas intensive, high-quality, ecologically pervasive interventions can and do. | Relevant evidence was summarized  in 6 principles about efficacy of early intervention.  Principle I: Principle of developmental timing.  Principle 2: Principle of program intensity.  Principle 3: Principle of direct (vs. intermediary) provision of learning experiences.  Principle 4: Principle of program breadth and flexibility.  Principle 5: Principle of individual differences in program benefits.  Principle 6: Principle of ecological dominion and environmental maintenance of development.  The public policy challenge in early intervention is to contain costs by more precisely targeting early interventions to those who most need and benefit from these interventions.  The empirical evidence on biobehavioral effects of early experience and early intervention has direct relevance to federal and state policy development and resource allocation. |
| **(13)**  Odom, S. L. (2000). Preschool inclusion what we Know and where we go from here. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, *20*(1), 20–27. | **This research paper did not have research questions. It described about past issues of outcomes of inclusion, social integration patterns, placement, definition, quality instruction, teacher attitudes, family attitudes, community participation, policy factors and cultural influences. In addition it discussed about addressing on-going issues related to definition, quality, intensity and instruction, outcomes and goals, social integration, and costs and funding.** | Qualitative studies  Quantitative studies  and Mixed method studies were discussed |  |
| **(14)**  Wolery, M., Brashers, M. S., & Neitzel, J. C. (2002). Ecological congruence assessment for classroom activities and routines: Identifying goals and intervention practices in childcare. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 22(3), 131. | 1. How deviant (different) the child’s behavior is for a given context or setting?   2. How competent the child is in performing functional tasks in that context or setting?  3. What is the level of tolerance (for difference-- the adult’s tolerance of the child’s difference, and the child’s tolerance for the context or  Setting)? | Qualitative research study  Case Study  Longitudinal study over a two year period at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development  Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). | Analysis of the data of the Ecological Congruence Assessment (ECA)  Involved 10 lead teachers.  All classes included children with and without disabilities, but a majority in each class did not have disabilities.  Many young children with disabilities are in childcare  centers, but their teachers often have little formal training regarding how to address their learning needs, and the consulting specialists have little time to observe the classroom.(p.141). |
| **(15)**  Guo, Y., Sawyer, B. E., Justice, L. M., & Kaderavek, J. N. (2013). Quality of the literacy environment in inclusive early childhood special education classrooms. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *35*(1), 40–60. | The first aim was to characterize the structural and instructional quality of the literacy environment in inclusive ECSE classrooms.  The second aim was to examine the contribution of teacher and classroom level factors to the quality of the literacy environment in inclusive ECSE classrooms | multisite experimental  study  This study included data drawn from the inclusive (Early Childhood Special Education) ECSE classrooms of 54 preschool teachers working within a single Midwestern state | *Structural literacy environment. The Classroom Literacy Observation Protocol* (CLOP; Children’s Learning Research Collaborative, 2008) was used as the measure of the structural literacy environment  The instructional support domain of the *Classroom*  *Assessment Scoring System* (CLASS; R. C. Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008) was used to measure the  instructional literacy environment.  *T*eachers completed a questionnaire about their demographic information and beliefs and perceptions (i.e., self-efficacy)  Classroom factors included the following variables:  (a) Number of children with IEPs, (b) Children’s literacy scores aggregated at the classroom level (from fall assessments), and (c) Number of children who were DLLs.  Caregivers completed the Parent Form of the *Clinical Evaluation of Language*  *Fundamentals Preschool–Second Edition Pre-Literacy Rating Scale* (CELF Preschool-2 PLRS; Wiig, Secord, & Semel, 2004) as the measure of children’s literacy skills. The 26 items of the PLRS focus on children’s emergent reading  Study results indicated that 1. The structural literacy environment of ECSE classrooms, including books and print and writing materials, was generally of low to moderate  Quality  2. The Quality of print and writing materials, the majority of the inclusive ECSE classrooms studied were also found to provide only a limited number of print materials.  3. The quality of the instructional literacy environment (instructional support) of inclusive ECSE classrooms was found to be generally low.  4. The teacher-level factors – It was found that the instructional literacy environment was positively associated with higher educational credentials  5.Several teacher- and classroom-level factors significantly predicted the quality of the literacy environment after controlling for all other teacher and classroom factors. |