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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the passage of PL94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, there has been confusion and controversy over the terms "least restrictive environment" and "mainstreaming." Even though mainstreaming was never mentioned in PL94-142, this term has concerned the classroom teacher and has added another challenge to the job of the Exceptional Educational Needs teacher. The challenge for the EEN teacher was to provide techniques, suggestions, and alternatives for the classroom teacher to use in facilitating the integration of the EEN students into the least restrictive environment.

Purpose

The purpose of this research paper was three-fold:
(1) To review the reasons and benefits of mainstreaming;
(2) To determine attitudes of regular classroom teachers and ways to involve the classroom teacher in mainstreaming;
(3) To investigate techniques to facilitate integration of the handicapped and the challenges of individualization.
This third section also contains a series of suggestions and techniques to enrich the curriculum to accommodate a variety of student learning styles and patterns.

**Scope and Limitations**

The term mainstreaming has only come into prominence in the last ten years. Thus the writer has limited the review of the literature on mainstreaming to publication dates since 1968. However, the majority of the techniques, suggestions, and alternatives mentioned in this research paper have been gathered from recent periodicals and journals listed in *The Education Index*.

Least restrictive environment was explained by Dr. Ed Martin, director of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, as "the program best suited to that child's special needs, which is as close as possible to a normal child's education program". (Martin, 1977, p. 63).

**Definitions**

The reviewer found a diverse number of definitions on mainstreaming. The definitions ranged from the succinct comments of Pohl (1975) to the formalized statement of the Council on Exceptional Children (1975).

Pohl (1975) stated "It [mainstreaming] means placing children with sensory impairments, intellectual limitations, and physical disabilities into regular classroom settings" (p. 5).
Hasazi, McKenzie and Birch (1976) defined mainstreaming to mean enrolling and teaching exceptional children in regular classes for the majority of the school day under the charge of the regular class teacher assuring that the exceptional child receives special education of the high quality to the extent it is needed during that time and any other time. (p. 14)

In 1972, Beery stated the concept of mainstreaming means:

creation of more individualized, personalized programs in regular classroom settings for children who have difficulties. It also means . . . the creation of educational environments which encourage collegial exchanges which help each educator in a building to grow and to be encouraged. It means increased personal and professional contact and mutual help among classroom teachers and specialists. (p. 6)

The main emphasis in the Klausmeier (1976) statement was the child.

Mainstreaming strives to create a management system, a learning environment in which each child is individually evaluated, prescribed for, and monitored in a learning program that is his alone; the purpose of mainstreaming is not to place him in any kind of group. (p. 37)

A statement issued by the Council for Exceptional Children in 1975 declared:

Mainstreaming is the belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on conviction that each child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his or her educational and related needs can be satisfactorily provided. This concept recognizes that exceptional children have a wide range of special education needs varying greatly in intensity and duration; that there is a recognized continuum of educational settings which may at a given time be appropriate for an individual child's needs; that to the maximum extent
appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with non-exceptional children and that special classes, separate schooling or other removal of an exceptional child from education with non-exceptional children should occur only when the intensity of the child's special education and related needs is such that they can't be satisfied in an environment including provision of supplementary aids and services. (pp. 44-45)

The most widely cited definition was offered by Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard and Kukic (1975).

Mainstreaming refers to the temporal, instructional and social integration of eligible exceptional children with normal peers, based on an ongoing individually determined educational planning and programming process and requires clarification of responsibility among regular and special education administrative, instructional, and supportive personnel. (p. 9)

The terms least restrictive environment and mainstreaming were defined in order to lessen the confusion over their meanings.

Summary

The terms, "least restrictive environment" and "mainstreaming," have become both popular and confusing since the passage of PL94-142. The three-fold purpose of this research paper was to gain insight into the benefits of mainstreaming, the techniques for facilitating it, and the attitudes of regular teachers toward the handicapped in their classrooms.

The scope of this research covers a ten year period: 1968-1978. In this chapter a variety of definitions of mainstreaming was provided. Chapter 2 presents the review of research on this important issue.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

The Benefits of Mainstreaming

Since the publication of Dunn's article (1968), which questioned practice of separate special class placement, research studies have shown that separateness on the basis of difference was stigmatizing (Carpenter, 1975). Many studies have advocated mainstreaming as an antidote.

Some of Dunn's comments which sparked the mainstreaming debate were "separating a child from other children in his neighborhood or removing him from the regular classroom for therapy or special class placement--probably has a serious debilitating effect on his self image" (Dunn, 1968, p. 9).

Studies using retarded subjects cited by Hewett (1974) are applicable to the mainstream examination. The studies maintained that special classes isolated the child from normal social experience. The special class placement could cause loss of self esteem to the stigma of isolation and rejection. It was found that while homogeneous grouping at ability level leads to effective teaching, there is little evidence that it provides optimum learning for normal or retarded youngsters.
A series of reasons suggesting that all exceptional children be placed in the regular classroom was provided by Neff and Pilch (1976). One of their conclusions was that special education classes have not been as effective educationally as proponents claim. Labeling oftentimes remains with the child for life. There were not enough trained and qualified special education teachers to do the job that some say is needed. In reality there were not enough special education classrooms to house all exceptional children. Neff and Pilch also list five benefits an EEN child received from being in the regular classroom. The regular classroom placement helped social adjustment, learning from other children, acquisition of a better social image, acceptance of the real world, and emotional adjustment.

Results from Cantrell and Cantrell (1976) uphold the concept of mainstreaming. Their study supported the hypothesis that regular classroom teachers, who have access to personnel trained in analysis and intervention strategies, can effect significant achievement gains for students at all levels of intelligence quotient functioning.

McCarthy (1971) summed up the importance of mainstreaming for special education youngsters in his comments that mainstreaming has proven to be the least restrictive placement, as most studies comparing the self-contained
special education classroom with the regular classroom have resulted in failure to prove the self-contained classroom as being superior in academic achievement.

Solomon (1971) felt that only through mainstreamed education can children learn about their handicapped peers without prejudice and misinformation.

Normal children benefit from having contact with the handicapped, since they can acquire skills, attitudes and knowledge to function and participate in a democratic society (Hasazi, McKenzie, Birch, 1976).

Mainstreaming can also be advantageous to the handicapped youngster. Hasazi et al. (1976) found it expanded the exceptional child's view of humanity. Mainstreaming eliminated the effects of isolation and segregation as well as bringing the handicapped youngster into a normal learning and social environment. These benefits were suggested by Yang (1975). Woodworth (1977) expressed a series of benefits in mainstreaming the handicapped student. No difficult transition from sheltered setting to community of peers would have to be made. The handicapped child would not question if he can measure up. As the handicapped recognized their developing abilities, they would be aware of a growing attitude of acceptance of themselves as persons.

Pohl (1975) advanced ideas that through mainstreaming the special education child would be more likely to
develop the capability in the non-handicapped world, to accept others as he is accepted and to live with whatever limitations are impossible to alleviate. The mainstreamed youngster would be more able to become part of and to contribute to his community as his self concept was enhanced.

More specifically, Farrar (1976) mentioned the benefits of mainstreaming for the learning disabled (LD) youngster. The LD student would be better prepared to meet the contingencies of life with adequacy and feelings of dignity. Through integration with society, the LD student can develop acceptable levels of performance proportionate with his ability. Students would be better prepared to cope with the stumbling blocks in life.

Through mainstreaming, Martin (1977) said, "once we [teachers] begin to see the child who is handicapped as a person first . . . we will learn that our children are more alike than different in how they learn in their desire for success, their pain in failure, their joy in companionship" (p. 46).

Hasazi and York (1977) suggested how mainstreaming has been advantageous for education in general. Mainstreaming has increased the recognition of the importance of good teaching. It has stressed the need for a supporting environment and increased options for all [students]. Due to mainstreaming, educators are more cognizant of the
uniqueness of all children and that all require specialized and individualized instruction. The mainstream makes the stream of education broader and deeper than in the past.

The overall attractiveness of the mainstream placement was stated by Keogh and Levitt (1976).

Mainstream placement was seen as a way of ensuring educational opportunity and success as well as providing educational services consistent with legal and legislative mandates and at the same time removing possible effects of pejorative labels. (p. 3)

In summary an article written by Dunn (1968) started the examination of the benefits of separate class placement for the handicapped. Several recent studies (Hewett, 1974; Neff & Pilch, 1976) have indicated special class placement could subject the handicapped child to labeling, isolation, and loss of self esteem. Results of these studies helped the movement for mainstreaming. Mainstreaming can be advantageous for children, handicapped children, teachers and education in general (Farrar, 1976; Hasazi et al., 1976; Pohl, 1975; Solomon, 1971). The next section of the research paper will examine teacher attitudes about mainstreaming.

Attitudes of Teachers Toward EEM Pupils

The second purpose of this research paper was to investigate teachers' attitudes toward exceptional children mainstreamed into their classroom. Results of several
studies of teacher attitudes and knowledge about mild handicapped pupils and how to teach them are of direct relevance to mainstreaming. Teacher attitude is one aspect of mainstreaming that is often overlooked. A review of these studies can be both enlightening and compelling for the special education teacher.

Gickling and Theobald (1975) commented that if mainstreaming were to be successful, teacher attitudes toward working with mildly handicapped children must be assessed. Without assessment, information, and training, regular classroom teachers' negative attitudes about mainstreaming may become more intense.

Differences in perception of special education and regular classroom teachers toward integrating exceptional children into the regular classroom were reported by Gickling and Theobald. Only 30 percent of special education teachers perceived that regular education teachers felt imposed, while actually 50 percent of the regular educators felt a sense of imposition.

Comments by Dexter (1977) indicated that most classroom teachers view mainstreaming as a 'sink or swim' proposition on their part. The classroom teachers see themselves as having been given major responsibility of teaching youngsters who previously were considered unfit for the classroom.
Another result of Gickling and Theobald (1975) study revealed that 60 percent of the regular classroom teachers felt special education students were best served in a self contained setting. Regular classroom teacher attitudes showed that only 50 percent felt that students in self contained classrooms were likely to be restricted from extra curricular activities.

Hewett and Watson's study (Note 1) found that while teachers were able to distinguish among characteristics of EEN pupils, few had knowledge of how to provide individualized instruction for them.

In a study conducted by McGinty and Keogh (Note 2) it was demonstrated that while teachers agreed on what they needed to know, they also agreed that they did not know it. Several major topics of interest were listed by teachers in McGinty and Keogh (Note 2) study. First the teachers wanted more knowledge as to how to plan and implement specialized remedial programs. Secondly, many wanted to learn to be more comfortable in teaching a broader spectrum of subject matter. Most wanted to become aware of resources and services available within and outside the school.

Several authors have gathered a series of techniques that can facilitate integration of the handicapped into the mainstream. That many [students] need leadership and guidance in accepting the atypical child as a worthy
and functioning member of the class was suggested by Pohl (1975). This leadership should be provided by the classroom teacher and special education personnel.

In a recent study Cleary (1976) compiled a comprehensive list of techniques to facilitate integration of the handicapped into the classroom. One of the techniques proposed was a series of group discussions. The discussions could focus on several topics. Some topics could be identification of personal strengths and weaknesses, differences in age, size, learning ability and socialization skills of students. Another topic could be to differentiate between a special need and a handicap. Another suggestion was to invite a resource speaker such as a special education teacher, speech clinician or physical therapist to comment on various handicaps. The students would also benefit from role playing, particularly since there might be transference of feelings in the process. A demonstration of self-help devices such as crutches, artificial limbs, wheelchairs, hearing aids, etc., was also mentioned by Cleary. The newly acquired knowledge about handicaps should be supplemented with books, movies, pamphlets, slides, tapes and records. If possible a field trip to selected agencies serving people with special needs would be appropriate.

Pieper (1974) also prepared some methods to facilitate integration of the handicapped. She advocated asking
several handicapped persons to speak to students. A physical therapist, who could illustrate equipment and how students could help could also be a participant if appropriate. The teacher could capitalize on feelings of students with temporal disabilities such as a broken leg. Joint activities could be scheduled with EEN students.

The social studies curriculum can be used to stress the theme of respect for differences in people and can be used to show how man has adapted to his environment (Cohen, 1978). Another suggestion by Cohen was that parents need workshops, discussion groups and conferences as much as children.

An evaluation of the regular teacher preparation model using the laboratory experimental approach by Yates (1973) indicated that a teacher preparation model can increase the amount of information possessed by the classroom teacher. The Yates study has shown that regular classroom teachers can learn more about special education if provided with information.

If the classroom teachers with the assistance of special education personnel use some of the techniques suggested by the various authors, all children will benefit from the integration of the handicapped into the mainstream. All students need to develop in an atmosphere of warmth and concern. In this kind of atmosphere, they will show genuine concern for one another (Fohl, 1975).
Hewett (1974) has shown that increased integration can be beneficial to the classroom teacher. Integration can help broaden the teachers' tolerance for behavioral and academic differences and can increase the effectiveness of individualized instruction. However, an effective teacher-pupil match up must be planned before the benefits can be realized. Thus integration can result in a better quality education for all youngsters.

At the conclusion of this study Shotel, Iano and McGettigan (1972) suggested that teachers would be more confident if there would be inservice workshops and if there was provision for intensive communication and intervention among special education and regular classroom teachers.

Harasymiu and Horne (1974) indicated that teacher opinions and attitudes can be positively modified using two techniques. First the in-service program should provide new knowledge. Classroom experience in working with special needs children should be planned. Support of administrators and resource personnel is critical to the success of the techniques.

A report by Reynolds and Birch (1978) on inservice education showed that teachers and principals wanted to see more workshops and less lectures on special education. They also indicated interest in participatory demonstrations. Both groups in the study wanted to attend more professional meetings. The participants in the report
wanted more emphasis on teaching exceptional children rather than emphasis on behavior modification.

In the study conducted by Gickling and Theobald (1975) 80 percent of the regular classroom teachers indicated they would feel more comfortable if special education teachers were to assist them in the classroom. Over 90 percent said they would work with special education personnel if they had the time.

It appears that there is a large gap between perceptions and concerns of teachers and special education personnel about mainstreaming. Several suggestions were given in this review that could be profitable to both existing or new special education programs that mainstream youngsters.

After the EEN student has been integrated into the classroom, the special education teacher can suggest peer teaching to the regular teacher as a procedure that can be beneficial to the teacher, tutor and pupil.

In his book Beery (1972) has suggested that the teacher must see himself or herself as the "orchestrator" of learning, who has many teacher aids and who must use others in order to individualize instruction.

Some of the benefits of peer teaching mentioned by Beery were that the tutor learned responsibilities and respect for differences. In addition the tutor usually gained more academically and socially than the pupil.

It must be acknowledged that sometimes students teach each other more efficiently than professionals.
Teachers should remember that children who take the teaching role improve as much or more than those who learn. Children who are not the best pupils benefit the most and are the most effective teachers.

Beery has outlined a procedure that proves helpful to both the overworked classroom and special education teacher. Both adults and students can benefit from active use of this plan. Again all children can benefit from being in the mainstream of education.

The importance of classroom teachers to the mainstreaming process is evident because they make referrals to the multidisciplinary team and they participate in the preparation and administration of the Individual Education Plan. The EEN teacher should rely on the classroom teacher as a variable resource. Communication is necessary for these two sets of teachers to maximize their input into the students' successful mainstreaming.

McDonnell (1978) felt that the classroom teacher has comprehensive knowledge of the students' strengths, weaknesses and level of performance. The teachers' input is vital in planning the IEP. Classroom performance can also be provided by the teacher.

Some of the teacher talents that can help the mainstreamed student were compiled by Neff and Pilch (1976). Classroom teachers are part of a continuous evaluation process and become diagnosticians. Their observations of daily performance and behavior can contribute to
decisions on what works for the student. After analysis of informal tests and work samples, the classroom teacher is able to choose published materials and programs that best serve the youngster. When testing for a particular skill, the teacher can break the skills into component parts for the youngster.

If classroom teachers are to be a vital component in mainstreaming, they have the right to expect support for themselves and for the mainstreamed youngsters. In recent articles by Roberts (1975) and Hasazi and York (1977) it was stated that classroom teachers can expect support from trained special education consultants, diagnostic specialists, physical and speech therapists, quality in inservice programs and administrative and community support.

Communication is a mandatory part of the mainstreaming process. Both branches of education, the classroom teacher and special education personnel, will have to be able to tell each other what they know and also to hear what each other has to say (Sheey, 1975). A teacher planning form suggested by Ozer (1978) can be used to increase communication within the two branches of education. Using the form, special education personnel can oversee five areas of concern. First, special education personnel can inquire as to the teachers' concerns about the child's progress at a particular time. From that they can discuss the child's positive accomplishments during the past week. From this they can decide what worked to make it possible
for the child to achieve such positive accomplishments. Next they can set goals for the child to do by the end of the next period. Finally they can set a priority goal for the future and decide on ways to reach the goal. In order for a systematic transfer of skills from the resource room to the regular classroom, both teachers must be consistent in remediation. This can be accomplished through communication of the short and long range goals of the IEP. Both educators must discuss the type of remediation and monitor the feedback. McDonnell (1978) commented that the cooperation of the classroom teacher with the EEN teacher can mean the success of the IEP.

In summary several recent studies (McDonnell, 1978; Neff & Pilch, 1976) have stressed the importance of classroom teachers' involvement in mainstreaming. The input from classroom teachers is critical to successful integration of handicapped students. Teachers can provide observations and comments that can be beneficial to the EEN personnel in planning future goals. When EEN personnel and teachers share their expertise, the student benefits. The planning form suggested by Ozer (1978) can be a springboard for such meaningful communication.

**Techniques to Facilitate Integration**

The classroom teacher faces a challenge to attempt to adapt the curriculum and to find teaching techniques to meet the exigencies of handicapped students. The challenge
for the special education teacher is to suggest teaching techniques and curriculum adaptations that can answer the needs of the handicapped students and classroom teachers. These techniques and adaptations can be proposed by the special educators during inservice workshops, group discussions, department meetings, weekly conferences and planning committees. The reviewer has assembled a collection of ideas for use by the special education teacher to meet the challenge.

Some ideas that could prove useful were compiled by Jones (1977). Her ideas were to allow students to use calculators, desk charts, timelines and maps, to encourage them to use a typewriter if desired, to emphasize important points by color coding, underlining or changing pitch of voice, to seat the students near the front of the room, to assign each student a buddy who can help with directions, to give written and oral directions, to require students to use a subject notebook or folder. Other suggestions by Jones were to use a course outline, syllabus, or contract, to give copy of outline to LD specialist and to remember to grade student on his or her progress not according to peers' achievements.

Suggestions for curriculum modification by teachers were prepared by Lometti-Fitzgerald (1977) for use in a team teaching (LD teacher and classroom teacher) situation,
but they are applicable for use by all teachers of handicapped students. The suggestions were for the teacher to modify language, to talk slower, to control vocabulary, to use step-by-step directions, to demonstrate directions, perhaps to have students repeat direction or to write assignment on the board. A multisensory approach was advocated. Some ways to use a multisensory method were to discuss vocabulary and purpose for reading beforehand, to tape a reading assignment, to have one student read with another, to reduce amount of reading, to use audiovisuals, to cut down on the amount of written material on a worksheet or lecture, to use chalkboard for providing models, to tape record important parts of a lecture, to provide visuals whenever possible in illustrating a point and finally to provide for active student participation (i.e., role playing, simulations, panels).

Techniques, prepared by Roberts (1975), for sharing with classroom teachers included comments to use informal teacher-made tests to assess skills in academic areas, to have teachers read current diagnostic test results and educational recommendations, to confer with former teachers, to set both long and short term objectives, to break objectives into sequential steps, to decide on helpful materials, to modify materials if necessary, to keep daily progress records. These techniques suggested by special
education personnel can assist both the classroom teacher and the integrated student.

The Council for Exceptional Children Guidelines for teaching the handicapped can be doubly helpful because the same principles, procedures and techniques suggested are profitable for use with many kinds of students. Some of the general guidelines were collected by Milbauer (1977). They were to undercut, begin a little below where the child is, to use direct experience, to help the child set pace of learning, to employ principles of reinforcement, to provide choices for the child, to encourage divergent thinking, to give chances for leadership, to use peer instruction and to give prompt feedback to pupils. Other ideas provided by CEC were to move from familiar to unfamiliar, to model things you can, to use reviews meaningfully, to help students learn how they learn, to limit extraneous stimuli, to remember the high interest-low difficulty principle, to be consistent and to be observant of what blocks progress.

Neff and Pilch (1976) gave a lengthly list of procedures that can be suggested to the classroom teacher by special education personnel. The procedures were to set up clear rules, to minimize or reduce disruptions and delays, to plan independent and group work, to stress positive aspects of classroom behavior, to praise good behavior, to be kind but also firm and consistent, to give one direction at a time, to keep language of instruction clear and
concise, to move from concrete to abstract ideas, to use short and frequent repetitions, to anticipate ups and downs, to control length and amount of work periods, to be flexible if work assignment has to be altered and to not allow students to practice their errors. Other areas to emphasize are to provide immediate feedback, to have a positive approach, to have alternative management systems such as team teaching, tutors or parent volunteers, to use money and materials in most profitable manner.

A series of principles and techniques proposed in the *Instructor* magazine (1977) can be useful to the classroom teacher. Some ideas that could be suggested by the special education teacher were to attempt to establish trust relationships with students, to keep the students' self-concept in mind, to realize no one has to go it alone, to remember to make full use of IEP and to keep daily written records. Other procedures given were to shape behavioral expectations to fit each student, to offer alternative routes to academic success, to find and become familiar with special education materials, and to try to reinforce uniqueness of each child.

In these paragraphs the special education teacher was given lists of suggestions and techniques to answer the needs of a classroom teacher, who will adapt curriculum to welcome a mainstreamed youngster. Though there was repetition of some procedures, this can prove helpful if
the special education teacher has to approach the same area of concern in a varied way.

Some classroom teachers may want to try some new methods once they become involved in the mainstreaming process. If this is the case, the LD personnel may then suggest ways in which the teacher can increase individualization and personalization.

One way to accomplish this goal suggested by Beery (1974) was to have the classroom be set up more like a resource room. It would include a stated continuum of academic and social skills, identification of each child's best learning style, one-to-one instruction as well as large and small grouping. Another way to reorganize the classroom was the incorporation of resource personnel in the classroom.

The independent learning center idea can be beneficial since it encourages truly individualized thinking and programming (Beery, 1972). Each learning center should have tasks that have been analyzed into component elements. From this, specific instructional goals to achieve these tasks should be developed. These ideas on learning centers were formulated by Pohl (1975).

Johnson and Johnson (1978) listed a series of techniques that can be helpful when planning large and small groups. These guidelines can be suggested by LD personnel to the teacher, who wants to use the method but seeks guidance to effectively manage this technique. The teacher
should specify instructional goals of lesson, select an appropriate group, size, assign students to groups and provide appropriate materials. In addition it should be suggested to the teacher to explain the task and goal, observe student interaction, intervene as a teacher consultant, evaluate group products using criterion reference evaluation system, reinforce cooperation by judging each group on progress. The cooperation that can come from this technique is the learning that is consistent with the purpose of mainstreaming.

Hewett (1974) reminded teachers that suitable learning tasks for normal children may be made on group or grade basis but for the exceptional learner it must be made on an individualized level. There should also be a difference in conditions in which tasks are presented, and an emphasis and concern for basic competence. Attention should also be given to the response order level and component parts of large tasks.

If the teacher is willing to reorganize the classroom and to rethink teaching style then these ideas could be helpful in facilitating this change.

Techniques to Assist Students with Perception Difficulties

The following suggestions are appropriate for students with visual and visual-motor problems. They were collected by Jones (1977) for teachers who had a LD student in class. The suggestions were to use reading materials at appropriate grade levels, to allow students
to tape lectures, discussions and directions rather than take notes, to give short written assignments, to give oral tests if appropriate and to provide a variety of test items. Other ideas included provision for variety of assignments, allowing students to copy others' notes and providing brief written outlines for reading assignments.

Ways to structure the learning environment to help the students with visual attention problems were supplied by Dexter (1977). The ways were to place the child where there was the least number of students, to seat students away from windows, to keep desk clear of unnecessary items and to use appropriate reinforcers. Dexter also mentioned ideas to assist the student with visual discrimination difficulties. These were to shorten assignments, to have written directions accompanied by verbal cues to demonstrate directions.

Brown (1977) gave specific suggestions appropriate for students with auditory problems. The teacher can be reminded to use visuals such as maps, slides, charts and pictures with lectures, to summarize key points in both introduction and conclusion of the lesson, to help with material that has to be memorized using mnemonic devices and to use tapes for individual instruction or to tape lectures for students.

Several teaching techniques to assist students with auditory attention deficits are to give approval for acceptable behavior such as hand on shoulder. Other
activities to use with students having auditory comprehension difficulties are to shorten teacher phrases, to ask shorter questions, to allow ample time for responses to oral questions and to use visual aids. These techniques were compiled by Dexter (1977).

A frequent request from classroom teachers for LD personnel is to suggest ways the students can demonstrate what they have learned from a unit of study in ways other than taking a typical test. Jones' ideas were that the students could make a transparency to illustrate ideas from the unit, prepare a glossary of terms and their definitions from a unit, prepare a chart or map showing information from the unit, draw a cartoon or cartoon strip expressing an idea from the unit, adapt information for a simple play or skit, make a collage or picture sequence related to ideas studied in the unit, construct a bulletin board display or write or tape a news commentary on subject related to the unit.

Techniques for Use in Academic Courses

The next part includes specific ideas that can be proposed by the LD personnel to the classroom teachers. Some ideas are general tips while others pertain to particular academic courses or for students with specific disability areas.

Some specific techniques for use by English teachers of mainstreamed learning disabled students were compiled by
Brown (1977). Her ideas were to find each student's comprehension level; to then locate appropriate materials that are relevant to the class; to adapt the material; to shorten assignments; to tape difficult selections and to prepare study guides or outlines including important points. Other suggestions mentioned were to plan for three to four different activities, to incorporate role playing or choral reading, to use a variety of media, to videotape relevant television programs, to make spelling and grammar games, to maintain a large classroom calendar and to remain flexible.

Ideas on procedures to use in a social studies classroom were suggested in Leone and Retish's research (1978). The ideas centered on organizing social studies textbooks according to degree of difficulty, to have readability studies on all textbooks, to provide alternative studies and assignments and for the teacher to serve as sole model in teaching students appropriate attitudes and behaviors.

**Individualization of Instruction**

Within each building there may be some teachers who want to rethink or reorganize their program to be better able to accomplish mainstreaming. Individualization of instruction may be seen as the key in facilitating their new programs. Thus, the LD personnel can serve as resource
agents able to give guidelines and suggestions to initiating an individualized curriculum.

The key to individualization stated by Beery (1972) is the creation of a process that identifies what each child knows and needs to know. Included in the process should be methods created to meet the child's need in an enjoyable and efficient manner. As part of the process, the teacher must analyze goals, specify objectives, and use criterion tests. Several alternative methods for reaching selected objectives should be planned by the teacher. Both pupils and teacher should be part of a continual reevaluation of the process.

As a result of individualization the classroom teacher becomes involved with the student in three new ways. First, the teacher becomes a facilitator of learning experiences; then a guide in assisting the child to fulfill the personalized curriculum, and finally an instructor of the individualized curriculum (Pohl, 1975).

Successful individualization is a result of a unique teacher philosophy. Neff and Pilch (1976) identified three components of this philosophy. The first part is that the teacher becomes part of a team of other professionals whose interest is to help children learn.

Successful individualization is a result of a unique teacher philosophy. Neff and Pilch (1976) identified three components of this philosophy. The first part is that teachers believe earnestly that children can learn
and learn well. Adequate instruction depends on knowing one's pupil; diagnosing his learning problem is the second part. Finally, teachers practice therapeutic teaching or examine students in the light of what they do as well as how they think and function.

Teachers desirous of using individualized techniques should remember Yang's (1975) suggestion that what you say is not as important as how or the way you behave.

An important part of individualization is the ability of the teacher to motivate the students. Neff and Pilch (1976) have prepared a list of procedures of how some teachers motivate students. First, teachers can motivate students by expecting them to work. The teachers also have the opinion that most students like to learn and generally enjoy learning. The teacher can impart the feeling that success is possible. Competition is not with the teacher but with the student's own goals. The teacher makes frequent use of carefully stated objectives, current events, and contemporary materials. The teacher's warmth and understanding helps motivate the student's curiosity. These are all ways teachers can motivate students to become involved in individualization.

If the classroom teachers need a good summary of what individualization means. Neff and Pilch (1976) have prepared an outline. Individualization means a highly or even tightly structured learning environment, personal tutorial help of a teacher to correct deficiencies. Individualization also
means careful guidance in ways to avoid wasted time as well as ways to avoid frustration and failure. Included in individualization is the child working with the teacher on a one-to-one tutorial basis for at least a short period of time.

The LD personnel can help the teachers interested in individualization by reminding them what individualization is NOT. Neff and Pilch (1976) state that individualization is not an open classroom where children are permitted to do as they choose. It also is not carefully prepared work packets, units, modules, or textbooks prepared to look individual. Individualization does not allow children to be turned loose in lessons or workbooks. Neither does it mean use of a teaching device or machine that the child can play with on his own.

Individualization of instruction will not succeed if major obstacles block the commitment of teachers. Neff and Pilch (1976) have defined some of these obstacles. Individualization cannot be practiced if learning is based on a uniform text or overreliance on teaching machines. It will not be successful if the administration is uncooperative and refuses to furnish extra resource materials or to allow time for teachers to prepare or plan for a change. Accountability for the success of individualization is jointly shared by teachers, administrators, and school boards.
In some cases individualization of instruction has become linked with mainstreaming. LD personnel can be of great assistance to teacher and integrated students, if she/he can clearly establish the components of the concept. One of the keys to successful mainstreaming may be individualization of instruction. However, individualization is a complex procedure that is dependent on cooperation of many people. LD personnel can help to explain the procedure so it can be understood more readily. It should be remembered that mainstreaming will be accomplished without intense cooperation, but individualization of instruction probably can not.

**Summary**

The premise by Dunn (1968) that special class placement could be stigmatizing was supported by recent research investigations (Hewett, 1974; Neff & Pilch, 1976). Some of the research on mainstreaming (Farrar, 1976; Hasazi, et al., 1976; Pohl, 1975; Solomon, 1971) has focused on the advantages and benefits of mainstreaming for students, EEN students, and educators.

Investigations examining teacher attitudes have revealed a difference in perception of regular classroom teachers and EEN teachers toward integration of the handicapped into classrooms (Gickling & Theobald, 1975;
Hewett & Watson, 1975; Dexter, 1977; McGinty & Keogh, 1975). Many classroom teachers tend to view mainstreaming as increasing demands upon them.

A series of recent studies (Cleary, 1976; Pieper, 1974; Pohl, 1975) provided some useful techniques that could ensure successful integration of handicapped children into regular classes.

The importance of inservice programs for classroom teachers of handicapped students has been studied (Harasymiu & Horne, 1974; Gickling & Theobald, 1975; McGettigan, 1972; Reynolds & Birch, 1978). In surveys (Harasymiu & Horne, 1974; Reynolds & Birch, 1978), classroom teachers indicated they felt the need for more workshops and participatory demonstrations as part of inservice. These methods would assist them become active participants in mainstreaming.

Classroom teachers are an intricate part of the mainstreaming process (McDonnell, 1978; Neff & Pilch, 1976). Their skills as diagnosticians and observers can assist EEN personnel in preparation of the IEP.

An extensive section was devoted to techniques, suggestions, and ideas that could be proposed by the LD teacher for use by the classroom teacher with handicapped students. Procedures, suggestions, and techniques for curriculum modification and adaptation were offered (Jones, 1977; Lometti-Fitzgerald, 1977; Milbauer, 1977; Neff & Pilch, 1976; Roberts, 1975).
Another way for classroom teachers to adapt their courses for handicapped students was to individualize their curriculum. Suggestions of ways to individualize were provided (Beery, 1974; Hewett, 1974; Johnson & Johnson, 1978).

EEN personnel may also want to provide assistance to classroom teachers with mainstreamed students who have perceptual difficulties. Specific ways to structure the learning environment were suggested (Brown, 1977; Dexter, 1977).

Next some specific techniques were given for teachers of academic courses where handicapped youngsters are enrolled.

The final section concentrated on individualization of the entire curriculum by the classroom teacher. The specific components of good individualized curriculum were mentioned for reference by the LD teacher when assisting the classroom teacher in setting up such a program which benefits all students. Neff and Pilch (1976) provided specific information on components of individualization, teacher philosophy and motivation for individualization.

Chapter 2 of this paper examined the research about a variety of issues surrounding mainstreaming.
CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY

The terms "least restrictive environment" and "mainstreaming" have been both popular and confusing since passage of PL94-142.

Several definitions of these terms ranging from concise comments to lengthly statements were provided in Chapter 1. The scope of this paper was limited to articles and research published from 1968 to 1978.

The purpose of this paper was to examine three aspects of mainstreaming. The areas of examination were the benefits of mainstreaming, the attitudes of regular teachers toward handicapped in their classrooms and some techniques to facilitate mainstreaming.

The concern over appropriateness of separate class placement can be traced to Dunn's article in 1968. Some of his comments sparked debate over the relevance of some separate class placement. Results of recent studies (Cantrell & Cantrell, 1976) revealed special education classes have not been as effective as once thought. It was also found that children benefit from interaction with their handicapped peers.
Mainstreaming can prove beneficial to the handicapped student since it can eliminate feelings of isolation and segregation. It also helps prepare the handicapped for life. Mainstreaming has also been advantageous for education in general, as it helps in the recognition of good teaching and individualized instruction.

Since classroom teachers are an intricate part of the mainstreaming process, their attitudes must be examined. A study of their attitudes revealed that they see mainstreaming as teaching students who formerly were not in their classroom.

If mainstreaming is to be successful, teachers must be included in plans to integrate the handicapped into the classroom. The leadership for integration can come from teachers or special education personnel. Integration can be enhanced with use of techniques such as guest speakers, group discussions, and joint activities with special education personnel. Part of the integration plan should be inservice programs by the special education personnel. Suggestions for topics of such programs are workshops and participatory demonstrations on working with special needs students.

When an EEN student has been placed in the classroom, the special education personnel can suggest peer teaching as a technique to assist the teacher. This method is also beneficial to both the tutor and pupil.
The importance of the classroom teacher to mainstreaming cannot be underestimated. The teacher's knowledge of the student's strengths, weaknesses, and performance levels can be shared with the special education personnel. Teachers' talents as diagnosticians and observers are important in the preparation of the child's IEP. A form by Ozer (1978) was recommended for use in gathering information from the teacher that can prove helpful in preparation of LD students' programs by special education personnel.

Classroom teachers have certain expectations of the mainstreaming process. They have the right to expect support from special education consultants, speech and physical therapists, and administrators. Inservice programs are also expected.

A comprehensive series of teaching approaches appropriate for instruction of special education students was given. The LD personnel can suggest one or several of the techniques, when a teacher requests support for instruction. The general guidelines for effective teaching of special education students will enhance the learning of all students.

Several methods for alternative ways to present learning tasks were listed. The LD personnel may suggest use of learning centers or alternate large and small group activities. Instructional goals, continuum of
academic and social skills, and task analysis are also part of reorganizing learning tasks. The teacher can use these methods to achieve a suitable learning environment for all students.

Some specific ideas were mentioned that can be proposed by the LD teacher for use in the classroom. They included tips for use in academic courses or to assist students with specific perceptual difficulties.

If some teachers desire to increase individualization and personalization of instruction for the handicapped student, the LD personnel can suggest ways to successfully accomplish their desire. This can be accomplished using methods such as preparation of learning centers, effective management of large and small groups, and rearrangement of the classroom to look more like a resource room. The LD personnel can also provide guidance on what constitutes individualization and some of the problems to be faced in setting up an individualized program.

If teachers are willing to accept the challenge of mainstreaming, special education personnel can use the suggestions and techniques in this paper to assist them as they respond to the challenge!

The writer of this paper is concerned that most classroom teachers are unaware of the benefits of mainstreaming for all students. More dynamite and informative
inservice offerings could ease classroom teachers' concerns over the demands of mainstreaming and could enlist their support in this challenge for education.

However, in many instances the LD teacher is the resource the classroom teacher contacts for ideas to integrate EEN students in a mainstreamed class. The researcher is hopeful that this paper with its series of techniques and suggestions to facilitate mainstreaming would provide the LD teacher with a variety of resources with which to respond to the demands of classroom teachers for assistance in mainstreaming.
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