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In November, 1975, Congress passed a bill which guaranteed "free, appropriate, public education" to all handicapped children. This bill is now known as Public Law (PL) 94-142. This law assures that all handicapped children receive an education, as all other children do, according to their needs and at public expense.

One part of this law affects not only special education, but regular education as well. This part requires that the child be educated in the least restrictive environment. That is, the child "should be educated with children who are not handicapped unless the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily" (NEA, 1976). Not only will special educators be responsible for the education of the handicapped child, but regular educators will also be involved for handicapped children will be placed into regular classrooms in order to receive their lawful education.
This placement of the handicapped into the regular classroom is commonly called "mainstreaming." Mainstreaming is not something new and innovative since the federal law. In recent years, court decisions and an increasing number of state laws and regulations have formed the basis of mainstreaming. However, with the federal law, the push in certain school districts toward mainstreaming all handicapped children especially the learning disabled is great.

Federal law, PL 94-142 does not mandate mainstreaming. Rather, it encourages mainstreaming, but allows for other forms of educational opportunities, from intensive language training in a resource room to institutional care for the severely handicapped. But even with allowances for other types of service, some school districts insist on complete mainstreaming of secondary learning disabled adolescents and other types of handicaps which they consider "mild." These administrators feel that the advantages of mainstreaming the L.D. adolescent outweigh its disadvantages. The educational opportunities in a regular classroom presently afforded to a mainstreamed child would be advantageous in helping the child to a full and productive life as an adult.

However, would this be the case? Do the advantages of mainstreaming really outweigh the disadvantages for all
secondary learning disabled (L.D.) children? Would the advantages of mainstreaming really help the L.D. child cope with his learning problem? Will they help him or her learn to deal with these problems as an adult?

Purpose of Paper

With the current emphasis on mainstreaming, the purpose of this paper was to explore the advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming the handicapped child, especially the secondary learning disabled adolescent.

Scope and Limitations

Even though mainstreaming has been in vogue for a number of years, this paper attempted to explore the recent developments in the area of mainstreaming since the passing of PL 94-142 in November, 1975. The paper's primary focus was to examine the advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming the learning disabled adolescent through a review of the literature since 1976. Sometimes the literature did not separate mainstreaming the learning disabled from mainstreaming other handicapping abilities. Therefore, when the literature pertains to all handicapping conditions it was included where appropriate.

Another factor which influenced the amount of literature involved was limiting the paper to secondary students. While this paper examined literature dealing with all ages of L.D. students, it emphasized the secondary L.D. student.
Research Questions

In reviewing the literature in regard to mainstreaming, this paper attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What were the advantages of mainstreaming?
2. What were the disadvantages of mainstreaming?
3. How could mainstreaming be made effective?

Finally, in the last chapter of this paper, after the literature was reviewed according to the above questions, results of the findings were applied to the secondary L.D. student. In the light of the literature, what can the secondary L.D. student expect from mainstreaming and is mainstreaming the answer for all his educational needs?

Definitions

Following are definitions of the important terms used in this paper:

Learning Disability--The handicapping condition of a learning disability denotes severe and unique learning problems due to a disorder existing within the child which significantly interferes with the ability to acquire, organize, or express information. These problems are manifested in school functioning in an impaired ability to read, write, spell or arithmetically reason or calculate (taken from Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 115).

Mainstreaming--The integrating of handicapped children from special education classrooms into regular classrooms.
Handicap (Handicapping condition)--Any disadvantage that makes achievement, especially in school, unusually difficult such as learning disabilities, mental retardation, physical impairment, and/or emotional difficulties.

Summary

With the passing of PL 94-142, the trend toward mainstreaming has increased. Even though the federal law does not mandate mainstreaming, nevertheless the push has been in this direction. The purpose of this paper was to explore the advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming the L.D. adolescent. Some of the areas to be researched include the advantages versus the disadvantages of mainstreaming and the effectiveness of this educational approach. Several definitions of important terms were given. The following chapter summarizes the literature dealing with mainstreaming the L.D. student.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The goal is to create a fertile learning environment that will help the learning-disabled child grow and learn in keeping with his potential and thus feel positive about himself as an individual. (DeFever & Flous, 1976, p. 367)

If the purpose of education is to provide learning and success for all students, how is this to be best achieved for all special education students? Should he or she be isolated in special classes or maintained in regular classes? How can this goal of education be attained for the special education student? The answers to these questions seemed to be found in the mainstreaming issue.

In this chapter, the issue of mainstreaming was explored. The research questions introduced in the first chapter concerning mainstreaming were examined. The questions were the following:

1. What were the advantages of mainstreaming?
2. What were the disadvantages of mainstreaming?
3. How could mainstreaming be made effective?

The chapter was organized according to these questions. Each question appeared as a heading with the literature favoring and disfavoring the topic presented.
Some topics were further subdivided into subheadings. In this manner, the pros and cons of mainstreaming were presented and examined.

The Advantages of Mainstreaming

In reviewing the literature of mainstreaming, it seemed that there were eight possible advantages or goals for mainstreaming. The following were taken from Robert Herman's monograph presented at Syracuse University in May, 1975, and seemed representational of all the literature:

1. Remove the stigma associated with special class placement.
2. Enhance the social status of handicapped children with their non-handicapped peers.
3. Provide a better learning environment.
4. Provide a more "real world" environment.
5. Provide a more flexible delivery mechanism more adaptable to individual children.
6. Enable more children to be served.
7. Provide decentralized services, avoiding costly transportation charges.
8. Avoid legal issues involved in segregated classes.

Remove the Stigma Associated with Special Class Placement

"Assignment of children with learning problems to self-contained, special classrooms received criticism on the ground that such assignment results in stigmatization of the child with a concomitant diminution of self-concept"
(Smith, Dobechi, & Davis, 1977, p. 185). With the removal of the handicapped from these special classrooms, it was the belief that the stigma would be removed and "self-concept" would increase.

In reviewing the literature, it was the opinion of a number of authors that special class placement led to the stigmatization and poor self-concept (Hawkins-Shopard, 1977; Heron, 1978; Jacks & Keller, 1978; Klein & Schleifer, 1977; Mitchell, 1976; Rosenberg & Gaier, 1977; Sarason & Doris, 1977; Schworm, 1976). The poor self-concept was due to: (1) being labeled as having a handicap; and (2) special class separating the handicapped from peers (Rosenberg & Gaier, 1977).

It was believed that the major cause of the low self-esteem was the labeling. "From the evidence presented, it appears that one of the most devastating practices for exceptional students is the effect of being labeled as something different from normal" (Mitchell, 1976, p. 310). This was especially the case for the adolescent.

The adolescent had so much to deal with emotionally at this time in his or her life. The impact of puberty, conflicting cultural expectations, the struggle for independence, peer group pressure, dating, sexuality identity-seeking, and occupational choice all confronted the adolescent (Jacks & Keller, 1978). Now add to this the stigma of being labeled, of being different from one's peers, and the result was a poor self-concept. He or she was labeled when it hurt the most (Jacks & Keller, 1978).
"The intent of mainstreaming, to avoid the negative affects of stigmatizing labels . . ." (Sarasen & Deric, 1977, p. 21). Mainstreaming was the way to overcome the poor self-imaging of labeling.

However, was labeling always seen as having negative effects? Doron Kronick, in her article on "The Pros and Cons of Labeling," felt that there were some positive benefits from labeling. Some of the advantages were: (1) The labels helped to alleviate fears among parents; and (2) A label provided a descriptor word and reduced the child’s problems to narrower parameters.

Also, did the research support such a humanistic approach? The concept of labeling producing poor self-concept had not been well documented in the past (Sappestein, Dopp, & Bah, 1978; Quima & Wilson, 1977). Research since the passing of PL 94-142 had been scanty. The literature showed that learning disabled children were not popular and had low self-esteem (Bryan, 1976; Rosenberg & Gaier, 1977; Sappestein et al, 1978). However, it also showed that the self-concept of children placed in special classes did not differ from their regular classroom counterparts (Ribner, 1978; Smith, Dobuchi & Davis, 1977).

In this literature, several interesting reasons other than labeling were presented as to why learning disabled children were not popular and thus had low self-concepts.
One reason for rejection was that lower achievers may be considered less desirable for friends. A second possibility was that learning disabled children may have had personality traits which were less desirable (Iryan, 1976). The third reason was that when children were mainstreamed they did not have significant others to relate to. For when they viewed themselves in comparison with those placed in special classes, then their self-concept was better than those in special classes (Smith, Obechi, & Davis, 1977).

There also was presented the possibility that the negative effects of labeling were counterbalanced by the positive effects of special help (Quinn & Wilson, 1977). In the study by Sol Rilnor (1978), he discovered that learning disabled children and adolescents felt better about success in school when placed in special classes. This group did not differ significantly from mainstreamed children and adolescents in their feelings about their competence outside of school activities. So special help “provides successful experiences and feelings outside the regular classroom and appears to enhance potential for learning disabled children to experience success within the regular classroom” (Quinn & Wilson, 1977, p. 199).

Enhance the Social Status of Handicapped Children with Their Non-handicapped Peers

One of the major goals of mainstreaming was to eliminate the "out of sight--out of mind" syndrome and maximize interactions with nonhandicapped students.
(Prakken, 1976). The advantage of this goal was "to equip the handicapped student to participate fully in society" (Solomon, 1978, p. 16). Besides, "not only would mainstreaming aid the handicapped it would also help the nonhandicapped to deal with a segment of society which for too long had been screened from view" (Solomon, 1978, p. 16).

In the literature, a number of articles brought home the point of contact with regular education students being a force to help integrate the handicapped in society. The purpose of this being that the integration helped to make people aware of the abilities each person has rather than the disabilities (Solomon, 1978). This understanding led "to foster tolerance and understanding between handicapped and nonhandicapped youngsters" (Sarason & Doris, 1977, p. 21).

How did the integration lead to those feelings of understanding and awareness? Direct contact led to improve the attitudes between the groups. With more and more contact, there was a move to more positive attitudes due to the cooperation on the parts of the groups. This cooperation came about by the handicapped and nonhandicapped youngsters joining together to complete tasks and projects in school. They engaged "in the pursuit of common objectives, under equal-status conditions or as functional equals" (Cohen, 1978, p. 16).

Mainstreaming then led to an awareness of individual differences (Bloom, 1977). People would learn to accept
and deal with others and their strengths and weaknesses (Sena, 1977). It helped people become "a little more tolerant, empathetic, and understanding" (Sena, 1977, p. 22).

In this same vein, mainstreaming was beneficial especially for the adolescent learning disabled. Adolescents were at a time in their lives where they sought peer approval. "Placement in small, self-contained classrooms within the public school may heighten the child's exposure to teasing and ridicule from his more normal peers" (Decker & Decker, 1977, p. 55). The adolescent needed the recognition and approval of his peers, and placement in regular education was the appropriate place for it (Cahn & Nolan, 1976).

However, was this simple contact with regular education students ensuring enhancement of social status? "Direct contact is, indeed, of critical importance in improving attitudes between groups of people, but it is not, in itself, enough" (Cohen, 1978, p. 16). Several studies have demonstrated that mainstreaming was not enough to change attitudes.

In dealing with their peers in regular classrooms, learning disabled students, seemed to be ignored by their peers and relegated to a lower social status (Brainiche, 1978; Heron, 1978). These students already felt inadequate and insecure, and by placing them into regular classroom...
situations their social problems seemed to be aggravated (Peirce, 1978). Their social adjustments did not improve over time either. Years in the program did not make any difference (Rosenberg & Geier, 1977). "In general, it appears that learning disabled children are rejected across time. One year later their social status had not changed" (Bryan, 1976, p. 309).

Provide a Better Learning Environment

A good classroom environment was composed of two crucial aspects. The first was the teacher's academic background or knowing what to teach. The second consisted of instructional technology or how to teach (Hoover & Hollingsworth, 1973). In placing special education students in regular classrooms, one must determine if both of these were present in the learning environment. If either one was not there, then a good learning environment was absent.

What happened when special education children were placed into the regular classroom? Did this learning environment continue? Even if this environment did exist beforehand, although the literature reviewed did not mention this, there seemed to be a breakdown in this environment upon placement of the children.

What caused this? It seemed that a possibility for the failure was in the teacher. Many teachers felt that they were inadequately prepared to teach these children.
(Decker & Decker, 1977; Flynn, Gocha, & Sunde, 1978; Lumsden, 1978; Milbauer, 1977; Schworm, 1976). "... Teachers in public school setting are poorly equipped to deal with the special problems presented by the learning-disabled child and his family, because of limited training, motivation, resources, or materials" (Decker & Decker, 1977, p. 354). The inadequacy of teacher preparation stemmed from lack of initial training in college. Many teachers felt that the college survey courses they had were not enough to prepare and help these "special" children (Alberta, Castricon, & Cohen, 1978; Flynn, Gocha, & Sunde, 1978; Milbauer, 1977). Teachers felt that more training was necessary. "Without significant reconciliation of needs and capabilities through retraining and the provision of supportive services to regular teachers, many fear that mainstreaming will result not only in detrimental education for handicapped students, but will bring about less effective education for all students" (Frakken, 1976, p. 7).

Also, many teachers felt that the amount and often times the lack of preparation time for the classroom was detrimental to all students. "A mainstreaming school needs lots of teacher preparation time . . ." (Sena, 1977, p. 22). Because extra time must be devoted to the handicapped child, lack of time for the "normal" child often times was the result. The teachers' time became devoted to the learning disabled child's academic and behavioral
problems with no time for the other children (Brown, 1976).

What then was the result of this lack of training and preparation time on the part of the regular teachers? A learning environment in which the teacher did not know how or what to teach.

Another factor influencing the learning environment was the teacher's attitudes. Attitude towards children seemed to play an important role in how a teacher taught. The teacher's attitude toward the handicapped child was of crucial importance in providing a good learning environment for that child.

In schools, "where mainstreaming is working ... one of the key factors in its success is attitude, especially teacher attitude" (Kilbauer, 1977, p. 44). Teachers felt that they could develop a relationship with special education and thus mainstream effectively (Flynn, Gocha, Sundean, 1978; Lumsden, 1978).

However, teacher attitudes often times provided a barrier in mainstreaming (Martin, 1976). Some teachers felt that handicapped children could not make academic progress in a regular classroom (Lumsden, 1978). The best place for them was in special education classes where they did not have to handle them all day (Moore & Fine, 1978).
A large part of a teacher's poor attitude and resistance seemed placed at being forced to accept mainstreaming. In making up the legislation designed to help the handicapped children, little regular education input was asked. When teachers resisted educational movements in the past, disaster set in. In the 50's and 60's, open education and open space schools did not work, because teachers were forced to accept them. Force and power did not win acceptance (Raubinck, 1978). Many classroom teachers will resist the concept of mainstreaming if they feel they are being forced to accept a concept and the children. They will often resist just because they do not like to be ignored when decisions are made. Other teachers will resist because they worked 'long and hard' to get handicapped children out of their classrooms and now are being told to let them back in again (Raubinck, 1978, p. 410).

If teacher attitudes remained such as these, then the learning environment for the handicapped children remained poor instead of better.

So far, it seemed that the literature reviewed spoke only in negative terms of mainstreaming providing a better environment for the handicapped child. In the literature reviewed, no specific mention of regular education being a better environment was ever made. However, there was one positive aspect. It seemed that it was an advantage for the use of regular materials with handicapped children.
In some instances the use of such materials can serve as a highly motivating device as a result because of the relevancy the realization will have to classroom assignments. Not only may this relieve the student's anxiety concerning his classroom assignment, but it can also reinforce the information he must master in the classroom. (Lerner, Alvan, & Meyers, 1977, p. 11)

With regard to this topic, the literature alluded to a major way in which mainstreaming the handicapped child could provide a means of improving the learning environment. This was, that in the preparation for teaching handicapped children, a means for better teaching of "normal" children was made possible (Graves, 1977). "Special teaching methods specifically designed to assist a critical learning problem can aid others within the same classroom" (Goldenberg, 1976, p. 316). The converse also appeared true that "... the same principles, procedures, and techniques for teaching nonhandicapped children are often useful with many different kinds of exceptional children" (Kilbauer, 1977, p. 46).

Finally, mainstreaming could help improve teaching by forcing teachers "to evaluate their own individual teaching styles and select methods and procedures which will promote a student's success" (Goldenberg, 1976, p. 316.). Also it could be the means "to move children in and out of classes by their skills rather than on some classification such as if they're fifth graders or they're handicapped" (Lussaden, 1978, p. 38).
Provide a More "Real" World Environment

This advantage was founded on the principle that society did not segregate itself. In the "real" world, one could not segregate parts of society into small components (Solomon, 1978). So in order for the handicapped to get ready for the world, schools must prepare them.

We're trying to prepare these handicapped kids to live in an adult world that determines the rules by which we are going to live; and there are few concessions made in that world for the handicapped people, so we've got to teach them as young people to accept and understand and learn how to live by those rules that society is going to expect them to live by as adults. (Hawkins-Hepard, 1977, p. 394)

Since the handicapped must function in today's society, then mainstreaming could help this assimilation. Mainstreaming could provide the confidence needed to function in the real world. Through mainstreaming the child began to feel and assert independence. He learned to cope and to relate to his peers. He began to handle this "real" world and viewed it not as something to be avoided but something in which he must live and work (Lechard, 1978).

However, was integration a reality? When the children went out into society was everyone truly mainstreamed? Was our society not broken up into segregated components based on religion, race, socio-economic factors? Was the visibility of the handicapped truly present in society?
Very often society looked to the schools in order to reform its social conscience (Nallan, 1975). Ideals were taught in our schools which did not generalize into society as a whole. Could this advantage of mainstreaming be a reflection of what society would like to see occur? Mainstreaming might just be part of the school world in order to have the young student "be considered as much like his peers as possible" (Cox, 1977, p. 83). While in the real world, "the adult knows he is different and has known for a long time" (Cox, 1977, p. 83).

Provide a More Flexible Delivery Mechanism More Adaptable to Individual Children

One of the components behind mainstreaming was that it was geared towards individualizing the work of students. In speaking about mainstreaming the handicapped are placed in regular classrooms with 'specially designed' or altered curriculums to meet their individual needs" (Turnbull, Strickland, & Hammer, 1978, p. 68). This individualization made the system of mainstreaming more flexible in educating the children.

Many handicapped children in mainstreamed setting could take part in the goals of regular education with appropriate adaptation in the method of instruction or materials used. For others, however, a major change in the goals must be considered. For instance, it would not be realistic to expect a high school student having difficulty in math to progress to a basic algebra level.
The goal of balancing a checkbook would be far more appropriate (Turnbull, et al., 1978).

Through grouping and individualization, mainstreaming could be flexible and effective. For instance, emotionally disturbed children were placed in regular classes. Factors in their environment which could cause problems were identified and steps were taken to overcome them (individualization). They were placed in the appropriate ability levels (grouping). Because of these two ingredients, these children were able to be maintained in a regular classroom situation (Cantrell & Cantrell, 1976).

These ingredients made mainstreaming highly flexible and able to work in a wide range of situations.

It is tempting to surmise that borderline intelligence children can be mainstreamed within the regular public school classroom if intensively and specifically trained support teachers are made available to deal with academic, behavioral and other problems such children pose for the regular classroom teachers. (Cantrell & Cantrell, 1976, p. 385)

However, some caution must be acknowledged. If one was to lock oneself into one type of delivery system, then complete flexibility was lost. There was a danger to use just one system without concern for the needs of the student or the severity of the handicap (Alley, 1977).

"Several options for delivering special education services should be available . . ." (Lerner, Evans, & Meyers, 1977, p. 8).
The federal law did not mandate mainstreaming, but allowed for a continuum of services ranging from mainstreaming in regular classes to clinical and residential placement. "However, instructional considerations are not the primary reasons for choosing one of the models" (Alley, 1977, p. 38). All too often it was the amount of money available that dictated which model would be used and not the individual needs of the students.

Not all students were able to be mainstreamed (Andelman, 1976; Hartman & Hartman, 1976; Turnbull, et al., 1978). If mainstreaming was followed rigidly, it lost its flexibility and some students could suffer. In mainstreaming, care must be given for placement. There must be careful matching of child's age, level of functioning, and personality characteristics (Hartman & M Hartman, 1976).

One had to be careful about placing children into programs without careful planning. Just because a program did not have a particular delivery system did not necessarily mean that all children must be mainstreamed (Turnbull, et al., 1978). "It must be remembered that the school system must provide services which are appropriate, based on the student's needs rather than on what may be available within the school system at a given time" (Turnbull, et al., 1978, p. 70).
Enable More Children to be Served

There is no doubt that through mainstreaming, more children were able to be programmed. Because this was the "least restrictive environment," the numbers for this type of delivery system were larger than the others. Also PL 94-142 was primarily designed to get all the handicapped children educated, for they were being missed up until this time (Lumsden, 1978). Thus more children were able to be served.

Provide Decentralized Services, Avoiding Costly Transportation Charges

Through mainstreaming it was possible to keep children in "neighborhood" or "home" schools. By placing the handicapped back into these home schools many children would not need transportation and therefore the cost was avoided. Also the cost of special education rooms were avoided (Newcomer, 1977).

Furthermore the spreading of services of all the handicapped out into all schools would naturally decentralize the delivery systems. No longer did one school provide one specific type of service, but each school provided the services necessary for their handicapped.

However, by implementation of mainstreaming were cost factors being avoided? Money was such a prohibitive
factor in mainstreaming (Jandelman, 1976). Money was needed for inservice teaching and ongoing training of all school personnel. The extra time that regular teachers needed to prepare for the handicapped was a cost factor (Lucaden, 1978). Also the amount of new materials needed for all the schools was costly. So the amount of money saved on bussing did not seem to compensate for that spent on the cost of mainstreaming.

Avoid Legal Issues Involved in Segregated Classes

Court decisions and state and federal legislations have laid the groundwork for a legal responsibility on the part of the school systems to provide free public education in the "least restrictive environment" for all handicapped children. (Pracken, 1976, p. 6)

The courts and legislators felt that it was preferable to provide children with the most appropriate and effective educational experiences which would enable them to become self-reliant adults. It was thought preferable to educate children the least distance away from the mainstream society (Pracken, 1976).

Mainstreaming, then, provided a way to live within the parameters of the new law. Its emphasis was on the movement of the handicapped into the regular classroom wherever possible. It provided the means of getting the handicapped into the mainstream of society which was the primary design of the federal law.
Mainstreaming also helped to avoid legal issues in the misplacement of children. When self-contained classrooms were the rule, some children were placed into those classrooms who should not have been there (Schwantes, 1976). The legal difficulties which arose from such placements led to establishing the federal and state laws dealing with the handicapped (NEA, 1976; Torres & Aberson, 1976). These laws eventually led to the concept of mainstreaming and the "least restrictive environment."

The above topics were the advantages of mainstreaming. The literature favoring and disfavoring those advantages was presented. Now the disadvantages will follow and be discussed similarly.

Disadvantages of Mainstreaming

In some of the literature, mainstreaming was not completely seen as a positive movement in education. Some authors had reservations and cautions about mainstreaming. They viewed these as disadvantages for making mainstreaming work. In this section, the following disadvantages were discussed: money; teacher preparation and time; teacher backlash; teacher attitudes; placement of all students into mainstreaming programs; peer attitudes and social acceptability; and, lack of research.

Money

The initial complaint of mainstreaming was the amount of money involved for its implementation. Money was needed
for formal orientation and ongoing training for all school personnel which were central to the implementation of the law (Andelman, 1976). Money was involved in the hiring of teachers and purchasing of needed materials and equipment.

With the passing of PL 94-142, federal funds were appropriated to help this implementation. However, as with all federal monies, the funding did not start until after programs had been in effect more than a year. The law said that mainstreaming must start now but the money would only come later. Plus, the government did not pay for it all. "In 1977-1978, federal funding is only 5 percent of the cost .... By 1982, federal contribution will have risen to a peak of 40 percent" (Lumsden, 1978, p. 38). The rest of the expenses must be paid by states and local communities. Thus, as with all tax dollars, money became a sore point for communities attempting to implement the federal law dealing with mainstreaming (Lumsden, 1978).

Teacher Preparation and Time

With the emphasis on educating handicapped children in the "least restrictive environment" the responsibility for teaching these students had been shifted from special educators to the classroom teacher (Graves, 1977). As a
result, the school needed lots of teacher preparation and planning time, more so than self-contained classrooms. Because of individualization and the types of handicaps, more space per child, more flexible teachers, and lots of resources were needed (Brown, 1976; Hoffman, West & Bates, 1978; Sera, 1977). A single talented teacher was not the answer.

All teachers needed to know the law, methods, and materials needed for individualizing the program of a handicapped student, writing Individual Education Programs (IEP's), and meeting with the parents of these students (Andelman, 1976). Mainstreaming meant a lot of teacher preparation and time.

Besides preparation time, teachers themselves must be prepared to teach the handicapped. Teachers in general felt inadequately prepared to serve the needs of mainstreamed exceptional children (Flynn, Cocha, & Sundeen, 1978; Martin, 1976). They felt that they did not have the know how to remediate learning problems (Alberta, Castricone, & Cohen, 1978). For instance, "the secondary school teacher typically has little background in special education and often doesn't have the necessary skills or knowledge to work with the adolescent who has moderate or severe learning problems" (Zance, 1977, p. 29).
Furthermore, besides teachers themselves feeling unprepared some of the literature reviewed saw the teachers as being unqualified to handle the educational needs of handicapped children (Decker & Decker, 1977; Feirer, 1978; Martin, 1976). This was due to a general lack of college preparation. The traditional survey course for learning about handicaps was too broad and did not touch upon needed skills and knowledge (Alberta, Castricone, & Cohen, 1978).

However, there was a bright light. Some teachers, who felt unprepared, were ready to accept the challenge of mainstreaming (Flynn, Gocha, & Sundoan, 1978; Alberta, Castricone, & Cohen, 1978; Moore & Fine, 1978; Lunsden, 1978). But one should not forget that "mainstreaming initiated with unprepared and unaccepting teachers will reduce the chances for successful integration of the child and the exceptional child involved will be the biggest 'loser'" (Moore & Fine, 1978, p. 259).

Teacher Involvement

One of the major disadvantages of mainstreaming has been the lack of involvement of regular teachers in its development. Many of the programs designed for the handicapped were those devised by psychologists and special education teachers. The regular educators were not involved (Martin, 1976). The federal law itself had little regular teacher input in its development (Raubinck, 1978).
Furthermore, teachers were initially instrumental in removing the handicapped from their classrooms. Now they were being asked to take them back in, plus have the responsibility for their education (Rubin, 1978). Whereas before teachers had relied on special education to relieve them of difficult children, now they had to deal with those children once again in their classrooms (Klein & Schleifer, 1977; MacMillan & Samuel, 1977). Teachers also disliked the money being spent on special education programs and teachers, when regular education is short of money. So teachers were resisting.

If teachers continued to resist mainstreaming, it could be devastating to the program. To mandate and force teacher involvement did result in anger, hostility, disrespect, and countermovements" (Rubin, 1978, p. 411). The classroom teachers must be involved in the process of mainstreaming and their guidance and support encouraged.

Teacher Attitudes

One of the key factors for mainstreaming to be successful is attitude, especially teacher attitude" (Nlabau, 1977, p. 44). In reviewing the literature, teacher attitudes appeared over and over as a prime requisite for success of mainstreaming (Cohen, 1978; Heron, 1978; Klein & Schleifer, 1977; Lumsden, 1978; Martin, 1976;
Mitchell, 1976; Milbauer, 1977; Moore & Fine, 1978). In any educational setting the attitudes and expectations of the teacher affected the learning of the children. "Teacher's perceptions and expectations of the student must be positive if maximum positive academic and behavioral growth is to take place" (Mitchell, 1976, p. 310). The federal law, by encouraging mainstreaming, also hoped to improve attitudes toward the handicapped by bringing the handicapped into contact with regular education (Cohen, 1978).

In reviewing the literature, mainstreaming did not seem to have influenced teacher attitudes. Teacher attitudes, in fact, had presented a problem for mainstreaming (Heron, 1978). First of all they had negative attitudes about having the handicapped returning to their classrooms (Brown, 1976; Raubinek, 1978). They felt that they should remain in special classrooms (Moore & Fine, 1978). Teachers had fears and anxieties about the handicapped (Martin, 1976). They also were not completely satisfied with the notion of mainstreaming and its implementation (Martin, 1976; Raubinek, 1978).

Finally they conveyed these negative feelings to the children in the classroom and thus the design of mainstreaming for improving relationships between the handicapped and the nonhandicapped was lost. For teachers served as models for their students. If the model transmitted
negative feelings about the handicapped rather than positive, then he or she actively reinforced that negative feeling (Cohen, 1978). This conveyance of negative attitudes was detrimental to the purpose of mainstreaming.

Placement of all Students into Mainstreaming Programs

The goal of mainstreaming is "normalization"; that is, the placing of all handicapped children in the "least restrictive environment" (Lumsden, 1978). To many educators, this meant that all handicapped children must be mainstreamed (Cruickshank, 1977). However, could all children be mainstreamed in regular classes, and did the law mandate mainstreaming?

First of all, the law did not mandate mainstreaming (NEA, 1976). "The law actually allows a continuum of services ranging from hospital care, home care, or residential centers, to integration in regular classes--for all or part of a child's studies" (Lumsden, 1978). The law did not push "wholesale mainstreaming" and "dumping" of the handicapped students.

What PL 94-142 was attempting to do was to ensure education of all students. The law was signed in 1975 because handicapped children were being missed in education. Schools were not educating these children (Lumsden, 1978). The federal law guaranteed to parents that their handicapped
children would be educated by the public school. Integration back into regular classrooms was one possible way of doing this. However, if integration was not appropriate placement then it was a violation of due process and the law was broken (Hilbauer, 1977).

Mainstreaming, also, did not seem appropriate for all handicapped children. Some were not able to learn in the regular classroom and had to be removed for a particular skill or subject (Klein & Schloifer, 1977; Vance, 1977). "It is unrealistic to expect all children with learning problems to achieve total assimilation into the norm" (Goldenberg, 1976, p. 318). For instance, the severely learning disabled adolescent was not likely to be literate, mathematically competent, or socially adequate (Gill, 1978). In order for this student to graduate with marketable skills, he or she "should be provided essentially in a self-contained classroom setting" (Gill, 1978, p. 395). Regular classrooms in public schools thus were not able to meet the needs of these students (Decker & Decker, 1977). "Indiscriminate mainstreaming of the learning-disabled is to be avoided as potentially disadvantageous to him, his family, his peers and teachers" (Decker & Decker, 1977, p. 356).
Peer Attitudes and Social Acceptability

One of the advantages of mainstreaming was to bring contact between the handicapped and the nonhandicapped. The purpose of this contact was to increase positive attitudes about the handicapped. In the literature reviewed, this did not seem to be the case.

Sapperstein, Bopp, and Loh, in 1978, found that learning disabled children were not popular. They were never considered the best liked, most athletic, smartest, or best looking. Bruinicks in the same year found similar results. Learning disabled students in mainstream programs were significantly less socially accepted than their classmates in regular classrooms. Bryan in 1976 discovered that "... learning disabled children were more likely to be rejected and less likely to be accepted by peers; thus replicating the results of an earlier study" (p. 309).

It also seemed then that simply mainstreaming a student did not guarantee an increase in positive attitudes towards the handicapped. In fact, it appeared that attitudes toward learning disabled children did not improve across time. According to Cryan (1976) their social status had not changed one year later. Thus, mainstreaming by itself did not appear to be enough to change attitudes toward the handicapped.
Lack of Research

A large drawback in establishing effective mainstreaming programs was the lack of research on which to build a solid and empirical base (Gill, 1978). Of the over one hundred articles examined for this paper, less than 20 percent were empirical research studies. Of the close to sixty articles which were used as references for this paper, six articles were empirical research studies using control and experimental groups and three articles dealt with surveys. This pointed to the fact of the general lack of research in this area.

The literature asked for research in order to establish programs (Cruickshank, 1977; Gill, 1978; Jenkins and Mayhall, 1976; MacMillan and Sammel, 1977; Sontag, 1976; Vance, 1977). At the present, so little was known about the needs and characteristics of the pupils such programs will serve (Gill, 1978). "There is conflicting evidence on whether resource teacher programs are any more effective than the alternatives of regular or special class placement" (Jenkins & Mayhall, 1976, p.21). Evidence also had to be found to justify alternative placement for students out of the mainstream (MacMillan & Sammel, 1977). Theories had to be established and examined (Cruickshank, 1977). Teacher and pupil attitudes had to be explored and ways to produce
positive attitudes found. The list of questions to be researched goes on and on. Study of this area was a necessary step in the establishment of effective and solid educational programs which would meet the needs of all the handicapped (Dill, 1970).

How Could Mainstreaming Be Made Effective?

In this section, the literature will be discussed which examined the ways to make mainstreaming more effective. The literature presented told how the problems of mainstreaming could be overcome. The problems that were discussed were: (1) Teacher Attitudes and Backlash; (2) Peer Attitudes; and (3) Proper Placement and Programs for students. These were examined because the literature reviewed addressed itself to solving only these problems.

Teacher Attitudes and Backlash

As has been discussed in a previous section, positive teacher attitudes toward the handicapped were necessary if the handicapped were to succeed in school. Teacher attitudes affected academic achievement to a great degree (Mitchell, 1976). Teacher attitudes "may be a far more potent and important variable in the successful integration of exceptional students into regular classrooms than any administrative or curricular scheme" (Mitchell, 1976, p. 302). How then were attitudes to be changed?
The general approach to changing attitudes was direct contact and experience with the handicapped. But as has been pointed out in a previous section, direct contact just was not enough (Cohen, 1978). Experience with special education integration was not sufficient either. It seemed that attitudes toward the handicapped changed to the negative over time spent with them (Mitchell, 1976). Along with the direct contact, other things had to be done.

First of all, administrators had to demonstrate positive attitudes toward mainstreaming. It was not just building principals alone that had to show this interest but central administrators as well (Mitchell, 1976). One of the ways to show positive attitudes was through discussion groups and conferences with regular education about mainstreaming (Cohen, 1978). Another way was to join administrators, special education teachers, and regular education teachers in a working relationship (Prakken, 1976).

Secondly, inservice and training for regular education had to take place. Teachers wanted inservice for learning how to deal with these students (Hoffman, Vest, & Bates, 1978; Martin, 1976). They felt that with such
training, they would be able to make mainstreaming work (Alberta, Castricone, & Cohen, 1978; Feirer, 1978). The inservice could be done through conferences, workshops, and discussion groups (Cohen, 1978). They could include such topics as the understanding of how a handicap affects learning, skills in recognizing handicaps, prescriptive teaching, skills in behavior management techniques, understanding of and ability to respond to emotional needs, and developing working relationships between special and regular educators (Prakken, 1976). Through inservices, their anxieties and fears about the handicapped could be overcome and positive attitudes toward the handicapped a result.

The third way to increase positive attitudes was to provide adequate preparation time and the support and materials the regular educator needs. Many teachers felt that with adequate time, support, and resources, they would be able to mainstream effectively (Hoffman, West & Eaton, 1978; Moore & Fine, 1978). They felt that given the resources and materials, they could work with the materials which would help the students (Alberta, Castricone, & Cohen, 1978). But what they needed most was extra help and time for individualizing to meet the needs of the handicapped (Feirer, 1978). With such support and time, they would welcome the handicapped into their classrooms.
The final way to increase positive attitudes toward the handicapped and at the same time to eliminate backlash was to get the regular educators involved in special programs (Martin, 1976; Raubinck, 1978). With regular educators feeling that these programs were theirs, then they would be more willing to work with the handicapped (Raubinck, 1978). With a greater willingness to work, there would come an increase in positive feelings toward the handicapped.

Peer Attitudes

In placing handicapped children in regular classes, care had to be taken to ensure that peer attitudes were or changed towards positive feelings. The development of self-concept depended a great deal on peer attitudes (Bruinick, 1978). If peers were negative and rejecting towards the handicapped, then the self-concept of the handicapped would decrease. But with positive feeling, an increase in self-concept would result (Krysan, 1976). How did one achieve positive attitudes toward the handicapped among peers?

As with teacher attitudes, direct contact was in itself not enough. Situations which increased positive attitudes were necessary. If the teachers saw that non-handicapped students were rejecting the handicapped students, then the teachers should provide situations to enhance
peer relationships (Bruininks, 1978). Some of these situations were those in which a nonhandicapped student must cooperate with a handicapped student (Bruininks, 1978; Cohen, 1978). Involving handicapped students in group work brought about positive attitudes (Bruininks, 1978; Heron, 1978). The teacher should also encourage adequate social behavior (Heron, 1978).

Another approach was curricular. Themes of content areas such as social studies could make students aware of different groups of people. A study of impairments and ways to overcome these disabilities could be made (Cohen, 1978). This would make the children aware of differences between people. Also emphasis on people's capabilities rather than disabilities could influence students to see the worth in others (Heron, 1978).

Finally an approach involving the parents of nonhandicapped students was beneficial. Parents served as the best models for their children's behavior. Much of the children's attitudes were picked up from their parents. The parents' attitudes on the handicapped naturally influenced their children, so it was necessary to get all parents involved in developing positive attitudes towards the handicapped. With both parental and teacher involvement towards positive attitudes, then children's attitudes should follow suit (Cohen, 1978).
Proper Placement and Programs for Students

The last problem discussed was the placement of all handicapped children into mainstream programs.

All mildly and moderately handicapped children may not be able to be fully mainstreamed. The intent of PL 94-142 is the least restrictive educational environment be pursued to meet the educational needs of the child. For some children, the mainstreaming model may not be the model of first choice and other types of learning environment should be pursued. (Baron, 1978, p. 211-212)

Many states and school districts felt that with the federal law, the handicapped must all be moved back into the classrooms. However, the law safeguards against "wholesale mainstreaming" (HIA, 1976; Milbauer, 1977). Moving children into regular education classrooms just for the sake of mainstreaming could be detrimental (Prakken, 1976). With school districts, "translating 'least restrictive' into 'unrestrained' does everyone concerned a disservice" (Allen, 1977, p. 35). The purpose behind the law was to provide everyone with an appropriate education and to provide it in the most normal situation possible (Hawkins-Shepard, 1977).

Mainstreaming's primary objective was to provide children with the most appropriate educational experiences "which will enable them to become self-reliant adults" (Prakken, 1976, p. 6). It hoped to accomplish this in the "least restrictive environment," but not all students could be taught in regular class settings. Now then
should students be placed in order to become "self-reliant adults?" Should the decision be based upon school policy such as what type of programs did the schools have (Schworn, 1976)?

The literature reviewed felt that placement of the student should be done according to his or her particular skill or needs (Burns, 1977; Holmes, 1976; Kingsbourne, 1977; Lerner, Evans, & Meyers, 1977; NEA, 1976; Schworn, 1976; Stein, 1976). "If an individual can safely, successfully, and with personal satisfaction take part in regular programs or in unrestricted activities, no special program is necessary" (Stein, 1976, p. 43). The closer a student could come to achieving the objectives of a curriculum in a regular class, the more he or she was able to be effectively mainstreamed. However, if students could not achieve the objective in class, they must be removed (Schworn, 1976).

There were particular skills that were necessary in order to achieve in the regular classes. "The child must have specified skills in his or her repertoire as readiness for the next successive stage" (Holmes, 1976, p. 17). Mainstreaming was a step by step process and could not be accomplished by automatic placement in regular classrooms. Basic skills were needed in order to succeed in the regular class. How could students acquire them?
The first place for acquiring these skills was in the classroom, full time with no help or just ancillary help provided (Anderson, 1976). For example, mild to moderately learning disabled adolescents could be taught in regular classrooms using careful class scheduling, academic tutoring in a resource room, and teaching school survival skills (Gill, 1978).

However, even regular classroom with supportive services were, at times, "not conducive to promoting social and academic growth for students with various kinds of learning and behavioral problems" (Schones, 1976, p. 180). It must be remembered that not all handicapped students learned the same way. They were individuals too and could not be treated alike just as no other group of children could. "Thus, the need for many alternative plans within the educational system" (Burns, 1977, p. 24).

Another place that these students could pick up these skills was in special part time or full time programs in the schools (Anderson, 1976). Some students were not able to learn in the regular class situation and had to be removed for a particular skill or subject (Klein & Schleifer, 1977). Being in special programs could help those that needed it (Allen, 1977). For example, skills which allowed severely learning disabled students to be self-reliant adults could only be taught in full time self-contained classrooms (Gill, 1978). Others had to
spend half-days in special rooms and learn the coping skills of listening, speaking, reading, thinking, mathematics, writing, and spelling. The rest of the day they were in regular classrooms (Alley, 1977).

The final place to be taught skills necessary for self-reliance was a clinical setting for the severely handicapped (Alley, 1977).

Even though these programs seemed to be rigid and inflexible, it should be remembered that this could not be the case. Handicapped students had to be able to move from one program to the next depending on their need. For example, in the Actor Day Treatment Center, a clinical setting in New York City, the children were placed into special programs in regular schools ranging from half-day programs to full time (Masserman & Adomony, 1976). Gordon Alley (1977) talked about half-day programs in special rooms and regular rooms that were effective. The purpose of these two programs was to get the handicapped back into the regular classroom and the mainstream of society.

But a cautionary note is added:

Mainstreaming is a good and appropriate idea, but we owe it to our students and to ourselves as professionals to see that when it is put into practice it is done right and that special needs children are assigned to educational settings which are prepared to meet and respond to their needs. (Andelman, 1976, p. 22)
SUMMARY

The passing of PL 94-142 brought an increase of interest in mainstreaming. In this chapter, eight advantages of mainstreaming were discussed. Also discussed were the seven disadvantages of mainstreaming. The literature favoring and disfavoring each of the topics was presented. The chapter concluded by presenting the ways the literature saw to overcome the major problems with mainstreaming. The next chapter presents the writer's views of how to make mainstreaming more effective.
CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

"This is not an appeal to eliminate special, self-contained classes. Many children will still require special grouping because of their unique characteristics" (Rager, 1977, p. 606).

When reviewing the literature, much of what was written concerning mainstreaming was done with caution in mind. There were some authors who came out completely for mainstreaming, but the majority had some reservations about mainstreaming. Even though there were eight advantages for mainstreaming, a great deal of the literature was not supportive of them. The literature dealt more with the problems and disadvantages. However, there was a bright spot in the literature. It gave ways to overcome the major problems with mainstreaming and thus make it more effective.

Making Mainstreaming Effective

In this chapter, the author of this paper will discuss all the problems and disadvantages of mainstreaming, with the hope of providing insights into overcoming them.
Conclusions will be made based upon the literature which the author hopes will show a way for making mainstreaming effective and the goals and advantages of mainstreaming real.

The first problem to be dealt with is that of money. Money is needed for the training of teachers, the materials and resources, the preparation time, the inservices, and the hiring of new special education teachers. In addition, special equipment such as elevators, wheelchairs, ramps, etc. is needed for some of the handicapped. Mainstreaming does not reduce the cost of educating the handicapped for school districts. Often times it increases the costs.

Money has always been a sore point for educators. There never seems to be enough. Now with tax payers demanding cuts in tax dollars, the money situation gets even tighter. Educators have to find ways of cutting back on waste and on spending money on needless materials in one year's budget to ensure it will not be cut the following year when the money might be needed. The times of rewarding educators for meeting and/or overspending budgets with more money has to stop. Rewards should be given out for devising ways of saving money without sacrificing educational quality.

All the money needed for special education, however, still could not come from waste saving measures. Other
sectors of education need that money also. Where else
could it come from?

Obviously the money saved on bussing could be a
possibility. However, some of the handicapped will need
specially equipped buses just to get to neighborhood
schools. The money then saved on bussing some of the
handicapped will be spent on equipment for others.

Another possibility is to have state and federal
monies reallocated from residential or clinical settings
to the public schools as the public schools receive the
handicapped from those situations. This would help defray
some of the costs.

But more importantly, what must be done is to ensure
that federal and state monies continue to come into the
school districts for educating the handicapped. It is not
good policy for federal and state lawmakers to implement
costly educational plans without monetary support. Much
of the initial monies has been appropriated, but how is
this continuance of money to be guaranteed?

The primary way is from pressure from the people.
Pressure is needed not just from the special educators
and the parents of the handicapped, but pressure and lobby­
ing from as large a segment of the population as possible.
People in general have to be for mainstreaming and for
educating all the handicapped. This is easy and ideal
to write, but how does this come about?
Part of the answer to this lies in dealing with the next major problem of mainstreaming, changing the attitudes toward the handicapped. Besides money, maintaining positive attitudes toward the handicapped is necessary in order to make mainstreaming effective. Without positive attitudes then the goals of removing the stigma of being handicapped, enhancing social status, and providing a "real world" environment will never be achieved. Also in demonstrating that it is worthwhile to educate the handicapped, people would be more willing to spend tax money on their education.

One of the first steps in changing attitudes is to provide teachers with models of how mainstreaming can work. Simply placing or dumping the handicapped into classrooms is not going to work, as the literature has previously pointed out. Regular educators need to be shown within their own school districts that, with supportive help and materials, handicapped children can be educated within their classrooms.

Several model classrooms have to be established which demonstrate a wide range of services being provided to the handicapped. These models first of all have to be established with guidance and support coming from regular teachers. With input coming from familiar regular education teachers, the threat of teacher backlash and rejection will be kept to a minimum.
Secondly, these models must be placed within the district so that they can be observed by all teachers. Teachers must be allowed to comment on these models for ways to improve them and make them work within their own schools.

Thirdly, a wide range of services must be provided in these models to show to the regular educators that not all handicapped students will be placed into their classrooms. Only those who can make it and whose needs can best be met within the regular educational setting will be placed there. In establishing the types of delivery systems for these models certain considerations must be taken into account for placement of the students.

First of all, the severity of the handicapped must be considered. Not all learning disabled children can make it in regular classes. Their problems are so severe that no amount of tutoring, curricular modification, materials, or resources would help them in remaining in regular classes. For instance, an adolescent with severe oral and written expressive skills cannot be kept in a regular English class which demands these communication skills. Modification of the English curriculum would be so extensive that its resemblance to what the other students are doing would be extremely minimal. The teacher in effect would be teaching two separate classes at the same time. One class would be taught for twenty-four students, the
other for one. The amount of time spent on that one student would be detrimental to the other twenty-four students. This student would be better off in a self-contained classroom.

Another consideration is the type of ability and disability of the student. A student should be placed into those classes in which he can succeed. The student with severe written and oral expressive skills should be placed for remediation and coping skills with other students who are experiencing the same difficulties. A student with a physical disability might just need a special chair to succeed in the regular classroom.

Another consideration is the goals and objectives of the regular classroom or course. Along with these, one must consider the means to achieving those goals. If a student can meet those goals and objectives without serious modification then the student should be placed into that classroom. However, if the student is lacking skills which would allow him or her to succeed in that class, he or she should be removed and given those skills. This probably would mean in a self-contained class with others who need those skills. Once these skills are attained, then the student should be allowed to move back into the regular classroom. Students should be placed then according to what they can and cannot achieve in the regular classroom.
With these considerations as a basis for placement of the handicapped, two primary delivery models and their variations should be utilized. First of all, self-contained classrooms will be necessary. Presently, there is a lack of self-contained classrooms on the secondary high level. These rooms would be used to teach either skills the severely or moderately handicapped need to succeed once they leave school or those skills which will help them to eventually move back into the regular classrooms. In these rooms, the students could spend anywhere from a full day to as little as one hour depending on the severity and type of handicap.

The second type of delivery system is the resource room. Here students that are capable of being placed into regular classrooms, receive support and help. The support and help could range from tutoring and alternative means for achieving the goals of the classroom, such as books on tape, oral tests and reports, and structuring of assignments, to study halls and simple monitoring of academic achievement through weekly, monthly, or quarterly reports. The students who are mildly handicapped would be placed here initially. Also students who are coming from self-contained classrooms would be placed here for mainstreaming into the regular classrooms.
These two delivery systems help mainstreaming achieve two more of its goals. They provide flexibility and individualization that are so advantageous and necessary in mainstreaming. They are flexible because students are not placed into a delivery system and simply left there. They move towards the ultimate goal of being mainstreamed into the classrooms. Furthermore, through these delivery systems appropriate placement of students takes place and legal issues are avoided because students are being educated and guided toward the "least restrictive" environment. These wide range of services also demonstrate to regular educators that they are being considered and wholesale mainstreaming is not taking place. With these delivery systems, a general positive attitude toward special education is taking place.

Once these model classrooms have been established and shown to work and modified where needed, then they can be incorporated into the school district as a whole. Because the whole school district was involved in establishing these models, teachers would be more willing to accept special education and the handicapped, then if they are forced to do so.

A second step in having positive attitudes is the one the literature points out--inservice and training for teachers. Just showing that mainstreaming can work is not
enough, but also training teachers to carry it out is necessary. The teachers must be informed about the handicapped. They must be taught techniques to educate the handicapped. They must be shown what type of help they can expect and will get. They must be shown who they can turn to for help and when. They must also be shown that their help is necessary for making sure that the handicapped student succeeds in their classes. Finally, they must be made to realize that only their positive attitudes toward the handicapped will allow the handicapped to receive the education that they are entitled to.

A third step in changing attitudes toward the handicapped was also discussed in the literature. This step is changing peer attitude. With positive attitudes and social acceptance by peers, the mainstreamed handicapped can make educational and self-conceptual gains.

It is far easier to learn when one's peers are accepting rather than when they are rejecting. Also, if people are accepting, then one's self-awareness increases. With a better self-concept, the handicapped could naturally devote more time to learning. Ways to improve peer relationships have already been discussed.

The final step in changing attitudes is to get parents and the community involved. Because parents serve as primary models for their children's behavior, their attitudes must be positive to ensure social acceptance of the handicapped.
Through parent conferences, open houses, and parent-teacher groups, the services which the school has for the handicapped can be examined and demonstrated. Parents can be made aware of the ways the handicapped are being educated and what benefit this education has not only for the handicapped but for the community as a whole. For if these handicapped students can learn the skills which will allow them to succeed after graduation, then they become productive members of the community. They can obtain and hold down jobs. They lessen the tax burden by paying taxes rather than using them. They become responsible citizens of the community.

As a matter of fact, with the changing of attitudes toward the handicapped to positive feelings then most of the advantages of mainstreaming will be realized and the problems overcome. With the acceptance of the handicapped into school settings, the stigma associated with special classes would be removed. The handicapped would have a rightful place in schools. They would be seen moving from special "help" rooms to regular classes as part of the regular school routines. They would become part of the regular school and accepted.

An obvious result of positive attitudes would be the enhancement of the social status of the handicapped children. Through demonstrating their abilities and worth in the regular school setting, they establish for themselves an understanding and tolerance by the nonhandicapped students.
At the same time, this also increases their chances of this status continuing into the "real world." All the students now enrolled in school will be cut in the larger community later and the ideas and understanding they have for the handicapped in school should carry with them. Thus, as the students in school learned to accept and deal with the handicapped those same students should do so in the same manner as adults.

Also with positive attitudes and establishment of proper delivery systems, a better learning environment and flexibility dealing with the handicapped takes place. The teachers are prepared and willing to take children they know are ready to deal with regular classroom tasks. Furthermore, they know that if a child is not succeeding, then that child will be removed and given the skills necessary for success. Or if the child is not succeeding, they will be given the help and support they need for educating that child. In addition, the teacher will be allowed to request that a student be removed or appeal the placement of a student. Presently, regular education teachers do not have much input in getting students removed or placed who are not succeeding in the regular classroom. This teacher appeal and placement procedure would become part of the student's educational program. Teachers, then, would be more willing to work with the handicapped and a proper learning environment will be made for them.
Finally with proper attitudes toward the handicapped most of the problems with mainstreaming could be overcome. First of all, the money problem will be helped. People are more willing to spend money on things that will help them. If the community can be shown that through helping the handicapped, they can help their community, they would be more willing to part with their tax dollars.

Secondly through the establishment of proper delivery systems, regular teacher preparation time and backlash would be kept to a minimum. Only those handicapped students who can succeed in regular classes will be placed there. This is not to say that no extra time will be devoted to the handicapped. Teachers, however, are willing to spend extra time if that time is being devoted to a good cause. Through use of the placement procedures discussed above, it would seem that the time would be used judiciously. Also with the teacher involvement in establishing these programs, backlash should not be a problem.

Thirdly, with the placement procedures already discussed, the child who should not be mainstreamed will not be. Only those with the capability of succeeding with slight modification and with the support of a resource room will be mainstreamed. The rest will be taught skills necessary for them to become mainstreamed at a later time, or skills that will allow them to be mainstreamed into society once leaving school.
The final problem of mainstreaming cannot be rectified with positive attitudes toward the handicapped. This is the problem of lack of research. This can only be solved by researchers taking the time to study the area of mainstreaming. It is an important area. Even though there is a law establishing mainstreaming as a way of educating the handicapped, it does not mean that it will work or should not be researched. There needs to be research in order to establish ways and means for making it work. There needs to be research to justify the contentions made in this paper. Research needs to be done to establish worthwhile educational programs.

With research, ways for improving mainstreaming and making it work more effectively can be found. Insights for improving attitudes toward the handicapped can be gained. Where students should be placed and the best types of delivery systems can be found. In general, research needs to be done in order to make mainstreaming and the educating of the handicapped a reality.

Summary

In Chapter 3, the conclusions of the author based upon the literature to make mainstreaming effective were presented. It was the author's opinion that if attitudes
were changed and proper delivery systems devised, mainstreaming could become an effective way to educate the handicapped. However, it was also pointed out that not all of the problems could be solved with a change of attitude. The lack of research was one area. But with special educators, regular educators, and all parents being concerned for the handicapped, then many of the problems facing mainstreaming could be solved.
REFERENCES


59


Herman, R. Public law: Implications for mainstreaming.
In J. F. Collins & J. A. Mercurio (eds.). Meeting
the special needs of students in regular classrooms.
Symposium presented at Syracuse University,
Syracuse, 1975.

Heron, T. S. Maintaining the mainstreamed child in the
regular classroom: The decision-making process.

Hoffman, E., West, T., & Estes, P. Exceptional children
in intermediate programs: A teacher survey.

Holmes, D. L. Mainstreaming exceptional children. Journal
for Special Educators of the Mentally Retarded,
1976, 13, 17-25.

Hoover, K. H., & Hollingsworth, P. H. A handbook for
elementary school teachers. Boston: Allyn and

Jacks, K. E., & Keller, M. E. A humanistic approach to
the adolescent with learning disabilities: An
educational, psychological, and vocational model.

Jenkins, J. R. & Mayhall, M. F. Development and evalua-
tion of a resource teacher program. Exceptional

Kinsbourne, M. Learning disabilities: Diagnosis and
management, part two. Exceptional Parent, 1977,
7, 6-9.

Kronick, D. The pros and cons of labeling. Academic Therapy, 1977, 12, 101-104.


Kallan J. T. "Exceptional" teachers for "exceptional" children? In J. F. Collins & J. A. Mercurio (eds.) Meeting the special needs of students in regular classrooms. Symposium presented at Syracuse University, Syracuse, 1975.


