
TEACHING MAINSTREAMED STUDENTS



2nd Edition



THOMAS M STEPHENS · A EDWARD BLACKHURST · LARRY A MAGLIOCCA

PERGAMON PRESS

Teaching Mainstreamed Students

2nd Edition

THOMAS M. STEPHENS

The Ohio State University, USA

A. EDWARD BLACKHURST

University of Kentucky, USA

LARRY A. MAGLIOCCA

The Ohio State University, USA



PERGAMON PRESS

OXFORD · NEW YORK · BEIJING · FRANKFURT

SÃO PAULO · SYDNEY · TOKYO · TORONTO

U.K.	Pergamon Press plc, Headington Hill Hall, Oxford OX3 0BW, England
U.S.A	Pergamon Press, Inc, Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, New York 10523, U.S.A.
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA	Pergamon Press, Room 4037, Qianmen Hotel, Beijing, People's Republic of China
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	Pergamon Press GmbH, Hammerweg 6, D-6242 Kronberg, Federal Republic of Germany
BRAZIL	Pergamon Editora Ltda, Rua Eça de Queiros, 346, CEP 04011, Paraiso, São Paulo, Brazil
AUSTRALIA	Pergamon Press Australia Pty Ltd., P.O. Box 544, Potts Point, N.S.W. 2011, Australia
JAPAN	Pergamon Press, 5th Floor, Matsuoaka Central Building, 1-7-1 Nishishinjuku, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan
CANADA	Pergamon Press Canada Ltd., Suite No. 271, 253 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5T 1R5

Copyright © 1988 T.M. Stephens, A.E. Blackhurst and
L.A. Magliocca

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written permission in writing from the publishers.

First edition 1982 (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.)

Second edition 1988

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Stephens, Thomas M.

Teaching mainstreamed students/Thomas M. Stephens,
A. Edward Blackhurst, Larry A. Magliocca. — 2nd ed.
p. cm.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

1. Handicapped children—Education. 2. Mainstreaming in
education. 3. Special education. I. Blackhurst, A. Edward.
II. Magliocca, Larry A. III. Title.

LC401S.S73 1988

371.9—dc1987—32782, CIP

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Stephens, Thomas M.

Teaching mainstreamed students.—2nd ed.

1. Handicapped children—Education—United States

I. Title II. Blackhurst, A. Edward

III. Magliocca, Larry A.

371.9'043'0973 LC4031

ISBN 0-08-035836-5 (Hardcover)

ISBN 0-08-035835-7 (Flexicover)

Other Pergamon titles of interest

WANG, REYNOLDS & WALBERG

Handbook of Special Education: Research & Practice, Volume 1:
Learner Characteristics and Adaptive Education

WANG, REYNOLDS & WALBERG

Handbook of Special Education: Research & Practice, Volume 2:
Mildly Handicapped Conditions

WANG, REYNOLDS & WALBERG

Handbook of Special Education: Research & Practice, Volume 3:
Low Incidence Conditions

MORRIS & BLATT

Special Education: Research & Trends

This book is dedicated to Professor Jack W. Birch of the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Birch was an early advocate of mainstreaming exceptional children at a time when it was unpopular. He has been in the forefront of the research, service, and teacher preparation of special educators. Through his leadership, commitment, and many years of service, Jack Birch has influenced thousands of people indirectly. We had the good fortune to be influenced and to have had our professional careers shaped directly by him.

Also dedicated to our early teachers —

Sidney L. Pressey	(Stephens)
William J. Tisdall	(Blackhurst)
Robert M. Smith	(Blackhurst)
Jack C. Dinger	(Magliocca)

Preface

This book is intended as an introduction to mainstreaming for students who are preparing to be regular classroom teachers. We have written with undergraduate and other preservice students in mind. Our assumption is that most users of this text will probably not have had much, if any, course-work in special education. Further, we expect that this book will be useful in those courses that are devoted to the mainstreaming concept.

We call readers' attention to our use of the word *mainstreaming* throughout this book. Although the language used in the federal legislation refers to placement in the *least restrictive environment*, we believe, along with Lester Mann,¹ that the "practical intent" of the two terms is the same. Similarly, we refer to the *mainstreamed student* as the student of concern. We find this phrase useful in that any exceptional student — handicapped or gifted — could be receiving some services within the regular class.

We believe that mainstreaming continues to be widely misunderstood by many educators and noneducators alike. For this reason our focus is on those students who are most likely to be placed in regular classrooms for part or all of their school days. Among the handicapped, those labeled *mildly handicapped* are most represented in our thinking. These are children who essentially have learning and behavior problems tending to interfere with their school adjustment — those students who are diagnosed as *educable mentally retarded*, *learning disabled*, and those with mild behavior problems. This group may also include, for purposes of our discussion, the visually impaired, the hearing impaired, the physically handicapped, and the language impaired. In other words, we have tried to address the needs of those students with mild disabilities for educational purposes.

It may seem strange to some that we have also considered gifted students in this textbook. However, with historical perspective it should become obvious to most serious students that not only did school treatment adversely influence education for the handicapped but it also hampered progress for able students. By assuming that intelligence is essentially genetically determined, some people still believe that "genius" can overcome all barriers. Ironically, able students are also neglected by those who favor equality of

¹Lester Mann, Divagations, *Journal of Special Education*, 1981, 15(2), 98–99.

opportunity; politically progressive thinkers are known to use distorted egalitarian arguments in opposing individualized instruction for gifted students.

In organizing the contents, we sequenced our discussion as follows:

- An historical perspective (Chapter 1).
- Students who potentially represent the mainstreamed population (Chapter 2).
- Factors comprising the mainstreaming concept (Chapter 3).
- Activities provided by classroom teachers (Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8).
- Rationale and procedures for working with parents (Chapter 9).
- Competencies needed by teachers (Chapter 10).

The back matter — six appendices and a glossary are aids that the reader can refer to. We hope that they are useful to you in your studies and career.

Although our purpose is to provide all necessary elements needed in an introductory course, we do recognize that courses in mainstreaming exceptional children are taught by university personnel who have had experience and professional preparation in special education; their backgrounds will permit them to supplement this text where they believe it is appropriate.

As teacher educators and former classroom teachers, we respect the great demands placed on all teachers in today's schools. We are also aware of the anxieties and concerns that parents have when they send their children to school. We hope that our efforts here have assisted both teachers and parents and, perhaps through them, have contributed to the welfare of students and children.

Thomas M. Stephens
A. Edward Blackhurst
Larry A. Magliocca

Contents

1. Origins of Mainstreaming	1
2. Mainstreamed Students	35
3. The Elements of Effective Mainstreaming	84
4. Obtaining Assessment Information for Teaching	101
5. Using Assessment Information for Teaching	135
6. Teaching Study Behaviors for the Mainstream	158
7. Teaching Social Behavior	173
8. Using Microcomputers With Mainstreamed Students	215
9. Working with Parents of Mainstreamed Students	241
10. Teacher Competencies for Mainstreaming	275
 Appendices	
A Agencies Serving Mainstreamed Students and Their Families	308
B References for Teaching Mainstreamed Students by Selected Content Areas	312
C Books for Adults, Parents, and Teachers to Develop Understanding	316

D Books for Children to Develop Understanding	333
E Classroom Management Assessment Guide	337
F A Mainstreaming Simulator	351
<i>Glossary</i>	381
<i>References</i>	384
<i>About the Authors</i>	391
<i>Index</i>	393

1

Origins of Mainstreaming

- What is mainstreaming?
- What are the historical forces that led to mainstreaming?
- What are the legal requirements for mainstreaming?
- What implication does mainstreaming have for teachers?
- What attitudes are detrimental to successful mainstreaming?

Mainstreaming is the education of mildly handicapped children in the regular classroom. It is a concept that is compatible with the least restrictive environment provision of P.L. 94-142 requiring that all handicapped children be educated with their normal peers whenever possible. Mainstreaming is based on the philosophy of equal educational opportunity that is implemented through individual planning to promote appropriate learning, achievement, and social normalization.

Mainstreaming has captured the attention of educators and the general public. Discussion and controversy have developed around mainstreaming as a result of coverage of the mass media and numerous articles in magazines and research journals. This public discussion has been filled with confusing concepts and assumptions from its advocates as well as its critics.

The major confusion of this public debate has been the mistaken notion that self-contained special education classes should be closed and that all exceptional students should be placed in regular education classrooms. The concept of mainstreaming was promoted with great fervor in the late 1960s and early 1970s; correcting this idea will take time. The concept of mainstreaming as an "all-or-none" placement in the regular classroom grossly oversimplifies the needs of exceptional students and creates acute apprehension for regular and special education teachers.

If mainstreaming is not the wholesale placement of exceptional students into regular classes, then what is it? We will elaborate on the meaning of *mainstreaming*, but for now we will say only that the key to mainstreaming is to provide equal educational opportunities to handicapped students by placing them in the educational environment that best fits their needs. Many times this can be the regular classroom, if not for the entire day, at least for



PLATE 1.1 Many students with physical disabilities can spend their entire school day in regular classrooms.

part of the day. Other times the least restrictive environment may not include the regular classroom. The type of educational placement is determined by considering how best to promote learning, achievement, and social normalization.

The majority of students with handicaps currently spend at least part of their educational day in the regular classroom. This book is about those students and for their regular education teachers. In this chapter, we describe the historical roots of mainstreaming, provide a detailed definition, discuss the implications that mainstreaming has for teachers, and conclude with a discussion of attitudes that are detrimental to successful mainstreaming.

Historical Roots of Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming is a relatively recent development of special education. Birch (1978) indicates that the origin of the term *mainstreaming* is not known. The seeds for mainstreaming grew from diverse influences: the advocacy movement, litigation, research and evaluation studies, professional maturity of special educators, legislation, and changing public attitudes about what constitutes appropriate treatment of exceptional students. At different times one influence was in the forefront of awareness more than another; however, there is no doubt that the evolution of mainstreaming was the result of the interaction of these influences.

No segment of education has shown such rapid and continual change over the past 90 to 100 years as special education. These changes can be attributed to the social forces and attitudes that prevailed at each moment in time as illustrated by Reynolds and Rosen (1976).

The building of institutions for exceptional persons in the mid-nineteenth century was fostered by strong optimism that the judgment and intelligence of mentally subnormal persons could be dramatically increased by improving their sensory discrimination process. This sensory training approach was initiated in France by Jean Itard's work with Victor, the Wild Boy of Aveyron, in the early 1800s and brought to the United States by Eduardo Sequin (1866). This unrealistic optimism was replaced quickly by a pessimism particularly reinforced by Galton's publication on eugenics. Galton hypothesized that handicaps were genetic defects that would be passed on from generation to generation. This fatalistic attitude of the unchangeability of the mentally handicapped prompted widespread compulsory sterilization for institutionalized mentally retarded people in the early twentieth century.

Education for the severely disabled was benignly neglected; the mildly disabled were either excluded from the public schools or placed in segregated facilities or classes. Public school systems excluded disabled children on the grounds they were "unteachable" and "harmful to others,"

or they pleaded lack of money for special programs. The compulsory school-attendance laws enacted by many states in the early part of the twentieth century were rarely extended to exceptional children.

The learning environments of schools ignored the individual's learning style and viewed variation as undesirable. This attitude was so prevalent that Hollingsworth (1926) felt it necessary to argue, in her classic publication on the gifted child, that precociousness in children was not something to fear but to be nurtured.

Special education programs multiplied following World War II. Previously, most special education occurred in residential schools serving the blind, deaf, epileptic, crippled, and retarded; and special educators served these children within these facilities.

The concern for the individual differences in learning has been of recent origin: only in the past 100 years in psychology, and only within the past 50 years in the United States by educators. Noting the group orientation of the schools and the past concepts of "protecting" exceptional persons in sheltered environments, it is easy to understand why the parents of exceptional children would have first sought special schools and classes for their children in relative isolation from mainstream education. During the latter half of the 1940s and particularly in the 1950s the accepted model of education for the handicapped was in the separate facility or class.

Sarason and Doris (1978) point out that special educators at that time would have viewed an effort to integrate the mentally retarded into mainstream education as unrealistic and probably not in the best interest of the exceptional individual. This attitude of parents and special educators supporting the development of segregated facilities and classes was to change.

Research and Advocacy

By the mid-twentieth century several forces came together to precipitate change in the direction of mainstreaming. Studies began to focus on the education of exceptional students, and these studies provided fuel for the efforts of parent advocates.

The research literature that relates most specifically to the mainstreaming movement deals with the mentally retarded. The "efficacy" studies, as they began to be called, of the 1950s to 1970s questioned the academic value of special-class placement for the mildly retarded; more about these studies will be said later. The research literature of the 1940s directly influenced the decision by parent advocates to seek special, isolated facilities rather than to demand integration within general education.

The classic study of Skeels and Dye (1939) and follow-up study (Skeels, 1941-1942) had a tremendous impact on the public's attitude toward the retarded. This research showed that environmental stimulation had significant positive effects on the development of the retarded child. This

contrasted with previous attitudes that nothing could be done to assist the retarded, particularly those who were institutionalized.

Skeels and Dye (1939) provided a clear break from other research published in the 1930s. The attitude of many professionals, including noted authority Edgar Doll (1941), was that the condition of retardation was permanent and irreversible. The Skeels and Dye study of the positive effects of environmental stimulation of institutionalized retardates was a landmark. With the publication of the *National Society for the Study of Education, Part II* in 1940, not only did the education of the handicapped receive national recognition, but the studies of Kephart (1940) and Speers (1940) furthered the research into the influences of environmental factors on retarded persons. These early studies undermined the concept that attempts to diminish retardation were hopeless and educational programs would be wasted.

Several education approaches emerged during this period that are still important today. From his studies Samuel Orton (1937), a psychiatrist, formulated a hypothesis that neurological malfunctioning was the cause of a reading disability. Later, through his contact with educator Anna Gillingham, the Orton-Gillingham method of multisensory approaches to teaching was born.

Another early pioneer was Grace Fernald (1943). Her multisensory approach to teaching known as VAKT (Visual-Auditory-Kinesthetic-Tactile) is widespread today. Her teaching approach uses the four sensory channels simultaneously and was one of the first nationally recognized teaching methods for children we now call learning disabled.

The works of Orton and Fernald had an important influence during the 1940s. Combined with the growing acceptance of the mental-measurement movement it convinced many persons of the importance of an individual approach to teaching exceptional students. Other publications stressed individual approaches to teaching the exceptional child. The works of Strauss and Lehtinen (1947) and Kirk and Johnson (1951) are two notable examples.

Following World War II, *democracy* came to mean "freedom from fear and want." Parents formed specific groups to better conditions for their handicapped children. One of the most powerful parent groups was the National Association for Retarded Children (later changed to National Association for Retarded Citizens). Through state chapters they lobbied state legislators to make special provisions for their children. They succeeded in getting legislation passed to reimburse local school districts for the "excess cost" (over and above the costs of educating every student) of educating the exceptional child. From the end of World War II to the 1980s, this excess-cost provision had enabled programs for the handicapped to increase exponentially.

The advocacy movement for the handicapped gained public acceptance due to the return of disabled veterans after World War II and the Korean War. Advocacy groups like NARC could apply political pressure to legislators, with the emotional acceptance of the public, to make special provisions

for the handicapped. This was heightened by national campaigns like the "March of Dimes" for the physically disabled, inspired by President Franklin Roosevelt's own physical handicap.

Special classes and special facilities burgeoned during the 1950s and 1960s, particularly in urban areas. With this growth began the publication of a broader array of educational research on exceptional persons. Drawing from the research of child development, applied behavior analysis, instructional technology, language and semantics, perceptual-motor development, and specific educational areas (e.g., vocational education), the research literature of special education proposed different methods, curriculum materials and media, and delivery systems for the handicapped. Concurrently, sociometric studies and efficacy studies of the comparative effects of special and regular education placement of the mildly retarded raised the question of the desirability of unrestrained growth of separate special-education programs. In certain ways, these two types of studies have drawn contradictory conclusions, as will be illustrated below.

Sociometric studies show similar results from the 1950s through to the 1980s. Mildly handicapped children have been less accepted, isolated, and more actively rejected than nonhandicapped classmates in the mainstream (Cassidy and Stanton, 1959; Goodman, Gottlieb, and Harrison, 1972; Gottlieb and Budoff, 1973; Kidd, 1970; Scranton and Ryckman, 1979; and Towne, Joiner, and Schurr, 1967). These studies also show that children in special classes have a loss of self-esteem with stigma attached to special class placement, lowered achievement expectancies, and restriction of social models from whom to learn interpersonal skills, beyond that presented by nonhandicapped peers.

In contrast, efficacy studies showed that some mainstreamed handicapped children fared better academically than similar handicapped children in special classes. Briefly, the efficacy studies examined the selective merits of regular versus special class placement for mentally retarded children. The studies followed this process: Equivalent groups of mentally retarded children were identified in a special class and in a regular class. These groups were given achievement tests and social adjustment tests in a pre- and post-test fashion. The data were analyzed through various statistical methods and in many of these studies the mentally retarded in regular classes performed better.

Several influential authorities reviewed these studies. First, Johnson (1962) reviewed a number of early works including Baldwin (1958), Cassidy and Stanton (1959), Jordan (1959), and Thurstone (1959) and concluded that special classes were of little academic value to mildly retarded children. Second, Dunn's (1968) review, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded—Is Much of it Justifiable?," caused widespread reevaluation of the establishment of special classes. Although Dunn's conclusions were similar to those of Johnson (1962), they found the United States six years later in a

different sociopolitical state of mind. *Dunn concluded, as did Johnson, that special classes were academically ineffective for the mildly retarded*, but he extended his criticism to other important factors. He pointed out that *special classes had disproportionately large numbers of minority and disadvantaged children in them, minimal justification was required by general educators for special placement, and the monumental growth of special classes had thwarted the development of instructional options in regular classes*. Dunn's article is frequently cited as the consciousness-raising article that began the mainstreaming movement in earnest.

Efficacy studies have been heavily criticized for using poor research methodology (e.g., Keogh and Levett, 1976; Kirk, 1964; MacMillan and Becker, 1977; Robinson and Robinson, 1976) and any attempt to generalize the conclusions of the studies should be done cautiously. One unfortunate result of the studies was the unwarranted assumption that all mildly handicapped children should be placed in the mainstream (e.g., Berry's call in 1972 for the wholesale return of the handicapped to regular classrooms). As Gickling and Theobald (1975) pointed out:

Mainstreaming is cited so frequently that one might mistakenly think it a magic elixir rather than a particular orientation toward supplying special education for the majority of the mildly handicapped. It has been treated as if full participation in regular educational programs would overcome any adverse problems facing exceptional children. (p. 317)

Although the scientific validity of the efficacy studies could be questioned, there were some positive effects. These studies accentuated the need for the following practices:

1. A broader array of special services to support the exceptional child (now known as a "continuum of special education services").
2. Nondiscriminatory testing.
3. Antilabeling movement.
4. Participatory decision making in placement on the part of parents.

To date the consensus of research findings suggests the general type of learning environment, i.e., regular versus special, by itself is not the determining factor in achievement. In a large-scale study, Gottlieb, Rose, and Lessen (1983) reported comparisons of mildly retarded children in mainstream or special settings throughout the state of Texas. Both groups of retarded children scored in the lowest percentages of achievement in reading and arithmetic regardless of setting. In a comprehensive review of the literature, Kavale and Glass (1982) summarize recent findings: mildly handicapped children will not necessarily progress well academically unless

the curriculum is adapted to their needs. The efficacy studies are being replaced by more comprehensive evaluation efforts (Kaufman, Semmel, and Agard, 1974; Keogh, Kukic, and Sbordone, 1975). This suggests researchers are more interested in the effectiveness of educational programming rather than its efficiency. Thus, the research focus has shifted to more fruitful avenues of search: What match do we need between the school environment and the exceptional child's needs to be successful?

Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987) have reiterated the concern of past researchers (Dunn, 1968; Hobbs, 1975; Heller, Holtzman, and Merrick, 1982) regarding the classification and placement of mildly handicapped students. They indicate there are few discernible differences between the mildly handicapping categories (e.g., specific learning disability, mild mental retardation) and various low achieving students (e.g., economically disadvantaged) in the regular classroom. From their perspective, there seems to be little justification for classifying students by these categories and using "pull-out" programs for educational services. Their concern is two-fold: (1) students in need of assistance don't receive it because they don't quite fit the eligibility criteria of a handicapping condition, and (2) regular education and special education should form a closer partnership, empowered by the principal, to serve all students who need special help. Thus, researchers are refocusing on the potential for serving students with learning problems in the regular education environment.

The most important research of the last two decades that has productively expedited mainstreaming has been in two areas: differentiated programming and functional noncategorical approaches to educating the exceptional student. The research questions are rightfully being rephrased to ask, What specific program delivery systems and methods of instruction will affect the exceptional child's learning satisfactorily?

Differentiated programming has focused on environmental and student factors. Preparation of the mainstream learning environment has been one effort. Wang and Birch (1984a,b) have described the development of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model. Chalfant, Pysh, and Moultrie (1979) have recommended the building-based teacher assistance teams that plan and implement collaboration and teamwork between general educators and specialists. The environmental approaches suggested by these researchers attempt to modify the regular education environment so that mainstreaming may be more successful. Differential programming for students has recently focused on learning strategy instruction. This approach has specifically tried to increase the student's preparation for success in the mainstream by deliberately teaching skills and strategies required to learn knowledge and information. Alley and Deshler (1979), Flavell (1979), Archer (1979) and Meichenbaum (1980), to cite a few researchers, have provided guidance in identifying skills and strategies more proficient students