THE FEASIBILITY OF INTEGRATING SPECIAL NEEDS ADOLESCENTS

by

Robert Stuart Harding

B.A. (English), Simon Fraser University, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL

FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty

of

Education

© Robert Stuart Harding

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

April, 1993

APPROVAL

Name: Robert Stuart Harding

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: The Feasibility of Integrating Special Needs
                               Adolescents

Examining Committee:

   Chair: Michael Manley-Casimir

Leone M. Prock
Senior Supervisor

Roland Case
Assistant Professor

Alan R. Táylor
Director Instruction
Curriculum/Assessment
Coquitlam School District
Coquitlam, B.C.
External Examiner

Date Approved _Mah. 30/93_____

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend
my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below)
to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or
single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the
library of any other university, or other educational institution, on
its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission
for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted
by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying
or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed
without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

The Feasibility of Integrating Special Needs Adolescents

_____

_____

_____

Author: _____
        (signature)

       Robert Stuart HARDING
         (name)

      MARCH 30, 1993
        (date)

ABSTRACT

     The feasibility of integrating special needs students

in regular classrooms depends largely upon the roles played

by the key constituents in the enterprise: the regular

classroom teachers. Special needs include learning

disabilities, behavioural disorders/emotional disturbances,

English as a second language, hearing and vision

impairments, mental and physical handicaps. This thesis

incorporates both a literature study and a field-based study

and is composed of five chapters. Chapter 1 (Introduction)

presents the problem, provides a rationale and definitions

and sets the context for the study. Chapter 2 (Literature

Study) examines the debate surrounding integration. The

discussion in Chapter 2 is grouped around seven main themes:

     1.   Models of service delivery

     2.   Prevalence and labelling

     3.   Efficiency of special education

     4.   Ideological agenda of integration

     5.   Feasibility of integration

     6.   Roles of regular and special educators

     7.   Class size/preparation time.

The literature study concludes that teachers are unlikely to

support total integration of special needs students for a

number of reasons.

Chapter 3 (Field Study Methodology) describes the survey instrument, a questionnaire which was distributed to secondary school teachers in a large suburban British Columbia school district (henceforward called School District X). The 55 questions elicited teachers' attitudes, values, and related beliefs regarding integration, and were grouped around the seven themes listed above. Chapter 3 also discusses how the questionnaire was refined, and how the data were collected and analyzed.

Chapter 4 (Field Study Results) includes and discusses 13 tables which present the questionnaire's findings. The results of the field study consistently support arguments against total integration.

Chapter 5 (Conclusions) suggests that for integration to work, teachers must a) see its value; b) understand the implications clearly; and c) be willing and able to fit the demands of mainstreaming into their routines. Chapter 5 concludes that integration is likely to fail in School District X because of the following:

1. Most teachers are not trained in special education.
2. Class sizes are too large at present to include several special needs students.
3. The demands on teachers' time are already formidable.

4.   Most teachers do not see the value of integration.

5.   Teachers have not been consulted regarding the innovation.

6.   Teachers will not receive adequate support in classrooms.

DEDICATION

To Jessie, Michael and Jonathan, with love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1:   INTRODUCTION

I.   Overview

As well as provide a rationale and definitions, Chapter
1 outlines in general terms the content and direction of
this thesis which studies the attitudes, values and related
beliefs of secondary general education teachers in one
school district in British Columbia toward the integration
of special needs students in regular classrooms.   Do
teachers support the movement toward integrating special
needs students?   Do teachers see the value of integration?
Do teachers clearly understand all of the implications of
integration?   Can teachers fit the demands of integration
into their routines?   If these questions cannot be answered
affirmatively, then it seems reasonable to predict that
integration will fail.

Integration, or mainstreaming has been a widely-
discussed educational issue for the past several years.
Informal teacher discussions return again and again to
integration, while publications such as the British Columbia
Teachers' Federation's Teacher magazine have featured
several articles focussing on the issue.   The British
Columbia Ministry of Education has set future directions for
B.C. public schools in its Year 2000 documents which clearly
mandate integration:

> Programs should be able to meet the learning needs
> of all students. Children with special learning
> needs are the highest priority for individualized
> learning plans....This type of differentiated
> programming must be clearly distinguished from
> streaming....Streaming is inconsistent with the
> concept of a learner-focused program. (B.C.
> Ministry of Education, 1990, pp. 10, 17)

In fact, School District X, which is the focus of the field
study, has been implementing integration in its elementary
schools for some time, whereas the integration movement in
its secondary schools is in the beginning stages. School
District X has undertaken a local initiative which supports
many of the directions indicated in the Year 2000 documents,
including integration:

> The educational setting for students with special
> learning needs has become the subject of a debate
> which spans moral, social and political issues of
> human rights....We should continue to move in the
> direction of integrating students with special
> learning needs into normalized school settings.
> (School District X, 1989, pp. 100 - 101)

Educators in the United States have also been debating and
discussing integration for years; the U.S. debate centres on
the Regular Education Initiative (R.E.I.) which may lead to
legislated integration of special needs students. Indeed,
an entire issue of the Journal of Learning Disabilities
(Volume 21, Number 1) was devoted entirely to the R.E.I.
debate.

The depth, breadth and duration of the integration
debate, as briefly outlined above, all highlight the crucial

importance of the issue, and provide the context for this thesis, which actually amounts to two studies in one: a literature-based study and a complementary field study.

Chapter 2 (Literature Study) examines the debate surrounding the integration issue in the U.S. while examining some of the other issues involved in educational change, providing context for the changes being implemented in British Columbia and in School District X. The discussion in Chapter 2 is grouped around seven sub-topics:

1. Models of service delivery

2. Prevalence and labelling

3. Efficiency of special education

4. Ideological agenda of integration

5. Feasibility of integration

6. Roles of regular and special educators

7. Class size.

Chapter 3 (Field Study Methodology) describes the survey instrument--a questionnaire--how the instrument was refined, and how the data were collected and analyzed. In this study, only general education teachers were included. This means, specifically, that special education teachers, learning assistance teachers, skill development teachers, English as a second language (E.S.L.) teachers, counsellors, administrators, and teachers with mixed general/special loads were not surveyed.

Chapter 4 (Field Study Results) discusses the findings of the questionnaire and a somewhat problematic response rate. The chapter also presents tables which cross-tabulate the data, grouping them around the seven sub-topics.

Chapter 5 (Conclusions) returns to the two focal questions of the thesis:

1. Is integration a good idea in principle?

2. Is integration likely to work in practice?

Centering on these two questions, Chapter 5 considers the following issues:

1. Will integration work in the secondary schools of School District X?

2. What are reasonable alternative recommendations?

3. What further research ought to be done?

II. The Problem

Despite its advocates, growing bodies of opinion and research indicate that integration may not be an educational panacea. One evident feature of the debate is the exclusion from it of general educators who are not specialists in dealing with disabilities--those persons whose working lives are most affected by the "mainstreaming" of special needs students (Kauffman, 1988; Kauffman, 1989; Lieberman, 1985; Lieberman, 1988; Singer, 1988). Whether or not integration is a good idea in principle--and the evidence in its favour is not strong--the problem of feasibility is crucial.

4

Classroom teachers are the gatekeepers of change, and educational change depends on what teachers think and do (Fullan, 1991). If teachers have not even been consulted regarding such a fundamental change, then success for the change is unlikely. As Fullan puts it, changes need to be considered from more than one point of view:

> In examining how and what decisions are made we should keep in mind two critical questions: who benefits from the change (the values question), and how sound or feasible are the idea and approach (the capacity for implementation question). Both are complex and difficult questions to answer. (1991, pp. 17 - 18)

III. Rationale

It was important to conduct this study for a number of reasons, perhaps most significantly because the classroom experiences of many teachers yield the belief that integration, unaccompanied by other fundamental changes in public schools, is highly problematic. Although for years claims regarding the benefits of mainstreaming were aggressively presented, little discussion regarding the feasibility of integration was available. Special needs students of all kinds were arriving unannounced in classrooms, in greater and greater numbers, and in many cases teachers were not informed of students' needs, let alone consulted with regard to the desirability of the presence of special needs students in their classes.

5

Consultation is an important issue in such cases, and
equally relevant in a discussion of feasibility are
teachers' lack of training in special education, large
classes, the already considerable demands on teachers' time,
and the completely inadequate, and often nonexistent
classroom support. The Year 2000 document (Year 2000: A
Framework for Learning, 1990) which will chart the future of
public schools in British Columbia includes integration of
special needs students as a founding principle:

>Ideally, programs should be able to meet the
>learning needs of all students. Children with
>special needs are the highest priority for
>individualized learning plans....This approach
>should make it possible to address a wide range of
>learner needs by using a range of teaching
>methods. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1990, p.
>10)

Combined with the local initiatives toward integration in
School District X, and in the context of the concerns
expressed above, the issue of feasibility is clearly
crucial. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that
the experiences and concerns of colleagues are significantly
different. Teaching experience informed by considerable
research allows agreement with Fullan:

>Even good ideas may represent poor investments on
>a large scale if the ideas have not been well
>developed or if the resources to support
>implementation are unavailable....Nisbet (1980)
>claims that the "metaphor" of growth and progress
>in Western thought has seduced us into falsely

assuming that change is development. He shows that actual historical events and processes do not sustain the notion of the linearity and inevitability of progress. The corrective is not a counter-metaphor of decay. Rather, the nature of educational changes should be examined according to the specific values, goals, events, and consequences that obtain in concrete situations. Educational innovations are not ends in themselves. We should strive to find meaning in assessing specific innovations and be suspicious of those that do not make sense - a task made no easier but all the more necessary by the fact that the goals of education in contemporary society and the best means of achieving them are simply not that clear or agreed upon. (1991, p. 28)

Finally, there is the concern that integration was part of a political agenda in which the needs of students and the concerns of teachers were not fully considered. Our children and our schools are far too precious to be manipulated for political expedience. Fundamental changes should be supported by sound arguments, not by platitudes.

IV. Definitions

This section defines the categories of special need included in the questionnaire with which some of the data for this study were gathered. These definitions are found in the British Columbia Ministry of Education's (1985) Special Programs Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines.

i. Severe Behavior Problems

Students with severe behavior problems are those who exhibit a variety of long standing excessive and chronic deviant behaviors. These behaviors can be exhibited through impulsiveness, aggressiveness, depression and withdrawal. The

7

severely behaviourally disordered child may also
demonstrate bizarre and inappropriate behavior
including self injury, destructiveness, crying,
and feelings of inferiority. These students
frequently exhibit a <u>significant</u> discrepancy
between academic performance and potential. Their
behaviors are so profoundly inappropriate that
they significantly interfere with the academic
process [sic] of self and others. (Section 7, p.
43)

ii.   English-as-a-Second Language/Dialect

English-as-a-Second Language/Dialect (ESL/D)
programs are designed to provide needs [sic]
additional support services to students who do not
speak standard Canadian English as a "home"
language so that these students adequately cope
with the school curriculum. The regular curricula
may also need to be adapted and/or modified to
meet the needs of the ESL/D students until they
can attain the ultimate goal of working in the
regular curricula.

ESL/D students bring to school a wealth of ideas
and experiences which are encoded in the language
of the home. They are cognitively as well
developed as their standard-English speaking
peers; they simply express themselves in a
different linguistic form. (Section 7, p. 51)

iii.   Hearing Impairment

Hearing-impaired students include those students
whose hearing impairment results in such a
substantial educational handicap that they require
direct special education and/or related services
<u>on a regular basis</u> from trained and qualified
teachers of the hearing impaired. These students
may be described as deaf or hard of hearing.
(Section 7, p. 21)

iv.   Learning Disabilities

Children with learning disabilities are those who
show a significant discrepancy between their
estimated learning potential and actual
performance. This discrepancy is related to basic
problems in attention, perception, symbolization

and the understanding or use of spoken or written language. These may be manifested in difficulties in thinking, listening, talking, reading, writing, spelling or computing. These problems may or may not be accompanied by demonstrable central nervous system dysfunctions. (Section 7, p. 29)

v. Mildly Mentally Handicapped (E.M.H.)

On formal psychological tests, mildly mentally handicapped students usually score between two and three standard deviations below the norm.

As a general guideline, educators could anticipate that many mildly mentally handicapped students are capable of attaining an academic level equivalent to upper intermediate grades. These students may be able to progress satisfactorily in standard programs in regular classrooms although modification of curricular materials and instructional methods may be required. (Section 7, p. 38)

vi. Moderately Mentally Handicapped (T.M.H.)

Many moderately mentally handicapped students generally function two to three years below their actual age level. The deficits are frequently evident in language acquisition, cognition, fine and gross motor skills, self-help and socialization.

On formal psychological tests, moderately mentally handicapped students usually score between three and five standard deviations below the norm.

As a general guideline, educators can anticipate that many moderately mentally handicapped students are capable of attaining academic skills to the upper primary level and some to the lower intermediate level. (Section 7, p. 1)

vii. Severely and Profoundly Mentally Handicapped

Severely and profoundly mentally handicapped students range in ability from individuals who are capable of learning self-care skills and basic communication to individuals who require intensive intervention to maintain and develop responses to

external stimulation. Frequently these students
will have sensory and physical disabilities in
addition to their mental handicap. (Section 7, p.
6)

viii. Physically Handicapped

Physically handicapping conditions include
disorders of the nervous system, musculoskeletal
conditions, congenital malformations and other
physically disabling and health related
conditions. The extent of the physical impairment
varies greatly resulting in a range of educational
implications. The majority of students in this
category have minimal involvement and thus require
minor adaptations in curriculum materials and
instructional techniques. Successful programming
for students who are more seriously involved may
require the use of support workers and specialized
teaching equipment in addition to modification of
curricular material and instructional methods.
Many of these students may be included and funded
in other special education categories. (Section
7, p. 11)

ix. Visual Impairment

Visually impaired students include those students
whose visual impairment result [sic] in such a
substantial educational handicap that they require
special education and/or related services from
trained and experienced teachers of the visually
impaired. These students are commonly referred to
as blind or partially sighted. (Section 7, p. 16)

V. Limitations of the Study

This study was restricted to the teachers in only one

of the 75 districts in British Columbia. School District X

is a large suburban district located to the east of

Vancouver; the district is more fully described in Chapter

3. This district was selected because the researcher lives

and works in it, making it an obviously practical choice.

restriction may limit generalizability of the results.

The questionnaire method used in this study also includes a limitation irrespective of the sample size. Parten (1966) lists the following drawbacks of the questionnaire method:

1.   Returns from questionnaires are often low. (In this study the return rate was approximately 50%.)

2.   Because respondents fill in questionnaires without the assistance of a researcher, they may misinterpret questions, omit essential items, or submit responses which cannot be put in form for meaningful analysis. (Of the 43 questionnaires returned, in this study one was incorrectly completed.)

3.   Questions used must be simple and practically self-explanatory, because respondents cannot be trained regarding such things as the meanings of terms. (A glossary of terms was appended to the questionnaire used in this study.)

4.   Questionnaires must be brief if high returns are to be obtained. (The questionnaire for this study took approximately 20 minutes to complete.)

5.   Checks on the honesty and reliability of returns are nearly impossible to devise.

6.   It is virtually impossible to return incomplete or unsatisfactory schedules to respondents for

correction. (There was no satisfactory way to return the one incorrectly completed questionnaire in this study.)

Other limitations of the study should also be acknowledged. The relatively small sample (43) and low return rate (50%) are discussed further in Chapter 3. In addition, it is possible that respondents were only those who held particularly strong views regarding mainstreaming, but this seems unlikely because respondents were randomly selected. Also, the survey questions may not be entirely balanced. For example, Question #23 which asks if special needs students have a right to separate classes could have been balanced by a question asking if these student have a right to integrated classes. Finally, the field study used a questionnaire only, and the results were not cross-validated, for example by interviews or by questionnaire design.

Despite these limitations, the questionnaire method has undeniable strength and validity:

> Sample surveys have become the major mode of empirical research in a wide variety of social science disciplines and their associated applied fields. Sample surveys provide much of the data that monitor trends in our society...and in general give us much of our current knowledge about our society. (Rossi, Wright & Anderson, 1983, p. xv)

This chapter has provided relevant definitions and a rationale. It has expressed, briefly, serious concern with the feasibility of integration.

CHAPTER 2:   LITERATURE STUDY

I.   Overview

This chapter discusses and analyzes the arguments of advocates and opponents of the movement toward integration of special needs students. Issues discussed include models of service delivery, highlighting the contrast between the "cascade" model and the "collaborative" model. The prevalence and labelling of special needs are addressed. Arguments concerning the purported inefficiency of delivery of special education are also examined, as is the underlying ideology of the pro-integration movement. The feasibility of integrating special needs students in regular classrooms depends largely upon the roles played by key constituents, such as parents, regular teachers, and special education teachers. These roles are scrutinized. Also examined are the following: the vagueness of the proposed restructuring; attitudes toward experimentation and research; the issue of class size; and the important differences between elementary and secondary school settings. This debate is relevant in British Columbia because of the move toward integration mandated by the Year 2000 document (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1990, p. 10). The debate is especially relevant in School District X because of the district's new policy of integrating special needs students at all levels (School District X, 1989, p. 100).

During recent years, grouping of students has been one of the most contentious educational issues. The concern

among special educators is whether students ought to be
grouped heterogeneously, or grouped separately according to
need or ability. On one side of this debate, special
educators such as James Kauffman (1985; 1988; 1989), Daniel
Hallahan (1985; 1988), and Lawrence Lieberman (1985) argue
that heterogeneous grouping of special needs students would
not necessarily serve the interests either of those students
or of the "regular" students with whom they would be
grouped. On the other side of the debate, special educators
such as William and Susan Stainback (1985; 1988), Douglas
Biklen (1986), and Nancy Zollers (1986), maintain that
integration of special needs students in regular classrooms
would provide those students with the equal educational
opportunities to which they are entitled. The latter group
of educators advocate service delivery to special needs
students according to a "collaborative model." They
suggest, somewhat problematically, that virtually all
special needs students be placed in regular classrooms under
the immediate supervision of the regular teacher, with whom
the special needs teacher would "collaborate" periodically
in an as yet vaguely-defined way. Under this collaborative
model, it is possible that "regular" classes will include
"normal" students, as well as English as a Second Language
(E.S.L.) students; physically handicapped students with
conditions such as cerebral palsy; vision impaired students;
hearing impaired students; behaviourally disordered
students; mentally handicapped students; and learning

14

disabled students.

II. Models of Service Delivery to Special Needs Students

In the U.S., the Regular Education Initiative (R.E.I.) proposes adoption of the collaborative model. Kauffman (1989) maintains that the R.E.I. would initiate revolutionary changes in the ways teachers deal with the problems of teaching and managing integrated classes. Kauffman lists several "foundational" ideas that have been the basis for special education endeavours for the last century in the U.S.:

1.   Some students are very different from most in ways that are important for education, and special education--not the usual or typical education--is required to meet their needs. In the context of public education, these students should be identified as exceptional. Excluding gifted and talented students, exceptional students are handicapped.

2.   Not all teachers are equipped to teach all students. Special expertise is required by teachers of exceptional students because such students present particularly difficult instructional problems. Most teachers are not equipped by training nor able in the context of their usual class size to ensure an equal educational opportunity for handicapped students.

3.   Students who need special education, as well as the funds and personnel required to provide appropriate education for them, must be clearly identified to ensure that exceptional students receive appropriate services. Special services will be compromised or lost unless both funding and services are specifically targeted.

4.   Education outside the regular classroom is sometimes required for some part of the school day to meet some students' needs. Removal of an exceptional student from the regular classroom may be required to (a) provide more intensive, individualized instruction, (b) provide instruction in skills already mastered or not

needed by non-handicapped students in the regular
class, or (c) ensure the appropriate education of
other students in the regular classroom.

5.   The options of special education outside the
      regular classroom and special provisions within
      the regular classroom are required to ensure equal
      educational opportunity for exceptional students.
      The most important equity issue is quality of
      instruction, not the place of instruction. (1989,
      pp. 4-5)

Both the collaborative model and the "cascade model"

(See Figure 1) are purported to serve the principle of least

restrictive environment: "This means that if the child's

needs can be met without removing the child from the regular

classroom, then he or she will not be placed in a special

needs class" (Hallahan, Kauffman & Lloyd, 1985 p. 19). The

cascade model, which provides the flexibility of student

placement described above by Kauffman, is to be replaced in

British Columbia by the collaborative model (B.C. Ministry

of Education, 1990, pp. 10, 11). A critical difference

between the two models is that the collaborative model does

not provide for alternatives to regular classroom placement.

The cascade model allows for "a broad continuum of service

delivery...extending from placement in a regular class, with

no need for special education, to special education provided

in settings that may be very highly specialized" (B. C.

Ministry of Education, 1985, p. 4.1). If an exceptional

student's needs cannot be met in regular

16

Figure 1

The Instructional Cascade

Move specialized instruction to a common setting whenever feasible

Move students to specialized and limited environments only for compelling reasons

Return students to heterogeneous environments as soon as feasible

Specialized educational environments | Limited educational environments

Diverse educational environments with special education support.

Diverse regular educational environments:

Regular classes and schools that offer individualized instruction of many kinds to students (including those with handicaps or gifts) showing a wide diversity of characteristics.

It is assumed that no educational "place" is impervious to change and development and that through good efforts many of the varieties of specialized and intensive forms of education can be moved into a developing mainstream.

Here, as in the case of the original cascade, it is assumed that students should be removed from the mainstream only for limited periods and compelling reasons, that when in specialized and limited environments their progress should be monitored carefully and regularly, and that they should be returned to the mainstream as soon as feasible.

(Reynolds and Birch, 1977, cited in Special Programs Manual, 1985, p.4.2)

classrooms, then a range of other options is available:

> The Instructional Cascade...proposes that regular
> classes be made more educationally diverse, with
> emphasis on moving specialized instruction into regular
> classroom settings. The view taken is that most
> students should begin their formal education in regular
> classes with special help....
>
>> Several broad policies are espoused by this
>> continuum model:
>>
>> (a)   to develop the capacity to conduct
>>   specialized forms of education in *many*
>>   settings, rather than in a *few*.
>>
>> (b)   to reinforce the consultancy role of
>>   specialists who must be prepared to share
>>   their expertise with other teachers, aides
>>   and parents.
>>
>> (c)   to develop school based responsibility for
>>   assessment, planning and instruction.
>>
>> (d)   to move towards a system of student
>>   descriptions based on instructional needs
>>   rather than in terms of abstract categories
>>   (British Columbia Ministry of Education
>>   Special Programs Manual, 1985, pp. 4.1-4.3
>>   [author's emphasis]).

On the other side of the debate are the advocates of

mainstreaming, such as Biklen and Zollers (1986), Lipsky and

Gartner (1987), and Stainback and Stainback (1984) who

propose essentially total integration. Kauffman (1989)

summarizes the premises underlying these R.E.I. advocates'

proposals:

> 1.   Students are more alike than they are different,
>   even in the most unusual cases. The same basic
>   principles apply to the learning of all students.
>   Consequently, no truly special instruction is
>   needed by any student. It is therefore not the
>   case that there are different kinds of students.
>   The exceptional--nonexceptional and handicapped--
>   nonhandicapped distinctions are not useful for
>   purposes of education.

2. Good teachers can teach all students; all good
    teachers use the same basic techniques and
    strategies. Teaching all students well requires
    that the teacher make relatively minor adjustments
    of strategy or accommodation for individual
    differences. Therefore, truly special training is
    not required for handicapped students or for their
    teachers. Special education has become a
    convenient way for general educators to avoid
    their responsibility to teach all students,
    leading to a decrement in quality of instruction
    for all students.

3. All children can be provided a high quality
    education without identifying some students as
    different or special and without maintaining
    separate budgets, training programs, teachers or
    classes for some students. Special targeting of
    funds for specific students is inefficient,
    confusing, and unnecessary. No student will be
    short changed in a system designed to provide a
    high quality education for every student.

4. Education outside the regular classroom is not
    required for anyone. All students can be
    instructed and managed effectively in regular
    classrooms. Moreover, the separation of students
    from their ordinary chronological age peers is an
    immoral, segregationist act that has no legitimate
    place in our free and egalitarian society.

5. Physically separate education is inherently
    discriminatory and unequal. The most important
    equity issue is the site, not the quality of
    instruction, for if handicapped students are
    educated alongside their nonhandicapped peers,
    then and only then can they be receiving an equal
    educational opportunity. (Kauffman, 1989, pp. 5-6)

III. Prevalence and Labelling

Among the advocates of the R.E.I. are Douglas Biklen

and Nancy Zollers (1986), who assert that the L.D. (learning

disabled) field is booming. They estimate that in 1983-1984

approximately 4.62% of the total school population in the

U.S. was identified as L.D.   Whereas Biklen and Zollers

appeared to be shocked by this figure, Hallahan, Kauffman

and Lloyd (1985) maintain that the percentage of L.D. prevalence cannot be calculated so precisely. They state that between 3% and 4% of the school-age population is identified as learning disabled. The statistics quoted by the opposing factions are reasonably similar, but only one side seems disturbed by these results. Regardless of prevalence and identification rates, U.S. Department of Education (1987) statistics indicate an actual decline in the percentage of students receiving special services: "Concern about escalating referral and identification rates hardly seems justified on the basis of current data" (Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988, p. 7). Biklen and Zollers argue that the "explosion" in the number of children labelled as L.D. may have to do with imprecision in the criteria used to identify learning disabled children: "It has been estimated that given the widely ranging characteristics employed in classifying learning disabled students, 80% of all school-age youngsters could be eligible for special education" (1986, p. 579). This argument may be valid: there appears to be a consensus regarding the inconsistency of labelling criteria (Hallahan, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1985) but this inconsistency is not entirely surprising, given the relatively recent (1960's) emergence of the term "learning disability" and of the associated fields of study and practice. Furthermore, Biklen and

Zollers (1986) and others such as Stainback and Stainback

(1984) want to do away with labelling all together:

> There are not two distinct types of students--special
> and regular....All students differ along continuums of
> intellectual, physical and psychological
> characteristics. Individual differences are universal
> and thus the study of deviant people is really a study
> of all humankind. (Stainback & Stainback, 1984, p. 102)

Kauffman disagrees. Obviously, when all

characteristics are included, all children are more similar

than they are different, but Kauffman points out that if we

do not draw distinctions among children along important

dimensions we are unlikely to provide for their differences

(1989, p. 11). Kauffman extends and analyzes Stainback and

Stainback's argument about the arbitrariness of labelling in

order to defend the logical need to make certain kinds of

distinctions:

> Arbitrary decisions involving characteristics
> distributed along a continuum are frequently necessary
> to promote social justice, even though the arbitrary
> criterion is less than perfectly correlated with the
> performance or responsibility in question....The
> decision to grant the right to vote to citizens 18
> years and older rather than 21 was arbitrary; voting
> age could be changed at will. And while some 18-year-
> olds exercise their right with a high degree of
> responsibility, others do not. Moreover, only a day of
> life may separate one young person who is granted the
> right to vote from one who is denied the right, and
> some 14-year-olds are better prepared to vote than are
> many 18-year-olds. Yet, to argue against the
> establishment of an arbitrary criterion for voting age
> is to suggest that we reduce the right to vote to an
> absurdity. We know that suffrage for 3-year-olds would
> make a mockery of the democratic process, but would
> suffrage for 17-year-olds? Perhaps not. Where do we
> draw the line? Clearly, we establish an arbitrary
> criterion; just as clearly, we must if we care about
> social justice. And just as clearly we must establish
> arbitrary criteria for inclusion in specific

21

educational programs if we want our educational system not to mock our intelligence. (1989, p. 12)

Stainback and Stainback use the example of autism to support their contention that such labels are not *educationally* meaningful:

The educational needs of students classified...autistic can be distorted by not viewing them individually and as whole persons. In short, there is much more to a child classified autistic than the characteristics that define him/her as having autism. (1984, p. 104)

This is obviously an accurate statement, but it implies that teachers who are morally and professionally obliged to understand students as whole persons, would make the error of viewing a student unidimensionally. On the basis of this unsound premise, Stainback and Stainback would rob teachers--and students--of some very useful, possibly invaluable tools: the labels themselves. There may or may not be a stigma associated with labels, but there is no doubt that bodies of knowledge have grown around such labels as "learning disabled" and "autistic." The labels allow teachers access to unified and coherent descriptions of disabled children's typical behaviours and to well-tested strategies for intervention and meaningful educational progress. Would Stainback and Stainback have teachers abandon these bodies of knowledge along with the labels? Where exactly would that leave disabled students?

We ignore what we do not label. Some labels are known to be more accurate or more palatable or less damaging than others. Surely the most humane and least damaging labels must be sought, but to suggest that no child should be labelled handicapped or disabled or to

22

attempt studiously to avoid all labels is clearly inane
and opens the door to apathy and indifference.
(Kauffman, 1989, p. 14)

Particularly problematic in the discussion of the issue
of "overidentification" are the statistics associated with
those students labelled as behaviourally disordered (B.D.).
Arguments that this group of students is overidentified run
counter to both prevalence data and most expert opinion
(Braaten et al., 1988). U.S. federal reports indicate that
under 1% of students are labelled B.D. and describe such
students as "underserved." Leaders in special education
believe that 3% is a conservative B.D. prevalence estimate
(Braaten et al., 1988).

Lieberman offers an interesting analogy when discussing
the labelling issue. He analyzes the relative meanings of
"differentness" and "handicap" in the following manner:

Blind people are handicapped. Being successful in a
school of sighted students does not necessarily
diminish that. Handicapped for what? Possibly for
many things, but we can start with one: the ability to
appreciate the visual beauty of the universe. I don't
think that makes blind people different. It makes them
handicapped. (1985, p. 514)

What Lieberman and the other critics of the R.E.I. seem to
be saying is that denying handicaps by abandoning labels is
simply denying the truth, and denying the need for special
service.

IV. The Efficiency of Special Education

The issue of labelling is closely associated by
proponents of the R.E.I. with another feature of special
education, its purported inefficiency: "It is inefficient to
operate two systems [regular and special]. This
inefficiency, coupled with the lack of need for two systems,
supports the merger of special and regular education"
(Stainback & Stainback, 1984, p. 106). The argument
supporting the "inefficiency" of the dual system of regular
and special education appears to rest on unsubstantial
ground, namely that duplication of offerings in the basic
skill areas such as math and reading unnecessarily drains
resources (Stainback & Stainback, 1984). It may be that
similar materials are used in some basic skill areas in both
regular and special education, but the materials are not the
major considerations. The major considerations are the
contrasting instructional methodologies with which the
materials are presented to general and special education
students *and*, most importantly, the vastly greater one-to-
one instructional time given to special education students
because of smaller classes of which they are members.
Stainback and Stainback contend that by consolidating all
curricular offerings into one unified system, any one
student would have access to any of the classes,
individualized teaching, support personnel, and material
adaptations now offered in special and regular education

(1984). This assertion presupposes that some students do not enjoy such access and it ignores the virtual impossibility of providing individualized instruction in the "normal" sized classes of regular education. Any "regular" educator might be able very quickly to point out this anomaly, but readers of the Stainbacks' article will "note that any validating or corroborative statements made by so-called 'regular educators' are conspicuous by their absence....This proposed merger is a myth, unless regular educators...decide that such a merger is in their own best interests" (Lieberman, 1985, p. 513).

Advocates of the R.E.I. argue that integration of special needs students within the regular classroom eliminates "inefficient" special programs and will save money, because fewer administrative structures, regulations, etc., will be required. These advocates appear to deny the results of such policies--actual *decreases* in funds and services for children at risk. In 1988, Verstegen and Clark reported that in dollars adjusted for inflation, U.S. federal funding for education dropped by 28% between 1981 and 1988. As part of the "block grant" scheme of education funding, *the biggest decrease during those years was in special programs--a decrease of 76%.* Kauffman contends that,

> Combining general and special education budgets and services or combining all compensatory programs would almost certainly have the effect of decreasing the special services available to handicapped

25

students....Ironically, politically liberal proponents of the R.E.I. are supporting an initiative which policy analyses indicate is virtually certain to retard or reverse progress in providing services to handicapped students. (1989, p. 16)

V. The Ideological Underpinnings of Mainstreaming

The push for mainstreaming originated with parent groups--particularly parents of special needs students--and with special educators (Kauffman, 1989). A persistent lobbying effort caused mainstreaming to be adopted by various governments which discovered that integration of special needs students could be made to fit their larger political agenda. Quite evidently, changes can be introduced for other than purely educational reasons:

> I have attempted here, however, to put the sources of change in perspective by suggesting that innovations are not neutral in their benefits and that there are many reasons other than educational merit that influence decisions to change. A closer examination reveals that innovations can be adapted for symbolic political or personal reasons: to appease community pressure, to appear innovative, to gain more resources. All of these forms represent *symbolic* rather than *real* change. (Fullan, 1991, p. 28 [author's emphasis])

One of the hallmarks of the Reagan and Bush administrations in the U.S. has been consolidating strategies designed to reduce spending on social programs. As far as education is concerned, the Reagan-Bush policy consists primarily of three strategies: (1) fostering an image of achieving excellence, regardless of substantive change, (2) federal disengagement from education policy, and

26

(3) block funding of compensatory programs for students with special needs (Kauffman, 1989).

Also according to Kauffman (1989), advocacy for the R.E.I. rests primarily on the emotional and public relations appeal of the proposed reforms, not on logical or empirical analyses of the probable consequences of those reforms. As a political strategy, the R.E.I. rhetoric is organized around emotionally loaded topics, such as labelling and efficiency, which were discussed above. Potentially the most emotionally loaded is the term 'integration,' with racial integration as a metaphor for integration of the handicapped.

The term 'integration' has become a slogan in the R.E.I. debate because of the inaccurate comparison of special education to racial discrimination, and even to apartheid:

> It is the attitudinal milieu, far more than the individual's physical conditions, which affects society's response to persons with disabilities. It is a skewed sense of the "place" of the disabled person which permits the maintenance of public and private facilities that in effect establish a system of separation not far distant from South Africa's apartheid. (Hahn, 1986, cited in Lipsky & Gartner, 1987, p. 70)

It is imperative that all educators remain vigilant and active against all forms of discrimination, but it is, in Kauffman's view, inaccurate and inappropriate to compare racial origin with disability because the comparison

> is demeaning to racial groups suffering discrimination on the basis of trivial

> differences, and it trivializes the needs of
> people with disabilities, whose differences
> require accommodations far more complex than
> disallowing skin colour as a criterion for access
> or opportunity. (Kauffman, 1989, p. 10)

Ethnic origin *may* have some relevance to learning and to the functioning of schools, but ethnic origin is far less relevant and obviously far less complex than are the cognitive, physical and behavioural characteristics of handicapped children and adults:

> Separate education may indeed be inherently unequal
> when separateness is determined by a factor irrelevant
> to teaching and learning (e.g., skin color), but
> separateness may be required for equality of
> opportunity when separation is based on criteria
> directly related to teaching and learning (e.g., the
> student's prior learning, the concepts being taught,
> the teacher's preparation). Were this not so, all
> manner of grouping for instruction would be struck down
> as inherently unequal. (Kauffman, 1989, p. 10)

Kauffman also points out that skin color involves a difference along a single dimension, and that any changes necessary to accommodate an entire group of students would be relatively simple; on the other hand, disabilities are extremely diverse and require highly individualized and occasionally complex educational programming accommodations. Because of the extraordinary educational requirements imposed by the characteristics of handicapped students, Kauffman argues that there is a *moral* basis for disabled students' access to special, sometimes separate, education, even if the regular or typical education is excellent. In Kauffman's argument regarding integration, he remarks that,

> Disabilities often are malleable [racial
> characteristics are not]. Handicapped individuals
> may therefore pass from one classification to
> another during the course of their development and
> education, requiring a more carefully weighed
> approach to legal rights involving separation.
> (1989, p. 10)

As a result of the struggle of black people for civil

rights in the U.S., the words 'integration' and

'segregation' have become enormously emotion-laden.

Otherwise rational people can easily become beguiled by the

use of these words as slogans, rather than to analyze their

usages more thoroughly:

> The civil rights issue for racial and ethnic minorities
> is one of gaining access to the same services provided
> to others regardless of their characteristics; the
> civil rights issue for handicapped students, however,
> is one of access to a differentiated education designed
> specifically to accommodate their special
> characteristics, even if accommodation requires
> separation. (Kauffman, 1989, pp. 10-11)

Essentially because of the emotional appeal of the words

'integration' and 'segregation,' R.E.I. advocates have

gained a public relations advantage in the debate. At least

for politicians, public image is very important; it is

especially important for the Reagan and Bush administrations

who are responsible for severe cuts in spending on social

services and education. Given the similarities between the

ideologies of the U.S. federal government and past Social

Credit British Columbia provincial governments, it is not

surprising that the B.C. Ministry of Education has

aggressively focused on public image building through

advertising, block funding, referenda, spending cuts and

proposed integration of special needs students. The move
toward integration is undoubtedly part of a political
agenda. The political agenda that drives mainstreaming does
not include the absolutely crucial issue of implementation,
an exclusion which has doomed many previous attempts at
change:

> Even if a certain idea is valued because of its
> goal direction, it may not be sufficiently
> developed and tested to be practically usable.
> Far too many innovations, even those with laudable
> (valued) goals, have been rushed into practice
> without any clear notion and corresponding
> resources related to how they could be used in
> practice (or, more charitably, the technical
> requirements or means of implementation have been
> underestimated). (Fullan, 1991, p. 18)

It behooves policy-makers to ask themselves before they go
too far with an innovation, what the policy will look like
in practice.

VI. The Feasibility of Mainstreaming

The ideology which drives the integration movement is
an important factor to consider, but there are several other
reasons to question whether or not integration can succeed:
(1) lack of support from key constituencies, (2) lack of
specificity in the proposed restructuring, and (3)
proponents' cavalier attitude toward experimentation and
research (Kauffman, 1989).

i. The Roles of Key Constituencies

Kauffman (1989) sees it as "startling" that the R.E.I.
is not an initiative of general educators, but of special
educators. It appears that some special educators would

burden general educators with the task of solving the

instructional problems of handicapped and other difficult-

to-teach students. The problems caused by reforms advocated

by people far removed from actual implementation have a long

and well-documented history of failure:

> A major review of education in 1970 draws a
> similar conclusion: that the reason the reform
> movement failed was "the fact that its prime
> movers were distinguished university scholars";
> what was assumed to be its greatest strength
> turned out to be its greatest weakness (Silberman,
> 1970, p. 179). The specific reasons cited by
> Silberman are revealing because they show that
> well-intentioned, intelligent university
> authorities and "experts' on education can be dead
> wrong. The reforms failed because of faulty and
> overly abstract theories not related or relatable
> to practice, limited or no contact with and
> understanding of the school, ignorance of the
> lessons of experiences of the reformers in the
> 1920s and 1930s, and above all the failure to
> consider explicitly the relationship between the
> nature of the proposed innovations and the
> purposes of schools. Innovations became ends in
> themselves as the reformers lost sight of the
> supposed central questions of the purpose of
> change: "What is education for? What kind of
> human beings and what kind of society do we want
> to produce? What methods of instruction and
> classroom organization as well as what subject
> matter do we need to produce these results? What
> knowledge is of most worth?" (Fullan, 1991, p.
> 23)

Kauffman, Gerber and Semmel (1988) suggest that regular

classroom teachers deserve to be asked what they perceive,

based on teaching practice, is feasible, desirable, and in

the best interest of students. General educators deal with

classrooms already full of so-called "normal" students--

students who all have individual differences and needs.

There is no evidence that general educators are willing or

31

able to take on the task of dealing with a variety of special needs students as well. Singer (1988) questions regular educators' willingness to take back the responsibility for handicapped children. Kauffman (1988) suggests that mainstreaming cannot succeed if general educators do not accept it as their own. Furthermore, recent studies in the U.S. have found that most general *and* special educators do not agree with the propositions on which the R.E.I. is based. Central among these propositions is the call for extensive retraining of regular classroom teachers, which presumably will enable them to teach more heterogeneous groups including those children who are very difficult-to-teach and who are now being taught by special education teachers in pull-out programs:

> Assumptions underlying the proposed retraining
> appear to be as follows: (1) The skills needed
> to teach handicapped (i.e. difficult to teach) and
> nonhandicapped (i.e. not difficult to teach)
> students are the same. (2) These skills, when
> possessed by many or most teachers, are
> essentially those associated with "effective"
> schools. (3) Regular classroom teachers trained
> in these skills will be able to use them at least
> as effectively in the regular classroom as will
> special education teachers in pull-out programs.
> (4) Regular classroom teachers will increasingly
> welcome more difficult-to-teach students in their
> classrooms as they become more proficient in the
> use of these effective instructional skills.
> (Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988, p. 8)

Given opportunity for one-to-one instruction, assumption (1) seems reasonable except in cases of severe behaviour problems. Assumption (2), however, implies the belief that the technical skills of teachers, irrespective of schools'

32

ability to reorganize functions, or reallocate resources, or

reassess priorities, are the keys to effective instruction.

Teachers may possess these skills, but be unable to employ

them because of limited time and/or resources, or because of

administrative demands.   Assumption (3) ignores the class

size issue.   Again, teachers may possess the appropriate

skills, but these skills are far more likely to be

successfully employed in a small pull-out class than in a

large class in the "mainstream," when dealing with

difficult-to-teach students.   Assumption (4) makes a giant

leap.   It equates proficiency in instructional skills with

tolerance for various problems associated with handicapped

students:

> For example, teachers who used more effective
> instructional procedures (associated with direct
> instruction or active teaching in the school
> improvement literature) have been characterized in
> a recent study as *least* tolerant of behavioural
> excesses and deficits characteristic of difficult-
> to-teach students....These teachers also *expected*
> more student conformity and expressed *less*
> *willingness* to accept the placement of difficult-
> to-teach students in their classrooms.   (Gersten,
> Walker, & Darch, 1988, cited in Kauffman, Gerber,
> & Semmel, 1988, p. 8 [authors' emphasis])

Integration proponents might argue that these findings

reflect an irrational rejection of difficult-to-teach

students or even that they reflect irresponsibility on the

part of regular teachers.   A stronger argument is that

effective teachers clearly consider the costs and benefits

to *all* their students when faced with the integration issue.

One might conclude with reasonable confidence that these

teachers did not see the value of integration for all their students, *and* that training in relevant instructional skills does not necessarily cause teachers to accept integration any more willingly. In British Columbia, the policy statements of School District X acknowledge both the key role to be played by teachers and the strong possibility that teachers may not accept integration:

> The School District should prepare a wide-spread, carefully orchestrated informational campaign which will sensitize and inform teachers...of the issues and current theory and research regarding appropriate programs for students with special learning needs. Without an appeal to the desire of teachers to serve all children well, as well as the reassurance to...educators...that adequate support will be available, anxiety may well give way to resentment. (School District X, 1989, pp. 101-102)

The collaborative model proposes the redefinition of professional roles: 'First-order' professionals are regular education teachers, whereas 'second-order' personnel consists of special educators and paraprofessionals (McKinney & Hocutt, 1988). Several professional organizations of special educators, such as the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders and the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, have expressed grave reservations about the mainstreaming.

Kauffman asserts that most parents of handicapped children would not support the mainstreaming:

> A major five-year research project begun in 1982 (The Collaborative Study of Children with Special Needs; Singer & Butler, 1987) involving five large school districts from various regions of the country suggested

34

that parents of handicapped children who are receiving special education in pull-out programs would be reluctant to see their children returned to general education. (1989, p. 19)

Stainback and Stainback (1985) claim that two large scale investigations conducted in the 1980's indicate that there is a promainstreaming and pronormalization attitude among regular classroom teachers. Their claim directly contradicts Kauffman's argument that the support for the movement to total mainstreaming among three critical constituencies--parents, general education teachers, and special education teachers--does not exist.

Furthermore, the movement toward mainstreaming appears to be based upon questionable premises: "It is a strange logic that calls for the regular system to take over responsibility for pupils it has largely demonstrated it has failed" (Keogh, 1988, p. 21). Kauffman maintains that R.E.I. proponents also claim "that special education has failed these students both procedurally and instructionally, and that radical reform is therefore necessary to provide effective instruction and procedural protection" (1989, p. 20). Yet, oddly, proponents of integration suggest that special educators have developed powerful interventions on behalf of handicapped students.

Advocates of integration are telling teachers that by means of this model "they can teach *all* students more effectively while accommodating *more* difficult-to-teach students in their classes" (Kauffman, Gerber & Semmel, 1988,

35

p. 10 [authors' emphasis]). This claim sounds marvellously

simple, but in fact it may be merely simple-minded or even

misleading. Mainstreaming advocates may argue that the same

strategies can be used for all students, regardless of

disabilities, but given the range of learning disabilities

and individual learning needs and styles, it seems obvious

that this claim is untrue. Common sense alone, not to

mention teaching experience, contradicts this assertion, as

do the research efforts of Morrison and Morris (1981);

Vellutino et al. (1983); Ryan Short and Weed (1986); Wong

and Wong (1988); Torgesen and Houck (1980); and Palincsar

and Brown (1987). For example, Torgesen and Houck (1980)

state that learning disabled students typically respond

poorly to cognitively challenging tasks such as tests of

short term memory. The reasons why these students perform

poorly on these tasks are not well understood. In their

study, Torgesen and Houck observed the responses of several

groups of students to the Digit Span Test and discovered

that one group of L.D. students showed a consistent drop in

performance over the duration of a session until they were

given incentives, which essentially eliminated the drop in

recall. The researchers suggest that this group's

performance dropped because of boredom or fatigue, which was

overcome by the incentives, which in turn suggests that the

group of students applied some kind of memory control

process. Another group of L.D. students given the Digit

Span Test performed at a consistent rate unaffected by incentives. Torgesen and Houck guess that these students did not possess the memory control processes used by the others. The researchers could shed no light on the *nature* of this process, however, but they suggest that the processes are not the major factor in the differences between the performances of the two groups. Essentially, the study of Torgesen and Houck reveals that some L.D. students may perform better at tasks requiring sequential recall if they are highly motivated with incentives, whereas for others incentives make no difference. They could only suggest some possible reasons why the differences exist:

> The groups may be different from one another in the extent to which they are able to develop efficient and easily accessed memory codes for stimuli to which they are repeatedly exposed. Although differences in memory coding do appear to be important in understanding the performance differences reported in this research, the precise nature of these differences cannot be specified at present....In addition to item-coding procedures, there are several other structural features that may account for the performance differences noted in this research. For example, Cohen and Sandberg (1977) presented evidence that individual differences in recall on serial memory tasks may be the result of differences in the rate of decay of the stimulus trace....Another possibility is that children in the LD-S group have particularl difficulties coding the order of items. (1980, p. 158)

In this article by Torgesen and Houck there is no suggestion regarding methodologies to overcome deficits in sequential recall, nor is there any indication of how long it would take to specifically identify such problems, or how much

37

one-to-one instruction--if any--may be required to remediate them.

The cognitive problems investigated by Torgesen and Houck are linked to metacognition:

> Brown, who has done much of the seminal work in the area of metacognition, has suggested that there are in fact two components to consider in defining metacognition (Brown, 1975, 1978). The first component refers to the statable and stable knowledge one possesses about his or her own cognitive processes. The second refers to the regulation of cognitive activity. To illustrate, a student who indicates that it is necessary to prepare differently for an essay exam than for a multiple choice test is reflecting metacognitive knowledge. (Palincsar & Brown, 1987, p. 66)

As well as define metacognition, Palincsar and Brown address the problem of memory deficits by suggesting strategic interventions which enhance students' abilities to remember by making explicit to students (1) the goal of the strategy to be employed, (2) the tasks for which the strategy is appropriate, (3) the range of applicability, (4) the learning gains anticipated from its consistent use, and (5) the efforts associated with its deployment. The researchers applied this intervention framework in a study which focused on students with deficits in reading comprehension. Specifically, they investigated four strategies: summarizing, question generating, clarifying and predicting. The methodology, employed by remedial reading specialists, was a dialogue between teacher and student called reciprocal teaching. During the first few days, the teacher initiated and sustained the dialogue, but as time passed, the teacher

38

attempted to transfer more responsibility to the students, while providing feedback and coaching during the discussion. Before the dialogue each day, teacher and students reviewed the strategy to be learned, why it was being learned, and in what situations it would be useful. After twenty consecutive days of the intervention, the researchers were able to report that the students acquired the strategies, and made significant, reliable improvements in comprehension which were maintained over time and generalized to improve classroom performance.

An important aspect of the article by Palincsar and Brown is that it acknowledges the separate role of special educators:

> Success with this endeavour will be, in large measure, a reflection of the special educator's knowledge and understanding of curriculum....All of this activity constitutes yet another challenge for special educators--a challenge that special educators have not yet been observed to embrace. (1987, p. 74)

Nowhere in Palincsar and Brown's article is the suggestion that general educators ought to be responsible for such interventions, or that they have the time or expertise to employ them. Of course, a mainstreaming proponent would argue that any teacher could acquire the expertise, but the mainstreaming proponent would have difficulty persuading regular teachers that they would find the time to employ the expertise in the required one-to-one or small group setting within the context of a large "mainstreamed" class.

Ryan, Short, and Weed (1986) echo the work of Palincsar
and Brown:

> L.D. children have been characterized as passive
> or inactive learners because of their failure to
> attend selectively, to use mnemonic and
> comprehension strategies, or to maintain on-task
> behaviour....The apparent lack of motivation on
> the part of many L.D. children can be
> conceptualized in terms of causal attributions.
> Their passive approach seems to follow from their
> tendency not to link task outcomes to their effort
> and skills. (Ryan, Short & Weed, 1986, pp. 521 -
> 522)

Ryan, Short, and Weed suggest that the passivity of L.D.

students can be overcome with strategies similar to those

advanced by Palincsar and Brown. Cognitive behaviour

modification (CBM) is suggested as an intervention which

requires active participation in learning, overt

verbalization, responses identifiable by discrete steps,

modeled strategies, and a goal statement of a planful,

reflective response style, as well as occasional task-

specific strategies. A specific suggested methodology

involves (1) task performance by instructor while self-

verbalizing; (2) performance by student while the instructor

verbalizes; (3) active performance by student while self-

instructing aloud; (4) active performance by student while

whispering; and (5) task performance while self-instructing

covertly. The goal of this strategy is clearly to help the

student become a more active and self-sufficient learner; it

should be obvious that a considerable amount of one-to-one

time is required to apply the strategy.

In a 1983 study, Vellutino, Scanlon and Bentley
reinforce the existing knowledge that L.D. students
consistently fail to perform as well as others in tasks that
require verbal responses on learning tasks. More
specifically, they connect the reading problems of L.D.
students with fundamental deficiencies in verbal learning:

> We have consistently found differences favoring
> normal readers over poor readers when these two
> groups were compared on various measures of verbal
> association learning....Studies more recently
> completed by our research group suggest that such
> difficulties are, in turn, related to more basic
> deficits in verbal memory. Thus, in one
> experiment (Vellutino & Scanlon, 1979), it was
> found that poor readers were less proficient than
> normal readers on free recall of simple nonsense
> syllables presented auditorily, and in learning to
> name novel cartoon figures using these same
> syllables as responses....In a second experiment
> evaluating semantic memory in these two groups
> (Vellutino & Scanlon, 1980), poor readers were
> found to be less able than normal readers on free
> recall of abstract and concrete nouns (also
> presented auditorily) suggesting that poor readers
> may have difficulty with some aspects of lexical
> retrieval....Thus, evidence is accumulating which
> favours a verbal deficit explanation of reading
> disability consistent with present findings.
> (1983, pp. 224 - 225)

Again, Vellutino, Scanlon and Bentley describe the nature of
a learning problem, but offer no methodological suggestions.
They clearly assume that students with these reading and
verbal deficits will be receiving special educational
services from specialists in the field.

Morrison and Manis (1981) examined the literature on
reading disability and their study reaches conclusions
similar to those of Vellutino (1979). Morrison and Manis

suggest that reading disability results not from deficits in serial ordering, attention, or short term memory, but, rather, that reading disability stems from problems in learning complex rule systems. Most evident are problems with tasks requiring rapid scanning, encoding, and rehearsal of multiple-stimulus arrays, whether the arrays are verbal or nonverbal. At the root of reading disability, Morrison and Manis suggest, is a primary failure to acquire knowledge and skills in the reading domain. This theory contradicts others (e.g. Deutsch, 1978), which suggest that some kind of basic process deficit is the primary cause of reading disability. Morrison and Manis believe that disabled readers fail to acquire the rules governing relationships between English spellings and sounds, a failure which leads to slow development of automatic word-decoding operations and retards development of scanning strategies, comprehension, and inferencing skills.

In 1988, Wong and Wong investigated the state of the art of cognitive interventions for learning disabilities, otherwise known as learning strategies:

> Learning strategies, as defined by Deshler and his associates, are principles, procedural rules or techniques that help students to learn, to solve problems, and to complete assignments independently. These learning strategies are basically content-free. They are not designed to teach specific course content, but rather to enable students to learn, retain and express content (Mercer, 1987). They conform to the way Weinstein (1978) defined learning strategies; namely, teaching students how to learn, not what to learn. (1988, p. 146)

A specific example of such a learning strategy is a reading strategy designed by Clarke et al. which teaches students to visualize the contents of a passage as they read it, to generate questions on it, and to rehearse memorizing particular contents.

Wong and Wong discovered in their review that cognitive strategy training involves several problems relevant to circumstances in regular classrooms. First, cognitive strategy training actually can *lower* the performance of non-disabled students who have already acquired their own workable comprehension strategies. Second, it was found that cognitive strategy training may create unintentional cognitive overloads in learning disabled students. Wong and Wong note the example of Graham (1986) who failed to make significant gains when applying a learning strategy to students with writing problems--this failure despite considerable intensive and individualized instruction. Third, learning disabled students frequently are unable to generalize their newly-acquired skills to various learning tasks. Fourth, teaching learning strategy use to sufficient proficiency requires considerable individual instructional time. In 1986, Wong, Wong, Perry, and Sawatsky took *five months* to teach seventh grade adolescents a summarization strategy for use with social studies materials. Finally, Wong and Wong examine the problem that learning disabled students frequently need specific strategies for specific

tasks at specific times. For example, verbal elaboration

instructions substantially enhance the performance of

students with high verbal fluency, but visual elaboration

instructions are found to impair the performance of such

subjects. Clearly, Wong and Wong believe that matching

specific strategies with specific tasks at specific times is

critically important for teachers of L.D. students.

The articles reviewed immediately above make several

issues clear: (1) specialists in the field of learning

disabilities do not agree on the nature of such learning

deficits or on the appropriateness of various interventions;

(2) very specific knowledge and skills *are* required to deal

with the wide range of complex learning problems which

exist; and (3) researchers agree that much more work needs

to be done to generate additional efficacious interventions

for learning disabled students. Clearly, it is unfair and

unrealistic to expect general education teachers, who have

no training and no time, to take on the task of educating

special needs students whose wide-ranging and complex

disabilities even research specialists find very difficult.

If specialists in the field of learning disabilities know

that designing interventions for such learning problems in a

laboratory situation is extremely challenging and complex,

it is highly unlikely that, even if he were willing, the

most skilled and hard-working teacher would be able to

provide even minimally appropriate individual programs for

these children in a regular classroom setting, despite the
contention by Reynolds, Wang and Walberg that Individualized
Educational Plans (I.E.P.'s) "ought to be extended to all
students as rapidly as is feasible, thus avoiding the
problem of having to specify the particular categories of
students to which such rights [to I.E.P.'s] shall pertain"
(1987, p. 395). As discussed above, a "regular classroom"
in British Columbia includes students with a variety of
special needs, as well as "regular" students who have needs
of their own. Many such classrooms contain thirty or more
students. In order to deal with just the learning disabled
students, the regular classroom teacher

> will have to possess a keen understanding of the
> child's ability to process information, an awareness of
> the cognitive demands of the specific instructional
> task, an understanding of the strategies the child
> brings to bear on an academic task, and finally, how
> that child fits into the overall curricular sequence
> and goals. (Bryan, Bay & Donahue, 1988, p. 27)

When the teacher has learned and understood these variables
for each L.D. student, he will have to understand how each
L.D. student functions socially in the complex world of the
classroom. Once the teacher has accomplished all of this,
he can concentrate on strategies for dealing with the other
students with special needs, and with "regular" students.

ii. Vagueness of Proposed Restructuring

Serious complaints also exist regarding the lack of
specificity of proposals by proponents of mainstreaming.
For example, Wang et al. (1988), and Will (1984) criticize

45

the loss of instructional time resulting from pull-out

programs, yet they offer no specific indication how such

losses can be avoided if special instruction and related

services are still to be available for *some* students.

Neither do they speculate how much instructional time would

be lost for *all* students in a regular class if teachers are

obliged constantly to attend to the demands of special needs

students.   These concerns with vagueness are also relevant

to British Columbia.   <u>The Year 2000</u> documents describe

individualized learning programs (i.e. integration of

special needs students) in the following way:

> This approach should make it possible to address a
> wide range of learner needs by using a range of
> teaching methods, by slowing or accelerating the
> pace of instruction, by using special materials or
> equipment, and/or by drawing upon specialized
> support services, as the situation demands.   In
> some cases, additional learning outcomes need to
> be identified for special needs students.   For
> example, blind students may need to develop the
> ability to read braille or use specialized
> equipment.   Achievement by special needs students
> should be recognized, and all students should have
> the opportunity to experience success in their
> particular program.   (B.C. Ministry of Education,
> 1990, p. 10)

As a general goal statement, the above may be satisfactory,

but as for providing specific direction for change, it is

deficient.   To begin, using a range of teaching methods is

always desirable, although as discussed above, expertise

does not equate with willingness to accept integration.

Also, the document does not suggest how to facilitate

training or retraining programs for teachers.   One would

also assume that *the time* for teachers to retrain would have

46

to come from somewhere, and one should also keep in mind
that the demands on teachers' time are already formidable--
an issue which will be discussed in more depth later on in
this study. Would retraining involve learning instructional
methods for the entire possible range of special needs?
Would teachers be expected to make their own time for
retraining? Would release time be provided? Or would
teachers be excused from a myriad of administrative and
extra-curricular responsibilities to make time for
retraining? And who would pay for this retraining?
Secondly, slowing or accelerating the pace of instruction is
a skill which all competent teachers possess, *but* slowing or
accelerating the pace of instruction appropriately for each
student in the teaching load of a typical secondary school
teacher is a formidable task indeed when one considers the
sheer numbers of students faced each day by secondary
teachers.

Although the Year 2000 documents mention plans to alter
timetables in order to reduce the numbers of students faced
by individual teachers, these alterations have not occurred.
On the other hand, mainstreaming *has* begun in secondary
schools of School District X. Third, the issue of special
materials or equipment--what materials and equipment? If
these materials and equipment exist, who has them? How will
they be made available? Who will pay for them? In the case
of the blind student, who will teach the teacher to read
braille? Finally, one might reasonably respond to the

statement regarding "specialized support services" by asking: *What* specialized support services? Does this refer to existing resource room programs or does it allude to some other model of service delivery?

It appears that the details of implementing integration in British Columbia schools will be left to the local districts and schools to decide. School District X has considered some of the issues relevant to integration raised in the Year 2000 documents. The issue of training is discussed in a major policy direction document which recommends "that all teachers and administrators be trained in the necessary skills relating to integration of these students" (School District X, 1989, p. 103). Again at the local level, though, the same questions regarding time and money for training remain. School District X is somewhat more specific in its recommendations regarding specialized support services:

> That support services continue to follow the student rather than being allocated on a school basis....That facilities for special needs programs be developed in the District on the basis of need and allocated strategically throughout the District to ensure accessibility for all....In support of integration, schools must continue to offer resource room programs and these may need to be redefined. (School District X, 1989, p. 103)

The redefinition of resource room programs will apparently be left to the schools themselves. The document directing change in School District X does not address the issue of special materials or equipment.

48

Clearly, neither the provincial nor the local
initiative reveals anything like an understanding of the
complexity of successfully implementing educational change:

> Innovation is *multidimensional.* There are at
> least three components or dimensions at stake in
> implementing any new program or policy: (1) the
> possible use of new or revised *materials* (direct
> instructional resources such as curriculum
> materials or technologies), (2) the possible use
> of new *teaching approaches* (i.e., new teaching
> strategies or activities), and (3) the possible
> alteration of *beliefs* (e.g., pedagogical
> assumptions and theories underlying particular new
> policies or programs). (Fullan, 1991, p. 37
> [author's emphasis])

Fullan goes on to contend that all three aspects of change
are absolutely essential because *together* they represent the
means of achieving an educational goals, but he qualifies
this assertion by implying that achieving the goal *in
practice* is more easily said than done. For example, any
teacher could implement none, one, or two dimensions of the
innovation, and not achieve the goal.

Apropos of the above, R.E.I. advocates propose to
redefine the role of school psychologists in very general
terms within the collaborative model:

> Reschly (1988) calls for school psychologists to spend
> less of their time evaluating students for eligibility
> for special programs and more of their time consulting
> with teachers regarding the resolution of difficult
> instructional and behavior management problems....Were
> it [the change in school psychologists' practice] to
> occur, and were it to result in all school
> psychologists doing nothing other than consulting with
> teachers, the average classroom teacher could not
> expect more than 30 to 40 minutes of consultation per
> week. (Kauffman, 1989, p. 21)

Kauffman (1989) doubts whether this redefinition of school psychologists' roles would help regular classroom teachers teach difficult students, especially if the numbers of such students in regular classes were to increase because of the dissolution of special education. In many British Columbia schools, no consultation would occur between school psychologists and general educators because many schools are not staffed by school psychologists. Although some neighbouring districts have school psychologists in their secondary schools, School District X has none.

The R.E.I. has been termed a "strategy without tactics," in that it does not provide full consideration of the implications of the massive changes it will bring about for both educators and students: "It behooves proponents of the R.E.I. to state explicitly and in considerable detail how restructuring special and general education will address the problems of students with histories of school failure" (Kauffman, 1989, p. 22). At the national level in the U.S., and at the provincial and local levels in British Columbia, the lack of specificity in directions for implementing integration is a serious concern. Integration proponents may argue that specific decisions are best left to school staffs who are positioned to respond to local conditions, and to a certain extent the argument is sound. Nevertheless, the leadership of fundamental change must be accompanied by far more specific support than is evident so

50

far. This support could take the form, for example, of
providing descriptions of various models of "redefined"
resource rooms, or it could take the form of a financial
commitment to provide time and money for training, to reduce
class sizes, and to increase preparation time. Inevitably,
it is the teachers who will actually implement integration,
and the implementation is far more likely to succeed if
teachers perceive that they are being supported adequately
in the enterprise of fundamental change. However clear and
specific a proposal for change may be, there is no guarantee
that teachers will automatically accept it. The values
question will inevitably arise; that is, do teachers *believe*
that a given change, in this case mainstreaming, is
educationally meaningful or worthwhile?

> The innovation as a set of materials and resources
> is the most visible aspect of change, and the
> easiest to employ, but only literally. Change in
> teaching approach or style in using new materials
> presents greater difficulty if new skills must be
> acquired and ne ways of conducting instructional
> activities established. Changes in beliefs are
> even more difficult: they challenge the core
> values held by individuals regarding the purposes
> of education; moreover, beliefs are often not
> explicit, discussed, or understood, but rather are
> buried at the level of unstated assumptions.
> (Fullan, 1991, p. 42)

Specificity aside, there is little evidence in the
literature that regular secondary teachers believe in the
value of mainstreaming under current conditions.

Clearly, understanding the nature and value of a given
change is important, but equally important in determining

51

the feasibility and desirability of a change is

understanding *how* the change will come about. Fullan

maintains that

> Educational change involves two main aspects:
> what changes to implement (theories of education)
> and how to implement them (theories of
> change)....It is helpful to realize this
> distinction in planning or analyzing specific
> reform efforts. In short, we have to understand
> *both* the change and the change process. (1991, p.
> 46 [author's emphasis])

The vagueness of proposals for mainstreaming is, as

discussed above, a crucial concern for implementation.

Equally important is the concern that in their rush to bring

in change, innovators forget that change is a process, not

an event. The changing of special needs students'

timetables to put the students in regular classes does not

constitute the implementation of mainstreaming, which is a

lesson being learnt the hard way by those who have not

thought through what would have to happen beyond that point.

Fullan (1991, p. 63) characterizes the beginning stages of

the change process as the three R's of relevance, readiness,

and resources. Included in *relevance* are the interaction of

need, clarity of the innovation (and practitioners'

understanding of it), and utility, or what it really has to

offer teachers and students. *Readiness* involves the

school's capacity--both conceptual and practical--to

initiate, develop, or adopt a given innovation. Fullan

suggests that readiness includes both "individual" and

"organizational" factors. Questions relevant to individual

readiness include the following: Does the change address a
perceived need? Is it a reasonable change? Do the
individual persons possess the requisite knowledge and
skills? Do they have the time? The following questions
apply to organizations: Is the change compatible with the
culture of the school? Are facilities, equipment,
materials, and supplies available? Are there other crises
or other change efforts in progress? The greater the number
of "no's," the more reason to take another look at
readiness. Finally, Fullan explains the significance of
resources:

> Resources concern the accumulation and provision
> of support as a part of the change process. Just
> because it is a good and pressing idea doesn't
> mean that the resources are available to carry it
> out. People often underestimate the resources
> needed to go forward with a change. While
> resources are obviously critical during
> implementation, it is at the initiation stage that
> this issue must first be considered and provided
> for. (1991, p. 64)

In some cases, vagueness of proposed legislation or
policies may be a deliberate tactic in a strategy to promote
acceptance. Stating new programs at a general level may be
seen as a way to avoid conflict. Such policies (see the
Year 2000 documents) do not indicate how implementation is
to be addressed. Curriculum guidelines in Canada have for
years suffered from vagueness of goals and especially of
means of implementation (Fullan, 1991, p. 70).

When considering specific educational change it is
important to think carefully about its complexity, which

refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of the persons responsible for implementation. Changes, again, need to be examined carefully with regard to difficulty, and skills required, as well as the extent of necessary alteration in beliefs, teaching strategies and use of materials. Mainstreaming is a large and fundamental change, similar in scope to previous changes, such as open education, effective schools, and restructuring experiments, all of which require a sophisticated range of activities, structure, diagnoses, teaching strategies, and philosophical understanding if effective implementation is to occur (Fullan, 1991). Another possibility to keep in mind when considering the issue of implementation is that attempting too much can result in massive failure. Schools have often been known to attempt to implement innovations that are beyond their ability to carry out.

iii. Experimentation and Research

Integration proponents also appear to make a serious error by ignoring experimentation and research. Critics of the mainstreaming do *not* support the following interpretations of research advanced by advocates of mainstreaming:

> (1) Special education pull-out programs are not effective; (2) referrals to and placements in special education programs are out of control; (3) the stigma of identification for special education outweighs the benefits; (4) students seldom or never exit special education; (5) tested alternatives to the current system are available....Indeed, these conclusions can

54

be reached only by ignoring research supporting
opposite conclusions. (Kauffman 1989, p. 23)

Specifically, Biklen and Zollers boldly state that "Even

when all measures are taken to coordinate the pullout

program with the work of the regular class, *students do not*

benefit from this special education" (1986, p. 581 [authors'

emphasis]). As a matter of fact, there *is* evidence that

regular classroom placement is desirable for *some* special

needs students (placements which are already provided for

within the cascade model), but dozens of researchers in the

field of special education have reached conclusions which

directly contradict Biklen and Zollers' claims. So far

there is no evidence on the outcomes for different types of

handicapped students who were placed in programs given as

examples of integrated models by proponents of the R.E.I.

(McKinney & Hocutt, 1988).

The meta-analysis by Carlberg and Kavale (1980) and

some individual studies suggest that pull-out instruction

has been effective for some students. Buttram and Kershner

(1989), who conducted their research in urban U.S. schools,

refute the claim that special education referrals are out of

control. Children themselves do not necessarily view being

pulled out of regular classes for special instruction as

more embarrassing or stigmatizing than receiving instruction

from a specialist in their regular classes (Jenkins &

Heinen, 1989). Kauffman (1989) reports studies by Singer

(1988) who reviewed evidence that the percentage of

handicapped students returned to classes is not as
"embarrassingly low" as critics (e.g., Gartner, 1989;
Gartner & Lipsky, 1989) have charged.

Kauffman (1989) suggests that mainstreaming proponents
appear not only to ignore research evidence, but to *distort*
such evidence if it contradicts their position. For
example, Lipsky and Gartner (1987) claim that there is no
compelling body of evidence that separate special education
classes have significant benefits for students, and that
there is substantial evidence that goes in the opposite
direction. Here is the point at which the two sides in the
debate have reached *exactly* opposite conclusions. Gartner
and Lipsky (1989) assert that placement in special classes
results in little or no benefit for students of all levels
of severity; Carlberg and Kavale's analysis shows that
special class placement produces substantially better
outcomes than regular class placement for students
classified as learning disabled and emotionally
disturbed/behaviourally disordered (Kauffman, 1989).

Integration advocates also trivialize or disparage
experimental trials and empirical data, arguing that
restructuring the current pull-out system is a moral
imperative (Kauffman, 1989). Advocates of the present
system of service delivery maintain that advocacy and policy
regarding the education of handicapped and other difficult-
to-teach students must be informed by reliable empirical

data, and that moral imperatives cannot be fully determined in the absence of such data (Kauffman, 1989). Marston (1988) reports on research which uses a methodology called the time series analysis design; the research provides exactly the type of reliable empirical data mentioned above, and Marston reaches the conclusion that the research supports the effectiveness of special education (1988). It is reasonable to acknowledge experimentation and research when engaging in such an important debate. Ignoring such evidence weakens the arguments of mainstreaming advocates.

iv.   The Role of Secondary School Regular Educators

The range of educational goals and expectations for schools and the transfer of family and societal problems to the school, coupled with the ambivalence of youth about the value of education, present intolerable conditions for sustained educational development and satisfying work experiences....For both stability and change, the mental health and attitudes of teachers are absolutely crucial to success. (Fullan, 1991, p. 117)

Because the attitudes and beliefs of secondary school teachers are the focus of this study, it is important to review those parts of the debate which focus on the issues, claims, demands, and assertions which are relevant to the secondary school setting. It is crucial to understand that regular classroom teachers are the de facto gatekeepers of change. Politicians may legislate, administrators may mandate, but ultimately it is the teachers who will decide whether implementing integration is feasible and desirable or not. A glimpse or two into the daily working life of a

57

secondary teacher provides some context to the discussion of
mainstreaming:

> Teaching decisions are often made on pragmatic
> trial-and-error grounds with little chance for
> reflection or thinking through the rationale;
> teachers must deal with constant daily
> disruptions, within the classroom in managing
> discipline and interpersonal conflicts, and from
> outside the classroom in collecting money for
> school events, making announcements, dealing with
> the principal, parents, central office staff,
> etc.; they must get through the daily grind; the
> rewards are having a few good days, covering the
> curriculum, getting a lesson across, having an
> impact on one or two individual students (success
> stories); they constantly feel the critical
> shortage of time. (Fullan, 1991, p. 33)

The quotation above sketchily describes a secondary

teacher's working life *before* mainstreaming. Mainstreaming,

if it means simply adding the full range of special needs

students to regular classrooms, cannot work unaccompanied by

other absolutely necessary changes such as in-class

instructional support, increased administrative support,

increased preparation and consultation time, training and

perhaps most critical of all, reduced class size. Now that

schools are at the beginning stages of mainstreaming, it is

worthwhile to examine teachers' attitudes toward change:

> At initial stages, teachers are often more
> concerned about how the change will affect them
> personally, in terms of their in-classroom and
> extra-classroom work, than about a description of
> the goals and supposed benefits of the program.
> In brief, change is usually not introduced in a
> way that takes into account the subjective reality
> of teachers....When change is imposed from
> outside, it is bitterly resented. Cooper (1988,
> p. 45) reminds us that it is important that we
> recognize that "outside looking in" is different
> from "inside looking out." Even when voluntarily

engaged in, change is threatening and
confusing....The extent to which proposals for
change are defined according to only one person's
or one group's reality (e.g. the policy-maker's or
administrator's) is the extent to which they will
encounter problems in implementation. (Fullan,
1991, pp. 35 - 36)

As discussed earlier, the "plans" for implementing

mainstreaming in British Columbia and in School District X

are far too general to address the concerns expressed above.

Fullan suggests considering another concern of

teachers, which he calls the "practicality ethic."

Practical changes are those which address obvious needs,

that fit well with teachers' situations, that are focused,

and that include clearly-stated and achievable "how-to-do-

it" possibilities:

Practical does not necessarily mean easy, but it
does mean the presence of next steps. Again we
see a dilemma in the change process. Changes that
are practical, even though of good quality, may be
trivial or offensive, while changes that are
complex may not be practically worked out.
(Fullan, 1991, pp. 72 - 73)

Politicians, administrators, and special educators have all

had input into the notion of mainstreaming in secondary

schools. It is not overstating the case to assert again

that regular classroom teachers are the ones who will choose

to implement mainstreaming, or choose not to:

One of the basic reasons why planning fails is
that planners or decision-makers of change are
unaware of the situations that potential
implementors are facing. They introduce changes
without providing a means to identify and confront
the situational constraints and without attempting
to understand the values, ideas, and experiences

59

of those who are essential for implementing any
changes. (Fullan, 1991, p. 96)

An unfortunate reality of teaching experience is the

frequent withdrawal and bitterness of veteran teachers.

Fullan (1991) cites Huberman's 1988 study of Swiss teachers:

As Huberman states, there are individual
exceptions to the pattern [of withdrawal and
bitterness] and the dividing lines are
approximate, but he wonders what the findings say
about how change is being managed if we are
producing a lot of older teachers who are bitter
or worn out. (Fullan, 1991, p. 125)

Such emotional and psychological changes are frequently

accompanied by physical and behavioural changes:

These include chronic fatigue, frequent colds, the
flu, headaches, gastrointestinal disturbances, and
sleeplessness; excessive use of drugs; decline in
self-esteem; and marital and family
conflict....Innovation can be a two-edged sword.
It can aggravate the teachers' problems or provide
a glimmer of hope. It can worsen the conditions
of teaching, however unintentionally, or it can
provide the support, stimulation, and pressure to
improve. (Fullan, 1991, p. 126)

One issue relevant to the role of regular teachers

involves the attribution of student failure. Biklen and

Zollers (1986) assert that a student's progress is

ultimately the responsibility of the regular class teacher

and that student failures reflect a lack of commitment on

the part of both special and regular educators. The

assumption that teachers are solely to blame for student

failure is countered with the argument that both ways of

looking at student failure--the "student deficit" model and

the "teacher deficit" model--are too simplistic. Neither

model takes into account the joint responsibility for achievement and neither accounts for the complexity of the instruction/learning transactions between teachers and students (Kauffman, Gerber & Semmel, 1988). Furthermore, although it is currently popular in some quarters to blame learning problems on poor pedagogy (i.e., on incompetent teachers), there is "a large corpus of evidence that does not support this interpretation, but rather suggests that despite good instruction, many children with mild handicaps present puzzling and persistent problems" (Keogh, 1988, p. 20). Kavale's review of longitudinal research in learning disabilities concludes that residual problems for students with reading disabilities are especially serious:

> It is evident that reading disability is likely to
> be associated with long-term negative
> consequences. The problem of reading disability
> is persistent and chronic as well as pervasive in
> the sense of being associated with other academic
> achievement problems. Decoding skills remain poor
> and reading tends to be based on sight words and
> context. Unfortunately, remedial intervention may
> or may not be effective and no one type of program
> is superior to any other; nevertheless, any
> program needs to be administered over the long
> term (about 2 years) and should be followed by
> supportive interventions. Even under the best of
> circumstances, reading disabled children do not
> usually close the gap in their reading ability,
> and may, in fact become worse in time. (1987, p.
> 317)

Kavale notes other persistent problems associated with reading disability as well. These problems include social and emotional difficulties often reflected in adulthood by reduced occupational status and low self-esteem. In 80% of

61

L.D. children, reading disability is the primary deficit, and Kavale suggests for the learning disabled child with reading disability, reading difficulties are likely to be longstanding, and likely to affect vocational outcomes in adult life.

Kavale's review of the literature also identifies long-term serious problems for hyperactive children. Symptoms of hyperactivity tend to persist into adolescence and adulthood. Symptoms include restlessness, impulsivity, anxiety, inattention, and irritability. Hyperactivity is clearly associated with lower levels of academic and vocational success. Hyperactive adolescents experience increased social and conduct difficulties with parents, teachers, and peers; as adults, hyperactive persons exhibit poor self-esteem and impaired social interactions. Clearly, because the cognitive, social, and behavioural problems of learning disabled students often become more pronounced as they enter adolescence and secondary school, and because the collaborative model has been proposed for both elementary and secondary schools, the relevant differences between the two settings should be examined. These differences include organizational structures, curricula, and learner variables.

Of particular concern among special needs students are learning disabled students who are the lowest of the low achievers; they perform below the tenth percentile on measures of reading, written expression, and mathematics

(Schumaker & Deshler, 1988). Typically, their skills are at about the fourth or fifth grade level when they reach high school. In addition to skill deficiencies, these students lack proficiency in higher order strategies that are necessary for success in the "mainstream." These strategies include "paraphrasing, self-questioning, gaining information from textbooks, critical listening, discriminating main ideas from details, memorizing large amounts of content information, theme writing, error monitoring, and test taking" (Schumaker & Deshler, 1988). If these students progress in high school, they will be required to perform increasingly complex tasks and the gap between their abilities and what they are expected to do will continue to widen.

Furthermore, among educators it is universally understood that it takes much more time to teach complex skills and strategies to special needs students--far more time than a secondary school teacher who is under great pressure to teach content may have available. The amount of contact time between individual students and their various teachers is far less in the secondary school setting than in the elementary setting. Elementary school teachers spend approximately five hours per day with the same group of students, whereas secondary school teachers, depending upon which timetable structure is employed, may spend less than three hours per week with any given group of students.

Schumaker & Deshler (1988) argue that the amount of contact time is an important variable in understanding *and* addressing a student's strengths and limitations.

v. The Role of Secondary School Special Educators

Another service delivery problem within the collaborative model in secondary schools involves the number of at-risk students in the special education teacher's caseload, and the number of regular classes that special needs students must attend. Biklen and Zollers assert that,

> Relieved of classroom duties, the consulting teacher can become a 'case-manager' for students, tracking their progress and that at its best, the consulting teacher arrangement results in full-time accommodation in regular class and utilization of special education staff to support integration and ensure student progress. (1986, p. 583)

This fanciful vision ignores the realities of secondary schools. For example, a special education teacher may have a caseload of twenty students; these students would receive instruction from *at least* fifteen regular teachers within the various subjects. It would be virtually impossible for the special education teacher to schedule--let alone deliver--services under these circumstances. In most cases, the special education teacher simply would not be in the regular classroom with the special needs student; service delivery would be left almost entirely up to the regular teacher. There is very little "collaboration" evident in this situation. Similarly, Stainback and Stainback (1985) argue that rather than advocate for special school programs,

64

schools should hire, as needed, support personnel such as physiotherapists, speech and language specialists, and/or behavior management specialists. Without special programs, it would be very difficult if not impossible for such specialists to provide service for all the various special needs students spread throughout various classes in a large secondary school. Not even the most dedicated worker can be in more than one place at a time.

vi. Class Size

Advocates of the integration of special needs students appear to ignore class size--arguably the largest issue which already detrimentally affects the working conditions of teachers. Stainback and Stainback (1985) advocate a single, unified, comprehensive system in which the unique educational needs of every student could be met. Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987) argue that I.E.P.'s ought to be extended to all students as rapidly as is feasible. It is common knowledge that, given current class sizes in secondary schools, the educational needs of some so-called "normal" students *are not being met* as it is. The suggestion that special needs students be thrown into crowded regular classrooms with the hope of having their educational needs met reveals ignorance of current conditions. Lieberman (1985) notes that individualization for all children is another marvelous idea of mainstreaming advocates, but he argues persuasively that the reason for

the separation between general and special education *in the first place* was the unwillingness or incapability of regular educators to individualize sufficiently for children who were moderately or very difficult. Braaten et al. (1988) argue that in secondary schools, full integration of all students is simply not feasible; it is an invitation to failure. Citing Fuchs and Fuchs, (1988); Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd and Bryan, (1988); and Lloyd, Crowley, Kohler and Strain, (1988), they conclude that research does not support the assertion that all students can be managed and taught effectively in regular classrooms:

> Moreover, analysis of the microeconomic realities of finite classroom resources (teacher time and effort) indicates that better education for *all* students, *all* in regular class settings is a misinterpretation of the meaning of school improvement research and scholarly rhetoric. (Gerber, 1988; Kauffman, Gerber & Semmel, 1988, cited in Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988, p. 21 [authors' emphasis])

From the standpoint of teachers as the gatekeepers of change, Braaten et al. present undeniably strong arguments:

> Expecting all teachers to take a measure of pride in overcoming instructional problems and to develop expertise in managing children's behavior is realistic. Expecting general education teachers to welcome, successfully teach and manage, and tolerate the most disruptive and disturbed students is extremely naive and illogical, both from the viewpoint of common sense and from the perspective of available research....The association between school failure and behaviour problems is well established....The general education teacher is caught up in the conflict by being made to feel accountable for tightening academic standards and enforcing discipline policies, while at the same time being expected to remain calm and empathetic in response

to students' noncompliance, nonperformance, and emotional outbursts. (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988, p. 24)

Braaten et al. highlight the reality of teachers' lack of support for integration. Furthermore, they state that integration of certain behaviourally disturbed (B.D.) students violates other students' rights to a safe and supportive learning environment and that "B.D. students may not welcome efforts to integrate them into what they consider a humiliating environment....Some students experience so much distress in a large regular class that they seek identification with a smaller group of peers" (1988, p. 25).

vii. Persuasion as the Key to Implementing Mainstreaming

As mentioned earlier, the integration debate touches on the attitudes of special and general educators. Stainback and Stainback (1985) concede that not all regular educators currently have positive attitudes toward normalization and mainstreaming but they contend that even when there are attitudes to be modified, it can be done effectively at either a preservice or inservice level. Lipsky and Gartner also suggest that persuasion is all that is needed:

> While some professionals in special education may prefer the shelter and opportunities of a separate setting, and other professionals in general education may resist serving 'those' [special needs] students, most [educators] can be mobilized for the needed changes. (1987, p. 72)

Braaten et al. flatly contradict the above assertions: "Not only is support for this [Stainback & Stainback's]

67

hypothesis lacking, evidence to the contrary is available"

(1988, p. 24). Predictably, Lieberman also takes a position

contrary to those of the Stainbacks and of Lipsky and

Gartner. He argues that the proposed merger between regular

and special education

> is a myth, unless regular educators, for reasons
> far removed from 'it's best for children,' decide
> that such a merger is in their own best
> interests....They will have to come to it in their
> own way, on their own terms, in their own time.
> How about a few millennia? (1985, p. 513)

Like Lieberman, Braaten et al. seem to have a more realistic

view of the position in which regular educators would be

placed by an integrated school system:

> Expecting general education teachers to welcome,
> successfully teach and manage, and tolerate the
> most disruptive and disturbed students is
> extremely naive and illogical, both from the
> viewpoint of common sense and from the perspective
> of available research. (1988, p. 24)

Kauffman remarks that,

> meaningful reform of education cannot be achieved
> without ownership of that reform by the teachers
> who will be called upon to implement
> it....Attempts to reform institutions without the
> support of primary constituencies almost always
> are disasters. (1989, p. 26)

> Fullan also contradicts the position taken by the

Stainbacks and by Lipsky and Gartner:

> Pre-implementation training in which even
> intensive sessions are used to orient people to
> new programs does not work (Berman & McLaughlin,
> 1978a, p. 27; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Joyce &
> Showers, 1988). One-shot workshops prior to and
> even during implementation are not very helpful.
> Workshop trainers and program consultants are
> frequently ineffective. (1991, p. 85)

Implementing fundamental educational change goes far beyond

mere "mobilization" or persuasion. Assuming that all the

other necessary factors such as readiness, relevance, and

resources are in place and that teachers are committed to

the change, then a strenuous, long-term effort must be

undertaken:

> One foundation of new learning is *interaction*.
> Learning by doing, concrete role models, meetings
> with resource consultants and fellow implementers,
> practice of the behavior, and the fits and starts
> of cumulative, ambivalent, gradual self-confidence
> all constitute a process of coming to see the
> meaning of change more clearly. Once this is
> said, examples of successful training to
> implementation make sense....They are effective
> when they combine concrete, teacher-specific
> training activities, ongoing continuous assistance
> and support during the process of implementation
> and regular meetings with peers and others.
> Research on implementation has demonstrated beyond
> a shadow of a doubt that these processes of
> sustained *interaction and staff development* are
> crucial regardless of what the change is concerned
> with. The more complex the change, the more
> interaction is required *during* implementation.
> People can and do change, but it requires social
> energy. School districts and schools can help
> generate extra energy by developing or otherwise
> supporting continuous staff development
> opportunities for teachers, administrators and
> others. (Fullan, 1991, pp. 85 - 86 [author's
> emphasis])

Fullan maintains that the odds against successful

educational change are considerable and furthermore that

relatively few educational changes are worth pursuing

because relatively few proposed changes are based on a clear

and important educational need and on the development of a

quality idea and program. Faithful implementation, he

argues, is sometimes undesirable because the idea is bad and sometimes impossible because conditions will not allow it.

Biklen and Zollers, the Stainbacks, and the senior administration of School District X would like to persuade regular secondary teachers of the value of mainstreaming, which in itself may be impossible. Regardless of the value of the change itself, a problem that these reformers may not have foreseen is *how* actually to bring the change about:

> One of the initial sources of the problem is the commitment of reformers to see a particular desired change implemented. Commitment to *what should be changed* often varies inversely with knowledge about *how to work through a process of change*....The adage "where there's a will there's a way" is not always an apt one for the planning of educational change....Stated in a more balanced way, promoters of change need to be committed and skilled in the *change process* as well as in the change itself. (Fullan, 1991, p. 95 [author's emphasis])

This is a good point to remark that if the many possible obstacles to a change in a particular setting are ignored, an effort at implementation can be more harmful to both children and teachers than if the change had not been attempted. Considerable obstacles to mainstreaming may be that teachers just do not accept its value, or that teachers are not trained in special education methodologies, to name just two.

VII. Conclusions

This chapter has discussed the "integration debate" among special educators who have struggled with issues of labelling, school structures, class sizes, professional

roles, and ideology as they pertain to the future of both "regular" and "special" students. It has also addressed implementation considerations.

The most compelling arguments in the debate regarding integration of special needs students have a common thread: there is room for improvement in both general and special education, but there is great need for more thought and consultation before such a fundamental change is imposed on any school system. In fact, parents of special education students included in Singer and Butler's (1987) five-year study were generally very satisfied with their children's education program and related services; with teaching and administration in the special education program; with their children's interactions with other students; and with the facilities. The study also suggests that parents of children in special needs programs were more satisfied with public schools than were parents of school children in general (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 1988, cited in Kauffman, 1989). As discussed earlier, politicians see a strong appeal in a stated objective of the mainstreaming, which is reduced special education cost, with respect to both placement and operation costs (McKinney & Hocutt, 1988). It may be that short term financial costs will be lower, but a far more important issue remains: What will be the long term costs, both financial *and* social, if the collaborative model impairs rather than improves educational

opportunities for both special needs and regular students?

All other considerations aside, what is best for students

should be the aim of every stakeholder in the educational

enterprise:

> The most logical and ethical approach should allow for
> multiple levels of intensity of special education.
> Rather than assuming that one type of service
> configuration will meet the needs of all youngsters
> identified in the higher prevalence categories of
> special education, it makes the most sense to have
> available a variety of service configurations (e.g.,
> self-contained classes, resource rooms, total
> mainstreaming). Only in this way can schools be
> prepared to educate the incredibly diverse population
> of students in the higher prevalence categories.
> (Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd & Bryan, 1988, p.
> 34)

To return to the main themes explored in this chapter,

it has been established that teachers are the gatekeepers of

educational change: "Thus, whether the source of change is

external or internal to the school (and either may be good

or bad, feasible or infeasible), it is teachers as

interacting professionals who should be in a position to

decide *finally* whether the change is for them" (Fullan,

1991, p. 132 [author's emphasis]). There is considerable

evidence that teachers have not been consulted regarding the

feasibility and desirability of mainstreaming, that the

demands on their time are already huge, and that they have

had, by and large, no training in special education. The

experiences of teachers reveal serious weaknesses in the

whole idea of mainstreaming. The literature review reveals

that despite efforts at persuasion, teachers generally do

not see the value of mainstreaming for themselves.
Mainstreaming is unlikely to succeed if teachers do not
support it. Perhaps the largest problem is that of
implementation. Even if mainstreaming were accepted as a
good idea, the procedural aspects of putting mainstreaming
into practice are formidable. There does not appear to have
been adequate discussion or recognition of the practical
impediments to a proposed change of this magnitude. In
short, total integration of special needs students in
regular classrooms is not supported by research.

CHAPTER 3: FIELD STUDY METHODOLOGY

I. Overview

The field-based part of this study surveyed the attitudes, values, and related beliefs of secondary general education teachers toward integration of special needs students in their classrooms. This information is essential because, as discussed in Chapter 2, mainstreaming is unlikely to succeed unless teachers are prepared to support it. The questionnaire method was used for several reasons outlined below in the "Instrument" section. Briefly, the questionnaire was selected rather than interviews because questionnaires survey the opinions of a large number of teachers more efficiently than a series of interviews.

II. The District

School District X is a large suburban district situated to the east of Vancouver, British Columbia. The district served 24,148 students in the 1991-92 school year: 9,101 of these were secondary students. The students are drawn from a large range of socio-economic levels. The number of teachers employed by the district in 1991-92 was 1,367.9 full time equivalent positions. Of these positions, 504.1 were in secondary schools.

III. The Sample

Packages of questionnaires were sent to the principals of the twelve secondary schools in the district, which includes three senior and nine junior schools. The survey

was conducted in June of 1991. District administration
directed that survey responses be requested from one in five
general education teachers in each of the twelve schools.
Administration made this request because they had just
completed a survey of their own which involved all teachers
in the district. It was felt that teachers would react
negatively if they all were requested to complete a second
questionnaire. The instructions provided to principals are
included in Appendix B. The response rate is difficult or
impossible to determine exactly because 1) two principals
did not return questionnaires and 2) the instructions left
it up to the principals to decide which teachers should be
designated as "general education teachers." Forty-three
questionnaires were returned which amounts to a return rate
of approximately 50%. One questionnaire was incorrectly
completed, which accounts for the totals of 42 in the items
listed below. Descriptions of the respondents follow:

1.   Age: 15 respondents were 20 - 35 years old; 23
      were 35 - 50; 4 were over 50.

2.   Gender: 13 women; 29 men

3.   Mean teaching experience: 12.9 years

4.   Highest degree held: 9 Masters degrees; 33
      Bachelors degrees

5.   Training in special education: 31 had no
      training; 9 had some training; among the 9, one
      holds a diploma and one has completed a thesis in
      special education.

6. Mean number of students taught in school year: 234

7. Mean class size: 26.4 students

No comparative "district profile" information is available.

IV. The Instrument

Parten (1966) lists the following advantages of the questionnaire:

1. Questionnaires enable the researcher to cover a much wider geographical area and to reach a far greater number of people much more quickly than could be accomplished by personal interviews.

2. Mailing costs are lower than transportation and time costs for an interviewer.

3. The informant may answer questions more frankly by mail since anonymity is assured.

4. The questionnaire can be answered at the convenience of the respondent. This gives the respondent time to deliberate on each question.

The instrument is a two-part questionnaire. (See Appendix A for copy of questionnaire). Part I consists of 15 items, 14 of which are questions that elicited demographic information such as age and years of teaching experience. The other item in Part I asked whether or not teachers regarded their current class sizes to be within acceptable levels. Part II consists of 40 statements which elicited beliefs, attitudes, and value judgements toward integration and related issues. The questionnaire was designed so that respondents could

express strong agreement, agreement, disagreement, strong disagreement, or no opinion. Part I required open-ended written responses, whereas Part II required responses on a Scantron® scan sheet. Scantron Corporation produces electronic devices which employ computer technology to quickly produce such data as test scores and percentages of responses to certain items. The scan sheet itself, once completed in the familiar "computer card" format, is fed into the scanning device.

The 40 items in Part II were derived from issues discussed in the literature review, and were designed to elicit beliefs concerning those issues which include the following:

1. Models of service delivery: Questions 6, 14, 24, 25, 29, 40

2. Prevalence and labelling: Questions 1, 2, 15, 20, 23, 30, 32

3. Feasibility of integration: Questions 7, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 25, 27, 35

4. Roles of regular educators: Questions 6, 7, 9, 13, 37, 40

5. Efficiency of special education/roles of special educators: Questions 3, 4, 5, 7, 31

6. Ideological agenda of integration: Questions 20, 23

7. Class size/preparation time: Questions 10, 12, 14

The reader will note that some items elicited beliefs concerning more than one issue.

A number of steps were involved in developing the instrument:

1. A first draft was submitted to the supervisors who suggested additions and deletions as well as some refinements in the wording of some items. These revisions were primarily to avoid ambiguity and superfluity of words.

2. Three colleagues were requested to read the draft questionnaire. These colleagues suggested further revisions.

3. The questionnaire was submitted to the statistics expert in the Faculty of Education. He helped to restructure the questionnaire to conform with standard formats.

4. The fourth draft of the questionnaire was submitted to school board administration for approval. They suggested one revision which corrected a duplication in respondents' choices of responses.

V. Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Using the definition of general education teachers provided in Chapter 1, the principals distributed the questionnaires to the appropriate teachers. The teachers

78

completed the questionnaires anonymously, after which the questionnaires were returned to the principals, 10 of whom forwarded them to the researcher. Two principals failed to return questionnaires. The data were analyzed in three steps. First, the Scantron® sheets were processed to produce raw data from Part II of the questionnaire. Second, the MacIntosh Excel® program was used to create a spread sheet which included all data from Parts I and II of the questionnaire. Third, the spread sheet was fed to Simon Fraser University's main frame computer which employed the SPSS-X® program to create detailed analyses, including tables, charts and histograms which graph analyses of variance, descriptions of subpopulations, cross tabulations, and Pearson correlation coefficients. Further correlational analyses were provided for several items which were statistically interesting. The criteria for selecting statistically interesting items include large differences in the mean responses between groups, and significant differences under .05.

This chapter has discussed the methodology employed in the field-based study. Included in the chapter are descriptions of the district; the sample of teachers surveyed; the instrument used; and data collection and analysis procedures.

CHAPTER 4:   FIELD STUDY RESULTS

I.   Overview

This chapter discusses the findings of the survey of
teachers in School District X and offers analysis of those
findings clustered around the seven sub-themes of the study.
The following tables provide the survey's results.
Following each table in Section I are explanatory notes.
Following each table in Section II are explanatory notes and
analysis of results.

II.   QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION I

Table 1:   Judgement of relative class size (n = 42)

	Frequency	Valid percent
Far too low	0	0
Too low	2	4.9
About right	30	71.4
Too high	6	14.3
Far too high	4	9.5
No response	1	0
TOTALS	43	100

Forty-two teachers responded. Mean class size was 26. Two
judged class sizes as too low; thirty judged class sizes as
about right; six judged class sizes as too high; four judged
class sizes as far too high. Although over 75% of
respondents were satisfied that class sizes were not too
high, one should keep in mind that the survey was conducted
before mainstreaming was implemented in secondary schools in
School District X. In other words, respondents' opinions

regarding class size may well be different after the
addition of several special needs students to their teaching
loads.

**Table 2: Total number of special needs students
this year (n = 42)**

	Frequency	Valid percent
None	2	4.8
One	1	2.4
Two	1	2.4
Three	5	11.9
Four	4	9.5
Five	2	4.8
Six	3	7.1
Seven	1	2.4
Eight	2	4.8
Nine	1	2.4
Ten	6	14.3
Twelve	3	7.1
Thirteen	3	7.1
Fourteen	1	2.4
Fifteen	3	7.1
Sixteen	2	4.8
Twenty	1	2.4
Thirty-one	1	2.4
No response	1	0
TOTALS	43	100

Forty-two teachers responded. The mean number of special
needs students for all classes in each teacher's load--not
simply in each class--was 8.8. The wide variance in
responses may mean that teachers applied different

81

definitions of special need, or it may simply mean that
certain teachers have more special needs students than
others have in their teaching loads. For example, 31
special needs students in one teaching load could reflect a
disproportionately large number of E.S.L. students for that
teacher, a situation which frequently occurs.

Table 3: Average number of special needs

students per class (n = 42)

	Frequency	Valid percent
None	2	4.7
One	7	16.3
Two	4	9.3
Two and one-half	1	2.3
Three	2	4.7
Four	2	4.7
Five	9	20.9
Six	4	9.3
Seven	2	4.7
Eight	4	9.3
Nine	1	2.3
Ten	1	2.3
Eleven	1	2.3
Fifteen	1	2.3
Twenty	1	2.3
No Response	1	2.3
TOTALS	43	100

Forty-two teachers responded. Average was 5% per class.

Table 4:   Personal (not professional) experience with special needs persons (n = 42)

	Frequency	Valid percent
None	29	69.0
Some	13	31.0
No response	1	0
TOTAL	43	100

Forty-two teachers responded.   Thirteen teachers, or approximately 30% of the sample, had personal experience with special needs persons.   Twenty-nine teachers had no personal experience.

Table 5:   Average weekly preparation time per week in hours (n = 41)

	Frequency	Valid percent
None	1	2.4
2.4	1	2.4
2.5	5	12.2
3.0	15	36.6
4.0	7	17.1
5.0	5	12.2
6.0	3	7.3
6.25	4	9.9
No response	2	0
TOTALS	43	100 .

Forty-one teachers responded.   Mean weekly preparation time was 3.8 hours.   Of forty-two teachers responding to a

question asking whether or not they had special preparation time to prepare for special needs students, all forty-two responded that they had no such preparation time.

Table 6: Hours per week spent marking, preparing, etc. (n = 40)

	Frequency	Valid percent
4	2	5.0
6	2	5.0
7.5	1	2.5
8	4	10.0
8.5	1	2.5
10	4	10.0
11	2	5.0
12	4	10.0
12.5	2	5.0
13	1	2.5
13.5	1	2.5
14	1	2.5
15	6	15.0
16.5	1	2.5
17.5	1	2.5
20	4	10.0
22.5	2	5.0
25	1	2.5
No response	3	0
TOTALS	43	100

Forty teachers responded. Mean is 12.9 hours per week. There is a significant variance in the number of hours spent marking and preparing. This variance exists almost undoubtedly because some academic teachers, such as teachers of English, social studies, and science, carry a much heavier load of marking and preparation.

84

III. QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION II

In all tables, SA indicates strong agreement, A indicates agreement, D indicates disagreement, SD indicates strong disagreement, and NO indicates no opinion or do not know. Tables cluster frequencies along the seven sub-themes:

1. Models of service delivery
2. Prevalence and labelling
3. Feasibility of integration
4. Roles of regular educators
5. Efficiency of special education/roles of special educators
6. Ideological agenda of integration
7. Class size.

i. Models of Service Delivery

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue of models of service delivery:

Question #6: I believe that there is no real need for special education services separate from regular classes in my school.

Question #14: The educational atmosphere in my classroom would improve with the introduction of several students with special needs.

Question #24: I can use the same array of methods to teach all students: no students need special instruction.

Question #25: All students, regardless of special needs, can be accommodated in my classroom.

Question #29: I can provide instruction for special needs students which is equal to or better than the instruction they would likely receive in a separate special education class.

Question #40: I have a clear understanding of the term "collaborative model of service delivery."

Table 7: Models of service delivery

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #6	0	0	4	34	5
Question #14	1	7	6	24	5
Question #24	0	1	6	30	6
Question #25	2	4	12	22	3
Question #29	2	4	12	20	6
Question #40	2	5	3	22	10
TOTALS	7	20	43	152	35
PERCENT	3%	8%	17%	59%	13%

Table 7 indicates that teachers surveyed strongly believe separate special educational services are needed. 79% of respondents to Question #6 disagreed strongly and another 9% disagreed that there is no need for separate special educational services. *No one* agreed or agreed strongly that there is no need for such services.

Although the results for Questions #14 and #40 indicate that *some* teachers (19%) felt that the educational atmosphere would improve with the addition of several special needs students and that 16% felt that they

understood the meaning of the term "collaborative model of service delivery," the results for Question #6 clearly suggest respondents believe that if the educational atmosphere deteriorated or if the "collaborative model" did not work, schools should have special educational services to fall back on.

On the other hand, 28% of respondents disagreed and 51% disagreed strongly that they could accommodate a number of new special needs students in their classrooms. A majority of respondents seemed concerned about the effect on the educational atmosphere in their classes if several special needs students were added. Fifty-six percent disagreed strongly and 14% disagreed that the educational atmosphere would improve under these circumstances.

The responses to Question #24 suggest that respondents believe that special expertise is needed to deal with special needs students; 14% of respondents disagreed and 70% disagreed strongly that no students need special instruction. Twenty-eight percent of respondents disagreed and 47% disagreed strongly that they could provide instruction to special needs students equal to or better than the instruction they would likely receive in a separate special education class.

With specific regard to models of service delivery, 51% disagreed strongly that they understood what the term "collaborative model of service delivery" means. Twenty-

four percent did not know, or had no opinion regarding their understanding of the term, which amounts to the same response. These results suggest that the implementation of mainstreaming cannot be achieved for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that this group of teachers do not understand the proposed model of service delivery.

ii. Prevalence and Labelling

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue of prevalence and labelling:

Question #1: I have a clear idea of the meaning of the term "learning disability."

Question #2: A mechanism exists in my school to allow me to find out if a student has been diagnosed as learning disabled.

Question #15: Labels, such as "learning disabled" and "behaviourally disordered," are useful to help me understand the behaviour, achievement, and socialization of students.

Question #20: Placing special needs students in separate classes does not amount to a violation of their rights equivalent to racial segregation.

Question #23: Special needs students have a right to separate educational opportunities.

Question #30: There are not far too many referrals to the special education program in my school.

Question #32: Labels, such as "learning disabled" and "behaviourally disordered," impose a stigma on students

which outweighs the benefits they might receive through
special education.

Table 8: Prevalence and labelling

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #1	12	25	6	0	0
Question #2	23	13	3	2	2
Question #15	7	19	6	8	4
Question #20	15	14	8	1	4
Question #23	9	21	3	3	6
Question #30	10	8	0	2	22
Question #32	9	15	8	2	8
TOTALS	85	115	34	18	46
PERCENT	29%	39%	11%	6%	15%

By and large, teachers understood the meaning and the value
of the labels for understanding students. Seventeen percent
of respondents agreed strongly and 45% agreed that labels
such as "learning disabled" and "behaviourally disordered"
are useful to help them understand the behaviour,
achievement, and socialization of students. Lipsky and
Gartner (1987) compare labelling of special needs students
to apartheid, implying that "segregation" of special needs
students violates their human rights. Thirty-three percent
of respondents disagreed and 36% disagreed strongly that
placing special needs students in separate classes amounts
to a violation of their rights equivalent to racial
segregation. In fact, 21% agreed strongly and 50% agreed
that special needs students have a *right* to *separate*
educational opportunities. One may infer that these

89

respondents would view Lipsky and Gartner's proposed
abolition of separate educational services as a human rights
violation, rather than accept the "segregation" argument.

Concerning the issue of overidentification, 19%
disagreed and 24% disagreed strongly that there were far too
many referrals to the special education programs in their
schools. Fifty-two percent did not know or could offer no
opinion, a statistic that suggests the lack of communication
between general and special education which Kauffman
discusses. These results also tend to support Kauffman's
arguments that labels are useful and the conclusion that
there is no apparent crisis of overidentification in School
District X.

Other than the percentage of respondents offering no
opinion on the issue of overidentification, discussed above,
the obvious variances within this cluster involve Questions
#15, #20, and #32. The 33% of respondents disagreeing or
strongly disagreeing that labels are useful to help them
understand students may not be familiar with what the labels
mean. Nineteen percent of respondents appear to feel that
there is some credence to the "segregation" argument. These
respondents may be caught up in the rhetoric of the
mainstreaming debate without a clear understanding of the
many issues pertaining to it. As discussed in Chapter 2,
the word "segregation" itself is loaded with emotional
overtones. Getting past strong emotions to come to grips

with the real issues, such as class size and special training for teachers, is sometimes difficult. One might reasonably use the same arguments to explain the 19% disagreement with the statement that labels do not impose a stigma on students which outweighs the benefits they might receive through special education. Also, Kauffman's (1989) argument that we ignore what we do not label seems especially pertinent in this context.

iii. Feasibility of Integration

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue of feasibility:

Question #7: I have been trained to diagnose learning disabilities.

Question #8: I have been trained to prepare Individualized Education Plans.

Question #9: It is realistic for me to provide an Individualized Education Plan for each of my students.

Question #12: I have enough preparation time to plan strategies to deal with several additional special needs students.

Question #17: I am confident that my school administration can provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

Question #18: I am confident that my school district can provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

91

Question #19: I am confident that the provincial government will provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

Question #25: All students, regardless of special needs, can be accommodated in my classroom.

Question #27: I have been consulted regarding the feasibility and desirability of integrating special needs students into my classes.

Question #35: I and my school are completely ready for the integration of special needs students.

Table 9: Feasibility of integration

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #7	2	4	6	29	2
Question #8	4	4	5	28	2
Question #9	0	2	2	35	4
Question #12	0	1	9	30	3
Question #17	2	6	14	17	4
Question #18	2	7	14	14	6
Question #19	0	1	4	30	8
Question #25	2	4	12	22	3
Question #27	3	2	9	27	2
Question #35	1	5	8	21	7
TOTAL	16	36	83	253	41
PERCENT	3%	8%	20%	59%	10%

Kauffman (1988) argues that integration cannot work unless general educators accept it as their own. Lieberman (1985) contends that integration cannot work unless general educators decide it is in their own interests. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that for general educators to accept integration, they should have acquired some knowledge

and skills enabling them to deal effectively with special
needs students. For example, learning disabled students
make up a significant percentage of special needs students.
Fourteen percent of respondents disagreed and 67% disagreed
strongly that they had been trained to diagnose learning
disabilities. It is reasonable to assume that these general
educators also had not acquired instructional strategies to
deal with learning disabilities. Such instructional
strategies have traditionally included Individualized
Education Plans (I.E.P.'s). Twelve percent disagreed and
65% disagreed strongly that they had been trained to prepare
I.E.P.'s. Regardless of their training in special
education, 21% of respondents disagreed and 69.8% disagreed
strongly that they had enough preparation time to deal with
several additional special needs students.

The feasibility of integration also depends largely
upon additional support for teachers receiving special needs
students in their classes. Respondents were not confident
of receiving such support: 9% disagreed, 70% disagreed
strongly, and 19% were unsure that the provincial government
would provide adequate support in the event of integration.
Among the teachers surveyed, 28% disagreed and 51% disagreed
strongly that all students, regardless of special needs,
could be accommodated in their classrooms.   Twenty-one
percent of respondents disagreed and 63% disagreed strongly
that they had been consulted regarding integration.
Finally, 19% disagreed, 50% disagreed strongly, and 17% were

unsure if they and their schools were ready for integration. These results cast serious doubt on the feasibility of integrating special needs students in secondary schools in School District X.

Responses in this cluster are quite consistent in their patterns of agreement and disagreement, except for Questions #17 and #18. Responses to those two questions indicate that respondents were more confident in their school and district administrations than they were in the provincial government.

iv. Roles of Regular Educators

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue of the roles of regular educators:

Question #6: I believe that there is no real need for special education services separate from regular classes in my school.

Question #7: I have been trained to diagnose learning disabilities.

Question #9: It is realistic for me to provide an Individualized Education Plan for each of my students.

Question #13: I do not find it challenging to meet the educational needs of my "regular" students.

Question #37: There is no need for improvement in general education.

Question #40: I have a clear understanding of the term "collaborative model of service delivery."

Table 10: Roles of regular educators

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #6	0	0	4	34	5
Question #7	2	4	6	29	2
Question #9	0	2	2	35	4
Question #13	0	2	15	25	1
Question #37	3	0	11	27	2
Question #40	2	5	3	22	10
TOTALS	7	13	41	172	24
PERCENT	3%	5%	16%	67%	9%

Mainstreaming advocates would essentially do away with separate special education services. Respondents to this questionnaire would appear to disagree with that move. Nine percent disagreed and 79% disagreed strongly that there was no need for separate special education services in their schools. Fifty-eight percent disagreed strongly and 35% disagreed that meeting the educational needs of their current "regular" students was not challenging. Fourteen percent disagreed and 67% disagreed strongly that they had been trained to diagnose learning disabilities. Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987) suggest that Individualized Education Plans ought to be extended to all students as rapidly as possible. Eighty-one percent of respondents disagreed strongly that it was realistic for them to provide such plans for each of their students. Respondents appear to feel that there is room for improvement in general education, but there is no indication that they accept the arguments of mainstreaming advocates as the way to achieve that improvement. Twenty-six percent of respondents disagreed and 63% disagreed strongly that there is no need

95

for improvement in general education. Fifty-three percent
of respondents disagreed strongly that they understood the
term "collaborative model of service delivery." Twenty-four
percent of respondents could offer no opinion in response to
that question. Within this cluster, the obvious variances
occur in responses to Questions #7 and #40. In response to
Question #7, 14% of teachers indicated that they had been
trained to diagnose learning disabilities. Sixteen percent
of respondents indicated that they understood the term
"collaborative model." In all likelihood, those who had
some training in special education indicated understanding
of a term which had been discussed during their training.
Nevertheless, over all, these results appear to affirm the
value of the separate roles and competencies of regular and
special educators.

v. Efficiency of Special Education/Roles
of Special Educators

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue
of the efficiency of special education and the roles of
special educators:

Question #3: The special education services in my school
are functioning well.

Question #4: I can refer a student for special education
services if I conclude that he or she needs them.

Question #5: I believe that special education services
separate from regular classes are needed in my school.

Question #7: I have not been trained to diagnose learning
disabilities.

Question #31: Special needs students benefit from placement
in special needs classes.

Table 11: Efficiency of special education/roles of

special educators

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #3	11	17	11	0	4
Question #4	14	20	5	1	3
Question #5	31	6	4	1	1
Question #7	29	6	4	2	2
Question #31	14	17	3	2	6
TOTALS	99	66	27	6	16
PERCENT	46%	31%	13%	3%	7%

The Stainbacks (1984) suggest that regular and special
education be merged into one, more "efficient" system.
Twenty-six percent of respondents agreed strongly and 40%
agreed that the special education services in their schools
were functioning well. Thirty-three percent agreed strongly
and 47% agreed that they could refer students for special
services on the basis of need. Seventy-two percent of
respondents agreed strongly and another 14% agreed that
separate special education services were needed in their
schools. Eighty-six percent of respondents were not trained
to deal with learning disabilities. Thirty-three percent of
these teachers agreed strongly and another 40% agreed that

97

special needs students benefit from placement in special
needs classes.

The pattern of responses to these questions is very
consistent, except for the responses to Question #3, for
which 26% of respondents indicated that they disagreed that
the special education services in their schools were
functioning well. Taken in the context of the responses to
the other questions, this result most likely indicates a
desire for improvement of services in some individual
schools, rather than a rejection of special education in
general. The results in this cluster strongly affirm the
value of separate special education services.

vi. Ideological Agenda of Integration

Following is a list of questions relevant to the issue
of the ideological agenda of integration:

Question #20: Placing special needs students in separate
classes does not amount to a violation of their civil rights
equivalent to racial segregation.

Question #23: Special needs students have a right to
separate educational opportunities.

Table 12: Ideological agenda of integration

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #20	15	14	8	1	4
Question #23	9	21	3	3	4
TOTALS	24	35	11	4	8
PERCENT	29%	43%	13%	5%	10%

Hahn (1986) asserts that separate special education services can be compared to apartheid, in other words, that pull-out programs violate students' civil rights. Thirty-three percent of respondents disagreed and 36% disagreed strongly that placing students in separate classes amounts to a violation of their rights. Twenty-one percent agreed strongly and 50% agreed that special needs students have a *right* to separate educational services. The total numbers of responses in agreement and strong agreement for each question are very close. The variance in the numbers of disagreeing and strongly disagreeing responses may be caused by the three missing responses to Question #23.

vii. Class Size

Question #10: Given the current number of students in my classes, it would be easy for me to accommodate a number of special needs students.

Question #12: I have enough preparation time to plan strategies to deal with several additional special needs students.

Question #14: The educational atmosphere in my classroom would improve with the introduction of several students with special needs.

Table 13: Class size/preparation time

	SA	A	D	SD	NO
Question #10	0	1	9	30	3
Question #12	0	1	9	30	3
Question #14	1	7	6	24	5
TOTALS	1	9	24	84	11
PERCENT	1%	7%	18%	65%	9%

99

Class size is a very important issue in considering the increased demands placed upon teachers by the addition of special needs students. Twenty-one percent of respondents disagreed and 70% disagreed strongly that it would be easy for them to accommodate a number of special needs students, given current class sizes. Twenty-one percent disagreed and 70% disagreed strongly that they had enough preparation time to plan strategies to deal with several additional special needs students. Fifty-six percent disagreed and 21% strongly disagreed that the educational atmosphere in their classrooms would improve with the addition of several special needs students.

The results for Questions #10 and #12 are identical. The obvious variance between those results and the results for Question #14 is that 16% of respondents agreed that the educational atmosphere in their classrooms would improve with the addition of several special needs students. Fullan (1991) observes that there is no consensus among teachers regarding the purposes of education; one might conclude with reasonable confidence that the 16% of respondents mentioned above have a different notion of "educational atmosphere" than the large majority of their colleagues. The results for this section demonstrate serious concern among respondents when mainstreaming is considered in the context of current class sizes and preparation time.

viii. Additional Information

The questionnaire also offered respondents the opportunity to add written responses to each of the items. Question #10 in Section I asked respondents to list the varieties of special needs students present in their classrooms; the entire range of special needs was represented. Other than responses to Question #10, there were virtually no responses to the opportunity to write comments. The only respondent who wrote anything substantive was an Australian exchange teacher who remarked that she was interested in the study and would like to have a look at the results.

ix. Conclusions

In summary, the results of the survey consistently support arguments against total integration. Respondents believe that separate special education services are needed *and* that students have a right to those services. They believe that special needs labels are useful in their understanding of students; they do not accept the "segregation" argument of Lipsky and Gartner; and they have noticed no particular problem of "overidentification." Also, because of a number of important considerations discussed above, respondents do not view integration as feasible under current circumstances. The results also reflect the conclusion in Chapter 2 that there is need for reflection and consultation before such a radical change should be made. Although almost all respondents agree that

there is room for improvement in both special and general
education, they feel strongly that integration is not the
way to do it.

x. Directions for Further Research

If this study were started again or if a follow-up
study were initiated, a number of additional questions might
be asked, and some of the statements included in the survey
should be rephrased. The following additional questions
should be asked:

1. Under what circumstances would general educators accept
    integration as feasible?

2. How do special educators in my district feel about the
    same issues discussed in this thesis?

3. Is there any correlation between the attitudes and
    beliefs of general and special educators regarding
    integration?

4. Respondents describe their class sizes as "about right"
    on average. Would these teachers feel the same way
    about class sizes if several special needs students
    were added?

5. There is a difference between preparation time at
    junior and senior secondary schools. Do junior high
    teachers and senior high teachers have differing
    responses to Q11?

6. Will some of the attitudes expressed change with the
    new government?

7. Teachers should be asked if they feel that the percentage of special needs students (*not* referrals for special services) seems to be rising.

   The following survey statements should be rephrased:

1. Q3 to "The special education services in my school are functioning *efficiently*" (rather than *well*).

2. Q7 to "I have been trained to *deal with* rather than *diagnose* learning disabilities."

   In addition to the questions listed above, this study raises a number of other important ones which may be pursued in future studies. Some of these questions follow:

1. What responsibilities do general education teachers have for the education of all students?

2. What additional resources are needed to make integration work (if it can)?

3. What types of special needs students can and should be accommodated in regular classrooms (e.g., gifted, E.S.L., learning disabled)?

4. What are the rights of special needs students?

5. What are the rights of "regular" students?

6. To what extent did lack of knowledge affect the responses of teachers in this study?

7. Now that mainstreaming is in place in secondary schools, how do teachers feel about it?

8. What are the opinions of administrators, teachers of special needs students, parents, and students?

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

The literature review and the survey results both suggest that mainstreaming will not work in School District X. As the gatekeepers of change, teachers must "buy into" mainstreaming if it is to be achieved. For teachers, buying in involves the following:

-- Seeing the value of mainstreaming as a worthwhile educational change. Fullan (1991), Kauffman (1988, 1989), Lieberman (1985), and Braaten et al. (1988) and many others present compelling arguments, reviewed in Chapter 2, which cast serious doubt on the value of mainstreaming. Although some teachers may see mainstreaming as worthwhile, respondents to the survey of teachers in School District X consistently expressed serious concern about the value of mainstreaming. For example, 70% of respondents felt that mainstreaming would not improve the educational atmosphere in their classrooms, and 88% felt there was a need for separate special educational services in their schools.

-- Understanding and accepting the implications for practice. Kauffman (1989) suggests that regular education teachers will be unwilling to accept responsibility for the most difficult-to-teach students, for whom special education was set up in the first place because the regular system had failed to meet their needs. 82% of respondents in School District X did not understand the meaning of the proposed mainstreaming strategy: the "collaborative model of service

104

delivery." Mainstreaming advocates Reynolds, Wang, and
Walberg (1987) propose that I.E.P.'s be extended to *all*
students as soon as possible; 86% of respondents in School
District X felt it would be unrealistic for them to do so.

    -- Understanding clear and specific proposals for
implementation. As discussed in Chapter 2, neither the Year
2000 documents nor the position statements of School
District X demonstrate Fullan's (1991) three specific
criteria for the beginning stages of successful change:
relevance, readiness, and resources, all of which presuppose
clarity and specificity. The mainstreaming proposals for
British Columbia and for School District X are stated in the
most general terms and are neither clear nor specific. 82%
of respondents in School District X did not even understand
the meaning of the general term "collaborative model of
service delivery."

    -- Seeing the reasonableness of the change given the
already large demands upon them. Lieberman (1985), Braaten
et al. (1988), Kauffman (1989), and Fullan (1991) all argue
that mainstreaming will place unreasonable demands on
teachers, who generally are already overloaded with stress
and time demands which frequently result in resignation from
teaching and even chronic health problems. Among
respondents in School District X, 91% felt that they did not
have enough preparation time to deal with several additional
special needs students.

Educational changes often fail for a number of reasons (Fullan, 1991). Legislators, administrators, or even other teachers proposing changes almost invariably promote these changes from a point of view different from that of the teachers being asked to implement the changes. From the promoter's point of view, the theory and principles supporting the changes may be sound and rational, but teachers may lack the resources to translate the changes into practice. Another reason why changes fail is that, despite good ideas and resources, teachers face conditions different from those assumed in the proposals. Sometimes changes are advocated in terms of supposed benefits to students, without evidence that any particular teacher's students would share the benefits. Braaten et al. (1988) point out the problems for "regular" students that will undoubtedly occur with the mainstreaming of behaviourally disordered students. Clearly, the credibility of claims for student benefits cannot be assumed. As well, some proposals are unclear as to procedural content; that is, *how* to implement the change is not clear. Others do not acknowledge the meaning of the change to individual teachers, the personal costs, and the time and conditions required to develop new practices. In other words, teachers reject changes for some very good reasons, regardless of the promoters' "rationality."

This thesis has established that all the problems discussed above are reasons why mainstreaming is likely to fail in School District X. The literature study yields the findings that teachers are and *ought to be* the gatekeepers of educational change, but that they have not been consulted regarding mainstreaming; that teachers already have huge demands on their time; that by and large teachers have had no training in special education; that teachers do not see the value of mainstreaming; and that there are formidable impediments to implementation. The survey of teachers in School District X reveals the following results along each of the seven sub-topics:

1. Models of service delivery

   Most teachers believed that separate special educational services were needed. Most did not understand the term "collaborative model of service delivery."

2. Prevalence and labelling

   A large majority of teachers saw the value of labels such as "learning disabled." They did not feel that labels stigmatize students.

3. Feasibility of integration

   Most teachers did not believe that mainstreaming is feasible, for the following reasons: they had no training in special education; they had no time to attend to the additional demands of special

needs students; they had no confidence that they
would be adequately supported by school and
district administration, or by the provincial
government; they did not feel they had been
consulted regarding integration; they had no
feeling of readiness for the change.

4. Roles of regular educators

Most teachers believed that there was room for
improvement in general education, but that
integration was not the way to achieve
improvement. They felt more than challenged by
their teaching situations.

5. Efficiency of special education/roles of special
educators

Most teachers felt that special education services
in their schools were functioning well. They
affirmed the value of the special expertise
required to deal with special needs students.

6. Ideological agenda of integration

Most teachers did not believe that special
education programs violated students' civil
rights. They believed that these students had a
right to separate services.

7. Class size/preparation time

A large majority of teachers felt that adding
special needs students to their classes would

place unreasonable demands on them, that is, upon

the teachers.

The combination of these findings suggests that

mainstreaming is not feasible in School District X, at least

as currently proposed and implemented. It is entirely

likely that the same problems and concerns revealed by the

field study exist elsewhere in British Columbia. There are

no particular reasons to suspect that School District X is

unique in this regard.

Given these findings, it seems that two options are

available. The first option is to abandon the idea of

wholesale mainstreaming. Maintain separate educational

services for special needs students. This is not to suggest

that mainstreaming might not work for *some* special needs

students, or that being assigned to a learning assistance or

special needs class ought to mean total or perpetual

segregation. For obvious reasons, total mainstreaming

should be the goal for E.S.L. students; also some mildly

disabled students may succeed in a partial program of

"regular" subjects. This option suggests that under current

conditions total integration is simply not feasible or

desirable. The second alternative is to greatly increase

the commitment to education for *all* students. This would

mean a large reduction in class sizes; an increase in

preparation time for teachers; clarifying and specifying the

proposals for implementing mainstreaming; a commitment to

long-term, continuous in-service training and in-class
support for teachers. Unfortunately, there is little
evidence that school boards and provincial politicians have
the political will to make such changes, or that taxpayers
have the resources to do so. Clearly, this is not a valid
option at this time.

The difficulties regarding mainstreaming in British
Columbia must be understood in the context of the other
proposals of the Year 2000 documents, all of which call for
fundamental changes in public schools. These changes
include not only mainstreaming, but also curriculum
integration, a "continuous progress" approach to evaluation,
and increased individualization of instruction for all
students. Each of these changes alone amounts to a huge
upheaval in the way teachers are expected to perform. In
addition, School District X has undertaken a complete
restructuring of student groupings. Elementary schools will
be kindergarten through year five; middle schools will be
years six through eight; secondary schools will be years
nine through twelve. Mainstreaming has been shown to be of
questionable value in and of itself; furthermore, it is not
supported by the teachers surveyed in this study. Even if
the other necessary conditions for successful
implementation--for example, a clearly worthwhile idea,
relevance, readiness, resources--were in place, without the
support of teachers, without their belief in the change,

mainstreaming cannot be implemented. Under current
conditions, and when considered in the context of other
massive changes, mainstreaming--if it is expected to provide
better service for *all* students--seems very likely to fail.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

For Secondary General Education Teachers

SECTION I

Please answer the questions in the spaces provided or as otherwise indicated.

1.   What is your age? (Circle one.)   <u>20-35;</u>   <u>35-50;</u>   <u>50+</u>

2.   What is your sex? (Circle one.)   <u>M</u>   <u>F</u>

3.   How many years of teaching experience do you have?_____

4.   What is the highest degree you hold? _____

5.   What training have you had in the field of special education? (e.g. none, one course, certificate, etc.)

_____

6.   How many students have you taught in total this year, including all classes?_____

7.   What is the average size of the classes you have taught this year? _____

8.   The number of students in my classes this year is (Circle one.)

  (a)   Far too low

  (b)   Too low

  (c)   About right

  (d)   Too high

  (e)   Far too high

9.   What is the total number of special needs students who have been enrolled in your classes this year? (An estimate will do; please see the list of categories at the end of this questionnaire if you need help.)_____

10. What categories and numbers of special needs students have been represented in your classes this year? (e.g. 10 L.D.; estimates will do.) _____

_____

_____

11. What is your estimate of the average number of special needs students present in your classes this year? (e.g. 10%)_____

12. Have you had any close personal experience (not professional) with special needs persons? (Circle one.) <u>Yes</u>   <u>No</u>

13. On average, how many hours per week of scheduled preparation time do you receive?_____

14. Do you receive any special preparation time due to the presence of special needs students in your classes? (Circle one.) <u>Yes</u>   <u>No</u>

If yes, how many hours per week?_____

15. On average, how many hours per week do you actually spend on preparation, marking, etc.?_____

SECTION II

Please respond to the following statements by indicating the appropriate letter on the scanner card.

        a.   agree strongly

        b.   agree somewhat

        c.   disagree somewhat

        d.   disagree strongly

        e.   no opinion/cannot answer/don't know

(The lines are provided after each statement so that you may make any additional comments that you feel are appropriate.)

1. I have a clear idea of the meaning of the term "learning disability."

    _____

    _____

2. A mechanism exists in my school to allow me to find out if a student has been diagnosed as learning disabled.

    _____

    _____

3. The special education services in my school are functioning well.

    _____

    _____

4. I can refer a student for special education services if I conclude that he or she needs them.

    _____

    _____

5. I believe that special education services separate from regular classes are needed in my school.

    _____

    _____

6. I believe that there is no real need for special education services separate from regular classes in my school.

    _____

    _____

7. I have been trained to diagnose learning disabilities.

    _____

    _____

8. I have been trained to prepare Individualized Education
    Plans.

    _____

    _____

9. It is realistic for me to provide an Individualized
    Education Plan for each of my students.

    _____

    _____

10. Given the current number of students in my classes it
    would be easy for me to accommodate a number of special
    needs students.

    _____

    _____

11. I have enough preparation time to plan strategies to deal
    with my current "regular" students.

    _____

    _____

12. I have enough preparation time to plan strategies to deal
    with several additional special needs students.

    _____

    _____

13. I find it challenging to meet the educational needs of my
    "regular" students.

    _____

    _____

14. The educational atmosphere in my classroom would improve with the introduction of several students with special needs.

    _____

    _____

15. Labels, such as "learning disabled" and "behaviourally disordered" are useful to help me understand the behaviour, achievement, and socialization of students.

    _____

    _____

16. I am confident that my colleagues can provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

    _____

    _____

17. I am confident that my school administration can provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

    _____

    _____

18. I am confident that my school district can provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

    _____

    _____

19. I am confident that the provincial government will provide me with adequate support if special needs students are integrated into my classes.

_____

_____

20. Placing special needs students in separate classes amounts to a violation of their rights equivalent to racial segregation.

_____

_____

21. Special expertise is needed to deal with special needs students.

_____

_____

22. The presence of special needs students in my classes will detrimentally affect learning opportunities for my "regular" students.

_____

_____

23. Special needs students have a right to separate educational opportunities.

_____

_____

24. I can use the same array of methods to teach all students: no students need special instruction.

_____

_____

25. All students, regardless of special needs, can be accommodated in my classroom.

_____

_____

26. I have been informed of the move toward integrating special needs students in my classes.

_____

_____

27. I have been consulted regarding the feasibility and desirability of integrating special needs students into my classes.

_____

_____

28. The move toward integration is a progressive one.

_____

_____

29. I can provide instruction for special needs students which is equal to or better than the instruction they would likely receive in a separate special education class.

_____

_____

30. There are far too many referrals to the special education program in my school.

_____

_____

31. Special needs students benefit from placement in special
    needs classes.

    _____

    _____

32. Labels such as "learning disabled" and "behaviourally
    disordered" impose a stigma on students which outweighs
    the benefits they might receive through special
    education.

    _____

    _____

33. Students seldom or never leave special education programs
    once they are enrolled.

    _____

    _____

34. There are feasible alternatives to separate special
    education programs.

    _____

    _____

35. I and my school are completely ready for the integration
    of special needs students.

    _____

    _____

36. There is need for improvement in special education.

    _____

    _____

<u>3</u>7. There is need for improvement in general education.

_____

_____

38. The integration of special needs students is a major step
    toward the improvement of special education.

_____

_____

39. The integration of special needs students is a major step
    toward the improvement of general education.

_____

_____

40. I have a clear understanding of the term "collaborative
    model of service delivery."

_____

_____

Would you please forward your completed questionnaire and
scanner card to your principal by June 21st, so that I
can begin my analysis before the end of the school year.
Thank you very much for your assistance!

List of Special Needs Categories

* Behaviourally disordered (B.D.)

* Emotionally disturbed (E.D.)

* English as a second language (E.S.L.)

* Hearing impaired

* Learning disabled (L.D.)

* Mentally handicapped (e.g. Down's syndrome; brain-damaged)

* Physically handicapped (e.g. chronic conditions such as cerebral palsy or amputee, not recovering from a disease such as measles)

* Vision impaired

* Other categories, such as recovering alcoholic or drug addict may be included.

(This list was attached to the questionnaire to help teachers unfamiliar with special needs categories.)

Instructions to Principals

June 1991

Dear Mr.

Here are the questionnaires which we have discussed and which, with your kind assistance, will provide the data for my Master's thesis at S.F.U. If I may, I would like to make a few remarks to clarify the method which I have been instructed to employ. The questionnaires are to be completed by **general education teachers only**; that is, **special education teachers, learning assistance teachers, skill development teachers, E.S.L. teachers, counsellors, administrators, and teachers with mixed general/special loads are to be excluded.** I have been directed to ask you to go down your staff list and select every fifth general education teacher alphabetically. To make the sample of responses as random as possible, principals will be asked to begin at various spots on their staff lists; in your case, would you please begin with the first general education teacher, then the sixth, then the eleventh, and so on. I would like to work on my data analysis during the summer, and would therefore very much appreciate receiving the completed questionnaires and scanner cards before the end of the school year. I have sent more than enough questionnaires for your staff sample, just in case of any unforeseen difficulties. Would you please return any incomplete questionnaires along with the completed ones. Finally, district administration has directed that the questionnaires should be distributed and collected during the week of **June 10 - 17.**

Thank you very much for your patience and assistance!

Yours truly,

Rob Harding

RH/np

Enclosure

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1.   Biklen, D & Zollers, N. (1986). The focus of advocacy in the L.D. field. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 19 (10), 579-586.

2.   Braaten, S., Kauffman, J.M., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C.M. (1988). The regular education initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. Exceptional Children, 55 (1), 21-27.

3.   Bryan, T., Bay, M., & Donahue, M. (1988). Implications of the Learning Disabilities definition for the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 23-27.

4.   Fullan, M. & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change. New York, New York: Teachers College Press.

5.   Hallahan, D.P., Kauffman, J.M., & Lloyd, J.W. (1985). Introduction to Learning Disabilities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

6.   Hallahan, D.P., Keller, C.E., McKinney, J.D., Lloyd, J.W., & Bryan T. (1988). Examining the research base of the regular education initiative: Efficacy studies and the adaptive learning environments model. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 29-35.

7.   Kauffman, J.M. (1989). The regular education initiative as Reagan-Bush education policy: A trickle-down theory of education of the hard-to-teach. Pro-Ed.

8.   Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 6-11.

9.   Kavale, K. (1987). Long term consequences of learning disabilities. In Wang, Reynolds & Walberg (Eds.) Handbook of Special Education Research and Practice. London: Pergamon Press.

10.   Keogh, B.K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 19-22.

11.   Lieberman, L. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? Exceptional Children, 51 (6), 513-516.

12. Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A., (1987). Capable of achievement and worthy of respect: Education for handicapped students as if they were full-fledged human beings. Exceptional Children, 54, 69-73.

13. McKinney, J.D., & Hocutt, A.M. (1988). The need for policy analysis in evaluating the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 12-18.

14. Marston, D. (1988). The effectiveness of special education: A time series analysis of reading performance in regular and special education settings. Journal of Special Education, 21 (4), 13-24.

15. Mesinger, J.F. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education: or, Is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion?" Exceptional Children, 51 (6), 510-512.

16. Miller, W.L. (1983). The Survey Methods in the Social and Political Science: Achievements, Failures, Prospects. London, England: Frances Pinter (Publishers).

17. Ministry of Education, British Columbia (1985). Special Programs Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines. Victoria, British Columbia: Province of British Columbia.

18. Ministry of Education, British Columbia (1990). Year 2000: A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future. Victoria, British Columbia: Province of British Columbia.

19. Morrison, F., & Manis, F. (1981). Cognitive processes and reading disability: A critique and proposal. In Brainerd, C. (Ed.) Progress in Cognitive Development: Verbal Processes in Children. New York: Springer-Verlag.

20. Palincsar, A., & Brown, D. (1987). Enhancing instructional time through attention to metacognition. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 66-75.

21. Parten, M. (1966). Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York, New York: Cooper Square Publishers.

22. Pugach, M. (1987). The national education reports and special education: Implications for teacher preparation. Exceptional Children, 53 (4), 308-314.

23. Reynolds, M.C., Wang, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53 (5), 391-398.

24. Rossi, P., Wright, J., & Anderson, A. (1983). Handbook of Survey Research. New York, New York: Academic Press.

25. Ryan, E., Short, E, & Weed, K. (1986). The role of cognitive strategy training in improving the academic performance of learning disabled children. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 19, 521-529.

26. Schumaker, J.B., & Deshler, D.D. (1988). Implementing the regular education initiative in secondary schools: A different ball game. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 36-41.

27. Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1987). Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on "Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility." Exceptional Children, 54 (1), 66-68.

28. Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1985). The merger of special and regular education: Can it be done? A response to Lieberman and Mesinger. Exceptional Children, 51, 517-520.

29. Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51 (2), 102-111.

30. Torgasen, J., & Houck, G. (1980). Processing deficiencies in learning disabled children who perform poorly on the digit span test. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 141-160.

31. Vellutino, F., Bentley, W., & Scanlon, D. (1983). Interhemispheric learning and speed of hemispheric transmission in dyslexic and normal readers: A replication of previous results and additional findings. Applied Psycholinguistics, 4, 209-228.

32. Wang, M.C., & Birch, J.W. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. Exceptional Children, 51 (1), 33-40.

33. Will, M.C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-415.

34. Will, M.C. (1984). Let us pause and reflect - but not too long. _Exceptional Children_, _51_ (1), 11-16.

35. Wong, B., & Wong, R. (1988). Cognitive interventions for learning disabilities. In Kavale, K. (Ed.) _Learning Disabilities: State of the Art and Practice_. San Diego, CA.: College Hill, 141-157.