

1993

The regular education initiative: A collaboration between regular education and special education

Kathy Winters
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1993 Kathy Winters

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Winters, Kathy, "The regular education initiative: A collaboration between regular education and special education" (1993). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3540.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3540>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

The regular education initiative: A collaboration between regular education and special education

Abstract

Prior to the 1960s, students needing special education services received their education in segregated classrooms and schools. Since then Special Education services have changed dramatically in response to the needs of the handicapped, their families, and the public school system. During the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, the field of Special Education experienced growth through the efforts of educators, parents, legislators, and the legal system (Smith & Neisworth, 1977; Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). The field of Learning Disabilities developed in the mid 1960s and continues to grow and develop as more is learned about students with learning disabilities (Lerner, 1976). The passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act occurred in 1975. This law has been called the handicapped child's "Bill of Rights" because it guarantees that all children regardless of their handicap are entitled to a free appropriate education (Singer, 1985).

The Regular Education Initiative:
A Collaboration
Between Regular Education and Special Education

A Graduate Project
Submitted to the
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

By
Kathy Winters
July 7, 1993

This Research Paper by: Kathy Winters

Entitled: The Regular Education Initiative: A Collaboration
Between Regular Education and Special Education

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

July 15, 1993

Date Approved

Greg P. Stefanich

Director of Research Paper

Greg P. Stefanich

Graduate Faculty Advisor

July 15, 1993

Date Approved

Marvin Heller

Graduate Faculty Reader

June 24, 1993

Date Approved

Peggy Ishler

Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

July 16, 1993

Date Approved

Table of Contents

History.....	3
Mildly Handicapped Special Learners.....	5
Public Law 94-142.....	7
Special Education Reform	11
Rationale.....	12
Teacher Responsibilities.....	17
Consultation.....	18
Special Education Services Within the Classroom.....	18
Cooperative/Collaborative Services.....	19
Education Programming and Planning.....	20
Teaching Practices.....	22
Conclusion.....	25

The Regular Education Initiative: A Collaboration Between Regular Education and Special Education

History

Prior to the 1960s, students needing special education services received their education in segregated classrooms and schools. Since then Special Education services have changed dramatically in response to the needs of the handicapped, their families, and the public school system. During the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, the field of Special Education experienced growth through the efforts of educators, parents, legislators, and the legal system (Smith & Neisworth, 1977; Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). The field of Learning Disabilities developed in the mid 1960s and continues to grow and develop as more is learned about students with learning disabilities (Lerner, 1976). The passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act occurred in 1975. This law has been called the handicapped child's "Bill of Rights" because it guarantees that all children regardless of their handicap are entitled to a free appropriate education (Singer, 1985). P.L. 94-142 has required schools to make fundamental changes in the quest to educate handicapped students in the public schools (Corrigan & Howey, 1980). The Americans with Disabilities Act has since been passed. This Act allows all disabled Americans to be educated.

Since the 1960s, the field of Special Education has focused on many issues. One issue that is as important today as it was in the 1960s is the issue of "normalization" and "mainstreaming" (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978; Lilly, 1982; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987). Hallahan and Kauffman (1978) define normalization as: "the philosophical belief that every exceptional child should be provided with an education and living environment as close to normal as possible" (p. 31). Normalization will vary with the severity of the handicap (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). It can range from allowing handicapped individuals to live at home rather than in an institution, to allowing handicapped adults the option of living on their own in a supervised apartment instead of living at home with their parents, to placing a child in a regular class instead of a special education class. Mainstreaming is a vital part of normalization. Mainstreaming consists of two major dimensions. It is a concept that refers to the process of educating handicapped students both academically and socially for all or part of the school day in the regular classroom with the regular curriculum (Lilly, 1982; Mercer & Mercer, 1989). Mainstreaming also refers to the process of returning mildly handicapped students to the regular classroom and allowing them to receive their supportive services in the regular classroom (Lilly, 1982).

There is a trend or movement to increase the amount of mainstreaming done in the public schools (Larrivee, 1986;

Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Schulte, Osborne, & McKinney, 1990). This movement has been growing and developing since the mid-1960s (Lilly, 1982) and is generally called the Regular Education Initiative (REI) (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Certain states may use different names, for example, Iowa uses the term: Renewed Service Delivery System (RSDS) (Grimes, 1990). However, the intent is the same. Proponents of REI want to see mainstreaming focusing on providing services that will make the classroom more accommodating to students with learning problems and will help the classroom teacher to adapt teaching methods to help all students to succeed (Lilly, 1982). They also want regular educators and special educators to work together to provide the remediation and programming needed to maintain the mildly handicapped child in the regular classroom (McIntosh & Raymond, 1989).

Mildly Handicapped Special Learners

Ninety percent of special education students are classified as mildly handicapped special learners (Sontag, 1982). Affleck, Lowenbraun, & Archer (1980) state, "Mildly handicapped refers to handicapping conditions of relative severity that do not preclude partial or full time placement in the regular classroom" (p. 21). This means that even though the students have been labeled as being handicapped, they are capable of participating and learning in the regular classroom. These are the children that regular

educators and special educators share every day. These children spend most of the day in a regular class and go to the resource room for a specific time period to receive academic help (Mercer & Mercer, 1989).

There are three labels or categories associated with the term mildly handicapped. They are: learning disabled, mildly mentally disabled, and behaviorally disabled (Affleck et al, 1980; Lilly, 1982). The term learning disabled refers to approximately 3% of the school population (Affleck et al, 1980). Children with learning disabilities have average or above average IQ, but are discrepant in one or more academic areas (Smith, 1981). The term discrepant means that the child's achievement does not match up to his academic ability (IQ). For example, a student in 5th grade with a normal IQ would be expected to have 5th grade reading skills, but would be considered discrepant in reading if the skills were only developed to 2nd grade level. Children with learning disabilities have problems in one or more academic areas and may require special teaching techniques in order to learn (Kirk, Kliebhan, & Lerner, 1978; Affleck et al, 1980). The term mildly mentally disabled can refer to up to 16% of the school population (Kirk et al, 1978). The term mildly mentally disabled is used to refer to those with an IQ between 52 and 85 (Kirk et al, 1978). These students are capable of learning and grasping concepts, however their learning occurs at a slower pace. They do best with very structured, sequential,

concrete tasks. They also require more repetition and review in order to master a concept. The third category is behaviorally disabled which is defined as maladaptive social-emotional behavior which interferes with the ability to learn (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). These are children whose behaviors interfere with their learning. It is estimated that approximately 2% of the school population is behaviorally disordered (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978). These students require structure and order in the learning environment. They also require help in developing a positive self-esteem and working with others.

These are the mildly handicapped special learners (MHSL). They are the students that Regular Education Initiative proponents say should be mainstreamed into the regular education classroom. What needs to happen to allow the Regular Education Initiative to be successful? This paper will attempt to answer that question as it addresses these questions: What are the needs of the mildly handicapped special learner?, How do classroom teachers view the REI?, and How can the classroom teacher and the special education teacher collaborate to meet the needs of the mildly handicapped special learner?

Public Law 94-142

Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was passed by Congress in 1975. P.L. 94-142 requires a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive

environment for all handicapped children ages 3 to 21 years (Federal Register, August 1977). This law mandates that students with educational, developmental, emotional, and physical disabilities be identified and provided with special education services by the public schools (Singer, 1985). P.L. 94-142 has had and continues to have a major impact upon the entire education community (Anderson, 1980). Corrigan and Howey (1980), stated, "P.L. 94-142 has shifted the focus of concern from children's handicaps to their learning needs, and changed the educational setting from segregated classrooms and institutions to 'appropriate' education in the 'least restrictive environment'" (p. 200). Least restrictive environment (LRE) refers to the educational setting. This means selecting the most normal educational environment in which learning can occur (Mercer & Mercer, 1989).

Since its implementation in 1975, P.L. 94-142 has been very beneficial to those identified as handicapped. It has provided educational services and has contributed to the academic growth of many students. It has expanded the knowledge base and provided many strategies to help in the teaching of students with handicaps (Will, 1986). P.L. 94-142 has also helped to develop and refine the concept of individualized instruction and goal setting (Will, 1986).

Madeline C. Will, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, the U.S. Department of Education (1986) stated, "A singular challenge facing education

today is the challenge of providing the best, most effective education possible for children and youth with learning problems" (p. 411). P.L. 94-142 was passed to help meet that challenge and has helped many handicapped children receive educational services. During the first seven years of P.L. 94-142, the number of students receiving special education services increased by 15% (Singer, 1985). However, as good as P.L. 94-142 is, it does not meet the needs of all children with learning problems. Special education programs have experienced mixed results (Will, 1986). Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, and Lesars, (1991) study indicates that both regular and special education teachers are not generally dissatisfied with the current system. They also are not entirely satisfied. There are frustrations with the pull out model used in most schools (Goor & Pohill, 1991) and the lack of coordination between special education and regular education (Reynolds et al, 1987). Additionally, many teachers are concerned with the current practice in our educational system, of not referring or providing students with extra help until they are identified as having a serious learning problem (Will, 1986). This causes children to experience failure and frustration with school and learning and helps to lower self-esteem. Most teachers would like to see services provided before failure occurs.

Eligibility for services is a major concern. There are two components to eligibility. The first component deals with the

number of students qualifying for special education services and the ability of the schools to provide the best services for them. Increasing numbers of children with mild learning problems are being declared eligible for special education services (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba, & Nania, 1990). These children spend the majority of their day in regular education (Ysseldyke et al 1990; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bishop, 1992). The second component deals with those children who are declared ineligible for special education programs. Eligibility requirements and screening procedures exclude many students--slow learners, underachievers, at-risk students who are not succeeding in the regular classroom, but remain there because they do not test low enough on standardized tests to qualify for special education services (Appalachia Education Lab, 1986). These students have many of the same learning problems and exhibit the same behaviors as those identified as mildly handicapped (Larrivee, 1986). There are some compensatory programs such as Chapter 1 Reading and Math that may serve some learners who aren't eligible for special education programs, but there will always be some learners without any supportive help (Appalachia Education Lab, 1986). According to Reynolds et al (1987), there isn't any one program in a position to serve the many children whose achievement falls just beyond the various categorical program boundaries. There has been a large

increase in the number of children and youth who are unable to learn in the general education system (Will, 1986).

Classroom teachers have the responsibility of providing a positive learning environment for all students. They have to teach to a wide range of student abilities (Munroe, 1982). The level of abilities ranges from the gifted to the MHSL mainstreamed and all the levels in between. Dr. Munroe (1982) stated, "The reality of meeting the needs of a wide range of student abilities taxes the talents of educators" (p. 3). Educators want and should receive assistance in meeting the needs of all students (Munroe, 1982; Affleck et al, 1980).

Special Education Reform

The time has come to attempt to remedy some of the problems associated with the present special education system in order to serve more effectively all children and youth with special learning needs (Will, 1986). This reform of special education delivery systems is referred to as the Regular Education Initiative (REI). This means that special education and regular education personnel work together to provide optimum learning experiences for the mildly handicapped special learner in the regular classroom. This should become mainstreaming at its best. Will (1986) envisions special education and regular education personnel working together and using their resources to provide effective, comprehensive services for all students based on need rather than

eligibility. The REI can become the catalyst for a school-wide improvement (Zigmond & Baker, 1990).

Rationale

There are many reasons why schools should participate in the Regular Education Initiative. First, the REI wants MHSL to be part of the regular classroom. Researchers feel that participation in regular classroom settings is important for students with handicaps (Ysseldyke et al, 1990). This is really important for MHSL; they do not want to be different from their classmates, and being allowed to stay in the classroom helps them to be "normal". MHSL are viewed as part of the class because they remain with their classmates (Self, Benning, Marston, & Magnusson, 1991) even though they may receive extra help in the classroom. Second, the REI solves the problem of fragmented instruction and segregated curriculum. Often skills being taught and mastered in the Resource Room did not transfer to the regular classroom, and/or the curriculum in the regular classroom was too difficult for the student. When the regular teacher and the special education teacher work together instruction is relevant and more likely to match the general education curriculum (Schulte et al, 1990). In addition, when both teachers are working together, it is more likely that they will identify techniques and strategies to help the MHSL succeed in the regular classroom (Tateyama-Sniezek, 1990) as well as learning new techniques and strategies from each

other (Self et al, 1991). Also the students are able to use learning strategies on real classroom assignments (Goor & Polhill, 1991). Third, REI has benefits for regular education students. According to Johnson and Pugach (1991), a major part of REI is directed at students who are experiencing learning problems in school, but who are not identified as handicapped. Teaching practices that are good for mainstreamed students should also be beneficial for nonhandicapped students (Larrivee, 1986).

Having the mildly handicapped child receive the majority of his instruction in regular education is not a new concept. The general education setting has become a common classroom placement for mildly handicapped children (Brady, Swank, Taylor, & Freiberg, 1988). Typically, Mildly Handicapped Special Learners receive their services through a "pullout" model where they spend the majority of their day in the regular classroom except for the time, which ranges from 30 minutes to 3 hours, they go to the Resource Room to receive help in one or more academic areas (Goor & Polhill, 1991; Will, 1986; Affleck et al, 1980; Ysseldyke et al, 1990). Since the MHSL are in the regular classroom for the majority of the day, the regular teacher assumes the responsibility for mainstreaming (Larrivee, 1986). The classroom teachers are vital to the success of mainstreaming (Haman, Issacson, & Powell, 1985).

Teachers are willing to mainstream mildly handicapped special learners into whole class activities and to provide encouragement and support for their academic success (Schumm & Vaughn, 1991). They also have goals for all of their students- handicapped and nonhandicapped (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bishop, 1992). Regular teachers do not feel prepared to instruct mainstreamed students (Romereim and Erion, 1990) and generally do not feel that the regular class program is adequate for the MHSL (Semmel et al, 1991). Many teachers do not feel knowledgeable about techniques and strategies needed to teach MHSL. Fuchs et al. (1992) report that teachers were frustrated with their inability to identify alternative actions or strategies for learning problems. Teachers feel pressure to meet district and school expectations such as: covering a certain amount of material in a set amount of time and teaching in a specified manner, such as using whole group instruction instead of small group instruction (Baker & Zigmond, 1990). These expectations may limit their ability to individualize instruction or assignments (Baker and Zigmond, 1990).

The basic assumption of mainstreaming is that the regular classroom and teacher can provide an environment that facilitates learning for a wide range of students (Baker & Zigmond, 1990). Several studies have been done to see if regular classrooms and teachers were capable of and ready for the demands of

mainstreaming. Baker and Zigmond's (1990) study examined the educational practices of an elementary school that was preparing for a full-time mainstreaming program the following year. Baker and Zigmond (1990) found that while teachers did not seem insensitive to individual needs, they were concerned with routine and conformity rather than addressing individual needs. They concluded that "fundamental changes in mainstream instruction must occur if the regular education initiative is to work in this school" (p. 526). Schumm and Vaughn (1991) did a study of classroom teachers' perceptions of the desirability and feasibility of making adaptations for MHSL in their classes. They found that classroom teachers were not willing to make instructional, curricular, or planning adaptations even though these adaptations will help the student to be successful. In Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba, and Nania's study (1990) of regular teachers instructional arrangements for handicapped children, the results were the same. They suggested that classroom teachers did not know how to accommodate MHSL or were not able to implement the modifications.

These studies do not paint a very promising picture for the future of the REI unless there is understanding of the regular education teacher's viewpoint. These teachers truly feel overwhelmed by their students needs. It is not that they are not willing to accommodate the MHSL, but that they cannot because

they do not know how to make the necessary changes or because they are not being given the support to do so. McIntosh and Raymond (1989) indicate that regular educators need to gain skills that will help with remediation of MHSL. Brady, Swank, Taylor, and Freiberg did two separate studies (1988 and 1992) on regular classroom teachers and their interactions with mainstreamed students. In these studies, the teachers were given training in intervention skills to be used with the MHSL and then were compared with teachers who hadn't received the training. The results were very positive. It was found that academic questioning and reinforcement improved in the classes where the teachers had received training. In the second study (1992), it was indicated that when teachers were giving academic information while allowing students to participate actively, they were much more likely to provide reinforcement. These studies showed that regular teachers can improve and enhance their learning environments through inservice opportunities (Brady et al, 1992). Inservice and training opportunities need to be provided to all who are involved with REI. It is felt that when regular education can develop the skills needed to modify appropriately the curriculum and learning environment to meet individual needs, that many suspected learning and behavioral problems will be eliminated (McIntosh and Raymond, 1989).

If the Regular Education Initiative is to succeed, three issues need to be addressed and clarified. These issues are teacher responsibilities, educational planning and programming, and teaching practices.

Teacher Responsibilities

It has become apparent that without the agreement and readiness of both regular and special educators, the Regular Education Initiative will fail (Semmel et al, 1991). The REI needs to be responsive to both groups. Currently, regular educators feel that they are assuming the majority of the responsibility for mainstreaming and most of the teachers felt that they were not doing a very good job with their MHSL (Semmel et al, 1991). The REI advocates collaboration between regular education and special education. Will (1986) states, "Special programs and regular education programs must be allowed to collectively contribute skills and resources to carry out individualized education plans based on individualized education needs" (p. 413).

Not only should there be collaboration between programs, but also between teachers. Through the sharing of teaching skills, the teachers should be able to meet the needs of their students. According to Goor and Polhill (1991), the regular educator is knowledgeable about the curriculum used and large group instruction while the special educator can analyze tasks and adapt tasks and curriculum. Providing special education consulting

services, special education services within the classroom, and cooperative/collaborative teaching between regular teachers and special teachers are all models for working together.

Consultation

Consultation involves the special educator providing technical assistance to the regular teacher (Schulte et al, 1990). Roles and expectations are clearly defined in this model. This means that the special teacher gives suggestions on curriculum, material, and teaching strategies and the regular teacher does all the teaching. This model works well for teachers who prefer to be in total control of the classroom and student learning. It can be beneficial for all students because it allows the regular teacher a chance to get new ideas and problem solve. Teachers view the consulting process as being a positive and promising approach (Schulte et al, 1990). There are some disadvantages. Scheduling can be a problem. Many times it is difficult for both teachers' schedules to allow the time to meet together. Also the consulting process can be time consuming.

Special Education Services Within the Classroom

Special education services within the classroom allows for more teacher integration than consulting (Schulte et al, 1990). This model has the special educator teaching small groups of children in the classroom as well as providing consulting services. This model allows students that had been served in a resource

room to continue to receive help from the special education teacher, but also allows the child to remain in the regular classroom (Mercer & Mercer, 1989). Scheduling can be a problem because the special education teacher has to be available when the regular teacher is teaching the subject and the two teachers have to have time for adequate planning (Mercer & Mercer, 1989). This model produces greater overall academic gains than the consulting model (Schulte et al, 1990).

Cooperative/Collaborative Services

The cooperative/collaborative model allows the most opportunities for integration between regular education and special education. In this model, the two teachers plan together and teach together with each teacher taking responsibility for part of the lesson (Goor & Polhill, 1991). Sometimes the regular teacher does most of the teaching while the special education teacher is providing supportive and enrichment activities and sometimes the special education teacher does a demonstration lesson to model the importance of a teaching strategy (Goor and Polhill, 1989). There are many benefits to collaborative/cooperative teaching. All students benefit from having two teachers in the classroom, because the special education teacher is able to assist any student (Goor & Polhill, 1989). With two teachers in the room, students have more opportunities to get help or attention from the teacher. Also with two teachers, it is very easy to separate the class in order

to reteach or review a concept or to provide an opportunity for enrichment. In a study by Self, Benning, Marston, and Magnusson (1991), all students taught through this model made significant educational gains and the majority were able to meet or exceed district expectations. Collaborative/cooperative teaching requires communication and planning (Goor & Polhill, 1989) which can be very time consuming, but it also provides teachers with feedback and support on their teaching. Scheduling can also be a problem in this model.

Educational Programming and Planning

Educational programming and planning is the second issue that needs to be addressed if the REI is to succeed. Basically, this issue deals with curriculum, instructional groupings, assignments, teacher expectations, and grades. Hallahan and Kauffman (1978) insist that the educational program of the MHSL needs to be planned carefully. Mainstreamed children should be instructed from the same curriculum as their classmates, but the material should be adapted to their individual needs (McIntosh & Raymond, 1989; Romereim & Erion, 1990). There are books, well known novels such as Charlotte's Web by E.B. White (1952), that are written at different readability levels. A child who has a reading disability could be given the book at the easier reading level. A teacher giving a lecture could give a MHSL an outline of key terms and words to listen to in the lecture prior to the lecture. A student

who understands the multiplication process, but who doesn't know the facts should be allowed to use a multiplication chart and/or a calculator. These are examples of curriculum modifications using the curriculum of the regular classroom and that are relatively easy to do. Another aspect of curriculum that needs to be addressed is placement. Students are much more likely to be successful when placed into classes that are of interest to them and which they have adequate prior skills or knowledge (Truesdell & Abramson, 1992). An 8th grade student with 4th grade math skills should not be placed in 8th grade math unless there are going to be major modifications in the curriculum because this student does not have the prerequisite skills. On the other hand, a student who cannot spell, but enjoys writing and is a good writer would be able to be successful in a journalism class.

Instructional groupings influence academic learning. There are three types of instructional groupings: whole group, small group, and individualized. Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Christenson, and McVicar (1988) found that whole group instruction is used the most in schools. They also found that whole group instruction produces the lowest proportion of academic responses (Ysseldyke, 1988). This indicates that in order to increase academic responses, teachers need to vary the size and composition of instructional grouping.

In the areas of assignments and grades, teachers need to be willing to accommodate and make adaptations. Students need to feel that they can be successful in their learning and modification of assignment and tests allows them to do that (Romereim & Erion, 1990). Through modifications, students were able to demonstrate their knowledge (Romereim, 1990). For example, since a history or science test is supposed to test the student's knowledge of history or science, students with reading difficulties should be allowed to have the test read to them. This allows the student to concentrate on the test questions instead of trying to read and comprehend the test. Many teachers find it hard to individualize instruction and modify assignments (Post, 1984). Post (1984) suggest that teachers look at the objectives, materials, presentation, and evaluation of each lesson. Modifications are made in the student's area of weakness. For example, if students are supposed to answer essay questions over a reading assignment and the student struggles with writing, have the student answer some multiple-choice questions over the reading assignment. Another example would be to have students play a math game instead of doing a worksheet. These modifications help students to learn and to feel good about themselves (Romereim & Erion, 1990).

Teaching Practices

Appropriate teaching practices for mildly handicapped special learners have been identified (Larrivee, 1986; Brady et al,

1988). These techniques are able to be used by classroom teachers as they work with mildly handicapped special learners (Johnson & Pugach, 1991). Affleck et al. (1978) stress that appropriate educational techniques help to lessen handicaps. Regular classroom teachers need to have these techniques demonstrated and modeled so that they are able to implement them (Monroe, 1982). A majority of the teaching techniques that are effective for mainstreamed children are also effective with regular learners (Larrivee, 1986). Therefore it would be beneficial for all teachers to be instructed in these techniques and to use them.

Munroe (1982) has developed a model of the 15 effective teaching techniques for mainstreamed students. She divides these practices into three categories (Munroe, 1982). The first category is instructional behaviors. Included in this category are learning involvement, individual help, probing, questioning, and latency. Latency is wait time (Munroe, 1982). Teachers need to allow students time to think before they answer the question. When teachers are willing to wait, students feel that the teacher thinks they are capable of answering the question. Probing is giving cues to help the students complete their answer. Questioning involves asking different types of questions. This helps to develop thinking skills. Questioning also involves asking questions that can be answered with a high degree of accuracy. These practices help instruction to be meaningful to the learner.

The second category is individual regard (Munroe, 1982). The behaviors in this category are touching, acceptance, listening, encouragement, and feedback. These are the behaviors that develop a positive self esteem. As the teachers use these behaviors, their students' self confidence is built. Students are not going to perform or learn for people who do not like them. Touching, listening, and acceptance show a child that he/she is liked. Feedback as defined by Munroe (1982) is the teacher's reaction to student responses or performances. Feedback should be given as soon as possible. According to Brady et al. (1988), the use of contingent feedback has been demonstrated as a teaching behavior that affects student learning.

The third category is managerial behaviors (Munroe, 1982). These behaviors include transitions, monitoring, structuring comments, task orientations- expectations and desisting from criticism (Munroe, 1982). These are behaviors that help the teacher to keep the students on task and to make sure that students are learning. By keeping on top of classroom behaviors, the teacher is able to prevent negative behaviors such as frustration, being off task and bothering others, and misunderstandings from happening. Refraining from criticism means that teachers do not make fun of student answers or questions. This helps to protect student's self-esteem.

Direct instruction is another teaching practice that benefits mainstreamed student (Mercer & Mercer, 1989). Direct instruction is instructing students on appropriate tasks using motivating conditions (Mercer & Mercer, 1989). This requires the teacher to be organized and to have thought through the lesson and learner outcomes. This approach stresses monitoring students' progress and reteaching or reviewing when necessary. Affleck et al. (1978) stress that mildly handicapped special learners need systematic direct instruction in the basic skill areas. This method is used by approximately 50% of the teachers who have mainstreamed children in their room (Ysseldyke et al, 1980). Anderson (1980) believes that skills such as planning instruction, adapting curriculum, and ongoing evaluation which are needed for the mildly handicapped are consistent with those skills needed to individualize instruction for non-handicapped students. Direct instruction provides all those skills for the learner.

Conclusion

There are many techniques available for regular educators to use with MHSL in their classrooms. Each educator needs to begin using these techniques and modify the techniques to work within their classroom with their students. Some techniques will work better in different classrooms and some techniques won't work at all. However the key is the willingness to try new techniques because the ultimate goal of all teaching is learning for all.

Special education services have developed and changed to meet students needs. The Regular Education Initiative has been developed to meet the needs of mildly handicapped special learners. It also has been promoted as a way to meet the various student abilities in each classroom. There have been difficulties with the REI when MHSL students were placed in regular classrooms without support and planning. However the goal of the REI is to have special education work with regular education to meet student needs. When regular educators and special educators are able to do the following things: plan together, work together, communicate honestly and openly, share ideas and techniques, and accept each others strength and weaknesses, then they will be able to address the needs of their students. This will enable mainstreaming to work which will allow the Regular Education Initiative to meet the needs of the mildly handicapped special learner in the regular class.

References

- Affleck, J. Q., Lowenbraun, S., Archer, A. (1980). Teaching the Mildly Handicapped in the Regular Classroom (2nd ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Anderson, A. S. (1980). P.L. 94-142 and suggested areas of competence for teacher educators. In D. C. Corrigan & K. R. Howey (Eds.) Concepts to Guide the Education of Experienced Teachers. (pp. 183-195). Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Appalachia Educational Lab. (1986). Tips for teaching marginal learners (Report No. 400-86-0001). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 192)
- Baker, J. M., & Zigmond, N. (1990) Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities?. Exceptional Children, 56(6), 515-526.
- Brady, M. P., Taylor, R. D., Swank, P. R., Freiberg, H. J. (1988). Teacher-student interactions in middle school mainstreamed classes: Differences with special and regular education students. Journal of Educational Research, 81(61), 332-339.
- Brady, M. P., Taylor, R. D., Swank, P. R., Freiberg, H. J. (1992). Teacher Interactions in mainstream social studies and science classes. Exceptional Children, 58 (6), 530-540.

- Corrigan, D. C., & Howey, K. R. (1980). The future: Creating the conditions for professional practice. In D. C. Corrigan & K. R. Howey (Eds.), Concepts to Guide the Education of Council for Exceptional Children.
- Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), Federal Register, 42 (163), August 23, 1977.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Bishop, N. (1992). Teacher planning for students with disabilities: Differences between general and special educators. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 7(3), 120-128.
- Goor, M. & Polhill, F. (1991, April). New help for the middle school student with learning disabilities. Paper presented at the Annual conference for Exceptional Children, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 775)
- Grimes, J. (1990, August). RSDS: Inventing the Future. RSDS presentation at the University of Northern Iowa.
- Hallahan, D. P. & Kauffman, J. M. (1978). Exceptional Children-Introduction to Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Haman, T. A., Isaacson, D. K., & Powell, G. H. (1985). Insuring classroom success for the LD adolescent. Academic Therapy, 20(5), 517-524.

- Johnson, L. J. & Pugach, M. C. (1991). Peer collaboration: Accommodating students with mild learning and behavior problems. Exceptional Children, 57(5), 454-461.
- Kirk, S. A., Kliebhan, J. M., & Lerner, J. W. (1978). Teaching Reading to Slow and Disabled Learners. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Larrivee, B. (1986). Effective teaching for mainstreamed students is effective teaching for all students. Teacher Education and Special Education, 9(4), 173-179.
- Lerner, J. W. (1976). Children with Learning Disabilities (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lilly, S. (1982). The education of mildly handicapped children and implications for teached education. In M. C. Reynolds (ed.) The Future of Mainstreaming: Next Steps in Teacher Education (pp. 52-64). Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project.
- McIntosh, D. K. & Raymond, G. I. (1989). Rural mildly handicapped students in the least restrictive environment: Implications for identification and intervention. Education and the Changing Rural Community: Anticipating the 21st Century. Proceedings of the 1989 ACRES/NRSSC Symposium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 223).

- Mercer, C. D. & Mercer, A. R. (1989). Teaching Students with Learning Problems (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Munroe, M. J. (1982, March). Teaching Strategies for Effective Mainstreaming. Paper presented at the Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Anaheim, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 705)
- Post, L. M. (1984). Individualizing instruction in the middle school: Modification and adaptations in curriculum for the mainstreamed student. The Clearing House, 58 73-76.
- Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53(5), 391-398.
- Romereim, L. & Erion, R. L. (1990). Use of cognitive reading strategies with mainstreamed students by expert middle school content area teachers. South Dakota State University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 841)
- Schulte, A. C., Osborne, S. S., & McKinney, J. D. (1990). Academic Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in consultation and resource programs. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 162-171.

- Schumm, J. S. & Vaughn, S. (1991). Making adaptations for mainstreamed students: General classroom teachers' perspectives. Remedial and Special Education, 12(4), 18-25.
- Self, H., Benning, A., Marston, D., & Magnusson, D. (1991). Cooperative teacher project: A model for students at risk. Exceptional Children, 58(1), 26-34.
- Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Exceptional Children, 58(1), 9-24.
- Singer, J. D. (1985). Educating handicapped children: 10 years of P.L. 94-142. Education Digest, 51(4), 47-49.
- Smith, D. D. (1981). Teaching the Learning Disabled. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Smith, R. M. & Neisworth, J. T. (1977). Special education: A changing field: careers in special education; definitions. In R. E. Schmid, J. Moneypenney, & R. Johnston (Eds.), Contemporary Issues in Special Education (pp. 6-12). New York: McGraw-Hall.
- Sontag, E. (1982). Perspectives on the status and future of special education and regular education. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.) The Future of Mainstreaming: Next Steps in Teacher Education (pp. 65-73). Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project.

- Tateyama-Sniezek, K. M. (1990). Cooperative learning: Does it improve the academic achievement of students with handicaps?. Exceptional Children, 56(5), 426-437.
- Truesdell, L. & Abramson, T. (1992). Academic behavior and grades of mainstreamed students with mild disabilities. Exceptional Children, 58(5), 392-397.
- White, E.B. (1952). Charlotte's Web. New York: Dell.
- Will, M. C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52(5), 411-416.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Christenson, S. L. & McVicar, M. (1988). Instructional group arrangements used with mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and nonhandicapped elementary students. Journal of Educational Research, 8(51), 305- 311.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., Wotruba, J. W., & Nania, P. A., (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions from general education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 4-8.