1997

Parental Perceptions on Full Inclusion for Children with Sensory and Cognitive Disabilities

Marsha Sledge-Bryant

PARENTAL PERCEPTIONS ON FULL INCLUSION FOR CHILDREN WITH SENSORY AND COGNITIVE DISABILITIES

Marsha Sledge-Bryant, B.S.

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate

School of Lindenwood College in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Art

1997

ABSTRACT

This investigation was designed to compare the perceptions of parents who have children with sensory, cognitive or multisensory disabilities in relationship to full inclusion within the educational setting. Eighty-one parents participated in the study by completing a questionnaire designed by the researcher. It was hypothesized that parents of children with sensory impairments would have greater resistance to the practice of full inclusion for their own child(ren). Results indicated no significant differences between the three groups' perceptions about full inclusion. In fact, all parents supported the concept of full inclusion, but did not agree that it was an appropriate educational service for all children with disabilities.

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY

Professor Pamela Nickels, Ed.D. Chairperson and Advisor

Yvonne S. Howze, Ed.D.

Stephen Laffoon, M.A., LPC, NCC

Table of Contents

PARENTAL PERCEPTIONS ON FULL INCLUSION FOR CHILDREN WITH SENSORY AND COGNITIVE DISABILITIES

Marsha Sledge-Bryant, B.S.

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate

School of Lindenwood College in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Art

1997

IV

DEDICATION

In memory of my mother, Sarah B. Sledge.

To my father, Theotis Sledge, for your love and belief in me

My sister Tari and my nephew Chermond for your faith in me.

To Steven, Aaron, and Khristen, for without you there would be no me

I Love You!

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to acknowledge the following individuals
for their time, dedication, support, and effort
in making my dream come true:
Pamela Nickels, Yvonne S. Howze, Stephen Laffoon, Kenneth Mitchell,
Joann Rankins-Cannon and Teresa Anderson

Introduction

Chapter 1

The present study was conducted to compare the perceptions and attitudes of parents regarding the concept of full inclusion within the regular classroom for children with developmental disabilities. This study focuses on parents' perceptions since they have been the primary catalysts for the enactment of what is now the premier legislation advocating the rights of children with special needs. Keogh, B. K., (1990) concludes that radical changes in policy and practices contained in Public Law 94-142 found its way to national attention from civil rights issues and had a constitutional rather than an empirical foundation. In essence, parents are what have made Special Education special.

In fact, Osborne (1992) contends that due to parental involvement, the federal government approved the Education for the Handicapped Children Act in 1975, more commonly known as Public Law 94-142, to ensure all children with developmental disabilities were given access to a free and appropriate education regardless of the nature and severity of their disability. For the past twenty-two years, parents have continued to fight and their efforts have continued to be successful.

Public Law 94-142, now reauthorized as The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has gained significant momentum in the area of educational reform. Consistent with this reauthorization, children must be

educated in the least restrictive environment which allows parents to have a choice from a continuum of educational alternatives (Osborne, Jr. A., & Dimattia, P., 1994). One of these alternatives, although not specified in any legislation, is the concept of full inclusion. Full inclusion continues to be of great controversy as it relates to the education of children with disabilities, and seems to stem from a debate over what educational setting works best given a child's disability. For example, the importance of full inclusion as an option for parents who have children with cognitive disabilities (e.g., mental retardation, cerebral palsy, learning disabilities, and behavior disorders) has been documented. Guralnick (1994) found that parents of children with cognitive disabilities believed a mainstreamed setting is an educationally effective one in enhancing their child's social and emotional development and has value in preparing children for later community based experiences.

However, according to Shirin, A., Kreimeyer, K., and Eldridge, N., (1993) parents of children who have sensory disabilities (e.g., deaf, blind, deaf-blindness, etc.) do not appear to be as receptive to the experience of full inclusion in the classroom setting. These parents have expressed concern with the possibility of isolation and low self-esteem when the child with a sensory impairment does not have the opportunity to interact with peers who share the same type of disability (p.263).

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., East, K., Sapon-Shevin, M., (1994) noted students with disabilities such as blindness or spina bifida are found to have a low incidence within the full inclusive classroom setting. Therefore, students with these characteristics have few opportunities to experience relationships with peers who have like or similar disabilities.

These inconclusive findings related to parents' perceptions were the basis for conducting this research study. This paper purports to evaluate the correlation between perceptions of parents and their respective preferences for inclusion in classroom settings as determined by their child's disability type--sensory or cognitive impairment. The null hypothesis for this study is that there is no difference in attitude towards inclusion between parents of children with sensory impairments and those with cognitive disabilities. However, it is the researcher's belief that the parents of children with sensory disabilities would have greater resistance to the practice of full inclusion for their children. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is that the parents of children with sensory impairments would be less likely to agree with the concept of full inclusion when compared to the parents of children with cognitive disabilities.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Review of Special Education Law

Brown vs. The Board of Education, U.S. 483 (1954) involved racial segregation in schools. The outcome of this legislation required that equal educational opportunities be given to all students. In its 1988 Summary of Existing Legislation Affecting Persons with Disabilities, the US Office of Education reported that when Congress held hearings in 1966, which revealed that only one-third of the children with disabilities in the United States were being provided with appropriate special education services. As a result of these findings, the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was created. Additionally, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act (P.L. 90-538) was established to support experimental preschool and early education programs for children with developmental disabilities.

In 1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142, was enacted. This law mandated all school districts to educate children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The passage of this legislation was an effort to involve parents in the decision-making process. Since educational services were designed for their child to provide parents with due

process rights in the event a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive environment was denied to their child.

> Public Law 94-142, known as the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975 states and guarantees all children, regardless of the nature and or severity of their disability, are entitled to a free, appropriate education. The purpose of this is to ensure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs, to ensure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected, to assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children and to assess and insure the effectiveness of efforts to educate those children (Education for the Handicapped Law Report, 1982, p. 192:922).

In 1990, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act was reauthorized and is now called Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This reauthorization added two new categories of disability: autism and traumatic brain injury. IDEA, the most comprehensive law regarding special education, guarantees all children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21 the right to a free appropriate public education designed to meet the child's individual needs. It requires complete parental participation in the decision making process, has extensive procedural protections and requires education in the least restrictive environment. Further, it provides funds and is an entitlement statute (Summary of Existing Legislation Affecting Persons with Disabilities, United States Department of Education, 1991). More specifically, Congress built

IDEA on the following findings in section 1400 state:

1. there are more than eight million children with disabilities in the United States today;
2. the special educational needs of such children are not being fully met;
3. more than half of the children with disabilities in the United States do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity;
4. one million of the children with disabilities in the United States are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers;
5. there are many children with disabilities throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose disabilities prevent them from having a successful educational experience because their disabilities are undetected;
6. because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside of the public school system, often at great distance from their residence and at their own expense;
7. developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and methods have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, State and local educational agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of children with disabilities;
8. State and local educational agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all children with disabilities, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special educational needs of children with disabilities; and
9. it is in the national interest that the Federal Government assist State and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of children with disabilities in order to assure equal protection of the law (The National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. EDLAW, 1991, p. 1-2).

The Office of Special Education Programs (1991) cited 11 out of 12 states monitored in 1990 for violations of the Least Restrictive Environment criteria. Several states failed to provide a continuum of alternative classroom environments for children with disabilities (United States Department of

Education, 1991). However, Heward & Orlansky (1992) showed that many accomplishments have been made in the past 20 years, particularly with respect to providing a free, appropriate education to children with disabilities who were previously denied access to an education.

The Movement Toward Inclusion

Since 1975, according to The Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices, (1996) special education has continued to grow as a separate and separating system. That is, while significant strides were made in developing diagnostic and teaching strategies that could be used with students who have a variety of disabilities, those strategies were applied increasingly in educational settings that were 'special' that is, separate from the classroom, neighborhood school and community of the student in special education.

Semmel, M., Abernathy, T., Butera, G., Lasar, S., (1991) noted the call for reform of special education has been referred to as the regular education initiative (REI). Advocates of REI have suggested that instructional services for children with disabilities be delivered within the regular classroom environment. The Regular Education Initiative proposed a merger of regular education special education in order to serve students with mild disabilities in a more efficient manner (Braaten , Braaten, & Mitchell, 1988).

The remedy of integrating children with special needs into the mainstream of schools while providing them with individualized support is one educational reform made particularly complex because it forces a tangential relationship between special and general education to intersect and become cooperative in nature (McLaughlin & Warren, 1992). Advocates of REI have proposed all educational instruction for children with disabilities be received within the regular classroom environment.

Keogh (1990) believed Public Law 94-142 emerged from civil rights issues and had a constitutional rather than an empirical foundation. Similarly, many of the changes proposed under the regular education initiative (REI) were derived from values and beliefs rather than from data.

Kaufman, M., Kameenui, E., Birman, B., Danielson, L., (1990) suggested that under Public Law 94-142, the free and appropriate public education (FAPE) requirement targets the special education and related services of a child's education program. He further contended that children with disabilities are not dropping out of special education, they are dropping out of school. These children, according to Kaufman, et al. (1990) are failing more frequently in regular than in special education classes.

Lieberman (1990) noted "some educators would fully integrate or mainstream any and all children into regular classrooms regardless of condition, disability, fragility, vulnerability, or need". These educators would argue all

students desire to participate in regular classroom settings (p. 561). Rather than categorizing students, regular education classes would be adapted to meet the needs of all individual learners. All children would be considered different in intellectual, physical, and psychological characteristics, but capable of learning in most environments (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987).

REI opponents have contended that if students with mild disabilities are placed in regular classes on a full-time basis, the additional variance in student learning styles and achievement levels and concomitant demand for increased instructional attention and teaching skill could result in adverse effects on the achievement levels of students with and without mild disabilities (Semmel et al. 1991). In addition, according to Semmel, et al. (1991), the advocates of REI believe when students are labeled and segregated from their peers without disabilities, this will result in stigmatization (p. 10).

Kaufman et al. (1990) wrote "in order to be a master of educational reform and not become a victim, special education must not be complacent with the impressive and significant achievements of the past. Special education must do more than focus on issues of access and inclusion for children with disabilities during these times of reform and change." (p. 110).

Kaufman et al. (1990) further stated that " in order to ascertain the desired results of educational reform, parents and educators must investigate all

possibilities which may provide an effective educational experience not only with special education, but with regular educations as well" (p. 110).

Full Inclusion of students with disabilities

Inclusion according to Joy Rogers (1993), "this term is used to refer to the commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate. In the school and classroom he or she would otherwise attend. It involves bringing the support services to the child (rather than moving the child to the services) and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class (rather than having to keep up with other students.)" (p.1.)

According to a survey conducted by Putnam, J., Spiegel, A., Bruininks, R., (1992), utilizing the delphi technique, thirty seven people participated, and the results indicate increasing movement toward inclusive practices throughout the 1990s and 2000. The desirability and likelihood of occurrence of inclusion by 2000 were: 1) The belief that people with disabilities have a right to full participation in integrated educational and community settings.; 2) There will be consensus that the goal of full integration of people who are learning disabled into general classes is appropriate; 3) General educators will agree that education generally should be modified, expanded, or adjusted to meet the needs of all students; 4) The opportunity for a child with a disability to attend a local public school (one that the child would have attended if he or she were not disabled) will

be seen as a fundamental right, no matter how severe the child's disability; 5) Social integration will be consistently included as an important component of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for children and youth with disabilities.

Advocates for inclusion support the need for specialized services, but do not support separate education. Advocates are concerned about the low expectations educators frequently have for students in special education, as well as the social isolation that results from students going to classes and schools with students who are not from their community. (Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices, 1996, p. 2).

Algozzine, B., Morsink, C., Algozzine, K., (1988), reported a need for specially designed instruction for some exceptional students, such as for individuals who are blind or deaf. These authors contend that special education programs for persons who are deaf, blind or both are the oldest, and maybe the best developed.

Fauchs & Fauchs (1994), noted that special education reform is increasingly symbolized by the term inclusive schools. Like REI, which grabbed the field's attention nearly a decade ago, the newer, according to these authors is a term which seems to defy straight forward interpretation. They further contend that like the REI, inclusion means different things to people who wish different things from it. For the group that want it least, it is a subtle effort to maintain the status. To those who want more, it means decentralization of power and the

simultaneous empowerment of teachers and building-level administrators requiring a fundamental reorganization of the teaching and learning processes utilizing innovative strategies like cooperative learning and thematic teaching. All in all, it appears that inclusion has meant and will continue to mean redefinition of professional relationships within buildings.

Fauchs and Fauchs (1994) also indicate there are many leaders in the inclusive movement who are working on the elimination of the continuum of services for students utilizing special education services by advocating for the abolishment and organizational structure of special education. Thus, these advocates wish to eliminate the entire range of options provided within the continuum.

Roger (1993) maintains there are two different schools of thought which have emerged from the inclusion movement. The first being the civil rights argument which contends separate education is unequal and human rights are violated. The second relies on the basis of empirical data regarding the outcomes of the traditional special education programs (p.3).

Jenkins and Pious (1991) point out separate education cannot be justified based on student differences regarding their ability and or achievement. Separate education is defined by the walls of the classroom. It is allowable to group children for instruction so long as all instructional groups are taught within the same room.

> According to Stainback, et al. (1994) "The alternative to segregation is not dumping students in heterogeneous groups and ignoring their individual differences. The is the express fear of many who oppose inclusion that students' individual needs will get lost in the process. We must find ways to build inclusive school communities that acknowledge student differences and meet students' needs, yet do so within a common context" (p. 487).

The issue remains whether stigmatization originates from the categorical label and placement or stems from the experience of repeated academic failure (Kaufman et al., 1988). However, advocates maintain children with disabilities have the right to attend the same neighborhood schools, classroom, extracurricular activities, and community programs they would attend if they did not have a disability. All supports necessary to ensure successful experiences and achievement of educational potential should be provided in these settings. Educational and community integration of students with disabilities are civil rights issues "Segregation is discrimination" (Children Today, 1991, p. 4).

According to Kunc (1992), it has become very evident in our educational system today many of our children have the ability to excel in particular areas which encourage their feelings of self worth and self-esteem. It suggests the educational system has promoted building ones' self-esteem through a sense of belonging. Kunc (1992) further contends that the practice of inclusion for students with disabilities means being supported through the opportunity of be included in all aspects of ones' life along with classmates who do not have disabilities. He believes that in order to accomplish this, children with

disabilities must be afforded the opportunity for educational placement in the regular classroom setting.

In contrast to the previous statement, Kauffman (1994) maintains that it is impossible to give all children a truly appropriate education in neighborhood schools and regular classrooms, and that a move toward full inclusion limits the choices of parents of disabled children. If the continuum of placements is curtailed or abandoned, then parent options are severely restricted. Further, it is Kunc's (1992) contention that Special Education needs to transform the instruction it offers, not where it's offered.

Advocacy Groups' Positions regarding Full Inclusion

The National Association of State Boards of Education (1992) maintains that an inclusive system is best. It further states that such a system does not differentiate between special education and general education, but rather would focus on meeting the needs of all children.

The National Organizations of and for the Blind (1993) have taken the position that educational decisions must be made on a case by case basis consistent with IDEA by guaranteeing a Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment. In essence, educational decisions should not be made simply on the basis of philosophy, limited budgets, administrative convenience or concerns about socialization. This group recommends extreme

caution so that full inclusion does not result in full submersion, social isolation, lowered self-esteem, or poor performance. Additionally, they urge that inclusion does not occur at the expense of having appropriate educational services unavailable to those children who need them.

Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorders (1993) further stated in their position paper, that there maybe times when regular education is not sufficient to ensure that all children succeed in school. The organization supports access to a continuum of special education placements and services to ensure children with disabilities' right to educational programs designed to meet their unique needs for positive achievement in school.

Parent Attitudes, Perceptions and Satisfaction regarding Special Education

Gerber, P., Banbury, M., Miller, J., Griffin, H., (1986) contend "that due to litigative and legislative mandates, in particular Public Law 94-142, parents are expected and required to be active participants in the decision-making process involving their handicapped child's educational program and placement" (p. 158). Green and Shinn (1994) also agree that parents must be strong advocates for their children with special needs in the special education process, but noted in their research that the perspectives of parents regarding changes in special education services create more attention to the LRE issues than to the educational reform efforts going on in the general education arena. For example, these researchers

found that the attitudes of the twenty-one parents in their study expressed extreme satisfaction with their child's placement in resource rooms for reading, and were reluctant to have their children integrated into general education classes for this subject matter. Parents' satisfaction was a result of their subjective perceptions, such as caring staff, rather than from their concern for their child's academic achievement.

Guralnick, J., Connor, R., and Hammond, M., (1995) reported there has been little to no effort to provide an opportunity for parents to express their opinions. In general researchers, have not focused in on the actual or perceived effects of inclusive or noninclusive settings and the thoughts parents may have regarding interactions of children with and without disabilities along with the development of building relationships.

In addition, Hanline and Halvorsen (1989), noted "given the current trend to integrate children with even the most profound disabilities, an additional change for these families may be making a transition from a segregated to an integrated educational setting" (p. 487). Exploring the basis for parent satisfaction regarding special education is also important because there is evidence that parents would like more information than they currently have about their children's experiences (Green & Shinn, 1994).

A study conducted by Lowenbraun, S., Madge, S., Affleck, J., (1989), sought to determine parental satisfaction with integrated special education class

placement relative to general education students. Their study indicates that well-integrated programs are likely to satisfy parents' educational concerns even when parents have requested the integrated setting. These results, indicated positive reactions from both special education and general education parents, but should not be overgeneralized since allowing parent preference to be the determining factor in special education placement decisions is only legal when they are choosing between two or more appropriate placements. Parental support for integrated classrooms spans even into the pre-school domain.

Reichart, D., Lynch, E., Anderson, B., Svobodny, L., Di Cola, J., and Mercury, M., (1989) studied the perceptions of parents who have children with and without disabilities enrolled in Head Start. His findings were that self concepts of children increase in integrated settings. Further, children would not receive less individual attention in an integrated setting and that children's needs can be met in this structure because young children with and without handicaps have much in common. So, although, parents had concerns about the development of self-concept, overall they valued the integration experience for their child.

In a study conducted by Guralnick (1994) the results showed widespread support for the benefits of integration, particularly promoting the acceptance of children with disabilities in community, preparing the child for the world of work, facilitating learning to a greater extent, and providing opportunities for more

creative activities. However, the researcher noted a substantial number of perceived drawbacks, especially in connection with the availability of special services, special help, and qualified personnel. There was also concern regarding rejection by peers.

In a comparative study conducted by Yanok and Derubertis (1989) involving 1,702 parents having children in regular and special education programs, parents' responses to telephone surveys indicated no significant differences in parents' perceptions regarding school involvement, quality of instruction and equality of educational opportunity. From this, it may be concluded that even though more than a decade (at the time of the study) had lapsed since the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Act had not significantly altered the levels of school participation of parents of exceptional children.

As parents and professionals continue to celebrate diversity among students learning in the same environment. Then perhaps diversity of services, programs and other environments should be celebrated as well. Special education has evolved on the belief that all children means all and does not take into account the differences and diversity children bring to the regular classroom (Kauffman & Hallahan, 1993).

Kauffman (1993) goes on to say, "The best guarantee of progress in special education may be to practice what we teach. Were we to change our customary ways of responding to educational problems - dramatic gestures, ill-

conceived propositions, over generalizations, decisions based on image, and disregard for history we might, just might, achieve truly radical reform"(p. 14).

Public Law 94-142 (IDEA) has been the catalyst for parental participation in the educational planning and the delivery of specialized services to their disabled child. It has been over 20 years since this law was enacted, but it is still affecting parental attitudes.

Chapter 3

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 81 parents throughout the state of Missouri who have a child with either a cognitive impairment, sensory impairment or both. Currently, there are approximately 3.9% (121,398) disabled children between the ages of 5 through 21 being served by Missouri schools under the auspices of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

The subjects' ages ranged from 15 through 60 (x =34) plus years, with the number per age category as follows:

4 subjects, 15-19 years
7 subjects, 20-29 years
29 subjects, 30-39 years
26 subjects, 40-49 years
5 subjects, 50-59 years
4 subjects, 60+ years
5 subjects, no response

All were familiar with some form of special education services. Subjects were from rural and urban areas of the State.

The average age of children whose parents participated in the study was 11 years. There were 37 boys, 42 girls and 2 no gender specified. The number of children in each disability type was as follows: Cognitive=27; Sensory=36; Both=18. Ethnicity was not a factor under consideration for this study for either the subjects or their children since research has not supported this to be a significant variable.

Design

A Quasi-Experimental design which includes a single sample was used. There were three groups of parents who participated in this study. Parents were grouped according to the disability type of their child--cognitive, sensory or both. The attitude of the parents was analyzed using a One Way Analysis of Variance.

Instrument

The instrument utilized in the study was developed by the researcher (1996) based on input from a number of sources. The instrument was first designed for review by two outside experts not affiliated with the study to begin to determine content validity. Appropriate changes were made to the survey which was then circulated to the subjects. A second group of experts reviewed the survey to categorize questions into the following three categories: a) Judgment/Comprehension, b) Impact/Benefit, and c) Parent Participation in the decision-making process. This item-by item analysis was completed to determine the instrument's efficacy relating to reliability and validity. However, due to the limited scope of the statistical package used, this information has not been obtained. A copy of the questionnaire used in this study appear in the Appendix

Procedure

A literature review was conducted to identify all of the elements considered important to parents' perceptions regarding the concept of full inclusion. One hundred five questionnaires were distributed to parents by the Superintendent of the Missouri School for the Blind. The Principal of the Central Institute for the Deaf also distributed thirty questionnaires to parents. An additional sixty questionnaires were distributed by Executive Directors affiliated with the Councils on Developmental Disabilities located throughout the State. Each administrator sent questionnaires to every parent they serve, rather than by random selection. Parents volunteered to participate. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a self addressed stamped envelope. Originally, there were 200 questionnaires distributed and 81 returned (approximately 25%). Of the 81 questionnaires returned, 7 did not have complete residence information. However, since residency was not a variable under investigation, all returned questionnaires were included in the final analysis.

Administration of the Parent Questionnaire

The questionnaires were sent to parents of children with cognitive and sensory disabilities. When the surveys were returned, they were reviewed for completeness. First, although the return of the surveys was considerably high, with a 25% rate of return, less than 10% of the parents surveyed did not complete

the demographic section related to place of residence. However, there were additional concerns with regard to the questionnaire. It was determined that no definition of full inclusion was provided for the parents to have a basic understanding of the concept. Secondly, it was observed that some of the questions may have been a bit confusing to some parents as indicated by some items being unanswered.

Statistical Analysis

The Statistical Programs for Social Sciences was used to conduct a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if parents of children with cognitive disabilities were more accepting of the concept of full inclusion than parents who have children with sensory disabilities. The one-way analysis of variance was selected because of the uneven number of subjects and to test the difference between the means of the two groups of subjects.

The second statistical analysis method used was the Tukey B procedure. This analysis, which is an approximation of a t-test, was used to determine pairs of means.

A Chi Square analysis was also conducted on the survey results. This analysis yielded inconclusive results due to low cell count.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Content Validity

Two education professionals reviewed the instrument designed by the researcher to begin to determine content validity. These independent reviewers determined that of the 65 initial questions selected for inclusion in the survey, several were misleading or not relevant to the research question. The researcher used these independent evaluations to redesign the survey which resulted in a 40 item questionnaire.

Analysis of Data

The table below describes the results of the One Way Analysis of Variance in an effort to demonstrate that there is no difference between the attitudes of parents who have children with cognitive disabilities and parents of children who have sensory disabilities towards inclusion. The failure to reject the null hypothesis indicates there was no significant difference between the disability classifications--sensory, cognitive or both. The Tukey-B procedure, one of several follow up analyses used to analyze pairs of means, indicated that the ranges for the variables at the $\alpha = .050$ level were 3.10 and 3.38. Thus, no two groups were significantly different at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance as indicated

by the F Ratio. A One-way Analysis of Variance for disability classification can be seen in Table 1.

Table I. Disability Classification

One Way Analysis of Variance					
Source	***D.F.***	***Sum of Squares***	***Mean Squares***	***F Ratio***	***F Prob.***
Between Groups	2	36.0919	18.9459	.0622	9397
Within Groups	76	22037.4524	289.9665		
Total	78	22073.5443			

Chi-Square Analysis proved inconclusive due to low cell counts (See Table 2). According to Statistical Programs for the Social Sciences, "one should not use the Chi Square test if more than 20% of the cells have expected value less than 5". (P. 262). For this study, 7 of the 12 disability classification cells fell into this category, which resulted in 58.3% of the cells having an expected frequency of less than 5. Thus, the Chi Square data are not useable.

Placement Type by Disability Classification

Chi-Square Results

Table 2

Placed		Sensory 1.003	Cognitive 2.003	Both 3.003	Row Total
Segregated	1.00	14	8	12	34 46.6
Inclusive	2.00	6	6	4	16 21.9
Pull-out	3.00	2	6	2	10 13.7
Other	4.00	7	2	4	13 17.8
Column Total		29 39.7	22 30.1	22 30.1	73 100.0

The complete questionnaire that was sent to parents can be found in Appendix A of this document. However, due to the size of the survey, the author has chosen to focus and discuss 12 questions from the survey. The author believed these 12 questions would be representative of the following areas: judgement, comprehension, impact, or parent participation. Table 3 for the purpose of this section, will look closely at twelve questions from the survey and will show the specific relationship between parent participation and their perceptions regarding Full Inclusion. Each of these twelve questions is listed below, along with a summary of the results of parents' responses.

Table III. Results and Analysis of 12 Questions Presented to Parents

Participants Response and Discussion			
Question # 1	As a parent of a child with a disability I understand the concept of Full Inclusion in the classroom setting.		
Parental response	45 strongly agree 4 disagree with statement one (1) respondent did not complete the question	17 somewhat agree 7 strongly disagree	6 unsure
From this response it can be concluded that over half of the parents participating in the survey understand the concept of Full Inclusion and its impact on their child with a disability.			
Question # 2	At the present time, I feel Inclusion for my child in the school setting would be very beneficial.		
Parental response	32 strongly agree 8 disagree with statement One (1) respondent did not complete the question	11 somewhat agree 18 strongly disagree	10 unsure
From the responses obtained it would appear most parents participating in the survey are interested in having their child participate in the experience of full inclusion for beneficial reasons.			

Table III. Continued

Question # 3	My child's school has made a constant effort to include me in the planning process of my child's education (Individual Educational Plan IEP).		
Parental response	39 strongly agree	14 somewhat agree	0 unsure
	8 disagree	15 strongly disagree	
	Three (3) respondents did not complete the question		

This question may warrant more investigation in the area of parent participation regarding the planning process of their child's IEP. Fifteen out of eighty parents do not feel their school is providing them with the opportunity to have input into the planning process. However, of the 39 parents who reported they agree this is occurring in their local school, almost half of them are satisfied with the current planning process.

Question # 8	If given the choice, I would place my child in a fully inclusive educational setting.		
Parental response	35 strongly agree	10 somewhat agree	8 unsure
	3 somewhat disagree	22 strongly disagree	
	All respondents answered the question		

This question reflects a spread throughout the responses. Thirty-five parents would place their child in a fully inclusive setting at the time of this survey. However, 22 parents show a strong disagreement and resistance in this area and when combined with the categories of somewhat agree, unsure and somewhat disagree, it is apparent that more than half (43) of the parents are wavering about their child's choice for being in a fully inclusive setting.

Question # 11	Children without disabilities become more accepting of children with disabilities when they are place in the same learning environment.		
Parental response	47 strongly agree	11 somewhat agree	7 unsure
	5 somewhat disagree	5 strongly disagree	
	One (1) respondent did not complete the question		

From the results shown in this area a great number of parents believe children without disabilities become more receptive of children with disabilities if they have the chance to interact with them in the same learning environment.

Table III. Continued

Question # 11	Children without disabilities become more accepting of children with disabilities when they are place in the same learning environment.		
Parental response	47 strongly agree	11 somewhat agree	7 unsure
	5 somewhat disagree	5 strongly disagree	
	One (1) respondent did not complete the question		

From the results shown in this area a great number of parents believe children without disabilities become more receptive of children with disabilities if they have the chance to interact with them in the same learning environment.

Question # 14	Full inclusion should be mandated for all students regardless of disability and or severity.		
Parental response	35 strongly agree	8 somewhat agree	6 unsure
	13 somewhat disagree	18 strongly disagree	
	All respondents completed the question		

It would appear from the responses almost half of the parents would like for full inclusion to become a part of special education law. However, the remaining 45 respondents seem to be supportive of maintaining the continuum of alternative placements, which lends support to existing law.

Question # 22	My child has the right to be fully included in all aspects of his/her life.		
Parental response	55 strongly agree	13 somewhat agree	2 unsure
	6 somewhat disagree	2 strongly disagree	
	Two (2) respondents did not complete the question		

The results show the majority of parents have the perception and/or attitude that their child should be included in all aspects of his or her life irrespective of disability.

Question # 28	Educators working with my child, have the required skills needed to make all decisions regarding my child's education.		
Parental response	14 strongly agree	11 somewhat agree	5 unsure
	9 somewhat disagree	39 strongly disagree	
	All respondents completed the question		

These results indicate parents believe there is a need for stronger preservice and inservice training of special educators. This data might best be interpreted as parents feeling they are more equipped to deal with their child than those working with them in educational settings.

Table III. Continued

Question # 30	I am the best resource for planning my child's education.		
Parental response	45 strongly agree 8 somewhat disagree One (1) respondent did not complete the question	16 somewhat agree 5 strongly disagree	5 unsure
Parents continue to show support for knowing what is best for their childs' education.			
Question # 34	Only teachers with extensive special education should teach children with disabilities.		
Parental response	23 strongly agree 15 somewhat disagree	12 somewhat agree 18 strongly disagree	12 unsure
From the responses received it would appear the majority of parents recognize that not all teachers are capable of teaching children with disabilities.			
Question # 37	Students with disabilities will be embarrassed if asked to participate in the same educational activities as typical children, and it is unfair to ask them to do that.		
Parental response	8 strongly agree 11 somewhat disagree All respondents completed the question	10 somewhat agree 39 strongly disagree	12 unsure
Parents do not feel that children with disabilities should be treated with 'kid gloves'.			
Question # 40	A regular school teacher can do a lot to help children with disabilities.		
Parental response	29 strongly agree 6 somewhat disagree one parent did not respond	20 somewhat 10 strongly disagree	14 unsure
Responses indicate no strong perception that regular school teachers can impact a child with disabilities.			

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The present study failed to support the notes that there would be a significant difference between parental perceptions of inclusion relating to disability. In fact, all parents who participated in the study whose children had cognitive, sensory, or multisensory impairments were positive in their thinking about inclusion for children with disabilities. However, although parents indicated they supported the concept of full inclusion, they did not agree that full inclusion would be substantially beneficial for all children with disabilities. Thus, it maybe concluded that many parents are informed about full inclusion, and also value the principle of least restrictive environment.

From this study, the researcher's findings indicate the majority of parents believe children without disabilities are more accepting of children with disabilities when they have the opportunity to be placed in the same learning environment. In a comparative study conducted by Guralnick et al. (1995) mothers believe children without disabilities exposed to children who have disabilities encourage a greater tolerance and acceptance (p. 473). In addition, parents surveyed remain convicted in their belief that they are the best resource for the development for their child's educational plan. Moreover, Abrahamson, M., Wilson, V., Yoshida, R. K., & Haggerty, G. (1983) report parents who take an active role in the IEP process exhibit positive characteristics. These parents

express more satisfaction regarding programming and placement decisions and, express positive feelings about the parent/professional relationship.

Limitations

One may point to several limitations of this study which may be used in undertaking future research. Limitations mentioned may also be used in determining topics for parent training initiatives.

The validity and reliability of the survey instrument was not determined. The instrument was created by the author of this study based on a comprehensive review of the literature on survey instruments used in a variety of studies, including those evaluating parent perceptions. No valid or reliable instrument was found which evaluated parents' perceptions about full inclusion. Thus, this would be an area for future investigation.

Parents whose children are enrolled in segregated settings may have already made a determination about their preference. It may be that just by the nature of the parents' choice to place their child in a special school, for example, that they may not realize that they have already determined that an inclusive setting is not the least restrictive environment for their child. Moreover, Guralnick (1994) contends in order to achieve a succinct understanding of parental views regarding the benefits and drawbacks of mainstreaming there needs to be some consideration for type and severity of the child's disability in

relationship to parental choice (p. 170). Training related to IDEA about least restrictive environment and the continuum of alternative placements may be of value to many parents, especially those whose children who have sensory impairments.

Low incidence disabilities such as blindness, deafness and deaf-blindness may have limited the size of the pool of parent respondents. These sensory impairments oftentimes require specialized equipment, specialized services and highly qualified individuals to work with school age children similar to those described in this study. Leaders in the respective fields of blindness, deafness, and multi-sensory impairments take various stances on this issue, but each are firmly rooted in this similar premise. Ripley (1994) vehemently holds the position that considering a special school placement as the select alternative over a general classroom setting has no place in professional discussion; moreover, that adopting inclusionary practices for all children at the expense of considering the continuum does not present options to the children who need them. Therefore, the availability and accessibility to parents who have sensory impaired children within general education programs may have been significantly reduced as many of these children are receiving services in special schools, programs and classrooms.

The literature available on parents' perceptions of special education services has been primarily limited to comparative studies of regular versus special education and have not focused on a comparison by disability type. This

limited the author in her efforts to identify studies upon which she could build her own research. Therefore, it may be that more research to compare parents' perceptions by disability of their child is needed.

Parents have been and continue to be good supports for their children. Their perceptions are important to future educational decisions. School choice, deduce Ysseldyke, J., Lange, C., and Gorney, D., (1994), is a reform desired by American parents - irrespective to whether of not the parents are choosing the school for the right reasons or a better school to meet the needs of their child (p. 360).

Recommendations

Two additional areas of research above and beyond those already mentioned, might be to add the variable of ethnicity to determine if it has an impact on parents' perceptions of full inclusion. Also, comparing the training provided to regular education teachers to that of teachers of children with cognitive and/or sensory disabilities. This might be of vital importance given parents' perceptions of how ill-equipped regular education teachers are in working with disabled children.

> According to Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) : "General education's capacity to incorporate meaningful adaptation has become a critical issue during the past decade, as the rhetoric of the regular education initiative and the inclusive schools movement has increased pressure to provide educational programs to students with disabilities in general education classrooms" (p. 440-441).

In summation, the outcome of this study appears to suggest that parents who have children with disabilities irrespective of disability type have shown no difference in their perceptions surrounding the practices of full inclusion within the regular classroom setting. This neutral outcome in perception of full inclusion as a placement option is of interest to the field, since the majority of respondents feel believe that regular school teachers may not be able to help children with disabilities. In fact, parent responses have indicated the need for a variety of placement options to exist in the area of special education with full inclusion being one of the viable choices.

APPENDIX

Letter to parent participants
Parent Survey
Professional Survey

Marsha Bryant
2 Red Cedar Court
St. Charles, MO 63303

May 16, 1996

Dear Parents:

My name is Marsha Bryant and I am a graduate student attending Lindenwood College in St. Charles, MO. My graduate studies and field work is in the area of ***Professional Counseling***. The last graduation requirement for the program is the completion of a thesis or culminating project.

I have chosen to focus on inclusionary practices for students with developmental disabilities - both sensory and cognitive - from a parent perspective. Please complete the attached survey. You may return it either to the professional who introduced the survey to you, or to me at the address indicated above.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and support in this endeavor.

Very truly yours,

Marsha Bryant
Marsha Bryant

Inclusion Survey

Parent Survey

Please answer the following questions regarding your thoughts and perceptions on Inclusion for children with developmental disabilities.

Parents Age: 15-19_____20-29_____30-39_____40-49_____50-59_____60 plus_____

City:_____

Check One: I reside in a (Rural Area population less than 25,000) _____
(Urban Area population greater than 25,000)_____

Child's Age:_____Child's Grade:_____

Child's Gender: Male_____ Female_____

Child's Disability:_____

(please check one)
Disability Classified
Sensory (Blind,Deaf):_____
Cognitive (Mental Retardation, Down Syndrome, Autistic, etc...):_____
Both (combination of sensory and cognitive disability):_____

Child's Current school program/placement :
Segregated_____ Inclusive__ ___ Pull-out__ ___Other
Explain_____

Please rate the following questions: **1-Strongly Agree with the statement 2- Somewhat Agree with the statement 3- Unsure or No Opinion about the statement 4- Disagree somewhat with the statement 5- Strongly Disagree with statement**

1. As a parent of a child with a disability I understand the concept of Full Inclusion in the classroom setting.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. At the present time, I feel Inclusion for my child in the school setting would be very beneficial.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. My child's school has made a constant effort to include me in the planning process of my child's education. (Individual Educational Plan IEP)
   1 2 3 4 5

4. As a parent I believe my child has the right to be fully included in all aspects of his/her education.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. My child's school has informed me of my legal rights as they relate to a free and appropriate education for my child with a disability.
   1 2 3 4 5

6 Specialized Placement (Segregated setting) can be a viable choice for some students.
1 2 3 4 5

7. Specialized Placement may be a option for my child.
1 2 3 4 5

8. If given the choice, I would place my child in a fully inclusive educational setting.
1 2 3 4 5

9. I believe full inclusion is more cost effective than specialized placement programs.
1 2 3 4 5

10. I believe children who participate in full inclusive programs learn valuable skills from their non-disabled peers.
1 2 3 4 5

11. Children without disabilities become more accepting of children with disabilities when they are placed in the same learning environment.
1 2 3 4 5

12. My child has the opportunity to participate in inclusive after school activities within our neighborhood.
1 2 3 4 5

13. My child feels accepted with all of his/her peers within the classroom setting.
1 2 3 4 5

14. Full inclusion should be mandated for all students regardless of disability and or severity.
1 2 3 4 5

15. I believe in some form of inclusion but not full inclusion.
1 2 3 4 5

16. Full inclusion promotes reverse discrimination toward non disabled students
1 2 3 4 5

17. Full inclusion in the classroom setting may impair the growth and learning of students without disabilities.
1 2 3 4 5

18. At times, as a Parent I feel the concept of full inclusion has been a forced issue upon me?
1 2 3 4 5

19 I believe all teachers are prepared to work with students regardless of disability.
1 2 3 4 5

20. I would encourage full inclusion programs within my neighborhood schools
1 2 3 4 5

21. Special Education classrooms function as a crutch for students who participate in such programs.
1 2 3 4 5

22. My child has the right to be fully included in all aspects of his/her life.
1 2 3 4 5

23. Children who are exposed to persons with disabilities at an early age are more receptive to persons with disabilities once they become adults.
1 2 3 4 5

24. Children with and without disabilities have the opportunity to learn and grow from each other when placed in the same or similar situations.
1 2 3 4 5

25. Most educators would encourage the idea of full inclusion for all students.
1 2 3 4 5

26. All specialized placement school settings should be dissolved and the children participating in these programs should be integrated and place in regular schools and classrooms.
1 2 3 4 5

27. Inclusion within the school system should become a federal mandate.
1 2 3 4 5

28. Educators working with my child, have the required skills needed to make all the decisions regarding my child's education.
1 2 3 4 5

29. I plan to be an active participant in the development of my child's IEP(Individual Educational Plan).
1 2 3 4 5

30. I am the best resource for planning my child's education
1 2 3 4 5

31. Our family and friends include our child in all activities without discrimination
1 2 3 4 5

32. Students who participate in fully inclusive classrooms teach valuable relationship skills to the students who do not have a disability.
1 2 3 4 5

33. Learning about children with special needs should be a mandatory part of every school district curriculum.
1 2 3 4 5

34. Only teachers with extensive special education should teach children with disabilities
1 2 3 4 5

35. Children with severe disabilities are too impaired to benefit from the activities of a normal school.
1 2 3 4 5

36. Many children with severe disabilities can not socialize well enough to profit from contact with typical children.
1 2 3 4 5

37. Students with disabilities will be embarrassed if asked to participate in the same educational activities as typical children, and it is unfair to ask them to do that.
1 2 3 4 5

38. Only teachers with extensive special education training should teach children with disabilities.
1 2 3 4 5

39. To include students with disabilities in a general education classroom, the teacher will need to lower his/her academic expectations for the typical children.
1 2 3 4 5

40. A regular school teacher can do a lot to help children with disabilities.
1 2 3 4 5

** Questions 36 - 40 were taken from the Michigan Inclusive Education Project.

Survey developed by Marsha Bryant, Graduate Student Lindenwood College 1996

Inclusion Survey

*What is your name?*_____

*What is your profession?*_____

*How long have you been in this profession?*_____

*What is your area of concentration?*_____

Your degree(s)? *Bachelors*____ *Masters*____ *Doctorate*____

Please DO NOT try to answer the questions based on your personal opinions

Please tell me what KIND of question it is according to the categories listed A, B, C.

Please categorize each question according to the following indicators

A. JUDGMENT/COMPREHENSION
The statement indicates that the respondent must have an understanding of the term inclusion.

B. IMPACT/BENEFIT
Despite respondent's opinion and understanding of inclusion, the statement addresses the anticipated impact or benefit to the child with a disability.

C. PARENT PARTICIPATION
The statement addresses parent involvement in the decision-making process regarding their own child's or another disabled child's education.

Example: Children with disabilities learn from children without disabilities

*A*___ *B X* *C*___

1. As a parent of a child with a disability, I understand the concept of Full Inclusion in the classroom settings.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

2. At the present time, I feel Inclusion for my child in the school setting would be very beneficial.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

3. My child's school has made a constant effort to include me in the planning process of my child's education. (Individual Educational Plan, IEP).

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

4. As a parent, I believe my child has the right to be fully included in all aspects of his/her education.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

5. My child's school has informed me of my legal rights a they relate to a free and appropriate education for my child with a disability.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

6. Specialized Placement (Segregated setting) can be a viable choice for some students.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

7. Specialized Placement may be a option for my child.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

8. If given the choice, I would place my child in a fully inclusive educational setting.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

9. I believe full inclusion is more cost effective than specialized placement programs.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

10. I believe children who participate in full inclusive programs learn valuable skills from their non-disabled peers.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

11. Children without disabilities become more accepting of children with disabilities when they are placed in the same learning environment.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

12. My child has the opportunity to participate in inclusive after school activities within our neighborhood.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

13. My child feels accepted with all of his/her peers within the classroom setting.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

14. Full Inclusion should be mandated for all students regardless of disability and or severity.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

15. I believe in some form of inclusion, but not full inclusion.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

16. Full inclusion promotes reverse discrimination toward non-disabled students.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

17. Full inclusion in the classroom setting may impair the growth and learning of students without disabilities.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

18. At times, as a Parent, I feel the concept of full inclusion has been a forced issue upon me.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

19. I believe all teachers are prepared to work with students regardless of disability.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

20. I would encourage full inclusion programs within my neighborhood schools.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

21. Special Education classrooms function as a crutch for students who participate in such programs.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

22. My child has the right to be fully included in all aspects of his/her life.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

23. Children who are exposed to persons with disabilities at an early age are more receptive to persons with disabilities once they become adults.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

24. Children with and without disabilities have the opportunity to learn and grow from each other when placed in the same or similar situations.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

25. Most educators would encourage the idea of full inclusion for all students.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

26. All specialized placement school setting should be dissolved and the children participating in these programs should be integrated and placed in regular schools and classrooms.

*A*___ *B*___ *C*___

27. Inclusion within the school system should become a federal mandate.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

28. Educators working with my child, have the required skills needed to make all the decisions regarding my child's education.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

29. I plan to be an active participant in the development of my child's IEP (Individual Educational Plan).

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

30. I am the best source for planning my child's education.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

31. Our family and friends include our child in all activities without discrimination.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

32. Students who participate in fully inclusive classrooms, teach valuable relationship skills to the students who do not have a disability.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

33. Learning about children with special needs should be a mandatory part of every school district curriculum.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

34. Only teachers with extensive special education should teach children with disabilities.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

35. Children with severe disabilities are too impaired to benefit from the activities of a normal school.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

36. Many children with severe disabilities can not socialize well enough to profit from contact with typical children.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

37. Students with disabilities will be embarrassed if asked to participate in the same educational activities as typical children, and it is unfair to ask them to do that.

A___ ***B***___ ***C***___

38. Only teachers with extensive special education training should teach children with disabilities.

A___	B___	C___

39. To include students with disabilities in a general education classroom, the teacher will need to lower his/her academic expectations for the typical children.

A___	B___	C___

40. A regular school teacher can do a lot to help children with disabilities.

A___	B___	C___

Survey developed and revised by Marsha Bryant, Graduate Student
Lindenwood College, 1996

REFERENCES

Abrahamson, M., Wilson, V., Yoshida, R. K., & Haggerty, G. (1983). Parent's perceptions of their learning disabled child's educational performance. Learning Disability Quarterly, 6, 184-194.

Algozzine, B., Morsink, C., & Algozzine, K. (1988). What's Happening in Self-Contained Special Education Classroom? Exceptional Children, 55, 259-265.

Braaten, S., Kauffman, J., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C. M., (1988). The Regular Education Initiative: Patent Medical for Behavior Disorders. Exceptional Children, 55, 21-27.

Children and Adults With Attention Deficit Disorders, C.H.A.D.D. (1993). Position on Inclusion.

Children Today. (1991) p. 4.

Cole, K., Pauletta, M., Phillip, D., & Jenkins, J., (1991). Effects of Preschool Integration for Children with Disabilities. Exceptional Children, 58, 36-45.

Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices (1996). Issue Brief, 2.

Education for the Handicapped Law Report (1982) 192:922

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L., (1994). Inclusive Schools Movement and the Radicalization of Special Education Reform. Exceptional Children, 60, 2194-309.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K., (1987). Beyond Special Education: Toward a Quality System For All Students. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 367-385.

Green, S. K., & Shinn, M. R., (1994). Parent Attitudes About Special Education and Reintegration: What Is The Role of Student Outcomes. Exceptional Children, 61, 269-281.

Guralnick, M., (1994). Mothers' Perceptions of the Benefits and Drawbacks of Early Children Mainstreaming. Journal of Early Intervention, 18, 168-183.

Guralnick, M., Connor, R., & Hammond, M., (1995). Parent Perspectives of Peer Relationships and Friendships in Integrated and Specialized Programs. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 99, 457-476.

Hanline, M., & Halvorsen, A., (1989). Parent Perceptions of the Integration Transition Process: Overcoming Artificial Barriers. Exceptional Children, 55, 487-492.

Heward, W. L., & Orlansky, M. D., (1992). Exceptional Children: An Introductory Survey of Special Education, New York: Merrill.

Jenkins, J., & Pious, C., (1991). Full Inclusion and the REI: A Reply Thousand and Villa. Exceptional Children, 57, 562-564.

Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Jewell, M., (1991). Special Education and the Regular Education Initiative: Basic Assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56, 479-491.

Kauffman, J., (1994). Making Schools More Inclusive. Curriculum Update (ASCD) Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 6.

Kauffman, J., (1993). How We Might Achieve the Radical Reform of Special Education. Exceptional Children, 60, 6-16.

Kauffman, J., & Hallahan, D.P., (1993). Integrating General and Special Education. Toward a comprehensive service delivery system. 73-102.

Kaufman, M., Kameenui, E., Birman, B., & Danielson, L., (1990). Special Education and the Process of Change: Victim or Master of Educational Reform? Exceptional Children, 57, 109-117.

Keogh, B. (1990). Narrowing The Gap Between Policy and Practice. Exceptional Children, 186-190.

Kunc, N., (1992). The Importance of Belonging. Speakout spring 1992, Peak Parent Center, Inc.

Lieberman, L. (1990). REI: Revisited Again. Exceptional Children, 561.

Lowenbraun, S., Madge, S., & Affleck, J., (1989). Parental Satisfaction With Integrated Class Placements of Special Education and General Education Students. Remedial and Special Education. RASE.

McIntosh, R., Vaughn, S., Schumm, J., Haager, D., & Lee, O., (1993). Observations of Students With Learning Disabilities in General Education Classrooms. Exceptional Children, 60, 249-261.

McLaughlin, M. J., & Warren, S. H., (1992). Issues and Options in Restructuring Schools and Special Education Programs. Eric Document Reproduction Service, No ED 350774.

Michael, M., Paul P., (1991). Early Intervention for Infants With Deaf-Blindness. Exceptional Children, 57, 200-210.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. (1991). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 20 U.S.C. Chapter 33 as amended by Pub. L. 101-476. 1-83.

National Association of State Boards of Education, (1992)

National Organizations of and for the Blind (1993). Full Inclusion Position Statement Joint Statement of Organizations Of And For The Blind

Osborne, Jr., A. (1992). Legal Standards for An Appropriate Education in the Post-Rowley Era. Exceptional Children, 58, 488-494.

Osborne, Jr. A., & Dimattia, P., (1994). The IDEA's Least Restrictive Environment Mandate: Legal Implications. Exceptional Children, 61, 6-14.

Putnam, J., Spiegel, A., & Bruininks, R., (1995). Future Directions in Education & Inclusion of Students With Disabilities. A Delphi Investigation. Exceptional Children, 61, 553-576.

Reichart, D., Lynch, E., Anderson, B., Svobodny, L., DiCola, J., & Mercury, M., (1989). Parental Perspectives on Integrated Preschool Opportunities for Children with Handicaps and Children without Handicaps. Journal of Early Intervention, 13, 6-13.

Ripley, P., (1994). Full Inclusion: Consider the Options. Missouri Innovations in Special Education, 21. 1-2.

Rogers, J., (1993). The Inclusion Revolution. Research Bulletin 11, 1-2.

Semmel, M., Abernathy, T., Butera, G., & Lesar, S., (1991). Teacher Perceptions of the Regular Education Initiative. Exceptional Children, 58, 9-23.

Shirin, A., Kreimeyer, K., & Eldridge, N., (1993). Promoting Social Interaction Between Young Children with Hearing Impairments and Their Peers. Exceptional Children, 60, 262-275.

Summary of the Existing Legislation Affecting Persons with Disabilities, (1991). United States Department of Education.

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., East, K., & Sapon-Shevin, M., (1994). Exceptional Children 60, 486-490.

Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Stefanich, G., (1996). Learning Together in Inclusive Classrooms. Teaching Exceptional Children, 28, 13

Yanok, J., & Derubertis, A. (1989). Comparative Study of Parental Participation in Regular and Special Education Programs. Exceptional Children, 56, 195-199.

Ysseldyke, J., Lange, C., and Gorney, D. (1994). Parents of Students with Disabilities and Open Enrollment: Characteristics and Reasons for Transfer. Exceptional Children, 60: 359-372.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bjorck-Akesson, E., Grandlund, M., (1995). Family Involvement in Assessment and Intervention: Perceptions of Professionals and Parents in Sweden. Exceptional Children, 61, 520-535.

Blacher, J., & Turnbull, A., (1983). Are Parents Mainstreamed? A Survey of Parent Interactions in the Mainstreamed Preschool. Education And Training Of The Mentally Retarded. 10-16.

Fuchs D., & Fuchs, L., (1988). Response to Wang and Walberg. Exceptional Children, 55, 138-146.

Gerber, P., Banbury, M., Miller, J., & Griffin, H., (1986). Special Educators' Perceptions of Parental Participation in the Individual Education Plan Process. Psychology in the Schools, 23, 158-163.

Giangreco, M., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R., (1993). Exceptional Children, 59, 359-372.

Janney, R. E., Snell, M., Beers, M., & Raynes, M., (1995). Integrating Students With Moderate and Severe Disabilities in to the General Education Classes. Exceptional Children, 61, 425-439.

Kluwin, T. (1993). Cumulative Effects of Mainstreaming on the Achievement of Deaf Adolescents. Exceptional Children, 60, 73-81.

Simpson, R., & Myles, B., (1989). Parent's Mainstreaming Modification Preference for Children With Educable Mental Handicapped Behavior Disorders, And Learning Disabilities. Psychology In The Schools, 26, 292-301

Wang, M., & Walberg, H., (1988). Four Fallacies of Segregationism. Exceptional Children, 55, 128-137.

Winners All (1992): A Call For Inclusive Schools. NASBE Study Group Report.

Ysseldyke, J., Thurlow, M., Algozzine, B., & Nathan, J., (1993). Open Enrollment and Students With Disabilities: Issues, Concerns, Fears, and Anticipated Benefits. Exceptional Children, 59, 390-401.

Ziegler, M., (Summer 1992). Office of Special Education Rehabilitation Services, OSERS.