
Student Work

8-1-1979

A Study of Advantages and Disadvantages of Mainstreamed Hearing Impaired Students in a Regular Public School Classroom

Otis Perry
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Perry, Otis, "A Study of Advantages and Disadvantages of Mainstreamed Hearing Impaired Students in a Regular Public School Classroom" (1979). *Student Work*. 1988.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1988>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

A STUDY OF ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES
OF
MAINSTREAMED HEARING IMPAIRED STUDENTS
IN A
REGULAR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOM

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty
University of Nebraska
at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Otis Perry

August 1979

UMI Number: EP73628

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73628

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

A STUDY OF ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES
OF
MAINSTREAMED HEARING IMPAIRED STUDENTS
IN A
REGULAR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOM

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty
University of Nebraska
at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Otis Perry

August 1979

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of
Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska
at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name

Department

Paul Kennedy

Ed Adm. Sup.

Donald J. Grandgenett

Secondary/Post Secondary

Doreen Kellars

Chairman

7-23-79

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED. | 1 |
| Introduction. | 1 |
| Statement of the problem. | 2 |
| Importance of the study | 2 |
| Limitation of the study | 4 |
| Definitions of terms used | 5 |
| Significance of the study | 6 |
| Procedures | 7 |
| Organization of the study | 8 |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE | 9 |
| III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 28 |
| Introduction. | 28 |
| Validation of the instrument | 29 |
| The sample | 29 |
| The questionnaire | 30 |
| Questionnaire results. | 30 |
| IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 41 |
| Summary | 41 |
| Conclusions | 42 |
| Recommendations. | 46 |
| FOOTNOTES. | 49 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. | 54 |
| APPENDIX | 58 |

TABLE I

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES FOR MAINSTREAMING HEARING IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN REGULAR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOMS. | 31 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On November 29, 1975, President Ford signed into law a multi-billion dollar aid measure to assist states in educating handicapped children. P.L. 94-142 requires that a state must ~~agree to~~ establish a goal of serving all handicapped children between the ages of three and eighteen by September 1, 1978, and children between three and twenty-one by September 1, 1980, in order to qualify for Federal Assistance. The Federal Assistance provided for this program is substantial as it will provide 40% of the excess cost for Special Education. ~~This excess cost reaches its full potential no later than 1982.~~¹

The rights of the handicapped child and his parents are protected by this law. Public Law 94-142 include: an opportunity to examine all relevant records regarding identification evaluation and educational placement of the child; appointment of a parent surrogate in cases where the child is a ward of the state or the natural parents are either unknown or unavailable; evaluation or placement of the child in an educational program and an opportunity to present ^{compliments and} complaints.²

The concept of mainstreaming appears to be largely based upon the philosophy that every child has the right

to an equal educational opportunity that is determined by his basic and individual needs. This concept has come to include the mainstreaming of children with special needs into regular classrooms with an ultimate goal of assimilation. With this goal in mind, the handicapped child is educated in a school and in classes for the non-handicapped and not in a segregated situation. Mainstreaming ensures that all handicapped learners will be exposed to the knowledge and skills which are necessary to lead a functional life in the "everyday" world. In order for this to happen, there are essentially two pre-requisites. First, the educator must be willing to accept the child who is handicapped in the regular classroom and second, the educator must be willing to provide adequately for that child's education.³

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to investigate the teaching techniques for hearing-impaired students who have been mainstreamed in regular public school classrooms to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the academic and social learning processes relating to achievement of the hearing-impaired students.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The effects that dedicated teachers have on the lives of students who are difficult to teach depend heavily upon

their enthusiasm, ingenuity and creativity. A degree of tenacity in continuing to utilize effective techniques and to search for new ones to replace ineffective ones. The statements below are an indication of the importance of this study as related to mainstreaming of the hearing-impaired: Availability of a broad range of co-curricular activities with hearing youth exist in mainstreaming. Co-curricular interaction can increase self-esteem and a feeling of belonging to a greater society than available in the restricted environment. Motivation and reinforcement exist for the development of good speech and speech perception. There should be a reduction in the amount of gesture language initiated by the hearing-impaired student. Regular students should provide normal age appropriate speech, language, and social models. There should be a reduction of the excessive dependence which may have developed between the parents and the hearing-impaired students. Faster academic pacing is available and achievement level expectations are raised. There should be a variety of school courses to meet differing needs and interests.

The special education department of Omaha School District I has established as one of its goals the development of a district-wide program for the mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children. They believe that hearing-impaired children can profit academically and socially by participating in a regular public school program.

The results of this study should help focus attention on the mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children in regular public school classrooms. The evaluation of this special education program utilizing the different schools in district I (as described in Chapter III) may indicate specific problem areas that will warrant further study for the possibility of needed change.

The results of this study should also be of significant value to the various state departments of special education as an indication of the need for a comprehensive evaluation of programs for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children.

This study may prove helpful to laymen and educators who are interested in and responsible for maintaining a well-rounded program of education in the public schools.

Finally, this study will be an aid to those efforts to improve the curriculum and instruction from elementary through senior high school by contributing information to the body of general research being accumulated in Omaha School District I.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY No

This study will be limited to include only those hearing-impaired students who have been placed in regular classroom settings in the metropolitan area of Omaha, School District I.

It should be noted, that the sizable task of examining the status of mainstreaming hearing-impaired children relied

heavily, but not entirely on the questionnaire responses of selected teachers of hearing-impaired children as to their perspectives of the impact on the hearing-impaired children in their classroom.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Mainstreaming This refers to the practice of placing hearing-impaired children in regular classrooms and providing special education services for them in that setting.⁴

Hearing-Impairment This is a generic term indicating a continuum of hearing loss from mild to profound as indicated on an audiogram.⁵

Hearing Aid This is an electroacoustic amplifying device which brings sound more effectively to the individual with a hearing loss.⁶

Itinerant Teacher This refers to a special educator who is functioning as an academic tutor, and providing individual or small group instruction to hearing-impaired children integrated in regular classes who may be located in more than one school within a district or region.⁷

Speech-Reading This is the art of comprehending what is being said without hearing, by observing the movements of the speaker's lips and facial expressions. Also referred to as lip-reading.⁸

P.L. 94-142 For the purpose of this study, public law 94-142 offers an education for handicapped children. It

stipulates that they be educated and that their education be paid for by the local school district, no matter what their handicap. This law gives these students a chance to be reassessed and to be educated in "the least restrictive environment."⁹

Least Restrictive Environment This term refers to an environment which is least restrictive for hearing-impaired children and where they can receive the best education possible for meeting their individual needs.¹⁰

Sign Language This is an orderly system of manual gestures and symbols for communication of thoughts and ideas.¹¹

Resource Room Teacher This is a special educator holding certification as a teacher of the hearing-impaired who provides instruction to hearing-impaired children in a self-contained setting, usually within a regular school, for a portion of the school day.¹²

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Federal and State legislation has played an extremely important role in the education of hearing-impaired students.

This paper will deal with mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children in normal-hearing classrooms on a part-time or full-time basis. Mainstreaming of the hearing-impaired is a very prominent issue in public school education today, and is initiated and supported by various parent

groups, educational administrators and state legislators.¹³

With such a current trend in public school education, the feasibility and quality of instructions which the hearing-impaired may receive as a result of this mainstreaming movement, be very seriously considered. It is hoped that as a result of this investigative study, a series of workshops and inservice sessions will be provided for teachers of hearing-impaired students who have been mainstreamed into their regular classrooms.

PROCEDURES

The initial step in this investigation was to research the advantages and disadvantages for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children into regular classrooms, relating to their academic and social achievements. After a review of literature and research in the field, it was decided that identification of the advantages and disadvantages for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children could best be made through an analysis of School District I current policies and practices in the area of mainstreaming. It was felt that this analysis gave a good overview of the complete mainstreaming program. However, the decision was also made that the most efficient way to elicit the specific information needed was by direct polling of selected teachers of hearing-impaired children by means of a questionnaire, and drawing conclusions and recommendations from the gathered data.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I introduced the topic. A background was structured in order to provide a framework for the research that followed. The problem was stated, the importance of the study was indicated and the limitations were defined. The need and significance of the study were discussed, and a definition of terms used was included.

Chapter II is a review of the related research and literature in the subject area of mainstreaming hearing-impaired children in a public school classroom.

Chapter III is a presentation and analysis of the findings from the teacher interviews and questionnaires, and a discussion of the instruments and treatment used in the process of obtaining data for the study.

Chapter IV will present a summary of the investigation and conclusions based upon the evidence presented, and recommendations for improvement of the mainstreaming program for hearing-impaired children.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The concept of mainstreaming appears to be largely based upon the philosophy that all children have the right to an equal educational opportunity, which in turn is determined by that child's basic and individual needs. This concept has come to include the mainstreaming of children with special needs in the regular classrooms with an ultimate goal of assimilation. With this goal in mind, the hearing-impaired child is educated in a school and in classes for the non-handicapped and not in a segregated situation. Coleman (1975), referred to mainstreaming as the practice of placing handicapped pupils in regular classrooms and providing special education services for them in that setting.¹⁴

Mainstreaming presents a legitimate concern surrounding the placement of the hearing-impaired child in an appropriate environment. To place a hearing-impaired child in a classroom with normal children and to expect normal or even satisfactory growth and development is not completely comprehensible without that environment's being appreciably modified to provide for the child's deviation from normal and for his or her acceptance into it. Also, there must be modifications to meet his or her social needs as well. It should also be mentioned that an abrupt change from a segregated classroom

to total integration could be very dangerous. There needs to be a systematic development of transitional classrooms which are cooperatively developed by appropriate educators and which are evolved as a result of controlled research.¹⁵

Federal and state legislation has played an extremely important role in the education of the deaf. The first legislative act in 1819, allowed for the allocation of certain lands to be sold, so that the income could be used to establish and support the American School for the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut, the first permanent school for the deaf in this country. The Kendall School, which became the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Gallaudet College, was established after federal legislation in 1857.¹⁶

Recently, legislation has played a key role in the attainment of mainstreaming for the hearing-impaired child. Two model state laws which provide the framework for the enactment of legislation affecting all exceptional children at the state level were drafted and published in "State Laws and Education of Handicapped Children: Issues and Recommendations" by the Council for Exceptional Children in 1972. This law was developed as a model to allow all states to view their own policies in terms of a standard which has been determined acceptable for the education of handicapped children.¹⁷ Specifically, there have been several cases which have directly affected the mainstreaming movement. One is that of the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded

Children vs. State Board of Education, a landmark case in education for the hearing-impaired. Another is the Mills vs. the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. Essentially, these two cases resulted in decisions assuring the hearing-impaired child's right to a mainstream education, regardless of expense and in as typical and as normal a school setting as possible.¹⁸

Attorney Herbert P. Feibelman (1975), stated in a paper presented at the Alexander Graham Bell Association National Convention in Atlanta, Georgia: "The principle has been clearly established that public education must be provided in the least restrictive environment, designed to maximize the abilities of the child, and with a view toward normalization."¹⁹

An outgrowth of the above mentioned cases (and others), and a very recent legislative action (P.L. 94-142), which in fact, is not yet fully implemented. P.L. 94-142 was enacted on November 29, 1975, and most of its amendments became effective October 1, 1977. Public Law 94-142 contains extensive amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act, including provisions which are designed to assure that all handicapped children have available to them free appropriate public education, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected, to assist states and localities to provide for the education of handicapped children, and to assess and assure the effectiveness

of efforts to educate such children.²⁰

Essentially for the first time, the Federal Government will be (substantially and consistently) subsidizing education for each handicapped child, over a long period of time. Also, P.L. 94-142 attempts to "play down" or preclude the labeling of handicapped children in order to obtain the largest possible federal contribution.²¹

P.L. 94-142 also mandates that all handicapped children be served by federal funding according to predetermined priorities which are 1) "unserved" children and 2) inadequately served children who are severely handicapped; all children between the ages of three to twenty-one, being beneficiaries. Those between three and eighteen must be provided with a free and appropriate education by September 1, 1978, and ages three to twenty-one by September 1, 1980.²²

The parents or guardian in consultation with the educator must develop an individualized written education program for each child which should be reviewed and revised as necessary, at least once a year. There is a wide variety of attitudes towards this new law. Many teachers in secondary schools are afraid that the passing of this law will mean many handicapped children will suddenly be enrolled in their classes with such teachers having little knowledge or experience in working with handicapped children. However, it is the feeling of many other educators that this will allow them to work toward individualization in

educating the handicapped child and that "the least restrictive environment" does not necessarily mean the regular classroom. It is the environment which is least restrictive for that child and where he or she can receive the best education possible for meeting his or her individual needs.²³

There is no doubt that all educators feel that an opportunity to receive the benefits of an equal education is a right of the handicapped child. Provision of such an education can vary immensely from regular classes, special classes, self-contained schools, state residential schools, etc. However, research on current educational trends seems to indicate that individualization within a regular classroom provides greatest benefit for the hearing-impaired child.²⁴ Some of these trends are: 1) Assuring the rights of the child to an educational program as soon as the diagnosis of a handicapping condition is established and without cost to the family, 2) Identification of the public school as the logical and accountable fiscal agency to coordinate a program for hearing-impaired children, 3) Adherence to the principle of normalization throughout the educational years, as far as reasonable, 4) A shift of emphasis from a medical to an educational model of intervention by the schools, 5) A systematic program of sequential auditory training activities offered throughout the school years, based on individually prescriptive behavioral objectives and 6) The neighborhood public school to initiate and coordinate the support ser-

vices subsystem required by hearing-impaired children who are integrated.²⁵

The rationale then for integrating a hearing-impaired child into the regular classroom stems from the following definition of mainstreaming: "education of the hearing-impaired child in as near normal an educational environment as is possible."²⁶

It must be remembered that partial or full-time integration in regular classes is not beneficial for every hearing impaired child. A serious look at the individual child's most basic educational needs is important for appropriate placement and modification of the educational environment.

The position of the parent concerning mainstreaming is a very dynamic one. Parents are often the ones to be most insistent that their child be mainstreamed.²⁷ Parents may panic at their realization of having a hearing-impaired child. Often, their insistence on the mainstreaming of their child is based upon a belief that this will make the child "normal" or "like everyone else."²⁸ It is this insistence by the parents that makes one realize that parents have rights too. Often, the only alternative to mainstreaming is institutional placement. As proposed by W. H. Northcott, parents have the right to an intact family whereby a public school program for their hearing-impaired child is made available, permitting home care and active parent-school interaction.²⁹ It is the responsibility of the

parents once their hearing-impaired child is mainstreamed, to maintain roles as language teachers and academic tutors in order for the child to progress in his educational environment.³⁰

The above discussion immediately poses several problems for those involved in mainstreaming the hearing-impaired child when considering the quality of education the child may receive. There is the problem of assessing the hearing-impaired child so as to know where he or she would be appropriately placed educationally. One needs to consider the adjustment problems the hearing-impaired child could experience with his or her disability while being mainstreamed. Also, it is important to know those parameters necessary for successful mainstreaming. Various management programs, specifically audiologic management, would need to be developed and / or current ones should be reconsidered. Also, one would need to consider the psycho-school functioning of the mainstreamed child, his or her social adequacy, the development of his self-concept and educational skills.³¹

When considering mainstreaming, it is a challenge to see that the laws are not violated, that the child's right to an education is as near normal an educational environment as possible, and the parents' rights to an intact family are respected.

Even more basically, a rationale for mainstreaming the hearing-impaired child is to encourage that child to use his

or her residual hearing and if at all possible, to listen to the natural speech and language of his or her peers. It is only logical that if the hearing-impaired child is placed in an environment where everyone else speaks, he or she will be motivated to speak as well. Furthermore, the hearing-impaired children will be exposed to more challenging concepts which will help in their conceptual development, they will also learn to accept mainstreaming and hopefully will become more socially accepted by the norm.³²

The whole idea of mainstreaming is very appealing to parents of hearing-impaired children, as well as proponents of integration of the prelingually deaf child. However, many assumptions concerning the handicapped child's achievements are made without realizing that there are "necessities" for bringing about the desired objectives. The necessities include the consideration of the handicapping condition in terms of severity and the ratio of incidence in the population when determining appropriate educational programs for the hearing-impaired. Once a program is established, it is essential to provide a quality education where the deaf child has the opportunity to develop his or her maximum potential. Again, one must analyze the nature and effects of the deafness and the competencies needed by the teacher in terms of communication modes and ability to teach subject matter.³³

The decision to place a profoundly hearing-impaired

child directly in a highly competitive normal classroom may be damaging emotionally, communicatively and educationally to the hearing-impaired child, due to repeated rejection and failure, if the above factors are not considered.³⁴ It is the opinion of Dr. Richard Brill that proponents of mainstreaming, who appear to be more concerned with a format for education which seems to serve a particular philosophical position, need to review their position and instead, provide the opportunity for a truly quality education for every deaf child. Otherwise, it is probable that many hearing-impaired children will suffer irreparable harm as a result of being placed in the mainstream where their needs will not be met, rather than being placed in a program that can provide a quality education.³⁵

There are various approaches to mainstreaming, the only thing being different among them, is the degree of interaction that takes place between the hearing and the hearing-impaired. Bitter, in 1973, described three approaches to mainstreaming that he found most frequently being utilized: 1) Standard mainstreaming where the hearing-impaired child essentially spends most of his day within a regular classroom, being taught by a regular classroom teacher. German termed this "full-time integration" where the hearing-impaired child received special help only when necessary.³⁶ McCay Vernon and Hugh Prickett, at Western Maryland College, referred to traditional mainstreaming as simply the giving of

hearing aids to the hearing-impaired child and then seating him at the front of a regular classroom with hearing children. They feel that the deaf child is seen by a resource teacher anywhere from once a month to one or two periods a day and that realistically, the child is comprehending at the most 5-20% of what the teacher says. Compound that with at least three to five years delay in academic achievement compared to hearing classmates, and the result is deaf children who read at second or third grade levels who vegetate all day in junior high and high school classes with hearing children.³⁷

2) Cross-mainstreaming according to Bitter, evolves from a team-teaching concept where the regular classroom teacher, the teacher of the hearing-impaired and the resource teacher exchange students throughout various class periods during the day so that while the regular classroom teacher instructs some hearing-impaired children with her hearing children, the teacher of the hearing-impaired is also instructing some hearing children with her deaf children.³⁸

3) Reverse mainstreaming, as discussed by Bitter, refers to the strategy where one or more hearing children are brought into the hearing-impaired students' classroom for instruction in just one or two periods for the day.

Vernon and Prickett discuss "partial integration" as mainstreaming for certain periods only, usually art, lunch, recess, etc., and then remain in self-contained or segregated

classes for the rest of the day. It is their feeling again, that although this is better than the full-time integration, the deaf children still are not experiencing positive interaction with hearing children which results in a "quality" education.³⁹

German divides partial or part-time integration into several subdivisions: a) "traditional", where the child is integrated only for subjects he or she can handle, b) "individual nonacademic" where the child is individually integrated into specific nonacademic classes on specific days, c) "group nonacademic" where the child is integrated with some of his hearing-impaired peers into nonacademic classes, d) "informal" where because of a close working relationship between the two teachers, the hearing-impaired child is spontaneously integrated for short term projects and e) "reverse" where, like Bitter described, the hearing children are brought into the classroom of the hearing-impaired for one or two periods during the day.⁴⁰

All of these approaches have been used and in some areas are still being used today. However, whether or not these approaches are satisfactorily meeting each child's individual needs in providing the best possible education needs to be examined. Vernon and Prickett both feel that mainstreaming, as it is being used today, for the most part is grossly inappropriate to the needs of hearing-impaired students.⁴¹

There are several suggested factors that need to be considered before mainstreaming a hearing-impaired child, as these may ultimately affect the success of the child's placement in a regular classroom. The first factor is the age of the child. It is the feeling of O'Connor that a hearing-impaired child is essentially not mature enough to meet the challenge of mainstreaming until age eight or nine and then only if all other factors are favorable. The second factor is the communication ability of the child. The hearing impaired child who is unable to use his language effectively for communicating with his hearing peers is not ready to be mainstreamed. O'Connor believes that the hearing-impaired child should be able to communicate expressively through speech and writing and receptively through reading and lip-reading. The third factor is intelligence of the child. This, according to O'Connor, is a very critical factor for the child's success in a regular classroom. The hearing-impaired child should have average or better intelligence. The fourth factor is the personality of the child. It is extremely important in that the child must be prepared for some rejection and for failure, teasing from classmates and unintended neglect from the teacher. Sensitive and timid hearing-impaired children may find themselves more segregated in a regular classroom than in a self-contained classroom, if they do not have self-confidence and the aggressiveness to compete with hearing peers.⁴²

It needs to be mentioned that the parents play a very important role in determining the success of the mainstream placement of their deaf child. How well the parents are oriented to their child's handicap and their willingness to actively help and guide their child during his educational experience will be a significant factor concerning the success of the child's integration and assimilation into the regular classroom. The parents who reinforce vocabulary and concepts encountered in school when the child is at home and who encourage outside activities and hobbies, will be an asset to their child, to his school program and to the success of his mainstreaming situation. The characteristics which should be observable in a well adjusted hearing-impaired child who is in a regular classroom are those of independence and persistence. He or she should be adaptable and flexible to various situations and should be socially mature as well as academically competitive.⁴³

Not every hearing-impaired child who is a candidate for mainstreaming, is best served by an initial mainstream placement early in the child's life. The child must possess the necessary entry level skills for each class placement.

It has been determined by W. H. Northcott, that when these skills are present, there are certain times when it becomes natural to mainstream the hearing-impaired child. The earliest time at which to mainstream the hearing-impaired child is kindergarten or first grade. This may be on either

a part-time or full-time basis. Next, mainstreaming could take place at the third or fourth grade level since it is at this age that the child usually has developed or is developing a large number of his reading and other academic skills. Socially, he or she is also more easily assimilated at this age level. The hearing-impaired child may be mainstreamed in his or her junior high school years.⁴⁴

Even though the hearing-impaired child qualifies under all of the parameters for a successful mainstream placement, it is a very real possibility that some of these children could be better educated by an alternative placement. Yet, parents who feel guilty because their deaf child is not mainstreamed, may pressure the professional into an inappropriate or premature placement of the child in a mainstreamed setting. This type of placement could be more damaging for the hearing-impaired child than one realizes, as the child may fail to develop communicative, academic, and social competence. He may also experience failure, frustration and isolation, resulting in the development of a poor self-concept, emotional problems, academic difficulties and low grades. When this is seen the hearing-impaired child should be transferred from his educational mainstreamed setting to a more appropriate educational setting for the purpose of meeting this child's needs.⁴⁵

The hearing-impaired child who is placed in a regular classroom situation is faced with adjusting to a whole new

environment. The child will need to adjust not only psychologically and socially, but academically as well. There are many learning problems which the hearing-impaired child needs to overcome. One, which is most basic, is that of his or her language deficit. Typical of hearing-impaired children, language acquisition is one of the most critical problems they will initially face in mainstreamed situations. Also, communication presents a problem unless the hearing-impaired child is proficient in expressive (speech and writing) skills or unless all those in contact with him or her can successfully communicate using a manual sign system. Comprehension of what is being said by others in the classroom will depend on whether or not the hearing-impaired child can clearly see the speaker's face so that he or she can lip-read, (if they are able to lip-read) as well as the ability of the child to receive and sort out acoustic stimuli. The hearing-impaired child must also adjust eventually to the fact that he or she will probably not progress at the same rate as the hearing child which may contribute to some of the segregation or isolation they may experience from hearing peers.

It is also important to look at psychological and social implications of mainstreaming. The reaction of their peers, including parents and siblings, to the hearing-impaired children's disabilities influence their ultimate adjustment. Parents play a key role in the psycho-social

*

adjustment of the hearing-impaired child, the parents' ability to accept the handicap of their child and to effectively handle their feelings will determine how the child grows socially, emotionally and psychologically.⁴⁶

The social status of the hearing-impaired in the regular classroom has been a subject of two recent studies which concluded that hearing-impaired children are as socially accepted as their normally hearing peers in estimating their own social status. (Kennedy and Bruininks, 1974, Kennedy, Northcott, McCauley and Williams, 1976).⁴⁷

Audiologically, one must consider the use of a hearing aid within the regular classroom, room acoustics, and the possibility of fluctuating hearing ability from day to day, before mainstreaming the hearing-impaired child. Because hearing aides magnify all sounds equally, it is logical that a child who wears a hearing aid would have considerably more trouble in a noisy classroom than a normal hearing child. Matkin and Crum (1976) feel that a hearing-impaired child with amplification may have to resort to a visual modality for learning due to the "overloading" of the auditory channel in a classroom with poor acoustics. It was further implied that the hearing-impaired child who is considered a candidate for mainstreaming is usually a successful hearing aid user with good auditory learning skills, and yet it is this same child who is placed in an environment detrimental to auditory learning.⁴⁸

For the teacher who is faced with a hearing-impaired child, and who is not familiar with the above mentioned factors, the hearing-impaired child may appear to be inattentive or misbehaving. It is essential that any teacher who faces the possibility of working with a child who is hearing-impaired and integrated into his or her classroom, be sufficiently prepared for the situation. In addition to knowing the general learning processes of the normal hearing child, the regular teacher must develop competencies to teach the deaf child to overcome his or her communication handicap. Not only must the regular teacher be concerned with expressive communication in the form of writing, speech and manual communication, but also receptive communication (reading the written form, speech-reading the voiced form, and reading manual communication) is a concern of the regular teacher as well.⁴⁹

The regular teacher must also be prepared to teach all subjects (content material and incidental learning) to the child, realizing that he or she is largely responsible for the deaf child's total input.

It is important that the regular teacher be able to devote more time to individualized instruction. This may require a teacher's aide to help with group activities especially. Also, it is important for the teacher to utilize many visual aids to maximize input for the hearing-impaired child. Gildston lists several "do's" and "don'ts" for the

regular teacher to help the children understand more adequately via speechreading as well as via hearing and to help them communicate more adequately through speech.⁵⁰

A model program, in Newark, Delaware, called the Holcomb Plan, places the deaf child in an integrated setting only if the hearing-impaired child has a tutor-interpreter who translates what the teacher is saying into sign language. The tutor-interpreter is also helpful in that he or she tutors both the hearing and hearing-impaired when it is appropriate. In this way, the hearing-impaired child has access to all the help he needs to maximize his educational learning and is not groping to understand what the teacher is saying.⁵¹ In the Holcomb Plan, the hearing children are given the opportunity to learn sign language if they would like to. Those that do learn, help to build meaningful relationships between themselves and the hearing-impaired children. What this plan is demonstrating, is that the hearing children must make efforts as well in order for a successful mainstream to occur.⁵²

There is a variety of other programs which are experimenting with mainstreaming situations where researchers are hoping to develop systematic transitional mainstream programs for the hearing-impaired children, ultimately providing the best education possible for them.

Finally, there are countless rationales for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children. It is a worthy and legitimate

consideration, provided it places the children in a learning environment, where they can receive the best education possible, in meeting their individual needs.⁵³

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

A questionnaire of thirteen questions to identify the advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming hearing-impaired children in regular school classrooms was prepared.

The questions were formulated and established as a result of visiting with fellow educators, surveying research, and related readings about mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children.

The first question was asked in order to determine the number of hearing-impaired children participating in regular school programs.

The second question was asked in order to determine unit levels of hearing-impaired children participating in regular school programs.

The third question was asked in order to identify the courses offered to the hearing-impaired children.

Question fourteen was asked in order to secure recommendations for improving the existing program for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children. Ten of the fourteen questions asked were to be answered with a "yes", "no", or "neutral" response. A cover letter and questionnaire were sent to fifty selected teachers participating in the

Omaha School District I mainstreaming program for the hearing-impaired. The questionnaires were returned and tabulated.

Validation Of The Instrument

The questionnaire was prepared by a supervisor of speech therapy and accoustically handicapped, a special resource consultant, and the investigator. It was sent by the investigator to Dr. Joseph Gaughan, Coordinator, Department of Special Education Services, Omaha School District I, for suggestions or any improvements on clarity of questions, relevance of the questions for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children in regular classrooms, and the establishment of an average time factor needed in filling out the instrument. His suggestions were in the final form. Dr. Gaughan's participation gave authorization for the study and also gave it credence. A copy of this instrument appears in Appendix A.

The Sample

The faculty of the special education department of Omaha School District I indicated that there were several organizational plans for mainstreaming. The review of current literature and statements of accepted authorities resulted in a decision to include in this study only hearing-impaired children involved in the mainstreaming program. The procedures described above resulted in obtaining a list which

contained the names and locations of thirty schools.

The Questionnaire

The first mailing of the printed instrument was done February 28, 1979. One copy of the instrument was mailed to fifty selected teachers of elementary through senior high schools in Omaha School District I. The original mailing consisted of a cover letter, the questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed returned envelope.

On March 16, 1979, two weeks after the first mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to the teachers who had not yet responded. A sample of the letter can be found in Appendix C. The survey was completed on March 31, 1979.

Questionnaire Results

Forty-three of the fifty teachers responded to the initial cover letter and questionnaire sent to them concerning mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children. Follow-up letters were sent to seven of the fifty teachers who did not return the questionnaire within two weeks. After this additional communication, all seven teachers responded to the questionnaire. In all, a total of fifty teachers participated in the study.

Statistical information gathered as a result of the questionnaire can be found in Table I. Additional information was asked for in some questions and the responses to

those questions are presented after Table I.

TABLE I

RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT
THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES FOR
MAINSTREAMING HEARING-IMPAIRED STUDENTS
IN REGULAR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOMS

| Questions | Total Percent Of Responses | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Total number of hearing-impaired students involved in this study. | 53% | Girls | |
| | 47% | Boys | |
| Grade levels of hearing-impaired students enrolled in regular classrooms. | 16% | Elementary | |
| | 22% | Junior High | |
| | 5% | Senior High | |
| Should hearing-impaired students be mainstreamed in regular classrooms? | YES 21% | NO 2% | NEUTRAL 3% |
| Have your teaching techniques been an effective learning process for the hearing-impaired students? | 21% | 2% | 3% |
| Have the hearing-impaired students benefitted socially from their integration in the regular classroom? | 43% | 2% | 2% |
| Have you observed any overt academic achievements, on the parts of the hearing-impaired students, that you would consider a direct result of their integration in the regular classroom? | 16% | 6% | 4% |
| Did the hearing-impaired students want to be mainstreamed in a regular classroom? | 20% | 1% | 5% |

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

| | YES | NO | NEUTRAL |
|---|-----|-----|---------|
| Is the school's curriculum designed for hearing-impaired students? | 4% | 15% | 9% |
| Do your hearing-impaired students have opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities? | 22% | 3% | 1% |
| Have you had any parent-teacher conferences, concerning your hearing-impaired students? | 22% | 4% | 0% |
| Do your hearing-impaired students have any problems relating to you as a regular classroom teacher? | 3% | 13% | 10% |
| Did you as a teacher set specific goals for your hearing-impaired students to achieve both socially and academically? | 20% | 9% | 0% |

Responses to question three showed there is a wide range of subjects being taught to hearing-impaired children in our regular public school classrooms. The subjects that were listed for elementary through senior high school are: Language, Reading, Spelling, Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education, Audiovisual Education, Math, Speech-Reading, Auditory Training, English and Language Arts.

Question four asked whether or not the hearing-impaired students should be mainstreamed in regular classrooms. Twenty-one percent of the teachers responded that they felt the hearing-impaired students should be mainstreamed with regular students. Two percent of the teachers responded that the hearing-impaired students should not be mainstreamed.

Three percent of the teachers responded with a non-applicable answer. One of the teachers who responded with a non-applicable answer commented that the answer to this question was totally dependent on the hearing-impaired students' determination and effort.

Twenty-one percent of the teachers said they believed that hearing-impaired children should attend public schools in regular classes from the earliest years and these students, they said, should be on the regular class rolls. Any special education, they need, such as auditory training and language development should be provided in their regular classes. The hearing-impaired student should leave class, only under very exceptional circumstances, and then only for short periods of special instruction during the school day.

Question five asked teachers if they felt that their teaching techniques were an effective learning process for hearing-impaired students. Ninety-one percent of the teachers surveyed, stated that they were using effective teaching techniques for all of their students, regardless of their handicap. Sixty percent of the teachers implied that hearing-impaired students should begin their formal education by spending all or most of their time in special programs conducted by special educators. These teachers, also, implied that the goal of the special educators should be to mainstream the hearing-impaired students into regular classes in a series of steps, and provide individualized instructions for

each student in order to maximize success in various curricular areas. One of the advantages, therefore, of beginning mainstreaming in the earliest years, is that the hearing-impaired student, whether educationally deaf or hard of hearing, has predominantly hearing students as models and can develop educationally as rapidly as individual differences will allow.

In response to question number six, twenty-two percent of the teachers indicated that hearing-impaired students usually have few problems getting along socially. Ten percent of the teachers stated that all of their hearing-impaired students ask them personal questions concerning how to handle their sexual feelings, smoking, drugs, dating, social differences, politics, the economy and etc. A junior high teacher commented that peer acceptance is very important at the junior high level. This teacher also stated that students who have accepted their hearing aids eagerly in elementary school suddenly come to school without them. They are often afraid that their classmates will know that they are hard of hearing. Another junior high teacher commented that students with moderate losses, frequently do not want to associate with students with severe losses, who may appear to their hearing peers to be more handicapped. A senior high teacher commented that junior high school is usually the most difficult time period for the hearing-impaired students. By the time they reach senior high school many of

these same students are more secure and accept their losses more gracefully. This teacher indicated that senior high is usually easier academically since the students have more of a choice over which subjects they take.

Question seven asked if teachers had observed any overt academic achievements on the part of mainstreamed hearing-impaired students. Sixteen percent of the teachers who answered, "yes", indicated that the academic achievement of hearing-impaired students can best be predicted in the same way that one predicts success for regular students. The two best predictors are past performance and intelligence tests according to the thirty-one teachers who answered with a "yes" response.

Question eight asked whether or not the hearing-impaired students preferred to be mainstreamed in a regular classroom. Twenty percent of the fifty teachers surveyed indicated that their hearing-impaired students wanted to be mainstreamed. They also stated that hearing-impaired students are often able to perform well in an academic setting, but lack the self-confidence to ask to be placed in regular classes.

Question nine asked if the school's curriculum were designed for hearing-impaired students. Twenty percent of the teachers responded that the school's curriculum was designed for regular students but the course work is flexible enough to accommodate hearing-impaired students. Eleven

percent of the teachers reported that in their opinion, the special education services for hearing-impaired students has not yet developed procedures for assuring that all such youngsters reach achievement equal to hearing children of the same age and intelligence.

Question ten asked if the hearing-impaired students had any opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities. Twenty-two percent of the teachers suggested that academic success should not be the primary objective in mainstreaming a hearing-impaired student. These teachers stated that the hearing-impaired students should become involved in the total school program. Fifty percent of the high school teachers commented that their school has a variety of extra-curricular activities ranging from athletics to literary clubs. Some extra-curricular activities are competitive and require trying out. During the past three years, five hearing-impaired girls have tried out for the school's cheerleading group, and three of them have become members. Twenty percent of the high school teachers listed the following extra-curriculars: Varsity football, swimming, track, cross country, wrestling, baseball, golf, girls' tennis, home economics club, chess club, math club, debate club, school newspaper and annual year book.

Question eleven is focused on parent-teacher conferences of hearing-impaired students. Twenty-two percent of the teachers indicated that at least twice a year a con-

ference which involves the school principal, the special resource teacher, classroom teacher and parents, is held for the purpose of reviewing the progress of the hearing-impaired students.

Question twelve asked if hearing-impaired students have problems relating to regular classroom teachers. Twelve percent of the teachers said that they had no problem relating to their hearing-impaired students. Ten percent of the teachers responded with a non-applicable answer, and three percent of the teachers stated that they are having certain kinds of problems relating to their hearing-impaired students.

Question thirteen asked if teachers set specific goals for their hearing-impaired students to achieve, both socially and academically. Respondents indicated that ninety percent of the teachers set goals. This comment by a teacher who has three different hearing-impaired students in various classes ranging from fifteen to twenty enrollment is representative of the responses. "It takes a little longer and a little more of my attention at the start of a project to get matters clearly understood. But they appear to make up for that by working just a little harder than the average student does. I enjoy them and they seem to enjoy me. Moreover, they are wonderful examples for the rest of the students on how striving and perseverance can overcome a handicap. And after the term is underway a while there are days that I forget there are hearing-impaired students in my classroom".

Question thirteen asked for suggestions on how to improve the teaching techniques of teachers for mainstreamed hearing-impaired students. Twenty-five percent of the elementary hearing-impaired teachers commented that reading is an important part of a hearing-impaired child's learning. Therefore, it is to his or her advantage to be exposed to it at a very early age. These teachers also commented that parents may stimulate a young child's interest by reading aloud to him in the evenings or before bedtime, buying at least one wholesome book or comic book appropriate for his age level every week, enrolling him in the library children's hour, or taking him to the library each week for an hour or so.

One junior high hearing-impaired teacher indicated that not all regular class students can be counted upon to treat the rest of their classmates with respect and consideration. She stated that the introduction of a new student to an already formed class tends to create tension among existing social units in the class. Therefore, the student with a hearing-impairment needs to be readied for such a situation. She suggested that teachers, special and regular, prepare the regular class for the new hearing-impaired student.

One high school hearing-impaired teacher indicated a concern for his hearing-impaired students development and maturation. This particular teacher suggested that all high school hearing-impaired teachers ask themselves the

following questions:

Is there a more effective way in which we can involve the young hearing-impaired child in active exploration of his or her role in interpersonal relationships?

Can we assist them in sharpening their perceptions of their own reactions and of those of others?

Can we help them to evaluate their assets and liabilities objectively and to set realistic goals?

Have teachers assisted in providing meeting places and organizations in which they can interact socially with other deaf and hearing peers from the community at large, so that they are not confined to school associates?

Have teachers aided hearing-impaired students in understanding the communication problems with which they must live, to accept them, and to compensate for them efficiently and effectively?

Have teachers helped hearing-impaired students develop a variety of socially acceptable ways of expressing emotion, of releasing frustration, of responding to social and emotional pressures?

This same high school teacher stated that these were only a few of the questions which should be asked and answered by all involved in working with hearing-impaired students. Progress has been made in many aspects of the teaching of communication skills, academic and vocational subjects to our hearing-impaired students. But, now is the

time to focus a part of our attention on the development of the independent, responsible, mature hearing-impaired teenager. The transition from child to adult is not easy at best. Perhaps, by using all our resources wisely we can help our hearing-impaired students to minimize the trauma with which they shed the cocoon of childhood.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

This study has focused upon Omaha Public School District I, in an effort to collect data concerning the advantages and disadvantages for mainstreaming hearing-impaired children in a regular public school classroom. A review of available literature was scrutinized and a questionnaire survey was sent to a selected number of teachers of hearing-impaired children in order to substantiate the data collected in the actual study of the school district.

In chapter I the problem was presented, purposes were stated, and terms were defined. It was cited in this chapter that this particular study would be confined to a review of available literature and a collection of data from Omaha Public School District I as well as data from the questionnaire survey.

The survey of literature in chapter II described the historical development of special education as it pertained to programs for the hearing-impaired. Chapter II also described the existing status of the Omaha Public School District's program as related to mainstreaming of hearing-impaired children in regular public school classrooms.

Chapter II also detailed minimum standards for efficient school district operation in a modern, technological and constantly changing society.

Chapter III described an analysis of the influence of hearing-impairment and its effects on public school education, financial support, curriculum, teaching techniques, social and academic achievements, parental concerns, personnel and building conditions in the school district.

The writer hoped that this investigation would prove to be of some significance in improving the teaching techniques and identifying the advantages and disadvantages for teaching hearing-impaired children in regular public school classrooms.

II. CONCLUSIONS

This study yielded evidence which appeared to support the following conclusions as indicated by the questionnaire survey and interviews of teachers of hearing-impaired children.

An examination of the findings in this study has led to the following conclusions:

1. This study indicated that hearing-impaired students are mainstreamed successfully in a wide array of schools in Omaha School District I. Partially or fully, it is carried out under different con-

ditions, ranging from system-wide endeavors with extensive professional and paraprofessional support services, to instances of a plan for a single hearing-impaired child, the regular classroom teachers and principal of one school, a helpful supervisor, and the child's parents.

2. In a number of the schools in Omaha School District I, the special education program directors recognize clearly that the standards of quality they desire, have not been attained. In all cases, however, the focus and the thrust are on assuring that the hearing-impaired child obtains high quality special education in the context of regular schooling.
3. Hearing-impaired pupils are scheduled into regular classes individually, after review by all personnel concerned, special education department, resource teacher, regular classroom teacher, parents and school principal. Regular class teachers, with very few exceptions, consider hearing-impaired students to be "theirs" as much as any other pupils.
4. Boys and girls with hearing-impairments take part in intramural and interscholastic athletics.
5. Omaha School District I maintains a varied curri-

culum, making a wider selection of courses available to the hearing-impaired students.

6. This study revealed that Omaha School District I has satisfactorily evaluated the quality of mainstreamed hearing-impaired student performance in the student activity program and that student participation in activity clubs varied in relation to school populations.

The above conclusions could be labelled as advantages for mainstreamed hearing-impaired children in Omaha School District I.

The following conclusions are identified as disadvantages for mainstreamed hearing-impaired children in Omaha School District I:

1. Assigning hearing-impaired children to an already full regular classroom causes problems for the teacher who attempts to individualize instruction.
2. Regular classrooms do not have appropriate equipment for a resource room, (listening equipment and audio-visual equipment needed by hearing-impaired students).
3. Several teachers indicated that they were not as knowledgeable about hearing-impairments as they would like to be and therefore are having some communication problems.
4. The noise level in a regular classroom exceeds that

of a special education classroom and causes hearing aids to over amplify.

5. A number of hearing-impaired teachers did not satisfactorily complete their inservice training covering procedures, observations, and practical experience.
6. The study indicated that there were not enough supplementary pictures, diagrams and other instructional materials which have been developed especially for use in teaching hearing-impaired children.
7. Hearing-impaired students cannot take adequate notes while they watch the faces of their teachers and fellow students.

The frequency and the nature of the disadvantages as opposed to the advantages cause this writer to make these final conclusions:

1. There is an advantage for hearing-impaired students who are mainstreamed into regular classes, where the entire staff welcomes the program and contributes to its continuing success in every possible way.
2. Mainstreamed hearing-impaired students have access to a fine school library and the supervision of a library teacher. There is a well-equipped gymnasium, which affords an opportunity for the

hearing-impaired children to take part in team sports along with hearing classmates.

3. Hearing-impaired students have the opportunity to participate in the music and drama departments, and families can experience the joy of having their hearing-impaired children perform in the chorus, orchestra and school plays.
4. Hearing-impaired students have the advantage of being included in reading enrichment programs under the tutelage of a reading specialist. The art program helps develop personal confidence, by working on their own projects and entering district competitions along with hearing classmates.

All of the above encounters with different people, possible only in a regular school situation, provide opportunities for the child to speechread and communicate freely in a lively and interesting environment.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study may be generalized only to Omaha School District I schools that meet the sampling requirements used in this study. The results previously described and the limitations thus set warrant the following recommendations:

1. Hearing-impaired students should be mainstreamed as soon as they are ready for placement, if a suitable regular class and specialist support is available.
2. Parents have a vital role to fill and must be actively involved in the hearing-impaired student's education at all levels.
3. All educational placements should be considered tentative with monitoring of each placement by resource consultants.
4. Regular class enrollment needs to be reduced in schools which provide a mainstreamed alternative in order to more effectively accommodate hearing-impaired children.
5. Inservice education programs must be implemented for teachers of the hearing-impaired who have not been trained as resource specialists but will be expected to assume such a role.
6. Continuing research on the effects of mainstreaming on the child's total development is needed.
7. Mainstreaming is both a process and an educational goal. It is not an educational panacea and educational alternatives must be provided in a service continuum.
8. The parents of hearing-impaired children must be supportive and interested in enrolling their

children in a mainstream program.

9. Mainstreaming should not be limited to mildly or moderately hearing-impaired children.
10. Teachers of hearing-impaired students should have ample opportunity early in any course to request assistance or change of course.
11. Install flashing lights for alarms and take other reasonable measures to adapt the school and facilities for full use by hearing-impaired students.
12. Avoid hearing-impaired students rooming together.
This is advisable both for security and safety reasons and for reasons of social development.
13. Hearing-impaired children should not be separated or excluded from children in regular public schools, unless there is a severe problem that can be solved only by a temporary separation.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

¹Richard J. Dowling, "An Outline and Explanation of Provisions of P.L. 94-142." Governmental Affairs Department, (1976), p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 4.

³Patricia Coleman, "A Severely Hearing-Impaired Child in the Mainstream." Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 8, No. 1, (November, 1975), p. 7.

⁴Winifred H. Northcott, The Hearing-Impaired Child In A Regular Classroom, Washington, D.C.: (The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc., 1973), p. 280.

⁵Ibid., p. 279.

⁶Ibid., p. 279.

⁷Ibid., p. 280.

⁸Ibid., p. 281.

⁹Dowling, "An Outline and Explanation of the Provisions of P.L. 94-142," p. 6.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹Northcott, The Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom, p. 281.

¹²Ibid., p. 280.

¹³Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁴Coleman, "A Severely Hearing-Impaired Child in the Mainstream," p. 7.

¹⁵Jerry D. Chaffin, "Will the Real Mainstreaming Program Stand Up?" Focus On Exceptional Children, VI (October, 1974), p. 2.

¹⁶Richard G. Brill, The Education of the Deaf, (Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Press, 1974), pp. 57-81.

¹⁷Gary W. Nix, Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1976), p. 2.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 2-35

¹⁹Ibid., p. 36.

²⁰Department of Health, Education, Education, and Welfare, Proposed Rules for Education of Handicapped Children and Incentive Grants Program, (P.L. 94-142); Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 252, December 30, 1976.

²¹Ibid, p. 9.

²²Ibid, p. 11.

²³Dowling, "An Outline and Explanation of the Provisions of P.L. 94-142," p. 12.

²⁴Ibid, p. 13.

²⁵Northcott, Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom, pp. 3-5.

²⁶Perry T. Lesslie, "A Rationale for a Mainstream Education for the Hearing-Impaired," Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1976), p. 24.

²⁷Helen R. Golf, "Mainstreaming: Sink or Swim," Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1976), p. 177.

²⁸Ibid., p. 177.

²⁹W. H. Northcott, "Mainstreaming the Preprimary Hearing-Impaired Child," Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1976), p. 113.

³⁰Golf, "Mainstreaming: Sink or Swim," Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, p. 178.

³¹Nix, Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, pp. 3-8.

³²Marian Ernest and Doreen Pollack, "Learning to Listen in an Integrated Preschool," The Volta Review, Vol. 75, No. 6, (September, 1973), pp. 359-367.

³³Richard G. Brill, "Mainstreaming: Format or Quality?," Audiology and Hearing Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, (April/May, 1976), pp. 13-15.

³⁴Ibid., p. 16.

³⁵Ibid., p. 17.

³⁶Lois Bell German, "Inservice Training: Mini-Model," in The Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom: Pre-school, Elementary and Secondary Years, ed. by W. H. Northcott, p. 115.

³⁷McCay Vernon and Hugh Prickett, "Mainstreaming: Issues and a Model Plan," Audiology and Hearing Education, Vol. 2, No. 2, (February/March, 1976).

³⁸Bitter, "Educational Expediency/Educational Integrity," in Mainstream Education For Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, ed. by Gary W. Nix, p. 13.

³⁹Vernon and Prickett, "Mainstreaming: Issues and a Model Plan," p. 6.

⁴⁰Lois Bell German, "Inservice Training: Mini-Model," in Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom, ed. by Northcott, p. 116.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 10.

⁴²Clarence D. O'Connor, The Integration of the Deaf in Schools for the Normally Hearing, "A Handbook of Readings in Education of the deaf, (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1967), pp. 82-83.

⁴³W. H. Northcott, "A Hearing-Impaired Pupil in the Classroom," The Volta Review, Vol. 74, No. 2, (February, 1972), pp. 107-108.

⁴⁴Northcott, "Mainstreaming the Preprimary Hearing-Impaired Child," Mainstream Education Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, ed. by Gary W. Nix, pp. 129, 259-260.

⁴⁵Nix, Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, p. 260.

⁴⁶Ruth Green, "Psycho-Social Aspects of Mainstreaming for the child and Family," Mainstream Education for The Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth, ed. by Gary W. Nix, p. 75.

⁴⁷Michael A. Crum and Noel D. Matkin, "Room Acoustics: The Forgotten Variable?," Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, Vol. 7, No. 2, (April, 1976), pp. 106-110.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 111.

⁴⁹Brill, "Mainstreaming: Format or Quality?," pp. 14-15.

⁵⁰Gildston, "The Hearing-Impaired Child in the Classroom," Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom, ed. by Northcott, pp. 37-43.

⁵¹Vernon and Prickett, "Mainstreaming: Issues and a Model Plan," p. 10.

⁵²Lee Katz, Steve L. Mathis and Edward C. Merrill, Jr., The Deaf Child in the Public Schools, (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1974), pp. 69-75.

⁵³Superintendent of Public Instruction, Douglas County Public School Educational Directory, (Omaha, Nebraska: Issued by the Office of the County Superintendent, 1977-78), p. 29.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Brill, Richard G. The Education of the Deaf. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Press, 1974.
- Frisina, Robert. A Bicentennial Monograph on Hearing Impairment. Washington, D.C.: The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc. 1976.
- Fusfeld, Irving S. A Handbook of Readings in Education of the Deaf and Postschool Implications. Chicago, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Publishing, Inc., 1967.
- Katz, Lee. The Deaf Child in the Public Schools. Chicago, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Nix, Gary W. Mainstream Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth. New York, New York: Grune and Stratton, 1976.
- Northcott, W. H. The Hearing-Impaired Child in a Regular Classroom-Preschool, Elementary and Secondary Years. Washington, D.C.: The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf Inc., 1973.
- Oyer, Herbert J. Auditory Communication for the Hard of Hearing. New Jersey, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Periodicals

- Beery, Keith E. "Mainstreaming: A Problem and an Opportunity for General Education." Focus On Exceptional Children, Vol. 11, No. 6, November, 1974.
- Brill, Richard G. "Mainstreaming: Format or Quality?" Audiology and Hearing Education, Vol. 2, No. 2, May, 1976.

- Chaffin, Jerry D. "Will the Real 'Mainstreaming' Program Please Stand Up?" Focus On Exceptional Children, Vol. 6, No. 5, October, 1974.
- Coleman, Patricia. "A Severely Hearing-Impaired Child in the Mainstream." Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 8, No. 1, November, 1975.
- Connor, Leo E. "The President's Opinions: Minority Status." The Volta Review, Vol. 73, No. 8, November, 1971.
- Crum, Michael A. and Matkin, Noel D. "Room Acoustics: The Forgotten Variable?" Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, Vol. 6, No. 2, April, 1976.
- Culhane, Barry R. "There's A Deaf Child In My Class." Learning-The Magazine for Creative Teaching, 111-119, October, 1978.
- Denton, David M. "Statewide Planning in the Education of the Hearing Impaired." American Annals of the Deaf, 35-47, Vol. 123, No. 1, February, 1978.
- Dowling, Richard J. "An Outline and Explanation of the Provisions of P.L. 94-142." Governmental Affairs Department, 1976.
- Garrett, Constance and Stovall, Esther M. "A Parents Views On Integration." The Volta Review, 338-344, Vol. 74, No. 6, September, 1972.
- Grosenick, Judith K. "Integration of Hearing Impaired Children into Regular Classes." Focus On Exceptional Children, Vol. 3, No. 5, October, 1971.
- Hadary, Doris. "Breaking Sound Barriers for the Deaf Child." Science and Children, 33-36, Vol. 14, No. 3, December, 1976.
- Hambleton, Donald. "Mainstreaming of Hearing Impaired Children in Regular Classrooms." American Annals of the Deaf, 522-544, Vol. 122, No. 6, December, 1977.
- Irvin, Tom. "Implementation of Public Law 94-142." Exceptional Children, 126-141, Vol. 43, No. 3, November, 1976.
- Jensema, Carl. "Three Characteristics of Teachers of the Deaf who are Hearing Impaired." American Annals of the Deaf, 307-311, Vol. 122, No. 3, June, 1977.

- Kennedy, Patricia. "Social Status of Hearing-Impaired Children in Regular Classrooms." Exceptional Children, 336-344, Vol. 40, No. 5, February, 1974.
- Kopchick, Eleanor. "Mainstreaming Deaf Students Using Team Teaching." American Annals of the Deaf, 522-544, Vol. 122, No. 11, December, 1977.
- Mecham, Stephen. "Pushing Back the Walls Between Hearing and Hearing-Impaired Children." The Volta Review, 359-364, Vol. 73, No. 6, September, 1971.
- Monaco, Theresa M. "Mainstreaming, Who?" Science and Children, 7-15, Vol. 13, No. 6, March, 1976.
- Murphy, Harry J. "Selected Readings in the Integration of Deaf Students." Center on Deafness Publication, Series No. 1, 1976.
- Northcott, W. H. "The Integration of Young Deaf Children into Ordinary Educational Programs." Exceptional Children, 29-34, Vol. 38, No. 1, September, 1971.
- Plotkin, Ellen Vee. "Are You Ready to Teach A Deaf Child?" Instructor, 72-76, June, 1976.
- Pollack, Doreen. "Learning to Listen in an Integrated Pre-school." The Volta Review, 359-367, Vol. 75, No. 6, September, 1973.
- Prickett, Hugh T. "Education of the Deaf-The Next ten Years." American Annals of the Deaf, 365-382, Vol. 122, No. 4, August, 1977.
- Rister, Anne. "Deaf Children in Mainstream Education." The Volta Review, 279-290, Vol. 77, No. 5, May, 1975.
- Scheeline, Alice. "Integrating Deaf Children into Public Schools." The Volta Review, 370-380, Vol. 73, No. 6, September, 1971.
- Scroggs, Carolyn Lee. "Analyzing the Language of Hearing Impaired Children With Severe Language Acquisition Problems." American Annals of the Deaf, 403-409, Vol. 122, No. 4, August, 1977.
- Stark, William. "Designing A Classroom For The Deaf." Audiovisual Instruction, 20-25, Vol. 21, No. 10, December, 1976.

Vernon, McCay and Prickett, Hugh. "Mainstreaming: Issues and a Model Plan." Audiology and Hearing Education, 5-11, Vol. 2, No. 2, March, 1976.

APPENDIX A

Otis Perry
8814 Raven Oaks Drive
Omaha, Nebr. 68152
571-5672

Dear _____

I am doing a study in an attempt to determine the advantages and disadvantages of classroom instruction to hearing-impaired students, who are mainstreamed in regular public school classrooms of Omaha School District I.

Since I am presently working in the Omaha Public School District's Department of Special Education, I have developed a keen interest in helping formulate plans for our special education services and programs. This study should aid the hearing-impaired teachers, parents, and students in developing a better understanding of the special education programs and services now being offered to the hearing-impaired students.

Will you please take the time to fill out the attached questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience? I have included a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your reply. If you feel that a summary of the data from this study will be helpful to you, please let me know and I will be glad to send you a copy of the results. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at the above address.

I also would like to thank you in advance for your time and effort.

Sincerely Yours

Otis Perry

QUESTIONNAIRE

For the purpose of this study, Yes is considered an advantage, No is considered a disadvantage and Neutral is considered a non-applicable answer.

Please indicate your response by checking (/) the appropriate alternative.

1. What is the number of hearing-impaired students enrolled in your classroom?

_____ Girls
_____ Boys

2. Indicate the grade level of the hearing-impaired students enrolled in your regular classroom.

_____ Elementary School
_____ Junior High School
_____ High School

3. What subjects are you teaching the hearing-impaired students enrolled in your regular classroom?

4. In your opinion, do you feel that the hearing-impaired students should be mainstreamed into the regular classrooms? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

5. Do you feel that your teaching techniques have been an effective learning process for the hearing-impaired students? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

6. Have the hearing-impaired students benefitted socially from their integration into the regular classroom? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

7. Have you observed any overt academic achievements, on the parts of the hearing-impaired students, that you would consider a direct result of their integration into the regular classroom? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

8. Did the hearing-impaired students want to be mainstreamed into a regular classroom? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

9. Is the school's curriculum course work designed for hearing-impaired students? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

10. Do your hearing-impaired students have opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

11. Have you had any parent-teacher conferences, concerning your hearing-impaired students? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

12. Do your hearing-impaired students have any problems relating to you as a regular classroom teacher? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

13. Did you as a teacher set specific goals for your hearing-impaired students to achieve both socially and academically? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Neutral

14. What suggestions do you have for improving the teaching techniques for mainstreamed hearing-impaired students? Please make comments at the end of the questionnaire if you so desire.

Comments: _____

Over If Necessary

APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT IN FOLLOW-UP
TO OBTAIN RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRE

A few weeks ago I sent a questionnaire to you concerning your school's mainstreaming program for hearing-impaired students.

I realize this is a busy time of the school year, but if possible could you complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

I am ready to tabulate the result of this survey and would like to be able to include your school in the tabulation.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, would you please notify me and I will be happy to send you another copy.

Waiting for your reply.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Otis Perry
571-5672