

PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE INCLUSION OF  
HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN REGULAR SCHOOLS  
IN THE STATE OF KUWAIT

by

Ali H. Abdulrahim

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Administration and Supervision of  
Special Education

Approved:

---

Philip Jones, Chair

---

Linda Little

---

Shirley Jones

---

Jim Fortune

---

Charles Humes

July 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

موقف نظار المدارس حول تدريس الطلبة المعوقين  
بمدارس التعليم العام بدولة الكويت

مقدمة من على حسن عبد الرحيم  
خلاصة البحث

الغرض من هذا البحث هو معرفة موقف نظار المدارس نحو تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس العادية في دولة الكويت . لقد شارك في هذا البحث نظار وناظرات من المدارس العادية للعام الدراسي ١٩٨٦ - ١٩٨٧ .  
لقد اختار الباحث ٢٢٩ ناظر / ناظرة ، عشوائيا من ٤٠٠ ناظر / ناظرة .  
ونسبة الذين جاوبوا على الاستبيان ٧٩,٥ % .

الاستبيان يحتوي على ٤٠ سؤالا لقياس الرأي الشخصي ، حول قبول الطلبة المعوقين بالبرامج المدرسية العادية . استعمل الباحث التردد ( Frequency ) المعدل ( mean ) ، الانحراف المعياري ( Standard deviation ) اختبار تي ( T -Test ) ، تحليل التغير ( Analysis of variance ) مربع كاي ( Chi- Square ) .

نتيجة البحث ، دلت على ان ٦٠٠ ناظر / ناظرة من ١٨٢ ناظر / ناظرة ، عبروا بالاجابية نحو تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس العادية ، ولا يوجد فرق بالرأي بين النظار والناظرات . ولكن هناك فرق بين النظار والناظرات ، من حيث المراحل التعليمية ( ابتدائي ، متوسط ، ثانوي ) .

PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE INCLUSION OF  
HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN REGULAR SCHOOLS  
IN THE STATE OF KUWAIT

BY

ALI ABDULRAHIM

Committee Chairman: Philip R. Jones  
Administration and Supervision of Special Education

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of principals toward educating handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait. The sample for this survey was composed of regular school principals in the State of Kuwait for the 1986-1987 school year. Of the 400 Principals, 229 principals were randomly selected. A 79.5% response was received.

The survey instrument consisted of 40 statements to measure attitudes of individuals regarding acceptance of special education programs in regular school. A Likert-type scale was used to rate the perceived influence of each statement. Frequency, mean, standard deviation, t-test, analysis of variance, and chi-square were used to answer the study questions.

The findings of the study indicated that 100 of the 182 principals identified positive attitudes toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools, there were no significant differences between male and female principals, but there were significant differences among principals at the three levels (elementary, intermediate, and secondary).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to my committee chairman, Dr. Philip Jones, for encouragement and counsel during my years of graduate study. The helpful input of Drs. Linda Little, Shirley Jones, Charles Humes, and Jim Fortune in the completion of this project is also greatly appreciated.

The cooperation of the many school districts and principals who participated on this study must be recognized.

Appreciation is extended to my wife LeAnn and niece Wedad for the many favors they have done for me throughout this project.

DEDICATION

To the most significant teachers in my life: my father and mother for their unalterable love and encouragement to be all I could be.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	7
Purpose of the Study .....	8
Research Questions .....	8
Significance of the Study .....	8
Definitions .....	9
Limitations of the Study .....	10
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	12
Public Law 94-142 .....	12
Least Restrictive Environment .....	16
Mainstreaming .....	24
Principals' Attitudes Toward Handicapped Students.....	41
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURES .....	46
Development of a List of Legal Requirements ...	47
Development and Field Testing .....	47
Determination of Sampling Procedure .....	49
Data Analysis .....	51
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....	53
Findings in Question One .....	54
Findings in Question Two .....	72
Findings in Question Three .....	74
Findings in Question Four .....	83
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, and RECOMMENDATIONS.....	85
Summary .....	85
Findings .....	88
Discussion .....	90
Recommendations .....	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	94
APPENDIX .....	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Statements of the Final Research Instrument which Pertained to each of the Clusters of the Study .....	48
2. Statements of Cluster #1 .....	56
3. Summary of Responses Toward Cluster #1 .....	58
4. Statements of Cluster #2 .....	61
5. Summary of Responses Toward Cluster #2 .....	63
6. Statements of Cluster #3 .....	66
7. Summary of Responses Toward Cluster #3 .....	67
8. Statements of Cluster #4 .....	68
9. Summary of Responses Toward Cluster #4 .....	69
10. Statements of Cluster #5 .....	70
11. Summary of Responses Toward Cluster #5 .....	71
12. Summary of t-Test for Male and Female Principals ...	72
13. Summary of Analysis of Variance (Group by Level) ...	75
14. Summary of Cell Means and S.D. of Level .....	83
15. Summary of Analysis of Variance (Principals by Gender) .....	84

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

The State of Kuwait is located at the northwestern corner of the Arabian Gulf (Persian Gulf), being surrounded by Iraq on the north and Saudi Arabia on the southwest and south. The state is 7,780 square miles which is equivalent to the size of the State of New Jersey.

In 1936, public education was instituted in the State of Kuwait. The Ministry of Education is responsible for administering a program of free education for all Kuwaitis. Compulsory school attendance was required in 1962 for all children from four to sixteen years of age. The Constituent Assembly, in 1962, adopted Article 14:

Education is a right for Kuwaitis, guaranteed by the state in accordance with law and within the limits of public policy and morals. Education in its preliminary stages shall be compulsory and free in accordance with the law. The law shall lay down the necessary plan to eliminate illiteracy. The state shall devote particular care to the physical, moral and mental development of youth.

During the last three decades, schools were established all over the country with enrollments increasing rapidly. Schools are divided into four years at each level in elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools. Schools are not coeducational except in kindergarten.

Kindergarten level (age four to six)

In kindergarten the curriculum covers Arabic language,



Islamic studies, basic arithmetic, basic science and hygiene, art, physical education, music, social studies, and recreation. The teaching staff at the kindergarten level is restricted to female teachers.

#### **Elementary level**

At the elementary level, some boys' schools are administered by male teachers and others administered by female teachers. The girls' schools are administered by female teachers. The curriculum covers Arabic language, Islamic studies, arithmetic, science and hygiene, music, social studies, art, and physical education.

#### **Intermediate level**

At the intermediate level, boys' schools are administered by male teachers and girls' schools are administered by female teachers. The curriculum for the intermediate schools covers the same areas as in the elementary schools. Additional studies include English as a second language and home economics for girls.

#### **Secondary level**

At the secondary level, boys' schools are administered by male teachers and girls' schools are administered by female teachers. The first two years, students study general academics. At the third and fourth levels, students specialize in literary or scientific curricula. The scientific curriculum covers Islamic studies, Arabic language, English language, history, geography, social

studies, geometry, algebra, modern math, geology, physics, biology, chemistry, physical education, and art. The literary curriculum covers Islamic studies, Arabic language, social studies, history, geography, economics, philosophy, English language, French language, physical education and art. Girls have home economics as an extra subject in both curricula. Schools operate five days a week at all levels from 7:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Handicapped students in the State of Kuwait are served in segregated schools. In 1955-1956, the first school for handicapped students was established. In the 1984-1985 census, out of 360,495 students 2,175 students were identified as handicapped. Mentally retarded, hearing impaired, visually impaired, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, and learning disabled students are enrolled in the special education program. An unknown number of handicapped students are denied enrollment in these institutions because they are non-Kuwaiti citizens and have been expelled from regular school for remaining two years in the same grade. Finally, there are handicapped students enrolled in regular school because their parents refuse to send them to the special institutions. These handicapped students have no special programs or any kind of consideration within the regular school. The regular school administration cannot do anything with these handicapped students until they reach sixteen years of age. At age

sixteen the Ministry of Education has the right to expel them from school. Some of these expelled handicapped students enter adult education programs while others stay at home. Special education programs for handicapped children are available in the State of Kuwait, but only in special institutions and parallel education.

#### Special Institutions

The enrollment in special institutions is comprised of mentally retarded, hearing impaired, visually impaired, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled students. Most of these children have transferred from regular elementary schools. Children who have difficulties in the regular programs are administered an intelligence test by the school administration. If the child's I.Q. falls below 70, the school administration considers him/her a handicapped student. Therefore, the student is recommended to be transferred into special institutions or can remain in his/her class, receiving no services, until the student reaches the end of compulsory attendance. The child is expelled from school when the upper age limit is reached.

In the special education institutions, the educational ladder is divided into kindergarten, elementary, pre-vocational and vocational rehabilitation for hearing impaired, mentally retarded, and emotionally disturbed students. Visually impaired and orthopedically impaired students have regular programs: kindergarten, elementary,

intermediate, and secondary level.

The curriculum for visually and orthopedically impaired is similar to the regular schools. The other handicapped students' curriculum covers basic Arabic language, math, social studies, science, art, music, and physical education. In pre-vocational and vocational rehabilitation children specialize in one program. Programs that are available for boys include offset printing, leather work, upholstery, book binding, and wicker work; for girls: cosmetology, tricot, embroidery, dress-making, book binding, and typing.

#### Parallel Education

Parallel education is found in separate schools. Students with learning problems whose I.Qs. are between 70 and 80 are transferred from regular intermediate schools to parallel education. The school administration considers them not qualified for regular education. Students spend four years in parallel education. The curriculum covers Islamic studies, Arabic language, English language, math, science, history, geography, physical education, plus one subject for specialization, which includes, offset printing, electrical installation, wood working, shuttering and steel reinforcement, welding and sheet metal work, and general painting.

There is no parallel education for girls. If girls cannot succeed in intermediate schools they can transfer into special institutions or stay in their schools while

receiving no special benefits. Students graduating from special institutions or parallel schools receive a diploma in their specialization and are guaranteed a job by the state.

### Principals' Roles

Principals are accountable and play roles in educational programs. The principals in the State of Kuwait have the authority in their schools which can affect and change the educational system in the State of Kuwait. According to the regulation of the Ministry of Education (1978), the principal is the main person who has the responsibility in management, technical, social, and cultural development in his school. All the employees within the school are accountable to the principal.

One part of the principal's job is being in charge of supervising the teachers' lesson plans. He is in charge of supervising and assigning teachers to extra curricular activities. He is the key person receiving all communications, paper work, developments and changes to or from the school and Ministry of Education. The principal has the authority to accept or decline any students transferring to his school. With all of the power and influence the principal has in his school, he is the one that will have the most influence on how successful any new program will be in his school. Therefore, knowing the principal's attitude is important before establishing any kind of integration

program of handicapped students into regular schools.

#### STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

With the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142, in the United States of America, handicapped students have access to free and appropriate public education. The implementation of protection in evaluation procedures, due process, individualized education programs, and least restrictive environment are emphasized.

In the State of Kuwait no similar law exists and the rights of the handicapped are not guaranteed. Handicapped students are segregated from nonhandicapped students. This segregation of handicapped students into special institutions causes many problems for the students, their parents, and the Ministry of Education. First, the handicapped students are stigmatized by this segregation. Second, the enrollments in the special institutions are increasing rapidly because handicapped students do not have access to regular education programs. Finally, due to the segregation, employers and co-workers (who were educated in the regular schools) do not expect good productivity or do not rely on the handicapped individual because they do not graduate from a regular school.

### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of principals toward educating handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions to be addressed in this study are the following. Differences will be ascertained at the  $P < .05$  level of significance.

1. What are the attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait?
2. Are there differences in attitude scores of male and female principals?
3. Are there differences in attitude scores among principals at the three grade levels?
4. Does an interaction exist between the variables sex and grade level? If so, what is the interaction?

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The issue of integration for the handicapped students is a new phenomenon to the education system in the State of Kuwait. This investigation is directed at examining the attitudes of regular school principals toward integration of handicapped students. It is anticipated that the attitude of principals may be a significant variable in successful integration efforts of handicapped students. Participation in the study may provide principals with some ideas about special education programs in more educationally advanced countries. This may lead to changing the educational

philosophy for the handicapped students in the State of Kuwait. Following the completion of this research, the researcher hopes improved programs for handicapped students will be developed in the State of Kuwait.

### Definitions

For the purpose of this study the following definitions will be used.

Attitudes. An attitude is a predisposition, based on prior evaluation or experience, to respond in a positive or negative manner to someone or something. Attitudes are tendencies to behave, not actual behaviors (Weisgerber, 1978).

Handicapped children. This term means children who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech or language impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired children or children with specific learning disabilities who by reason thereof require special education and related services (20 U.S.C. 1401a).

Handicapped students. Handicapped students is a term used synonymously with handicapped children.

Integration. Integration is the concept of including the special education student into regular classroom, coupled with concrete assistance for nonspecial educational teachers. (Lewis and Doorlag, 1983).

Least restrictive environment (LRE). LRE is an assurance that handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped to the maximum extent appropriate. Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (20 U.S.C. 1412 (B) (5)).



Mainstreaming. Mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on the conviction that each such child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his educational and related needs can be satisfactorily provided (Council for Exceptional Children, 1983).

Principal. The principal is defined as the educational leader or the administrative head of the school (Marsh, 1976).

Regular classroom. A fixed group of students, usually selected largely by age, who are confined for most of their school time to a single room, normally for a school year, in the charge of and instructed primarily by a single teacher (Hart, 1981).

Resource room. A resource room program consists of specific and specialized instructional strategies for students with learning problems. Resource teaching programs can provide from thirty minutes to not more than one half the school day of the child's instructional time (Marsh, 1976).

Self-contained classes. Self-contained classes are those in which pupils are in attendance more than half the school day with certified special education teachers (Marsh, 1976).

Special education. A subsystem of the total educational system for the provision of specialized or adapted programs and services or for assisting others to provide such services for exceptional youth and children (Lewis and Doorlag, 1983).

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results and findings of this study will be limited by the following factors.

1. The population of this study will be selected from only the regular public school principals in the State of Kuwait.
2. The study is limited to the information that the researcher will provide with the instrument.
3. The confidentiality of all participants concerned has been protected.

4. The instrument is generated in English and translated into the Arabic language.
5. Handicapped children for purposes of this study will be limited to educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and orthopedically impaired.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to define and review elements of this study. The first section is concerned with the background of Public Law 94-142. The second section is concerned with the least restrictive environment regulation. The third section is concerned with mainstreaming programs. The fourth section is concerned with principals' attitudes toward handicapped students.

#### PUBLIC LAW 94-142

In November of 1975 the Congress of the United States of America passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). The act mandated a "free, appropriate public education", which included special education and related services to "meet unique needs", for all school-age handicapped children, and to "assure the rights of handicapped children and their parents".

The major principles and requirements in P.L. 94-142 are:

- 1) protection in evaluation procedures,
- 2) individualized education programs (IEP),
- 3) least restrictive environment (LRE),
- 4) procedural safeguards, and
- 5) parental involvement (Federal Register, 1983).

Handicapped children are protected in evaluation procedures by ensuring that tests and other procedures used

to evaluate a handicapped student's special needs are not discriminatory either racially or culturally. The child must be evaluated in his/her native language or mode of communication. The regulations require that a child receive a complete evaluation by a trained multidisciplinary team consisting of at least one teacher or specialist knowledgeable about the suspected disability. The child must be evaluated in all areas related to the handicap. The evaluation must address areas of educational need, not just intelligence, and the instruments used in the evaluation must have been validated for the specific purpose for which they are used.

A written individualized education program (IEP) must be prepared at a conference that includes: 1) a representative of the public agency, other than the child's teacher, who is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, special education; 2) the child's teacher; 3) one of both of the child's parents; 4) the child, where appropriate; and 5) other individuals at the discretion of the parent or agency (34 C.F.R. 300.344 (1981)). The IEP must be prepared before the student begins to receive special education services. The IEP must include a statement about a child's present level of educational functioning, short and long-term performance goals and objectives, the specific types of special education and related services the handicapped child will receive, projected dates for the initiation and

duration of services, and the criteria which will be used to measure the child's progress. The IEP must be reviewed and revised if necessary, at least annually.

Handicapped children must be educated in the "least restrictive environment" with nonhandicapped students to the maximum extent appropriate. Handicapped students can only be educated out of the normal classroom situation when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The child's educational placement must be determined at least annually, based on his/her IEP, and as close to the child's home as possible.

Parents have the right to examine all relevant records on their child, to obtain an independent evaluation, and to a due process hearing to challenge school decisions relating to identification, the evaluation, placement or denial or provision of a free appropriate education to their child. A surrogate parent must be appointed to safeguard these rights when the parent or guardian of the child is unknown, or not available, or when the child is a ward of the state. The school district also can initiate a due process hearing when a parent refuses to give consent for evaluation or initiation of service.

Congress intended the law to 1) insure that all handicapped children have a free appropriate public

education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs, 2) to insure that the rights of handicapped and their parents are protected, 3) to assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and 4) to assess and insure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children (34 C.F.R. 300.1 (1983)).

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act has had and will continue to have profound effect on America's public education system. The passage and implementation of this Act came as a result of the efforts of many individuals, organizations, and advocacy groups. The Act is very far-reaching in its impact. All levels of public education are affected, from the state education agency to each individual handicapped student.

To receive additional funding for educating the handicapped, states and school districts must comply with the following provisions of the law. First, they must assure that they are making every effort to serve all handicapped students. Second, they must assure that they are using nonbiased assessment procedures to screen and identify students as handicapped. Third, they must assure that all students identified as handicapped are placed in educational settings that are the most suitable for their educational and social needs. Fourth, each student who is placed in a special education program must have an individualized

education program (IEP). Fifth, each state education agency and local school district must submit a comprehensive plan for personnel development. Sixth, each state education agency and local school district must assure the federal government that they have enacted procedural safeguards to protect the rights of both children and parents. Seventh, each local educational agency must provide for an annual review of each student's progress and placement.

#### Least Restrictive Environment

The concept of the right to education in the least restrictive environment (LRE) provides that students should not be removed from their expanded peer group without benefit of procedural safeguards. The idea of the LRE mandated by Public Law 94-142 requires that handicapped children be educated within regular classrooms or educational environments that are as close to normal as possible depending upon their individual needs. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) and related judicial decisions have mandated assignment of handicapped students to the "least restrictive environment" possible. That means among all alternatives for placement within a general education system, handicapped children should be placed where they can obtain the best education at the least distance away from mainstream society (Pasanella and Volkmer, 1981). In general, all children,

including the handicapped, should be educated in a manner that does not inhibit interaction with peers or employs unusual instructional arrangements (Meyen, 1982). This means that many students who were formerly taught in self-contained special education programs are to spend as much time as possible in the regular program, with only as much special instruction outside the regular class as absolutely necessary. It also implies that the regular program should be adapted as much as possible to accommodate the needs of the handicapped students, with appropriate support for the regular class teacher. Educational administrators in many states have moved handicapped students from segregated classes to an appropriate education in LRE.

The law requires states to create procedures to assure that, to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions, are educated with children who are not handicapped (Turnbull, Ellis, Boggs, Brooks, & Biklen, 1981). The federal government requires the provision of a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive setting for all identified handicapped children.

P.L. 93-112 (The Rehabilitation Act of 1973) was concerned with discrimination against disabled persons. Section 504 of this law provides that, "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States--- shall solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the



participation in, be denied the benefit of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Section 504, P.L. 94-142, and their accompanying regulations clearly indicate that; 1) all children have a right to a free and appropriate public education; and 2) there should be several options available to provide these appropriate educational opportunities.

The legal bases for the litigation involving the rights of handicapped children are the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. Litigation involving individual rights such as the right to treatment, the right to education, the right to due process, and class action suits has resulted in a challenge to placement of handicapped children in isolated and segregated educational settings (Meyen, Vergason, and Whelan, 1975). In general, the policy of placing handicapped persons in the least restrictive environment means that developmentally appropriate care, training, and support based on an individual's needs should be, to the maximum extent possible, provided in the types of community settings that are used by nonhandicapped persons (Lakin and Bruininks, 1985).

Parent-consumer groups like the Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC), National Society for Crippled Children, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, and the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities have

actively and politically pursued special education and related services for handicapped people (Lakin and Bruininks, 1985). Until very recently, the law offered parents of handicapped children relatively little assistance in resolving their most pressing educational problems. The problem areas most frequently addressed by the courts have been (a) exclusion of handicapped children from the public schools, (b) misclassification (labeling), and (c) inappropriate programming.

Persons with disabilities and their parents have become increasingly litigious within the past two decades. Indeed, the very impetus for P.L. 94-142 was the success of parents seeking access to public education through the courts. More recently, a number of special education related cases have involved failure to diagnose, assessment practices, failure to provide related services, provision of appropriate instruction, suspensions and expulsions, and parent involvement. (Brady, and Dennis, 1984).

The concept of LRE is that to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children should be educated with nonhandicapped, and the removal of handicapped children from the regular school environment should occur only when the nature and the severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes, with the use of supplementary services, cannot be successfully achieved (34 C.F.R.300.550 (1983)). State departments of education have responded by

implementing regulations and financial aid programs which allow for and encourage alternative delivery systems (Meyen et al. 1975).

The LRE mandate is founded on the belief that handicapped students will benefit socially and/or academically from exposure to their nonhandicapped peers. Mainstreaming, or placing handicapped students in regular educational programs for most or part of the school day, is the predominant means of meeting the LRE requirement (McCann, Semmel, & Nevin, 1985). Zettel and Ballard (1982) emphasized handicapped students should have a wide continuum of educational placement, ranging from least restrictive (regular classroom) to the most restrictive (special school or institution).

Not all handicapped children can be integrated into regular classes. Even with mildly handicapped children, special resources and additional services need to be provided along with special adaptations of regular classroom programs. In principle, LRE mandates the placement of handicapped children in regular classes unless the child's limitations are so constraining that a more protective or restricted environment is considered to be necessary (Schifani, Anderson, & Odle, 1980). The LRE principle was designed to reduce unnecessary governmental restrictions in the lives of individuals (Turnbull et al., 1981).

Deno (1970) has identified a hierarchy of placements for handicapped children:

- (1) Regular classroom assignment, possibly with classroom modification and supportive services provided.
- (2) Regular classroom assignment plus supplementary instructional services (a resource room or itinerant teacher might provide these).
- (3) Part-time special classes with the balance of the day spent in regular class or resource room.
- (4) Full-time special class with the child segregated into a separate class in a conventional school.
- (5) Special day school.
- (6) Homebound instruction.
- (7) Institutional or residential assignment.

The regular classroom is the least restrictive of all the educational placement options. On the other hand, the residential program is most restrictive of all the educational placement options. There are three requirements for placements. The regulations require that the public school system ensure that each handicapped student's educational placement decision is:

- 1) Determined at least annually;
- 2) Based on the IEP; and
- 3) As close to the child's home as possible (34 C.F.R. 300.552 (1981)).

One of the major purposes of P.L. 94-142 was to ensure that classification errors were minimized. This was done by forbidding placement based on the results of a single test, and by mandating that tests be administered appropriately. Placement decisions should be made by a team of

professionals, and include the student's parent or guardian. Placements must be reviewed at least once a year to determine whether the student is making progress; if not, a new assessment should be made in the student's program or placement (Morsink,1984). After the requirements for establishing a child's program have been developed in the IEP, the child must be placed in the educational setting which is the least restrictive in permitting the child to achieve the established objectives. The least restrictive environment should encompass the range of all aspects from the regular classroom to a special institution.

There has been some empirical research substantiating the benefit of integration for mildly handicapped students. The majority of studies have concerned mild to moderately handicapped students of school age. Research with these populations focused primarily on academic achievement and social perceptions as a function of integration. Madden and Slavin (1983) found that placement in regular classes had more positive effect on the achievement of both educable mentally retarded (EMR) and learning disabled (LD) students than did special class placement. Anderson, Martinez, & Rich, (1980) have concluded that labels created a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure; and that stigmatized and segregated approaches to the education of children with mildly handicapping conditions is inconsistent with the moral values regarding human dignity and civil rights.

Zero reject education, integrated education, appropriate education, and due process are four major principles of right to education (Laski, 1985).

The idea of the least restrictive environment is not clear to many educators (Bachrach, 1985). The two concepts of mainstreaming and least restrictive environment are perceived to be so close in meaning as to be indistinguishable (Shrybman, 1982). Much of this confusion results from the inappropriate interchanging of the terms mainstreaming and least restrictive environment. Icabone and Gallery, (1982) stated "mainstreaming is related to the educational practice of placing children who are disabled in regular classrooms. Least restrictive environment (LRE) is a much more global concept which sets forth the notion that the ideal placement for any child is that bringing the child closest to his or her learning potential, while still providing for the child's unique educational needs. Clearly, LRE describes a far more encompassing range of educational options." The term mainstreaming itself has been difficult to define and has been used to describe a wide variety of programs and concepts (Schifani et al., 1980). The LRE is the appropriate placement that is closest to the mainstream of education for a nonhandicapped student (Lewis and Doorlag, 1983). Recent court cases, public laws, and professional literature now advocate the term least restrictive environment, instead of mainstreaming (Schifani

et al. 1980). Finally, LRE when applied to education, "means that among all alternatives for placement within a general education system, handicapped children should be placed where they can obtain the best education at the least distance away from mainstream society" (Pasanella and Volkmer, 1981).

### Mainstreaming

Since 1975, Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, has mandated a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment for all handicapped students. Most school districts have responded to the stipulations in this law by extending the opportunities for handicapped children, especially those who are mildly to moderately handicapped, to receive some portion of their education with nonhandicapped peers. This practice, commonly referred to as "mainstreaming", has received considerable attention in research and practitioner literature in the last several years.

The educational rights of the handicapped as initiated by individuals and groups representing the parents of handicapped children, forced school districts to provide a free appropriate education to the handicapped students they had previously excluded or educated poorly (Morsink, 1984). Federal legislation (P.L. 94-142) and the subsequent implementation of state mandates for the appropriate

education of all handicapped children in accordance within the "least restrictive environment" concept provided for handicapped student participation within the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible. The quantity and quality of social interaction among handicapped students and nonhandicapped students and school personnel are the biggest concern for the educators. Many students with special needs are being returned to regular classrooms where they receive instruction from classroom teachers and supportive services from special educators and other specialists.

According to The Council for Exceptional Children's Delegate Assembly in April 1976:

Mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on the conviction that each such child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his educational and related needs can be satisfactorily provided. This concept recognizes that exceptional children have a wide range of special educational needs, varying greatly in intensity and duration; that there is a recognized continuum of educational settings which may, at a given time, be appropriate for an individual child's needs; that to the maximum extent appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with nonexceptional children; and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of an exceptional child from education with nonexceptional children should occur only when the intensity of the child's special education and related needs is such that they cannot be satisfied in an environment including nonexceptional children, even with the provision of supplementary aids and services.

Mainstreaming according to Johnson & Johnson (1980) is:

---an appropriate educational opportunity for all handicapped students in the least restrictive alternative, based on individualized education programs, with procedural safeguards and parent involvement, and aimed at providing handicapped



students with access to and constructive interaction with nonhandicapped peers.

The definition of the term mainstreaming which was employed in a study was that proposed by Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agatd, & Kukic (1975):

Mainstreaming refers to the temporal, instructional, and social integration of eligible exceptional children with normal peers based on an ongoing, individually determined educational planning and programming process and requires clarification of responsibility among regular and special education, administrative, instructional and supportive personnel.

Mainstreaming refers to instruction of students within the regular education setting. P.L.94-142 does mandate placement of handicapped pupils into regular classes to the maximum extent appropriate. Therefore, when a student is placed in an educational setting other than the regular program, a continuum of alternative placements is required to meet the special needs of handicapped students.

In a typical mainstreaming program, special students in regular classrooms participate in instructional and social activities side by side with their classmates. Pasanella and Volkmer (1981) found acceptance of the normalization concept of special education programming designs should encourage a continuum of special education service to meet the changing needs of handicapped children. The majority of handicapped students will be served in regular classrooms where their program can be modified or supplemented to meet their individual needs. Often, they receive additional instruction

outside the regular classroom from a special education teacher such as a resource teacher (Lewis and Doorlag, 1983). Mainstreaming is interaction of regular and special students in either social activities or classroom instruction. Some interact with regular peers on a social basis: other interactions are on social activities and classroom instruction (Lewis and Doorlag, 1983). Social integration gives handicapped students an opportunity to gain status, acceptance, feeling comfortable, and secure as a full member of the classroom (Turnbull and Schulz, 1979). Salend and Salend (1986) suggested that the effectiveness of mainstreaming can be increased by employing the social skill competencies for regular and special students. Special and regular teachers should be provided with a list of skills to teach in order to increase student ability for integration into the mainstream. The extent to which handicapped children are educated with nonhandicapped peers should be determined by skills and deficits rather than by labels or categories of handicapping conditions (Sabornie, 1985). In some cases, integrating handicapped children with lack of social skills is misguided mainstreaming and insufficient attention to the handicapped and nonhandicapped students; both special and regular educators must ensure that social skills are taught to handicapped and nonhandicapped children in appropriate settings to avoid negative attitudes toward disabled peers (Hlidek, 1980; Sabornie 1985).

Public Law 94-142 does not use the term mainstreaming. The law outlines placement procedures to assure that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (20 U.S.C. 1412 (5)(B)).

This mandate has increased the pressure on educators to mainstream exceptional children into regular education settings. It also requires that students be evaluated by a multidisciplinary team and be found to match one of the categorical definitions of "handicapped" to be eligible for special education services. These requirements are intended to insure that handicapped students receive an appropriate education which corresponds to their unique educational needs (Federal Register, 1981).

There are many benefits of mainstreaming programs that can affect both handicapped and nonhandicapped children, as well as their parents and teachers. Working and playing with other children encourages handicapped children to achieve and develop a positive self-concept (Lasher, 1979). It also can help nonhandicapped children to accept and be

comfortable with handicapped people. Studies have shown that children's attitudes toward handicapped children can become more positive when they have the opportunity to play together regularly (Wang, Rubenstein, & Reynolds, 1985; Lakin and Bruininks, 1985; Lasher, 1979). Mainstreaming helps people with handicaps in everyday settings where they will have the greatest opportunity to become as independent as possible (Spodek, Saracho, & Lee, 1984). In addition, it gives handicapped children the chance to join in the "mainstream of life"; and nonhandicapped children, have the opportunity to learn and experience the strengths and weaknesses of their handicapped friends (Spodek et al., 1984). Finally, it provides a unique opportunity to foster development of socio-moral values by emphasizing mutual respect and equal rights (Hopkins-Best, 1984).

The advantages of mainstreaming programs as defined by Pasanella and Volkmar (1981) are:

- 1) Students remaining in the educational mainstream and in their neighborhood school.
- 2) Students having the advantage of individualized instructional programming based on identified strengths and weaknesses.
- 3) More students being served than are served via special classes.
- 4) Early identification of learning problems. Resource program services can often prevent severe disorders later.
- 5) Placement based on educational need, not on diagnostic category. Therefore, labeling and the resulting stigma are minimized.

The proponents of mainstreaming maintain that the segregation of handicapped children results in their stigmatization and exclusion from opportunities for social and academic interaction with nonhandicapped peers. In addition, educating children in segregated settings has a number of disadvantages. It deprives children of many informal incidental learning opportunities that result from interacting (Spodek et al., 1984). Children who have not been exposed to handicapped people may have misconceptions and fear about disabilities (Hlidek, 1980; Hopkins-Best, 1984).

The rejection of labelling children has grown. The label "handicapped" often has a very negative implication (Knoff, 1984; Gearheart and Weishahn, 1984). Most people tend to perceive a labeled person more negatively than, or at least differently from, a nonlabeled person. Several researchers have reported that high achieving students receive more praise and teacher support than low achieving students (Icabone and Gallery, 1982; Iverie, Hogue, & Rulle, 1984; Thompson, Vitale, & Jeweet, 1984). Meyen and Lehr (1980) reported that lower achievers receive differential treatment in classes; and teachers demanded better performance from students they identified as high achievers and they provided praise to those students for their performance when compared with the perceived low achievers. Knoff (1984) found significantly different ratings by

teachers who were told to evaluate behavioral and self characteristics of a child labeled as learning disabled when compared to teachers rating the same child when they were told the child was "normal". These labels can have disastrous academic and social involvements. In some cases, labeling the child immediately creates a stigma under which the child must perform in school; and it will affect the teacher's perception of the student's strengths, student's self-concept, friendships and the student's postschool adjustment (Turnbull and Schulz, 1979). Horne (1985) stated that peer attitudes toward a student may be influenced by a handicapped label; and most special educators would agree that applying labels to exceptional children not only conveys negative information but tends to have a negative influence on their lives (Meyen, 1982).

Most recent research indicates that those who have worked with handicapped students have developed much more accepting attitudes. Hagarty (1985) found teaching pupils with special needs is not a totally different enterprise from teaching other pupils. Integration is possible and pupils with special needs can be taught in mainstream classrooms, if teachers are willing to accommodate students with special needs. For many mildly handicapped students (i.e., educable mentally retarded, mildly emotionally handicapped, and learning disabled), the regular classroom is seen as the least restrictive environment.

The success of education of handicapped children in the regular classroom will depend largely upon the regular classroom teacher's attitudes and skills. Special and regular teachers do not judge their students on similar criteria. Madden and Slavin (1983) described that special class teachers rated their students as well or poorly adjusted based on characteristics such as personal appearance and social compliance; on the contrary, regular class teachers rated the children's adjustment more on the basis of their ability to acquire academic skills and their expectations about their future educational success.

Gearheart and Weishahn (1984) found four contributing factors valuable for the handicapped students to be accepted by nonhandicapped students;

- (1) the extent to which the teacher accepts the student as an individual,
- (2) the interactions between students and modeling of peers,
- (3) the attitudes and value systems of nonhandicapped students, and
- (4) the extent to which systematic efforts provide nonhandicapped students with specific information, experience, and the opportunity to discuss experiences involving handicapping conditions.

Teachers initially appeared to expect those who were labeled and placed in special education classes to perform according to their labels. Thus, if special education is included more into the realm of regular education, the need for labelling will be minimized and hopefully, children will

not be stigmatized.

The main point for the integration of handicapped students into their neighborhood schools has been based on their right to participate in their own community. Research findings indicated that integrating handicapped students into regular classrooms with appropriate supports and interactions has a great influence on student academic and social outcomes than those exhibited by students in more restrictive settings (Strain and Shores, 1983; Lakin and Bruininks, 1985; Wang, Peverly, & Randolph, 1984; Madden and Slavin, 1983).

Handicapped children can be taught effective social skills, in both self-contained and mainstreamed settings. There is currently enough empirical evidence to suggest that social skills training with handicapped children may be a means of helping these children interact more positively and to become better-accepted by their nonhandicapped peers (Gresham and Reschly, 1986). Placement of handicapped children in regular classrooms should result in increased social interaction between handicapped and nonhandicapped children; and should result in increased social acceptance of handicapped children by their nonhandicapped peers. Strain and Shores (1983) found that social skill training for handicapped children is an important requirement to ensure successful placement of handicapped children with nonhandicapped peers. In social learning theory, handicapped



children can imitate appropriate social behavior as long as modeling is carefully planned and sequenced (Brinker and Thorpe, 1984). The academic achievement levels of mildly handicapped students in regular classrooms are higher than those in segregated special classes (Morsink, 1984; Hasazi, Rice, & York, 1979). Morsink (1984) mentioned that handicapped students may benefit from exposure to social interaction with nonhandicapped students who present appropriate models of behavior. On the other hand, it gives the nonhandicapped student an opportunity to come into contact with handicapped persons in a natural setting, and through structured interactions, to overcome fear or misunderstanding.

The federal regulations require that the public school system insure that the placement decision is made by a group of persons, including persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options (34 C.F.R. 300.533 (a)(2) (1981)). Laski (1985) pointed out that placement decisions be designed to fit the individual needs of the child, not to fit the child into the available openings. As a result, public school systems have to adopt procedures that will assure that placement decisions will be multifactored and multisourced in order to provide a comprehensive view of the child from the perspective of the school, home, and community (Shrybman, 1982; Salend and Salend, 1986).

Many changes have taken place since children regarded as "special" were not educated in public schools. Some of these changes have resulted from new laws and regulations providing resources for teaching handicapped children and requiring that these children be educated in public schools. Other changes were stimulated by litigation in which courts ruled that the denial of educational opportunity to any child is the denial of equal protection by the law. As a result, schools have increased the educational opportunities provided to all handicapped children over the years. Educators believed that mainstreaming helps to improve the academic and social/behavioral performance of handicapped students. Mainstreaming has not failed, but its successful implementation requires a coordinated effort among classroom educators, administrators, and college teachers (Ammer, 1984). The absence of adequate preservice training and/or misunderstanding of the meaning of "mainstreaming" were one of the causes for teachers' failure in implementation (Morsink, 1984). The implication is that the classroom teacher, by acquiring the skills essential for mainstreaming handicapped learners, can become more effective with all students who have special needs (Johnson and Johnson, 1986; Wang and Baker, 1986); and creates favorable attitudes toward school and academic success (Brantlinger and Guskin 1985).

It is not safe to assume that the failure of a student

is primarily the fault of the student. Rather, it may result from a handicapping situation related to inadequacies in the environment, educational materials, instructional techniques, or interactional patterns in the classroom (Gearheart and Weishahn, 1984). Administrators, as well as teachers, must receive relevant inservice in how to perform competently in their new role (Anderson-Inman, 1986; Pasanella and Volkmor, 1981).

Some recommendations are emphasized by The National Education Association to avoid the failure of mainstreaming:

- 1) A favorable learning experience must be created both for handicapped and nonhandicapped students.
- 2) Regular and special education teachers, administrators, and parents must share in planning and implementation for the disabled.
- 3) All staff must be adequately prepared for their roles through inservice training and retraining.
- 4) All students must be adequately prepared for the program.
- 5) The appropriateness of educational methods, materials, and supportive services must be determined in cooperation with classroom teachers.
- 6) The classroom teacher(s) must have an appeal procedure regarding the implementation of the program, especially in terms of student placement.
- 7) Modifications must be made in class size, using a weighted formula, scheduling, and curriculum design to accommodate program demands.
- 8) There must be a systematic evaluation and reporting of program developments using a plan which recognizes individual differences.
- 9) Adequate funding must be provided and then used exclusively for this program.

- 10) The classroom teacher(s) must have a major role in determining individual educational program and should become members of school assessment teams.
- 11) Adequate released time must be made available for teachers so that they can carry out the increased demands upon them.
- 12) Staff must not be reduced.
- 13) Additional benefits negotiated for handicapped students through local collective bargaining agreements must be honored.
- 14) Communication must be maintained among all involved parties.
- 15) All teachers must be made aware of their right of dissent concerning the appropriate program for a student, including the right to have the dissenting opinion recorded.
- 16) Individual educational programs should provide appropriate services for the handicapped students and not be used as criteria for the evaluation of the teacher. (Anderson et al. 1980, p.33&36).

Pasanella and Volkmore (1981) offer the following list of success strategies for mainstreaming.

- 1) Take into account the power structure of the total educational system.
- 2) Create administrative arrangements and staffing patterns which permit communication and interface between regular and special educators at all levels.
- 3) Enlist the support of building administrators. Build their role as change agents and educational leaders.
- 4) Employ personnel from the educational mainstream as supervisors and coordinators of new programs to provide special education services.
- 5) Focus on external variables in the system or in the students.
- 6) Design programs which allow exceptional pupils to truly participate in the instructional and social activities of the mainstream.

- 7) Remember that the degree to which all exceptional children can be integrated is more a function of the adaptability of the curriculum, instructional materials, and teaching procedures than of handicap.
- 8) Allow the regular and special education staff to cooperatively design and make decisions on local policies and procedures for mainstreaming. They will have an investment in its success.
- 9) Do a needs assessment prior to initiating inservice.
- 10) Use creative, innovative faculty members for leaders in building-level inservice programs.
- 11) Give the school staff a detailed description of how the mainstreaming program will work. Before the program begins, handle concerns of both regular and special educators, such as "How will my professional responsibilities change?"
- 12) Give regular teachers inservice before you give them the exceptional students. Help them understand that handicapped students will only be placed in their class with their full understanding and agreement.
- 13) Build the confidence and competence of the regular class teachers so that they do not greet the atypical learner with rejection.
- 14) Remember that the regular class teachers will be more willing to accept handicapped students when they know that they will get support and can also refer nonhandicapped pupils with learning problems.
- 15) Provide help with the social and emotional development of exceptional children to insure that these students will be better accepted by the regular teacher and ready for academic instruction in the mainstream.
- 16) Keep the responsibility for the education of children with learning disabilities with the regular class teacher.
- 17) Alert teachers to the value of early detection and prevention of learning problems.
- 18) Make the teacher a central member of the treatment team.

- 19) Improve the capacity of the regular teachers to provide for the diversity for children's needs by showing them effective ways to individualize instruction.
- 20) Be aware that the attitudes of special educators toward mainstreaming influence the reactions of regular educators.
- 21) Encourage resource persons to take into account at all times the "real world" of the student's regular classroom.
- 22) Provide opportunities for cross-fertilization so that teachers may share experiences, exchange ideas, and visit other classrooms within and across school district boundaries.
- 23) Make record keeping, monitoring of pupil progress, and reporting of program results as simple as possible-communication will be enhanced.
- 24) Respect and protect the rights of individual children, parents, and teachers (p.26-27).

Some problems that affect the mainstreaming programs are emphasized by Pasanella and Volkmer (1981):

- 1) Lack of agreement on a definition of mainstreaming. Program elements that must be present must be specified before outcomes can be predicted and measured.
- 2) Failure to look systematically at the quality of the instruction being provided to mainstreamed students.
- 3) Over looking the fact that some regular classroom teachers are unwilling to modify their classroom environment and goals and/or are not equipped to teach to a wider range of behaviors.
- 4) Frequent lack of articulation between what is provided to the student in the regular classroom and what is provided by support services.
- 5) Differences in perception across roles. An administrator may say mainstreaming is good because it is cost-effective and parents are happy, while regular teachers in the same school view the program negatively because they have to cope with more

problem behaviors than before.

- 6) Lack of appropriate progress made by the learners being studied.
- 7) Ignoring the effects of mainstreaming on the achievement levels and social adjustment of regular class students (p.21).

Mainstreaming means helping people with handicaps live, learn, and work in typical settings where they will have the greatest opportunity to become as independent as possible. Mainstreaming is defined as the integration of handicapped children and nonhandicapped children in the same classroom. It gives handicapped children the chance to join in the "mainstream of life" by including them in a regular school experience, and gives nonhandicapped children the opportunity to learn and grow by experiencing the strengths and weaknesses of their handicapped friends. According to the Department of Special Education University of Illinois at Urbana (1974):

The "mainstreaming concept" is educating most children in regular classrooms and providing special education on the basis of learning needs, rather than a category of a handicap. Children with learning needs can receive help from special education teachers without being labelled or segregated from peer associations. Mainstreaming will bring about an amalgamation of regular and special education to provide a range of services for all children according to learning needs. Under the mainstreaming system, special education will be a resource for the entire school population and not an isolated body of skills and knowledge adjusted to a minute population.

Principals' Attitudes Toward Handicapped Students

Principals are key persons in all public school programs. Among the many responsibilities of the principal are selecting personnel, working with the community, managing the school, and improving the educational program, including programs for the handicapped (Smith, Flexer, & Sigelman, 1979). Principals are key figures in the implementation and success of any integration project for the handicapped. Therefore, the role of principals to provide special programs in their school for the handicapped is very important. Smith et al., (1979) found principals' knowledge and support for such programs is very important. Principals are accountable and the key persons in implementing changes in public education (Johnson and Johnson, 1980; Jamieson, 1984). The principal must be supportive of the special education program in order for it to facilitate the education of handicapped children; and teachers have to know that the principal fully supports the program.

The attitudes of principals are significantly related to the quality of the educational program provided for handicapped students (Jamieson, 1984). Specific experience with the skills required to mainstream may affect attitudes. Education and inservice training have also been suggested as variables that may affect administrator perceptions of realistic placement for handicapped (Johnson and Johnson,



1980; Johnson, 1981). The school administration can reduce the stigma attached to handicaps through increased contact between handicapped and nonhandicapped students. The achievement of this goal depends on the school principal. A good administrator should fight for inservice training and support personnel to help his staff adjust to the demands of the new educational programs.

The role and responsibilities of the principals in mainstreaming programs for handicapped children have expanded substantially since the passage of P.L. 94-142. Principals can play an integral role in the effective mainstreaming programs of handicapped children. Principals are the educational leaders of the school. Lewis and Doorlay (1983) found principals' activities and attitudes can help to establish the necessary school climate for successful mainstreaming programs. Principals should understand their role as instructional leaders. This role will greatly influence the cooperative integration among handicapped and nonhandicapped students, and among regular and special teachers (Leibfried, 1984; Johnson, 1981). A positive aspect of working in mainstreaming is that staff work hand in hand with the principal of their school.

The local education agency has the primary responsibility for insuring the successful implementation of special programs in regular schools (Federal Register, 1983). Consequently, the responsibilities lie with the

school principals who must influence the attitudes and perceptions of the teachers and staff members in their schools. Smith et al, (1979) found the attitudes and actions of the principal toward programs for the handicapped may be adopted by teachers with either a positive or negative result. Negative attitudes toward handicapped children among professionals serving exceptional persons can be more harmful and crippling than any mental or physical state inherent to the exceptional individuals.

The principal has the authority to establish working teams made up of regular and special teachers; and cooperative activities bring the handicapped and nonhandicapped students together in ways that will make social integration more likely to occur (Leibfried, 1984). Furthermore, the principal must be aware of the law and the special needs of the handicapped students. Knowledge of the law and positive attitudes toward handicapped students by the principal will help assure successful mainstreaming programs (Leibfried, 1984; Bond, 1978). Therefore, the principal must be aware of the effects of mainstreaming. These would include, the handicapped and nonhandicapped students, the regular and special teachers, and the parents of the handicapped and nonhandicapped students (Dougherty, 1979). School personnel will not be able to cope with the new changes as mainstreaming if the principal does not adopt the idea (Rebore, 1979).

Empirical research regarding the roles and functions of building principals (Turnbull and Schulz, 1979; Lietz and Kaiser, 1979; Lietz and Towle, 1979; Gage, 1979) found that principals' roles are necessary and appropriate to ensure the effective and complete provision of education of handicapped children in regular schools. The ultimate success of mainstreaming depends on the leadership of building principals. Principals should provide the leadership to make mainstreaming a success in their schools. School principals are a significant influence in the amount and quality of services provided to educationally handicapped children (Leibfried, 1984; Lietz and Towle, 1979). Special educators, general educators, parents, and children need principals who will assume that leadership role (Gage, 1979).

Most regular classroom teachers and school administrators have not been adequately prepared to cope with the curricular, management, and administrative problems associated with handicapped children in their schools (Schifani et al., 1980). Principals are in a position to encourage their staff to be prepared and trained for teaching handicapped students; and they must arrange the educational environment to insure that maximum cooperation between regular and special teachers can occur (Hasazi et al., 1979).

Some roles that principals should play to make mainstreaming works are defined by Gage (1979):

1. Know what staff members are doing;
2. Encourage respect for children;
3. Emphasize positive self-concept;
4. Exhibit positive attitudes toward the school and all its program;
5. Provide alternative learning opportunities for all students; and
6. Reinforce effective home-school relationships.

While principals are autonomous with regard to the school program, and while it is they who must take leadership in developing and evaluating school programs, the attitudes and actions of the principal toward programs for the handicapped students are essential.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to conduct a comparative investigation of attitudes of regular school principals toward integrating handicapped students in their schools. This study analyzed the attitudes of selected principals in the State of Kuwait Public School System toward handicapped children and toward educational mainstreaming. At present there is no information regarding the attitudes of selected principals in the State of Kuwait Public School System toward educational mainstreaming. Consequently, there were no data available to educational planners concerning principals' attitudes toward handicapped children and toward educational mainstreaming. The information contained in this study should help to provide a rational and viable basis for current and future educational planning and decision making for the identification, placement, and education of handicapped children.

The method and procedures of the study are presented in this chapter. The procedures of the study consist of sequential steps which are: (1) development of a list of legal requirements for educating handicapped children in the U.S.A. (2) development and field testing of the data collection instrument, (3) determination of sampling procedure, and (4) analysis of the data.

DEVELOPMENT OF A LIST OF  
LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR EDUCATING  
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE U.S.A.

The researcher began this study by developing a list of services mandated for the education of handicapped students in the U.S.A. and translated into the Arabic language (see appendices A&C). This list was used to provide background information for the regular principals in The State of Kuwait, especially for those who have no idea of the services that are provided for the handicapped students in the more educationally advanced countries such as U.S.A.

DEVELOPMENT AND FIELD TESTING  
OF THE DATA-COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

An existing instrument which was related to the objectives of this study could not be found by the researcher. It was, therefore, necessary to develop such an instrument consisting of: 1) Background information which is a brief list of legal requirements for education handicapped children in the U.S.A. (see appendices A&C); 2) Demographic data (school levels, gender, age, degree, teaching experience, and administrative experience), and 3) A mainstreaming opinionnaire (40 statements to measure attitudes of individuals regarding acceptance of special education programs into regular school in the State of Kuwait); (see appendices A&C).

An attitude questionnaire was developed for use in the study. A list of positive and negative statements regarding

principals' attitudes toward integrating handicapped students into regular school programs was selected from a review of the literature and to facilitate the development of the questionnaire. A Likert-type scale was employed for the mainstreaming opinionnaire to measure the attitudes. For each opinionnaire statement, the respondent was asked to place himself/herself on an attitude continuum for each statement, ranging from "strongly agree" to "agree" to "disagree" to "strongly disagree". Each category has a corresponding weight of 1, 2, 3, or 4 for the scoring of positive statements; where as, the reverse is true for negative statements. The questionnaire was broken down into five clusters (see Table 1).

Table 1

STATEMENTS OF THE FINAL RESEARCH INSTRUMENT WHICH  
PERTAINED TO EACH OF THE CLUSTERS OF THE STUDY

Number	Cluster	Statement Number							
1	Attitude toward regular classroom environment	3	4	5	8	11	14	15	
		20	22	23	28	29	31	34	
2	Attitude toward social environment	2	7	9	12	13	17	21	24
		25	26	27	30	32	33	39	40
3	Attitude toward expanding integration					10	16	18	38
4	Attitude toward segregated environment						1	6	36
5	Attitude toward administrative role						19	35	37

The instrument was translated into the Arabic language (see appendix C); and sent to twenty-five principals who would not be included in the actual study to participate as a panel of experts in evaluating and screening the original instrument. All 25 members were asked to read the background information, answer the 40 items, and to comment on any ambiguities or difficulties they might notice. Follow-up telephone calls were made to each subject who did not return the questionnaire, requesting them to do so as soon as possible. Twenty of the surveys or 80% were returned.

Utilizing Cronbach's Alpha, the reliability for this scale was estimated at 0.79, suggesting a moderately consistent measure of attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Based on the additional comments and reactions, the final instrument was devised. It should be noted here that the coefficient alpha technique for the final study was .94.

#### DETERMINATION OF SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Male and female principals were randomly selected from The State of Kuwait. A representative sample of 229 was selected from the 400 public school principals (principals of kindergartens, combined elementary and intermediate schools, combined intermediate and secondary schools, special institutions, and private schools are not included). The population of this study consisted of six groups. These were: 1) female elementary school principals; 2) male



elementary school principals; 3) female intermediate school principals; 4) male intermediate school principals; 5) female secondary school principals; and 6) male secondary school principals. The questionnaire was administered by mail via school districts.

A survey instrument was sent to 52 elementary female school principals, 44 elementary male school principals, 34 intermediate female school principals, 41 intermediate male school principals, 27 secondary female school principals, and 31 secondary male school principals randomly selected from a potential pool of 400 regular public school principals in The State of Kuwait. The names and school locations of the pool of principals were obtained through records of the Data Processing Department of the school system. Survey instruments were returned to the researcher by: 46 or 88.5% of the elementary female school principals, 29 or 65.9% of the elementary male school principals, 29 or 85.3% of the intermediate female school principals, 35 or 85.4% of the intermediate male school principals, 23 or 85.2% of the secondary female school principals, and 20 or 64.5% of the secondary male school principals. The total response rate was 79.5%. Considering the researcher received a 79.5 percent return rate of 229 principals contacted, it was believed unnecessary to do a follow-up via mailings or otherwise.

The principals received the revised survey which

included four items: 1) a cover letter from their district, 2) a cover letter from the researcher indicating the purpose of the research (see appendix B), 3) the background information about the handicapped services in the U.S.A., and 4) the questionnaire and demographic characteristics of the principal (see appendix C).

Principals were asked to complete and return the survey to their school districts in the envelope provided. To obtain a more objective response, principals were assured of confidentiality in the dissertation and on other reports or articles that may result from the study. Data received from their responses would be used for the purpose of the dissertation, and participation would be voluntary.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

The Likert-style statements were analyzed using descriptive techniques in order to review general results and tendencies. Frequencies were tallied for each item. Each factor was analyzed by using SPSS program to obtain the percentages, means and standard deviations due to the cluster nature of the instrument. The items which had mean values of 2.5 or less were considered as favorable toward acceptance of special education programs. The items with mean values greater than 2.5 were considered as unfavorable toward acceptance of special education programs. For the six different groups of principals the t-test and one way ANOVA

test of significance were calculated to determine possible significant differences. The significance level for each was set at .05. Analysis of the data was conducted by the computer facility at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech).

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter deals with the results of the statistical analysis as it relates to each question. The design of the study permits examination and comparison of attitude scores but does not allow for causal inferences. The analyses of the data are presented and discussed by utilizing the questions which were asked.

Detailed analysis of the responses to individual questions is presented to provide the reader with a comprehensive look at the group means to each cluster. Each individual group mean represents the response of the group for that individual question. Each response was scored on a scale from 1 to 4 (see appendix A for summary of responses). This scale represented the continuum from strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The four research question responses were analyzed using, frequencies, t-tests, analysis of variance, and chi-square methods.

The following tables reflect the responses of all principals toward each item on the questionnaire. Due to the cluster nature of the instrument, Tables 2 and 3 describe the responses of principals that reflect the attitude towards regular classroom environment for handicapped students; whereas Tables 4 and 5 describe the responses of principals that reflect their attitude towards social

environment for handicapped students. Tables 6 and 7 describe the responses of principals that reflect the attitude towards expanding integration for handicapped students; and Tables 8 and 9 describe the responses of principals that reflect the attitude towards segregated environment for handicapped students. Tables 10 and 11 describe the responses of principals that reflect the attitude towards administrative role for handicapped students. Table 12 describes the responses of gender attitudes; while Table 13 describes the mean attitude of principal levels. Table 14 describes the differences among group levels; and finally, Table 15 describes the interaction among group levels.

Findings in question one:

Five clusters of principals' attitudes toward integrating handicapped students into regular school were collected; these five measures were principals' attitudes towards (1) regular classroom environment, (2) social environment, (3) expanding integration, (4) segregated environment, and (5) administrative role for handicapped students.

The question asked was, "What are the attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait?"

To answer the above question, the frequency procedures, mean, and standard deviation were utilized to determine the

source of significant differences among all principals' mean scores. There was a need to consider the factors that had means within the range from 1.0000 to 2.5000 which were considered favorable attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools. On the other hand, means within the range above 2.5000 were considered unfavorable attitudes. There were twenty-five items with means falling in the 1.0000 to 2.5000 and these were listed according to their clusters (see Tables 2-11).

TABLE 2

STATEMENTS OF CLUSTER #1  
ATTITUDE TOWARD REGULAR CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

---

3. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for handicapped students.
- \*4. Handicapped students should not have to compete with nonhandicapped students.
- \*5. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains handicapped students.
- \*8. Placement of a handicapped child in a regular classroom will likely result in his becoming socially withdrawn.
11. Handicapped students will develop a more positive attitude toward school when placed in a regular classroom.
14. A handicapped child will be motivated to learn in regular classrooms.
- \*15. The presence of children with obvious physical deformities will make the nonhandicapped students uncomfortable.
20. A more positive social relationship with other children will likely form if handicapped students are placed in a regular class.
22. Most handicapped students are well behaved in regular classrooms.
- \*23. Handicapped students will monopolize the teacher's time in regular classrooms.
- \*28. A teacher does not have enough time in a day to deal satisfactorily with the need of both handicapped students and nonhandicapped students.
- \*29. I believe the handicapped student's self-concept would be damaged if placed in a regular classroom.
31. Handicapped students should compete with normal students in the regular classroom.

table 2 (continued)

---

\*34. I think that the educational achievement of regular students would be harmed with the integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom.

---

\*Negative statements scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

Eight of fourteen items or 57 percent of cluster #1 revealed favorable responses toward integrating handicapped students into regular classroom environment (see Table 3).



TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TOWARD CLUSTER #1: THE ATTITUDE OF  
ALL PRINCIPALS TOWARD REGULAR CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
3. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for handicapped students.	30	16.5	103	56.6	44	24.2	5	2.7	2.1319*	.7084
4. Handicapped students should not have to compete with nonhandicapped students.	13	7.1	58	31.9	75	41.2	36	19.8	2.7363	.8583
5. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains handicapped students.	17	9.3	95	52.2	39	21.4	31	17.0	2.4615*	.8833
8. Placement of a handicapped child in a regular classroom will likely result in his becoming socially withdrawn.	9	4.9	44	24.2	87	47.8	42	23.1	2.8901	.8136
11. Handicapped students will develop a more positive attitude toward school when placed in a regular classroom.	32	17.6	76	41.8	64	35.2	10	5.5	2.2857*	.8181

teble 3 (continued)

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
14. A handicapped child will be motivated to learn in regular classrooms.	22	12.1	82	45.1	69	37.9	9	4.9	2.3571*	.7572
15. The presence of children with obvious physical deformities will make the nonhandicapped students uncomfortable.	14	7.7	65	35.7	76	41.8	27	14.8	2.6374	.8279
20. A more positive social relationship with other children will likely form if handicapped students are placed in a regular class.	30	16.5	97	53.3	46	25.3	9	4.9	2.1868*	.7640
22. Most handicapped students are well behaved in regular classrooms.	20	11.0	97	53.3	61	33.5	4	2.2	2.2692*	.6805
23. Handicapped students will monopolize the teacher's time in regular classrooms.	7	3.8	76	41.8	55	30.2	44	24.2	2.7473	.8680
28. A teacher does not have enough time in a day to deal satisfactorily with the need of both handicapped students and non-handicapped students.	12	6.6	52	28.6	64	35.2	54	29.7	2.8791	.9144

table 3 (continued)

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
29. I believe the handicapped student's self-concept would be damaged if placed in a regular classroom.	9	4.9	85	46.7	61	33.5	27	14.8	2.5824	.8015
31. Handicapped students should compete with normal students in the regular classroom.	21	11.5	77	42.3	77	42.3	7	3.8	2.3846*	.7399
34. I think that the educational achievement of regular students would be harmed with the integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom.	28	15.4	69	43.4	57	31.3	18	9.9	2.3571*	.8597

\*Note. Items within means of 2.5 or less are considered in favor of integration programs.

TABLE 4  
STATEMENTS OF CLUSTER #2  
ATTITUDE TOWARD SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

---

2. Handicapped students should have appropriate social and academic skills before integration into regular schools.
7. Handicapped students do not want any more sympathy than other students.
- \*9. Handicapped persons are usually more sensitive than other people.
- \*12. Handicapped people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.
13. It would be best if handicapped students would participate and work with nonhandicapped students.
17. I think handicapped people are capable of becoming useful members in society.
- \*21. Handicapped students cannot be as independent as regular students.
24. Integrating the handicapped student will promote his/her social independence.
25. The integration of handicapped students can be beneficial for regular students.
- \*26. Integration is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the handicapped student.
- \*27. The handicapped student will be socially isolated by regular classroom students.
30. I believe that nonhandicapped students need the experience of being in contact with handicapped students in an academic setting.
- \*32. Behavior problems among regular students will increase with the integration of handicapped students.
33. Assigning handicapped students to a regular classroom is good for both handicapped and nonhandicapped students.

table 4 (continued)

- 
39. A more positive self-concept will develop in the handicapped student if placed in a regular classroom.
40. I believe the chances of a handicapped student attaining a more productive and independent place in society will take place from his/her experience of being in a regular classroom.
- 

\*Negative statements scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

Thirteen of sixteen items or 81 percent of the cluster #2 revealed favorable responses toward integrating handicapped students into regular social environments (see Table 5).

**TABLE 5**  
**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TOWARD CLUSTER #2: THE ATTITUDE OF**  
**ALL PRINCIPALS TOWARD SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT**

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
2. Handicapped students should have appropriate social and academic skills before integration into regular schools.	79	43.4	78	42.9	20	11.0	5	2.7	1.7308*	.7646
7. Handicapped students do not want any more sympathy than other students.	23	12.6	74	40.7	71	39.0	14	7.7	2.4176*	.8083
9. Handicapped persons are usually more sensitive than other people.	1	.5	11	6.0	83	45.6	87	47.8	3.4066	.8303
12. Handicapped people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.	22	12.1	115	63.2	41	22.5	4	2.2	2.1484*	.6437
13. It would be best if handicapped students would participate and work with nonhandicapped students.	33	18.1	96	52.7	52	28.6	1	.5	2.1154*	.6916
17. I think handicapped people are capable of becoming useful members in society.	89	48.9	89	48.9	4	2.2	0	.0	1.5330*	.5457
21. Handicapped students cannot be as independent as regular students.	5	2.7	69	37.9	83	45.6	25	13.7	2.7033	.7357

table 5 (continued)

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
24. Integrating the handicapped student will promote his/her social independence.	31	17.0	92	50.5	49	26.9	10	5.5	2.2088*	.7869
25. The integration of handicapped students can be beneficial for regular students.	22	12.1	77	42.3	74	40.7	9	4.9	2.3846*	.7619
26. Integration is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the handicapped student.	9	4.9	89	48.9	67	36.8	17	9.3	2.5055	.7339
27. The handicapped student will be socially isolated by regular classroom students.	15	8.2	95	52.2	53	29.1	19	10.4	2.4176*	.7876
30. I believe that nonhandicapped students need the experience of being in contact with handicapped students in an academic setting.	60	33.0	89	48.9	30	16.5	3	1.6	1.8681*	.7390
32. Behavior problems among regular students will increase with the integration of handicapped students.	15	8.2	98	53.8	49	26.9	20	11.0	2.4066*	.7933

table 5 (continued)

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
33. Assigning handicapped students to a regular classroom is good for both handicapped and nonhandicapped students.	17	9.3	82	45.1	70	38.5	13	7.1	2.4341*	.7606
39. A more positive self-concept will develop in the handicapped student if placed in a regular classroom.	34	18.7	88	48.4	55	30.2	5	2.7	2.1703*	.7570
40. I believe the chances of a handicapped student attaining a more productive and independent place in society will take place from his/her experience of being in a regular classroom.	27	14.8	84	46.2	66	36.3	5	2.7	2.2692*	.7426

\*Note. Items within means of 2.5 or less are considered in favor of integration programs.



TABLE 6  
STATEMENTS OF CLUSTER #3  
ATTITUDE TOWARD EXPANDING INTEGRATION

---

- \*10. Handicapped students should only participate with nonhandicapped students in non-academic courses.
  - 16. Handicapped students should be educated in a regular classroom and moved into special classrooms in accordance with their needs.
  - 18. Handicapped students should be educated full time in special classes at regular schools.
  - 38. I believe handicapped students should be integrated in regular school.
- 

\*Negative statement scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

Two of four items or 50 percent of cluster #3 revealed favorable responses toward expanding integration for handicapped students (see Table 7).

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TOWARD CLUSTER #3: THE ATTITUDE OF ALL PRINCIPALS TOWARD EXPANDING INTEGRATION

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
10. Handicapped students should only participate with nonhandicapped students in non-academic courses.	11	6.0	77	42.3	54	29.7	40	22.0	2.6758	.8853
16. Handicapped students should be educated in a regular classroom and moved into special classrooms in accordance with their needs.	41	22.5	92	50.1	44	24.2	5	2.7	2.0714*	.7583
18. Handicapped students should be educated full time in special classes at regular schools.	7	3.8	36	19.8	114	62.6	25	13.7	2.8626	.6876
38. I believe handicapped students should be integrated in regular school.	46	25.3	118	64.8	14	7.7	4	2.2	1.8681*	.6344

67

\*Note. Items within means of 2.5 or less are considered in favor of integration programs.

TABLE 8  
STATEMENTS OF CLUSTER #4  
ATTITUDE TOWARD SEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT

---

- \*1. Handicapped students should be educated in special schools.
  - 6. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of the handicapped students.
  - \*36. The handicapped student will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.
- 

\*Negative statements scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

One of three items or 33 percent of cluster #4 revealed favorable responses toward desegregated environments for handicapped students (see Table 9).

TABLE 9  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TOWARD CLUSTER #4: THE ATTITUDE OF  
ALL PRINCIPALS TOWARD SEGREGATED ENVIRONMENTS

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
1. Handicapped students should be educated in special schools.	10	5.5	44	24.2	67	36.8	61	33.5	2.9835	.8949
6. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of the handicapped students.	54	29.7	68	37.4	54	29.7	6	3.3	2.0659*	.8514
36. The handicapped student will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.	3	1.6	63	34.6	69	37.9	47	25.8	2.8791	.8120

\*Note. Items within means of 2.5 or less are considered in favor of integration programs.

TABLE 10  
STATEMENTS OF CLUSTER #5  
ATTITUDE TOWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE

---

19. I would be willing to supervise teachers that have handicapped students in their classrooms.
- \*35. I believe I have too many responsibilities in regular school to accept the responsibilities of handicapped students.
37. Working with handicapped students is a challenge I would look forward to.
- 

\*Negative statement scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

One of three items or 33 percent of cluster #5 revealed favorable responses toward administering programs for handicapped students in regular schools (see Table 11).

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TOWARD CLUSTER #5: THE ATTITUDE OF ALL PRINCIPALS TOWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE

Statement No.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
19. I would be willing to supervise teachers that have handicapped students in their classrooms.	29	15.9	78	42.9	61	33.5	14	7.7	2.3297*	.8351
35. I believe I have too many responsibilities in regular school to accept the responsibilities of handicapped students.	11	6.0	76	41.8	57	31.3	38	20.9	2.6703	.8739
37. Working with handicapped students is a challenge I would look forward to.	21	11.5	58	31.9	91	50.0	12	6.6	2.5165	.7847

\*Note. Items within means of 2.5 or less are considered in favor of integration programs.

Results of the data analyses indicate that principals, as a group, expressed positive attitudes on 62.5 percent of the items. The principals' individual total scores ranged from 54.00 to 133.00. The mean total score was 96.549, and the S.D. was 16.714. Indicating, 100 of 182 principals expressed positive attitudes toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools.

Findings in question two:

The question asked was, "Are there differences in attitude scores of male and female principals?" A t-test was used with the significance level at .05 .

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF t-TEST FOR MALE AND FEMALE PRINCIPALS

VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	S.D.	D.F.	t
MALE	84	94.667	16.859	180	-1.41*
FEMALE	98	98.163	16.503		

\*p>.05

The t-test was utilized to determine the source of significant differences between gender mean scores. The results indicate that there were no group differences overall ( $t=-1.41$ ,  $p>.05$ ), (see Table 12), but there were differences in groups on four specific statements. Therefore, the chi-square distributions were utilized to determine the source of significant differences of mean

scores in these statements. The significant differences of mean scores were stated at the .05 level of significance.

The difference in groups can be explained by several specific statements:

In statement #19, which pertains to supervising teachers that have handicapped students in their classrooms, a chi-square of 4.6202 with 1 df and a probability level of .0316 indicates there was a significant difference in gender responses. More male school principals agreed than was expected, and fewer female school principals agreed than was expected. Fewer male school principals disagreed than was expected, and more female school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the male school principals agreed more than the female school principals.

In statement #20, which pertains to a more positive social relationship with other children will likely form if handicapped students are placed in a regular class, a chi-square of 10.2438 with 1 df and a probability level of .0014 indicates there was a significant difference in gender responses. More male school principals agreed than was expected, and fewer female school principals agreed than was expected. Fewer male school principals disagreed than was expected, and more female school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the male school principals agreed more than the female school principals.

In statement #22, which pertains to most handicapped



students being well behaved in regular classrooms, a chi-square of 4.0685 with 1 df and a probability level of .0437 indicates there was a significant difference in gender responses. More male school principals agreed than was expected, and fewer female school principals agreed than was expected. Fewer male school principals disagreed than was expected, and more female school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the male school principals agreed more than the female school principals.

In statement #31, which pertains to handicapped students competing with normal students in the regular classroom, a chi-square of 4.7009 with 1 df and a probability level of .0301 indicates there was a significant difference in gender responses. More male school principals agreed than was expected, and fewer female school principals agreed than was expected. Fewer male school principals disagreed than was expected, and more female school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the male school principals agreed more than the female school principals.

Findings in question three:

The question asked was, "Are there differences in attitude scores among principals at the three grade levels?"

A one-way analysis of variance was used with the significance level at .05. A closer examination of the data for question #3 in accordance with analysis of variance

technique revealed that significant differences existed regarding attitude scores among principals at the three grade levels (see Table 13).

TABLE 13

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE MEAN ATTITUDE  
TOWARD INTEGRATION CROSSED WITH PRINCIPAL  
LEVELS: ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE, & SECONDARY

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
BETWEEN-GROUPS	2	2776.82	1388.41	5.20*
WITHIN-GROUPS	179	47784.24	266.95	
TOTAL	181	50561.05		

\* $p < .05$

An analysis of variance for mean attitudes crossed with principal levels yielded a significant difference among groups ( $F=5.20$ ,  $P < .05$ ). The chi-square distributions were utilized to determine the source of significant differences of mean scores in specific statements. The significant differences of mean scores were stated at the .05 level of significance.

The difference in groups can be explained by several specific statements:

In statement #6, which pertains to isolation in a special class having a negative effect on the social and emotional development of the handicapped students, a chi-square of 7.2594 with 2 df and a probability level of .0265

indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #11, which pertains to handicapped students developing a more positive attitude toward school when placed in a regular classroom, a chi-square of 6.8008 with 2 df and a probability level of .0334 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #15, which pertains to the presence of children with obvious physical deformities making the nonhandicapped students uncomfortable, a chi-square of 7.4374 with 2 df and a probability level of .0243 indicates

there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #16, which pertains to handicapped students being educated in a regular classroom and moved into special classrooms in accordance with their needs, a chi-square of 11.1143 with 2 df and a probability level of .0039 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #18, which pertains to handicapped students being educated full time in special classes at regular schools, a chi-square of 8.7041 with 2 df and a probability level of .0129 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. More elementary and

intermediate school principals agreed than was expected, and fewer secondary school principals agreed than was expected. Fewer elementary and intermediate school principals disagreed than was expected, and more secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the elementary and intermediate school principals agreed more than the secondary school principals.

In statement #19, which pertains to supervising teachers that have handicapped students in their classrooms, a chi-square of 8.1346 with 2 df, and a probability level of .0171 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #20, which pertains to a more positive social relationship with other children forming if handicapped students are placed in a regular class, a chi-square of 9.4780 with 2 df and a probability level of .0087 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school

principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #22, which pertains to most handicapped students being well behaved in regular classrooms, a chi-square of 6.6657 with 2 df and a probability level of .0357 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #24, which pertains to integrating the handicapped student to promote his/her social independence, a chi-square of 10.4569 with 2 df and a probability level of .0054 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than

was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #25, which pertains to the integration of handicapped students being beneficial for regular students, a chi-square of 8.5563 with 2 df and a probability level of .0139 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #31, which pertains to handicapped students competing with normal students in the regular classroom, a chi-square of 8.0379 with 2 df and a probability level of .0180 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed

more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #33, which pertains to assigning handicapped students to a regular classroom being good for both handicapped and nonhandicapped students, a chi-square of 10.9103 with 2 df and a probability level of .0402 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #35, which pertains to too many responsibilities in regular school to accept the responsibilities of handicapped students, a chi-square of 7.8167 with 2 df and a probability level of .0201 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.



In statement #39, which pertains to a more positive self-concept developing in the handicapped student if placed in a regular classroom, a chi-square of 8.8815 with 2 df and a probability level of .0118 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

In statement #40, which pertains to the chances of a handicapped student attaining a more productive and independent place in society from his/her experience of being in a regular classroom, a chi-square of 7.5444 with 2 df and a probability level of .0230 indicates there was a significant difference in level responses. Fewer elementary school principals agreed than was expected, and more intermediate and secondary school principals agreed than was expected. More elementary school principals disagreed than was expected, and fewer intermediate and secondary school principals disagreed than was expected. It was concluded that the intermediate and secondary school principals agreed more than the elementary school principals.

The ANOVA indicates there is a difference among groups,

but it doesn't tell where. The NEWMAN-KEULS procedure indicates there are differences between groups 1,2 and 1,3 (see Table 14).

TABLE 14  
SUMMARY OF CELL MEANS AND S.D.

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.
1. ELEMENTARY	75	101.213	18.098*
2. INTERMEDIATE	64	93.391	14.952
3. SECONDARY	43	93.116	15.008

\*Group (1) is different from group (2) and (3).

Findings in question four:

The question asked was, "Does an interaction exist between the variables gender and grade level?" An analysis of variance was completed with the significance level at .05. The analysis of variance indicates there was no interaction between male and female principal's mean attitude scores (see Table 15).

TABLE 15  
 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN  
 ATTITUDE TOWARD INTEGRATION CROSSED:  
 PRINCIPALS BY GENDER

source	SS	DF	MS	F
WITHIN CELL	47426.25	176	269.47	
PRINCIPALS	2776.82	2	1388.41	5.15*
GENDER	294.02	1	294.02	1.09**
PRIN. BY GENDER	63.97	2	31.98	.12***
TOTAL	50561.05	181	279.34	

\*p<.05

\*\*p>.05

\*\*\*p>.05 (no interaction)

## CHAPTER V

### Summary, Findings, Discussion, and Recommendations

#### Summary

Mainstreaming means handicapped students participate in instructional and social activities side by side with nonhandicapped students in regular classrooms when possible. Integration programs have benefited handicapped and nonhandicapped students, especially in academic and social achievements. Studies have shown that integration had a positive attitude toward handicapped children and gives nonhandicapped students an opportunity to learn from their handicapped friends. Principals are the educational leaders of the school and can reduce the stigma attached to handicaps through increased contact between handicapped and nonhandicapped students; and their attitudes can help to establish the necessary school climate for successful mainstreaming programs.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of regular school principals in the State of Kuwait regarding integrating handicapped students into regular schools. This refers to the placement of special class children in regular classes whenever the child could benefit from the regular class program. This can be accomplished, in some instances, through the use of the special education teacher becoming a resource teacher to the

regular classroom teacher. This study was designed to determine the attitudes of the principals to these changes. An additional area of investigation of this study was to determine to what degree principals expressed positive or negative attitudes toward special education programs in regular schools. The study was limited to a random sampling of elementary, intermediate, and secondary school principals employed in The State of Kuwait for the 1986-1987 school year.

The instrument was developed by the researcher and translated into the Arabic language. It consists of forty statements concerning the attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait. Each statement consists of four-point Likert-type scale possible choices for response, ranging from "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree", and "strongly disagree".

The instrument was mailed to 229 principals of whom 52 were in female elementary schools, 44 were in male elementary schools, 34 were in female intermediate schools, 41 were in male intermediate schools, 27 were in female secondary schools, and 31 were in male secondary schools. One hundred eighty-two of the 229 principals completed and returned the survey, resulting in a 79.5 percent return.

The instrument was broken down into five clusters: (1) attitude toward regular classroom environment, (2) attitude toward social environment, (3) attitude toward expanding

integration, (4) attitude toward segregated environment, and (5) attitude toward administrative role. A comparison of these attitudes was used in conjunction with gender and three grade level variables.

Four research questions were tested. The first question concerned differences in attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in regular schools. The second question concerned differences in attitude scores between male and female principals. The third question concerned differences in attitude scores among principals at the three levels. Finally, the fourth question was developed to determine if there was an interaction between the variable gender and grade level.

Frequencies, means, standard deviations, t-tests, analysis of variance, and chi-square tests were employed to test these questions. The significance level for these questions was set at the .05. The coefficient alpha technique of reliability was .94 on the combined elementary, intermediate, and secondary principals responses.

The frequency procedures, mean, and standard deviation were utilized to determine the source of significant differences among all principals mean scores. Means within the range from 1.0000 to 2.5000 were considered favorable attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools. On the other hand, means within the range above 2.5000 were considered unfavorable attitudes.

There were twenty-five items with means falling in the 1.0000 to 2.5000 range, and these were listed according to their clusters.

A t-test was used to determine if there were differences in attitude scores of male and female principals. The chi-square distributions were utilized to determine the male and female mean scores in specific statements. There were significant differences of mean scores in statements 19, 20, 22, and 31.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there were differences in attitude scores among principals at the three grade levels. The chi-square distributions were utilized to determine mean scores among principals at the three grade levels in specific statements. There were significant differences of mean scores in statements 6, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 31, 33, 35, 39, and 40.

#### FINDINGS

The findings relative to the question, "What are the attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait?" were:

(1) Responses to twenty-five of the forty statements identified positive attitudes of principals toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools.

(2) Responses to fifteen of the forty statements were identified as unfavorable toward serving handicapped

students in regular schools.

(3) Twelve of these unfavorable attitudes were concerned with handicapped students in regular classes.

(4) The last three unfavorable attitudes were concerned with teacher attitudes toward handicapped students.

(5) None of the unfavorable attitudes were concerned with regular student attitudes.

(6) Individual mean scores showed that 100 of 182 principals expressed positive attitudes toward serving handicapped students in the regular schools.

The findings relative to the question, "Are there differences in attitude scores of male and female principals?" were:

(1) Significant difference was not found between male and female principals' attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular schools ( $t=-1.41$ ,  $p>.05$ ).

(2) Mean scores on survey responses of male principals (94.667) were lower than the mean scores of female principals (98.163) suggesting male principals had more favorable attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular schools.

The findings relative to the question, "Are there differences in attitude scores among principals at the three grade levels?" were:

(1) A significant difference was found among principals attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular



schools at the three grade levels ( $F = 5.20, P < .05$ ).

(2) The mean score on the responses of elementary principals (101.213), was higher than the mean score of intermediate principals (93.391) and mean score of secondary principals (93.116) suggesting elementary school principals have less favorable attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular schools.

(3) There were differences between groups 1,2 and 1,3.

The findings relative to the question, "Does an interaction exist between the variables gender and grade level?" were:

(1) An interaction was not found between the variables gender and grade level ( $F = .12, P > .05$ ).

#### DISCUSSION

The result of this study did show a sizeable positive response from school principals toward educating handicapped students into regular schools. Results of the data obtained in this study, indicate a need for increased efforts on the part of teachers' training for handicapped students in developing new programs which would reach teachers of the regular schools regarding special education in general. Therefore, major or elective courses should be offered at the Kuwait University and teacher college for special education. Additional money should be available for instructional and curriculum materials regarding special

programs in regular schools. Special programs for nonKuwaiti students are needed in private schools. The Ministry of Education, as advocates for optimum growth and development of all children and teachers, have an opportunity to support the material needs, skills, and positive attitudes for special education as reflected in this project. Finally, since regular schools already have handicapped students integrated into the classrooms without special programs, due to the parents' rejections toward transferring them to the special institutions, these parents might be more willing to accept special education services for their children if programs were housed in regular schools.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Data obtained in this study, would indicate a need for increased efforts on the part of The Ministry of Education to develop new programs to reach the general principals of the schools regarding special education in regular schools. This effort should include procedures that would get principals personally involved with special education programs. Knowing that regular principals contacted for this study had more favorable attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular schools, the principals and the supervisors should have an opportunity to support diversity and differing needs, skills, and attitudes as reflected in this project.

The following recommendations are given based on results in this study.

(1) A need exists for inservice programs for all school principals (particularly elementary level). Content of the inservice should focus on serving handicapped students in the regular schools of Kuwait.

(2) Pre-service and in-service programs for preparing principals should include information, concerns, topics for placement procedures, program options, role of special education in the school, and familiarization with materials and methodology in special education.

(3) Guidelines for special education programming must state clearly the roles and function of personnel in the Ministry of Education particularly to placement procedures, supervision responsibilities, and regulations.

(4) Teacher preparation programs must be developed for teachers in regular and special education programs, especially for working together for the education of all children in public schools regardless of educational needs.

(5) Future research should attempt to determine if age, degree, teaching experience, and administrative experience become significant as a function of attitudes toward serving handicapped students in regular schools.

(6) A replication of the study should be attempted comparing responses among regular teachers at the three grade levels.

Most studies referred to in the literature conclude that variables beyond the control of the investigator could have altered the results. This project was no exception.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ammer, J.J. (1984). The mechanics of mainstreaming: Considering the regular educators' perspective. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5, 15-20.
- Anderson-Inman, L. (1986). Bridging the gap: Student-centered strategies for promoting the transfer of learning. *Exceptional Children*, 52, 562-572.
- Anderson, R.M., Marinez, D.H., & Rich, H.L. (1980). Perspectives for change. In J.W. Schifani, R.M. Anderson, & S.J. Odle (eds.), *Implementing learning in least restrictive environment*. University Park. Baltimore, Maryland.
- Bachrach, L.L. (1985). Deinstitutionalization the meaning of the least restrictive environment. In K.C. Lakin, & R.H. Bruininks (Eds.), *Living and learning in the least restrictive environment*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.
- Bond, R. (1978). Attitudes. In R. Weisgerber(ed.), *Vocational education: Teaching the handicapped in regular classes*. Reston, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Brady, M.P., & Dennis, H.F. (1984). Integrating severely handicapped learners: Potential teacher liability in community based programs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5, 29-36.
- Brantlinger, E.A. & Guskin, S.L. (1985). Implications of social and cultural differences for special education with specific recommendations. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 18, 1-12.
- Brinker, R.P., & Thorpe, M.E. (1984). Integration of severely handicapped students and the proportion of IEP objectives achieved. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 168-175.
- Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, (1983). *Mainstreaming exceptional students*. Reston Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. *Exceptional Children*, 37, 229-37.

- Department of Special Education University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1974). Administrative and Legal Aspects of the Mainstreaming Issue In Special Education.
- Dougherty, J.W. (1979). An approach implementing IEPs - Implications for the principal. NASSP Bulletin, 63, 49-54.
- Dowling, M. (1985). Stigma-narrowing the gap, Academic Therapy, 21, 107-12.
- Education of the Handicapped Act, 20 U.S.C. 1401 (a) (1).
- Education of the Handicapped Act, 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a) (5).
- Federal Register. (1981). Assistance to states for education of handicapped children: Interpretation of the individualized education program, 46 (12). Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Gage, K.H. (1979). The principal's role in implementing mainstreaming. Educational Leadership, 36, 575-577.
- Gearheart, B.R., & Weishahn, M.W. (1984). The Exceptional Student in the Regular Classroom. New York: Times Mirror/Mosby, College Publishing.
- Gresham, F.M. (1982). Misguided mainstreaming: The case for special skills training with handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 48, 422-33.
- Gresham, F.M. & Reschly, D. J. (1986). Social skill deficits and low peer acceptance of mainstreaming learning disabled children. Learning Disability Quarterly, 9, 23-32.
- Hart, L.A. (1981). Classrooms are killing learning. Principal, 60, 8-11.
- Hasazi, S.E., Rice, P.D., & York, R. (1979). Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education, Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Hegarty, S. (1985). Integration and teaching: Some lessons from practice. Educational Research, 27, 9-18.
- Hlidek, R. (1980). Creating positive classroom environments. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed), Social environment of the schools. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.

- Hopkins-Best, M. (1984). What's so good about mainstreaming for the nonhandicapped student. University of Wisconsin-Stout.
- Horne, M.D. (1985). Attitudes Toward Handicapped Students: Professional, Peers, and Parent Reactions. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc..
- Icabone, D.G., & Gallery, N.E. (1982). Caught in the mainstream: The severely and profoundly retarded learner and the least restrictive environment. Rehabilitation Literature, 43, 66-71, 85.
- Ivarie, J., Hogue, D., & Rulle A. (1984). An investigation to mainstream teacher time spent with students labeled learning disabled. Exceptional Children, 51, 142-149.
- Jamieson, J.D. (1984). Attitudes of educators toward the handicapped. In R.L. Jones (Ed), Attitudes and attitude change in special education: Theory and practice. Reston Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1986). Mainstreaming and cooperative learning strategies. Exceptional Children. 52, 553-61.
- Johnson, R.E. (1981). Administration of programs for the handicapped. Journal for Special Educators, 18, 73-85.
- Johnson, R. & Johnson, D.W. (1980). The social integration of handicapped students into the mainstream. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed), Social environment of the schools. Reston Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Kaufman, N.J. Gottlieb, J. Agard, J., & Kukic, M.D. (1975). Mainstreaming: Toward an exception of the construct. In E.L. Meyen, G.A. Vergason, & R.J. Whelan (Eds.), Alternative for teaching exceptional children. Denver: Love Publishing Co.
- Knof, H.M. (1984). Mainstreaming attitudes and special placement knowledge in labeling versus nonlabeling states. Remedial and Special Education, 5,7-14.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sampling size for research activities, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

- Lakin, K.C., & Bruininks, R.H. (1985). Contemporary services for handicapped children and youth. In K.C. Lakin, & R.H. Bruininks (eds.), *Living and learning in the least restrictive environment*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.
- Lasher, M.G. (1979). *Mainstreaming Preschoolers: Children with Emotional Disturbance*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing.
- Laski, F.J. (1985). Right to habilitation and right to education the legal foundation. In K.C.Lakin, & R.H. Bruininks (Eds.), *Living and learning in the least restrictive environment*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Inc.
- Leibfried, M. (1984). Improving one's attitudes toward special education programs; The principal's role is instrumental. *NASSP Bulletin*, 68, 110-113.
- Lewis, R.B., & Doorlag, D.H. (1983). *Teaching Special Students in Mainstream*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Lietz, J., & Kaiser, J.S. (1979). The principal's role in administering programs for exceptional children. *Education*, 100, 31-40.
- Lietz, J.J., & Towle, M. (1979). The principal's role in special education services. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 4, 12-20.
- Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 519-569.
- Marsh, M.A. (1976). Factors that influence principals toward the acceptance of special education programs in their buildings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of South Dakota.
- McCann, S.K., Semmel, M.I., & Nevin, A. (1985). Reverse mainstreaming: Nonhandicapped students in special education classrooms. *Remedial and Special Education*, 6, 13-19.
- Meyen, E.L. (1982). *Exceptional Children and Youth An Introduction*. Denver: Love Publishing Company.
- Meyen, E.L., & Lehr, D.H. (1980). Least restrictive environment: Instructional implications. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 12, 1-8.



- Meyen, E.L., Vergason, G.A., & Whelan, R.J. (1975). The alternative movement in special education. In E.L. Meyen, G.A. Vergason, & R.J. Whelan (Eds.), *Alternative for teaching exceptional children*. Denver: Love Publishing Co.
- Ministry of Education. (1985). *Census of School Year 1984-1985 for General Education*. Kuwait Government Press.
- Ministry of Education. (1981). *Educational Programs and Plans for General Education*. Kuwait Government Press.
- Ministry of Education. (1982). *Institutes of Special Education*. Kuwait: Printing Press Affairs Department.
- Ministry of Education. (1978). *Principals Roles*. Kuwait: Ministry of Education Press.
- Morsink, C.V. (1984). *Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classrooms*. Boston: Little, Brown Co. Boston.
- Pasanella, A.L., & Volkmor, C.B. (1981). *Teaching Handicapped Students in the Mainstream*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co..
- Rebore, R.W. (1979). Public Law 94-142 and the building principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 63, 26-30.
- Regulations for Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. (1983). Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations Part 300 - Assistance to States for Education of Handicapped Children
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 (P.L. 93-112), as amended, 29, U.S.C. 794.
- Sabornie, E.J. (1985). Social mainstreaming of handicapped students: Facing an unpleasant reality. *Remedial and Special Education*, 6 (2), 12-15.
- Salend, S.J., & Salend, S.N. (1986). Competencies for mainstreaming secondary level learning disabled students. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19, 91-94.
- Schifani, J.W., Anderson, R.M., & Odle, S.J. (1980). *Implementing Learning in the Least restrictive Environment: Handicapped Children in the Mainstream*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Shrybman, J.A. (1982). *Due Process in Special Education*. Rockville: Aspen Publication.

- Smith, T.E., Flexer, R.W., & Sigelman, C.K. (1979). The role of principals in work-study programs for the handicapped. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 14, 247-250.
- Spodek, B., Saracho, O.N., & Lee, R.C. (1984). *Mainstreaming Young Children*. Lexington: Wadsworth, Inc.
- Sprinthall, N.A., & Blum, L.T. (1980). Peer and cross age teaching: Promoting social and psychological development in mainstream classes. In N.C. Reynolds (Ed), *social environment of the school*. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Strain, P.S., & Shores, R.E. (1983). A reply to " Misguided Mainstreaming ". *Exceptional Children*, 50, 271-73.
- The Constituent Assembly. (1962). *The Constitution of the State of Kuwait*. Kuwait Government Printing Press.
- Thompson, R.H., Vitale, P.A., & Jewett, J.P. (1985). Teacher-student interaction patterns in mainstreamed classrooms. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5, 51-61.
- Turnbull, A.P., & Schulz, J.B. (1979). *Mainstreaming Handicapped Students: A Guide for the Classroom Teacher*. Old Tappan: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Turnbull, H.R., Ellis, J.W., Boggs, E.M., Brooks, P.O., & Biklen, D.P. (1981). *The Least Restrictive Alternative: Principles and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency, Inc.
- Wang, M.C., & Baker, E.T. (1986). Mainstreaming programs: Design features and effects. *Journal of Special Education*, 19, 503-521.
- Wang, M.C., Peverly, S., & Randolph, R. (1984). An investigation of the implementation and effects of a full-time mainstreaming program. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5, 21-32.
- Wang, M.C., Rubenstein, J.L., & Reynolds, M. (1985). Clearing the road to success for students with special needs. *Educational Leadership*, 43, 62-67.

Zettel, J.J., & Ballard, J. (1982). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142): Its history, origins, and concepts. In J. Ballard, B.A. Ramirez, & F.J. Weintraub (Eds), Special education in America: Its legal and governmental foundations. Reston Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.

APPENDIX A

A LIST OF SERVICES MANDATED FOR THE EDUCATION  
OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN THE U.S.A.  
AND THE INSTRUMENT IN THE  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Dear Principal,

You have been selected from the principals' population list at the Ministry of Education to respond to the questionnaires enclosed.

The data gathered through the questionnaire will be used in a study for integration of handicapped students in regular schools, as part of my doctoral dissertation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute And State University. All data will be treated confidentially. Names of principals or names of schools will not be used in the completed study.

I appreciate your cooperation and your participation in this study. A return address envelope is enclosed.

Before you respond to the questionnaires enclosed, please read the attached papers. This will give you some knowledge and information about the kind of programs and services provided for the handicapped students in the United States of America.

In 1975, Public law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was enacted in the United States of America. The purpose of this legislation was to ensure that handicapped children ages three through twenty one, regardless of the nature and degree of their handicap, would have access to free and appropriate public education.

The term "free appropriate public education" means special education and related services must be provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and with out charge to the child's parents.

Public Law 94-142, emphasizes four major provisions: Protection in evaluation procedures, due process, individualized education program (IEP), and least restrictive environment(LRE).

Handicapped children are protected in evaluation procedures by ensuring that procedure tests and other procedures used to evaluate a handicapped students's special need are not discriminatory either racially or culturally. The child must be evaluated in his native language or mode of communication. The regulations require that a child receive a complete evaluation by a trained multidisciplinary team consisting of at least one teacher or specialist knowledgeable about the suspected disability, before placement in a special program. The child must be evaluated in all areas related to the handicap; the evaluation must address areas of educational need, not just intelligence;

and the instruments used in the evaluation must have been validated for the specific purpose for which they are used.

The department of education in any state can initiate a due process hearing when a parent refused to give consent for evaluation or initiation of service. Parents also have the right to examine all relevant records on their child, to obtain an independent evaluation, and to a due process hearing to challenge school decisions relating to identification, evaluation, placement or denial or provision of a free appropriate education to their child. A surrogate parent must be appointed to safeguard these rights when the parent or guardian of the child is unknown, or not available, or when the child is a ward of the state.

A written individualized education plan (IEP) must be developed for a handicapped student before receiving special services. The IEP must include a statement about a child's present level of educational functioning, short and long-term performance goals and objectives, the specific types of special education or related services the handicapped child will receive, projected dates for the initiation and duration of services and the criteria which will be used to measure the child's progress. The IEP must be reviewed and revised at least annually.

Handicapped children must be educated in the "least restrictive environment" with nonhandicapped students to the maximum appropriate. Handicapped students can only be

educated out of the normal classroom situation when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily . The child's educational placement must be determined at least annually, based on his/her IEP, and as close to the child's home as possible.

The term "related services" means transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services (including speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, and medical and counseling services, except that such medical services shall be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only) as may be required to assist a handicapped child to benefit from special education, and includes the early identification and assessment of handicapping conditions in children.

The concept of the least restrictive environment means that handicapped children should be educated within regular classrooms or regular educational environment to the maximum extent appropriate. The legislation emphasized a number of placement alternatives for the handicapped children should be available. These alternatives, as developed in response to that legislation, include full-day regular class placement, full-day regular class placement with consultation services for the teacher, part-day class



placement and part-day resource room services for the student, part-day placement in special class and part-day placement in regular class, full-day placement in special class, full-day placement in special school, and full-time placement in residential facilities.

The mildly handicapped students spend most of the school day within the regular classroom. The school may provide mildly handicapped students assistance from a special education teacher in a resource room if they need it. A student may also receive instruction outside the regular classroom from a reading or math teacher. Special education consultants and the regular teacher collaborate to design a program that fits the needs of the handicapped student in the regular classroom.

Moderately handicapped children may be assigned to a special classroom in a regular school but participate with nonhandicapped students in nonacademic subjects such as art, music and physical education. They also participate in extracurricular activities.

Educational programs for severely/profoundly handicapped students are being developed and organized to help them capitalize on their learning potential; and they are being integrated into regular school programs throughout the United States of America.

The eighth annual report to congress on the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act

(1986) listed that 67.94% of the handicapped students were educated in regular classes, 24.98% of the handicapped students were educated in separate classes within regular schools, 6.08% of the handicapped students were educated in separate schools, and 1.01% of the handicapped students were educated in other educational environment such as hospitals or homes.

Complete the following by marking the response which best describe you or your present situation.

## Principal of:

- Elementary school
- Intermediate school
- Secondary school

## Gender

- Male
- Female

## Age:

- 25 or less
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46 and over

## Degree:

- Teacher's institution
- Junior college diploma
- Bachelor Degree
- Master Degree or above

## Teaching Experience:

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11 -15 years
- 16 years and over

## Administrative Experience:

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16 years and over

For this questionnaire, handicapped student means a student who is evaluated by qualified professionals and verified as educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, or orthopedically impaired and require special education services in the State of Kuwait.

Please mark (X) in each statement indicating how you feel about the statement.

	S t r o A n g g r l e y e	A A g r e e	D i s a g r e e	S d t i r s o a n g g r l e y e
*1. Handicapped students should be educated in special schools.	<u>10</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>61</u>
2. Handicapped students should have appropriate social and academic skills before integration into regular schools.	<u>79</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>
3. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for handicapped students.	<u>30</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>5</u>
*4. Handicapped students should not have to compete with nonhandicapped students.	<u>13</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>36</u>
*5. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains handicapped students.	<u>17</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>31</u>
6. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of the handicapped students.	<u>54</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>6</u>

	S t r o n g l e y e	A A g r e e	D i s a g r e e	S D t i r s o n g r e l e y e
7. Handicapped students do not want any more sympathy than other students.	<u>23</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>14</u>
*8. Placement of a handicapped child in a regular classroom will likely result in his becoming socially withdrawn.	<u>9</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>42</u>
*9. Handicapped persons are usually more sensitive than other people.	<u>1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>87</u>
*10. Handicapped students should only participate with nonhandicapped students in non-academic courses.	<u>11</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>40</u>
11. Handicapped students will develop a more positive attitude toward school when placed in a regular classroom.	<u>32</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>10</u>
*12. Handicapped people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.	<u>22</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>4</u>
13. It would be best if handicapped students would participate and work with nonhandicapped students.	<u>33</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>1</u>
14. A handicapped child will be motivated to learn in regular classrooms.	<u>22</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>9</u>
*15. The presence of children with obvious physical deformities will make the nonhandicapped students uncomfortable.	<u>14</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>27</u>
16. Handicapped students should be educated in a regular classroom and moved into special classrooms in accordance with their needs.	<u>41</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>5</u>

	S t r o n g r e l e y	A A g r e e	D i s a g r e e	S D t i r s o a n g r e l e y
17. I think handicapped people are capable of becoming useful members in society.	<u>89</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
18. Handicapped students should be educated full time in special classes at regular schools.	<u>7</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>25</u>
19. I would be willing to supervise teachers that have handicapped students in their classrooms.	<u>29</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>14</u>
20. A more positive social relationship with other children will likely form if handicapped students are placed in a regular class.	<u>30</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>9</u>
*21. Handicapped students cannot be as independent as regular students.	<u>5</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>25</u>
22. Most handicapped students are well behaved in regular classrooms.	<u>20</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>4</u>
*23. Handicapped students will monopolize the teacher's time in regular classrooms.	<u>7</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>44</u>
24. Integrating the handicapped student will promote his/her social independence.	<u>31</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>10</u>
25. The integration of handicapped students can be beneficial for regular students.	<u>22</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>9</u>
*26. Integration is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the handicapped student.	<u>9</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>17</u>

	S t r o n g r e l e y	A A g r e e	D i s a g r e e	S D t i r s o a n g r e l e y
*27. The handicapped student will be socially isolated by regular classroom students.	<u>15</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>19</u>
*28. A teacher does not have enough time in a day to deal satisfactorily with the need of both handicapped students and non-handicapped students.	<u>12</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>54</u>
*29. I believe the handicapped student's self-concept would be damaged if placed in a regular classroom.	<u>9</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>27</u>
30. I believe that nonhandicapped students need the experience of being in contact with handicapped students in an academic setting.	<u>60</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>3</u>
31 Handicapped students should compete with normal students in the regular classroom.	<u>21</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>7</u>
*32. Behavior problems among regular students will increase with the integration of handicapped students.	<u>15</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>20</u>
33. Assigning handicapped students to a regular classroom is good for both handicapped and nonhandicapped students.	<u>17</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>13</u>
*34. I think that the educational achievement of regular students would be harmed with the integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom.	<u>28</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>18</u>

	S t r o n g l e y e	A A g r e e	D i s a g r e e	S D t i r s o a n g r e l e y e
*35. I believe I have too many responsibilities in regular school to accept the responsibilities of handicapped students.	<u>11</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>38</u>
*36. The handicapped student will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.	<u>3</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>47</u>
37. Working with handicapped students is a challenge I would look forward to.	<u>21</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>12</u>
38. I believe handicapped students should be integrated in regular school.	<u>46</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>4</u>
39. A more positive self-concept will develop in the handicapped student if placed in a regular classroom.	<u>34</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>5</u>
40. I believe the chances of a handicapped student attaining a more productive and independent place in society will take place from his/her experience of being in a regular classroom.	<u>27</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>5</u>

\*Negative statements scored 4, 3, 2, and 1

Note: A summary of responses by principals has been included in the response section.



APPENDIX B  
THE FINAL COVER LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS

٧٥/٣٠/٠٥٠٣/٨٦/٨٠٠٠



وزارة التربية

ادارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة : ت/اتع/  
التاريخ : ٢٦/١٠/١٩٨٦م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة

تحية طيبة . . وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحيم  
لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس  
العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينة عشوائية من نظار المنطقة .

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ،،،

مديرة ادارة  
تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

نسخة للسيدة /الوكيلة المساعدة للتعليم العام  
نسخة / للملف

ع.ي

٧٥/٣٠/٠٥٠٣/٨٦/٨٠٠٠



وزارة التربية

ادارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة: ت/ات ١٤  
التاريخ: ١٠/٢٦/١٩٨٦ م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة العاصمة التعليمية

تحية طيبة . . وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحيم  
لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس الطلبة الموقنين بالمدارس  
العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينة عشوائية من نظار المنطقة .

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ،،،

تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

نسخة للسيدة /الوكيلة المساعدة للتعليم العام  
نسخة / للملف

ع.ي



وزارة التربية

ادارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة : ت/ ا ت م /  
التاريخ : ٢٦ / ١٠ / ١٩٨٦ م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة حولي التعليمية

تحية طيبة . . وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحيم  
لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس النلب المعمول بالمدارس  
العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينه عشوائية من نظار المنطقه .

شاكون لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ،،،

تنسيق ومتابعة جميع العام

نسخة للسيدة /الوكيلة المساعدة للتعليم العام  
نسخة / للملف

ع.ي

٢٥/١٠/٢٠١١/٨٧٨٠٠٠



وزارة التربية

دارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة : وت / ات ١٤  
 التاريخ : ٢٦ / ١٠ / ١٩٨٦ م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة الفروانية التعليمية

تحية طيبة .. وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحيم  
 لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس  
 العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينة عشوائية من نظار المنطقة .

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ..

تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

نسخة للسيدة / الوكيله المساعدة للتعليم العام  
 نسخة / للملف

ع.٥



وزارة التربية

ادارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة : ت/أت ١٤  
التاريخ : ٢٦/١٠/١٩٨٦ م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة الجهراء التعليمية  
تحية طيبة . . وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحمن  
لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس  
العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينه عشوائية من نظار المنطقة .

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ،،،

تنسيق ومتابعة تعليم العام

نسخة للسيدة /الوكيلة المساعدة للتعليم العام  
نسخة / للملف

ع.٥



وزارة التربية

ادارة تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

رقم الاشارة : ت/ات م/  
التاريخ : ٢٦ / ١٠ / ١٩٨٦ م

السيد المحترم / مدير منطقة الاحمدى التعليمية

تحية طيبة . . وبعد

يرجى التفضل بتسهيل مهمة الباحث السيد / علي حسن عبدالرحسيم  
لاجراء الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراه في تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس  
العادية ، وذلك باختيار عينة عشوائية من نظار المنطقة .

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم .

مع خالص التحية ،،،

تنسيق ومتابعة التعليم العام

نسخة للسيدة / الوكيله المساعدة للتعليم العام  
نسخة / للملف

ع.٥

” بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم ”

المادة / نظار وناظرات المدارس الحكومية المحترمين

تحية طيبة وبعد ،

نرفق اليكم الاستبيان الخاص برسالة الدكتوراة في ” تدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس العادية ” والمقدم الى معهد فرجينيا للتكنولوجيا . ولقد تم اختياركم كهيئة مشاورية تمثل مجتمع نظار وناظرات المدارس الحكومية في الكويست .

آمل أن تكون اجابتكم دقيقة ومعمبرة عن خبرتكم العميقة في مجال الادارة المدرسية .

مع رجاء قراءة مقدمة الاستبيان قبل الاجابة عليه واعادة السى منطقتكم التعليمية خلال أسبوعين من استلامه .

طما بأن هذا الاستبيان المعبر عن رأيكم سوف تكون له الصريفة التامة من قبل الباحث .

واننا ان نأمل تعاونكم معنا نتنى لكم مزيدا من التقدم والرقسي والسلام ...

الباحث

علي حسن مهدي الرحيم



APPENDIX C

A LIST OF SERVICES MANDATED FOR THE EDUCATION  
OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN THE U.S.A.  
AND THE INSTRUMENT IN THE  
ARABIC LANGUAGE

### مقدمة

في سنة ١٩٧٥، أصدر الكونجرس الأمريكي قانونا يضمن التعليم المجاني والملائم لكل المعوقين من عمر ٣ الى ٢١ سنة بغض النظر عن طبيعة ودرجة الاعاقة التي يعاني منها الطالب. ويقصد بهذا النوع من التعليم، التعليم الخاص لكل طالب معوق كسل حسب قدراته مع توفير الأجهزة والوسائل اللازمة لذلك مع تحمل الدولة لكافة المصاريف. ولقد شمل هذا القانون أربعة بنود رئيسية هي :-

#### أولا : حماية المعوق عند اجراء الاختبار أو التقييم :-

يجب أن لا يكون في خطوات الاختبار وغيرها من الخطوات اللازمة من أجل تقييم الطالب أية تفرقة من الناحية المنصرية أو الثقافية، وأن يشمل الاختبار معلومات تتعلق ببيئة الطالب. فليس من العدل أن يتم اختبار الطالب بمعلومات بعيدة عن معرفته أو لا تتعلق بالبيئة التي يعيش فيها. ويجب اختيار الاختبار المناسب الذي سوف يحقق الهدف من الاختبار. وعلى سبيل المثال: يجب عدم اخضاع طالب يواجه مشكلة في الرياضيات لاختبار لغوي. ويجب أن يكون الاختبار باللغة التي يفهمها الطالب. كما يجب أن يكون المستعن مؤهلا وعلى دراية في طريقة تقديم الاختبار، لكي يتمكن من اصدار التقرير الصحيح عن حالة الطالب المعوق ووضع في البرنامج الدراسي الخاص والمناسب له. ويجب أن يختبر الطالب المعوق بأكثر من اختبار واحد، وليس باختبار الذكاء فقط. كما يجب أن تكون أدوات التقييم المستعملة صالحة من أجل الغرض المحدد الذي تستعمل من أجله.

#### ثانيا : ضمان حقوقه القانونية :-

يحق للمنطقة التعليمية اقامة دعوى ضد أولياء الأمور في حالة عدم السماح لها باجراء اختبار على الطالب المعوق. وفي نفس الوقت أعطى القانون الحق لأولياء الأمور بالاطلاع على جميع التقارير والنصائح المقدمة عن أبنائهم، والاعتراض قانونيا في حالة عدم اقتناعهم بالتقييم أو عدم وضع طفلهم في المكان المناسب له أو عدم توفير التعليم المجاني الملائم له. وتشمل هذه الصلاحيات التي يتمتع بها أولياء الأمور أيضا أولياء الأمور بالتبني، والمؤسسات الخيرية التي يعيش فيها الشخص المعوق.

ثالثا : برنامج تعليمي منفرد لكل طالب معوق :-

- يجب وضع برنامج فردي للطلاب المعوق قبل وضعه في أى صف أو مرحلة دراسية ، ويجب أن يحتوى هذا البرنامج أو الخطة على مايلي :
- أ - المستوى العلمي للطلاب المعوق قبل بداية البرنامج الخاص به .
- ب - أهداف البرنامج الخاص على المدى القصير والمدى البعيد بالنسبة للطلاب .
- ج - أنواع الدراسة الخاصة المحددة والخدمات المتعلقة بها التي سيتلقاها الطالب .
- د - تحديد موعد بدء الخدمات ومدتها ، وكذلك الأسس التي سيتم بناء عليها قياس مدى التقدم بالنسبة للطلاب .
- هـ - وأخيرا يجب مراجعة الخطة التعليمية لكل طالب مرة سنويا على الأقل .

رابعا : وضع الطالب المعوق في بيئة عادة غير محصورة بقدر الامكان :-

- يجب تدريس الطالب المعوق مع الطلبة العاديين الى أقصى درجة ممكنة . ولا يمكن عزل الطالب المعوق عن الطلبة العاديين أو التعليم العادى الا في الحالات التي يكون فيها تعليم الطالب المعوق في الفصل العادى أمرا مستحيلا بسبب الاعاقة الموجودة عنده . ولا يتم عزل الطالب الا بعد استعمال جميع الوسائل التعليمية الخاصة التي تساعد المعوق على التعليم بالفصل العادى .
- ويجب أن يحدد مكان تعليم الطالب المعوق سنويا على الأقل ، وذلك على أساس البرنامج التعليمي الخاص المحدد له ، وأن يكون هذا المكان قريبا من بيته بقدر الامكان . ويجب أن تكون هناك خدمات لازمة مع التعليم الخاص . ويقصد بالخدمات اللازمة مايلي :
- المواصلات ، وخدمات مساعدة للتعلم مثل اخصائي في النطق ، وعلم النفس ، وبحث اجتماعي ، والتدليك والترفيه ، وكذلك الخدمات الطبية والاستشارة التي لا تحتاج الى طبيب متخصص . أما الخدمات الطبية التي تتعلق بحالة المعوق الصحية مثل أمراض البطن أو الاسنان ، فهي من اختصاص الطبيب المتخصص .
- وهذا يشمل التحديد والتقييم المبكر لحالات الاعاقة عند الأطفال . ويقصد بـ مفهوم البيئة الغير محصورة بقدر الامكان ، أن يجرى تعليم الطالب المعوق في داخل فصل عادى ، أو بيئة تعليميه عادة لأقصى حد ملائم له . ولقد وضع القانون حرية الاختيار والتنقل لكل طالب معوق على حسب قدراته التعليمية والاجتماعية .

وقد تكون هذه الاختيارات في فصل عادى طوال اليوم الدراسي، وقد تكون في فصل عادى طوال اليوم مع ساعده عن طريق الشرف الاجتماعي لتذليل الصعوبات التي تواجه الطالب يوميا وقد يجرى وضم الطالب في الفصل العادى جزءا من اليوم، ثم التنقل الى غرفة خدمات خاصة تناسب احتياجات الطالب بصورة مركزة. ومن الممكن كذلك، أن يقضى الطالب المموق نصف اليوم الدراسي في الفصل العادى، والنصف الآخر من اليوم في فصل خاص للتقوية. كما ويمكن وضع الطالب في مدرسة خاصة يوميا دراسيا كاملا، أو وضعه طوال الوقت في مبنى سكن خاص كالمستشفيات و دور الرعاية الاجتماعية. ويوضع الطالب في هذه الاحتمالات حسب قدراته الدراسية والاجتماعية واحتياجاته الفردية.

نتيجة لهذا القانون فان أغلب الطلبة ذوي الاعاقة الخفيفة يقضون أغلب الوقت مع الطلبة العاديين في فصول العاديه. ومن الممكن أن يتلقى الطالب المموق بالاعاقة الخفيفة. أيضا تعليما خاصا خارج غرفة الفصل العادى لكي يساعده ذلك على التعلم، مثل المدرس المتخصص، والفصول الخاصة مع الوسائل المطلوبة للتعلم. ويوجد تعاون بين مستشارى التعليم الخاص وبين المدرس العادى من أجل وضع برنامج تعليمي يلائم احتياجات الطالب المموق في غرفة الفصل العادى.

أما الطلبة ذوي الاعاقة المتوسطة، فان أغلبهم يقضون اليوم الدراسي في فصول خاصة في المدارس العاديه. ويشاركون الطلبة العاديين في المواد أو الحصص البسيطة مثل الرياضة والرسم والموسيقى والنشاط المدرسي.

أما بالنسبة للطلبة المموقين ذوي الاعاقة الثقيلة، فقد بدئ بوضع برنامج خاص لهم في المدارس العاديه على مستوى جميع المراحل في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وذلك لمساعدتهم من أجل تحقيق طاقاتهم المتعلقة بقدرتهم على التعلم. وحسب آخر احصائية لوزارة التعليم في الولايات المتحدة، يدرس ٦٧٩٣٪ من الطلبة المموقين في الفصول العاديه و ٢٤٩٨٪ من الطلبة المموقين في فصول خاصة في المدارس العاديه و ٦٠٨٪ من الطلبة المموقين في مدارس خاصة، و ١٠١٪ من الطلبة المموقين في أماكن خاصة كالمستشفيات و دور الرعاية وذلك لصعوبة حالات الاعاقة عندهم.

ملاحظات من أجل هذا الاستبيان :-

( ١ ) يقصد بالطالب العموق ، الطالب الذي اختبر وتيم من قبل موظف مؤهل ومتخصص على أنه متخلف عقليا ، أو عنده اضطرابات نفسية ، أو عجز دراسي أو عجز جسماني ( يتعلق بالهيكل المعظمي والمفاصل ) ، ويحتاج الى خدمات تربية خاصة نفسي وولسة الكهت .

( ٢ ) الطالب العموق المقصود تعليمه بالمدارس العادية هو الطالب العموق صاحب الاعاقة الخفيفة أو المتوسطة . وهذه الاعاقة لا تسبب مشاكل أو أي تأثير على سير البرامج التعليمية أو الادارة المدرسية في المدارس العادية .

( ٣ ) تعليم الطالب العموق بالمدارس العادية لا يعني أنه يجب تدريسه مع الطلبة العادية بين في فصل واحد ، حيث يمكن تدريسه في فصول خاصة داخل المدرسة العادية . ويمكن تدريس الطالب العموق مع الطلبة العاديين في فصل عادي اذا كانت حالته تسمح بذلك مع اعداد فصول تقوية لمساعدته بالمواد التي يتسبب فيها ضعفه .

( ٤ ) في حالة تطبيق هذا النظام ، يجب أن تجهز المدارس بالمعدات والوسائل التعليمية الخاصة بالطلبة العموقين مع توفير المدرسين المتخصصين بالتعليم الخاص ، مع توفير تعاون متكامل بين مدرسي الطلبة العاديين والطلبة العموقين .

الاستبيان الخاص بتدريس الطلبة المعوقين بالمدارس العادية

---

الرجاء وضع علامة ( ✓ ) في المكان المناسب :

- ( ١ ) ناظر / ناظرة مدرسة :  
ابتدائية ( ) متوسطة ( ) ثانوية ( )
- ( ٢ ) نوع المدرسة :  
بنين ( ) بنات ( )
- ( ٣ ) الجنس :  
ناظر ( ) ناظرة ( )
- ( ٤ ) العمر :  
٢٥ سنة أو أقل ( ) ٢٦ - ٣٥ سنة ( )  
٣٦ - ٤٥ سنة ( ) ٤٦ سنة أو أكثر ( )
- ( ٥ ) المؤهل :  
دبلوم معهد المعلمين أو ما يعادله ( ) دبلوم معهد المعلمين ( )  
( ٤ سنوات بعد الشهادة المتوسطة ) ( سنتين بعد الثانوية العامة )  
شهادة جامعية ( ) ماجستير أو دكتوراة ( )
- ( ٦ ) الخبرة في العمل كدرس :  
١ - ٥ سنوات ( ) ٦ - ١٠ سنوات ( ) ١١ - ١٥ سنة ( )  
١٦ سنة فأكثر ( )
- ( ٧ ) الخبرة كناظر مدرسة :  
١ - ٥ سنوات ( ) ٦ - ١٠ سنوات ( ) ١١ - ١٥ سنة ( )  
١٦ سنة فأكثر ( )

يرجى وضع علامة (✓) على الاجابة التي تشمر انها تناسب رايبك :-

	<u>أوافق جدا</u>	<u>أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق أبدا</u>
١ - يجب أن يدرس الطلبة المموقون في مدارس خاصة بهم .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٢ - يجب أن يحصل الطلبة الموقين على مهارات تعليمية واجتماعية قبل الاختلاط في المدارس العادية .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٣ - كثير من الطرق والوسائل التعليمية التي يقوم بها المدرسون مع الطلبة العاديين تملح لأن تستخدم أيضا للطلـلاب المموقين .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٤ - ليس من الضروري أن يتنافس الطلبة المموقون مع الطلبة العاديين .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٥ - من الصعب المحافظة على النظام في فصل عادي به طلبة مموقين .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٦ - عزل الطلبة المموقين في فصول خاصة بهم يؤثر تأثيرا سلبيا على نموهم الاجتماعي والشعوري .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٧ - لا يحتاج الطلبة المموقون الى عطف أكثر من الطلبة العاديين .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٨ - من الممكن أن ينتج عن وضع الطفل المموق في فصل عادي ، انطوا اجتماعي .	_____	_____	_____	_____
٩ - يكون الأشخاص المموقون عادة أكثر حساسية من الأشخاص الآخرين .	_____	_____	_____	_____
١٠ - يجب على الطلبة المموقين أن يشاركوا الطلبة العاديين في المقررات فير العلمية فقط (مثل الرسم والرياضة) .	_____	_____	_____	_____







<u>أوافق جداً</u>	<u>أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق جداً</u>
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—

٣٠- يحتاج الطلبة العاديين

الى خبرة ومعرفة عن المعوقين قبل  
الجلوس معهم في جود راسي .

٣١- يجب على الأطفال المعوقين أن

يتناصروا مع الأطفال العاديين في  
الفصل العادي .

٣٢- ستزيد المشاكل السلوكية عند الطلبة

العاديين في حالة اختلاطهم مع الطلبة  
المعوقين في الفصل العادي .

٣٣- وضع الطلبة المعوقين في الفصول

العادية ذا فائدة للطلبة المعوقين  
والعاديين معا .

٣٤- سيتم تسر التقدّم العلمي للطلبة

العاديين نفسي حاله  
اختلاطهم مع الطلبة المعوقين  
في الفصل العادي .

٣٥- لدى المسئوليات

الكثيرة في المدرسة العادية بحيث  
لا أستطيع قبول مسئوليات الطلبة  
المعوقين أيضا .

٣٦- سيمسي الطالب المعوق مهارات علمية

أكثر سرعة في الفصل الخاص ما لو وضع  
في فصل عادي .

<u>أوافق جداً</u>	<u>أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق</u>	<u>لا أوافق أبداً</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

٣٧- يعتبر العمل مع الطلبة المموقين ،

عمل تحد وأنا أتطلع السي مثل هذا

العمل .

٣٨- يجب وضع الطلبة المموقين في المدارس

العادية في حالة سراح حالتهم لذلك .

٣٩- سوف تتطور ثقة الطالب المموق بنفسه

الى الأحسن اذا وضع في فصل عادى .

٤٠- وضع الطالب المموق في فصل

عادى سيتهج له فرص الحصول على مكانة

أكثر ايجابية واستقلالية في المجتمع .

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**