

Full Inclusion: Parent and Educator Objectives for Students with Challenging Needs

Gary Bunch, Ed.D.
York University

In a growing number of school jurisdictions, educators and parents have welcomed the concept of full inclusion. They believe that the appropriate place for all students is the regular classroom of the community school with other same-age students. Basic to this philosophy is the belief that parents, principals, regular classroom teachers, and special education teachers can understand and respond to the needs of students with challenging needs in the regular classroom. Advocates are confident that these groups can work together in designing a viable social and academic program that responds to individual abilities and needs. What Biklen (1985, p. 3) has termed "Unconditional mainstreaming" views every individual as having the right to participate in the community as fully as his or her abilities permit. The groundwork for this participation is laid in the regular classroom with regular peers rather than in a segregated situation: Although a student may not be as intellectually astute or as physically adept as many of his or her classmates, he or she still will be expected to and have the right to vote, live and recreate in, adapt and contribute to, and understand the world around him or her" (Stainback & Stainback, 1989, p. 82).

Full inclusion of students with challenging needs calls for an effective working relationship between the home and the school. The school principal and the responsible teachers and support personnel must be aware of the parents' objectives for their child. The parents must be knowledgeable regarding the program the school offers and what the formal educators intend to achieve. For full inclusion to succeed acceptably, it is necessary to "gather the people involved to develop a process for continuously adapting the curriculum and the class routine" (O'Brien & Forest, 1989, p. 7). For students with challenging needs, this "gathering" must include the parents. The curriculum is concerned with home and community activities as well as school activities. There must be a mutual awareness of the full life context of the child in order to ensure that efforts are coordinated for maximum effect. Inclusion in school without inclusion in the community would be less than half an answer.

Full inclusion has been criticized as being no more than expensive baby sitting. Critics of the practice argue that regular classroom teachers are not prepared to understand and meet the needs of students with challenges. They argue further that regular classroom teachers will be "terrified" at the prospect of having responsibility for such students (Vergason & Anderegg, 1989). Proponents counter that full inclusion can work, but they emphasize that "the teacher must be willing to take responsibility as the key educator in charge of the new student's behavior and achievements. The teacher must agree to accept the new students as an equal and vital classroom participant, beyond simply allowing him or her to attend the class" (Stainback & Stainback, 1989, p. 72). Intrinsic to this position is the assumption that average regular classroom teachers possess the potential to be successful with students with challenging needs.

These dichotomous positions exist, in part, because of a paucity of research information detailing the degree to which regular classroom teachers participating in full inclusion accept and feel competent in the practice. York, Vandercook, Caughey and Heise-Neff (1990, p. 3) note that "perhaps the greatest single piece of feedback [they] are hearing from regular educators is 'besides socializing, why are the students with severe disabilities in the regular classes?.... What are they learning?.... What are we able to teach them?'" The same authors (York, Vandercook, Heise-Neff, & Caughey, 1990) report elsewhere on an integration project in which some of these concerns were addressed. They note that at the end of one school year of experience regular and special educators recommended that their school district continue the inclusion program. The acceptance and involvement of students with challenging needs by peers, improved self-esteem, improvement in curricular areas, improved social communication and interaction skills, and increased motivation to attend class were cited as the positive contribution of this inclusion program. These educators also noted that there was some difficulty among regular educators in identifying changes in social and academic areas. The authors (York et al., 1990) ascribe this difficulty to "unclear expectations for student involvement" (p. 8). They suggest that differences between regular and special educators in identifying and setting expectations may lie in differing views of how these two groups regard students with challenging needs. Biklen (1985) supports this possibility in a discussion on goals set for their students by regular and special educators. He states that "most regular classroom teachers said they strived to prepare their students for going out in the world and making their mark. They spoke of their students as future leaders, as people who would make a difference. The special classroom teachers, on the other hand, spoke of adjustment and of finding happiness. Most expressed their goal as 'helping the students learn how to cope with

community life" (p. 8). Although the York et al., (1990) project provides some indication that regular classroom teachers are less than "terrified" by full inclusion once they become involved in it, the question of the regular classroom teacher's ability to accept a key role in designing a strong educational program is left in doubt for many.

A third concern raised by the question of full inclusion is whether a program which is heavily focussed on socialization for many students is an acceptable program for implementation in the regular classroom. The traditional view of regular classroom is that its focus is on the "Three R's." York and her colleagues (1990) point out that "nonsubject area outcomes that might be appropriate for a student with disabilities, such as initiating involvement in class activities, communicating with classmates, and participating partially in regular classroom routines, are currently not part of the way in which regular classroom educators evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching." If full inclusion is to be practiced, regular classroom teachers must develop an appreciation of individualized programs and an accompanying appreciation of alternate sets of objectives. When students with clearly differing skill levels sit side-by-side in a classroom, the teacher must offer differing task levels and monitor student interaction with those tasks in an effective and appropriate fashion.

York et al., (1990) suggest that regular classroom teachers might base educational objectives on the following categorization system:

1. Learning how to interact with peers;
2. Learning to participate in common components across typical routines;
3. Learning life-long curricular subject area skills; and
4. Learning about subject areas that might not adhere strictly to a life-space domain curricular orientation. (p. 3)

Strully and Strully (1989), among others, accept the viability of such a framework in developing socially focussed objectives, particularly at the initiation of full inclusion. They state that "developing friendships in school is one of the most important things that we as parents and educators can do" (p. 62).

The context for setting a socially and/or academically oriented curriculum and for pursuing differing task levels in a heterogeneous class grouping is suggested by Stainback, Stainback, and Slavin (1989). They cite Ysseldyke and Christenson (1986) in encouraging the development of a learning situation where "motivation and/or competition for positive attention and recognition should be focussed toward competing against

one's own achievement rather than against the achievements of others.... . With this approach, students can be compared with and encouraged to excel beyond their present highest achievements, rather than the achievements of others who have a different set of potential resources from which to draw" (p. 132).

Kernel Issues

These remarks coalesce into three issues. The first issue is whether educators and parents understand and share the goals of each other. The willingness and ability of the regular classroom teacher to assume focal responsibility for the academic and social education of all students is the second issue. The third issue is the acceptability of a program in which social objectives and activities equal or outweigh academic objectives and activities. To a degree which daunts many, the viability of fully inclusive education is determined to a large extent by the resolution of these three issues. The importance of such issues cannot be underestimated.

Full inclusion calls for nothing less than a redefinition of what education is and of what a student is. Advocates of full inclusion argue that education must never separate learners no matter whether the focus of learning is to be social or academic or both. All students being together takes precedence over any need for all students being at the same place at the same time in any curriculum. Students are not categorized or labeled by their needs or abilities. They are members of an integrated community of learners in which all learn together. In that integrated community, it is the needs of the student which are paramount, not the difficulties faced by the educators. Those who disagree with full inclusion advance the position that some learners will learn best in segregated environments with others of like needs and abilities under the instruction of specialist teachers. For these people, the category of disability and the concentration of specialized resources outweigh the social aspects of integrated education.

Present Study

Little direct information on the practice of full inclusion is available. Educators continue to disagree on many issues related to the implementation of this concept. The three issues forming the focus for the present discussion were investigated as part of a larger study with a three-year field phase designed to shed light on a number of contentious aspects of full inclusion. The particular observations made here deal with the social and academic objectives of parents, principals, regular

classroom teachers, special education resource teachers, and teacher aides for fully integrated students.

The three-year field phase of the study was designed to gather observational and interview data in three school jurisdictions with full inclusion policies. Thirty-two students comprised the study group. Students were nominated by the school jurisdictions as having challenging needs and as entering regular classrooms on a full-time basis for the first time coincident with the beginning of the study. The students' ages ranged from four to fourteen. Grade placements were age-appropriate and covered Early Childhood Education to Grade Nine.

The purpose of the study was to describe aspects of an educational practice of some controversy, one of which little is known beyond the circles of those practicing or advocating it. Specific areas of data collection within the study were the objectives of parents and educators, educational service delivery models designed to support full inclusion policies, and actual daily classroom activities carried out in the implementation of full inclusion.

Interview Instrument and Procedure

A common interview instrument was designed for parents and educators in order to obtain and record the objectives for students. Interviews were conducted individually by the principle investigator or a full-time field research assistant. Interviews were conducted at the beginning (September to mid-October) and at the end (mid-May to mid-June) of each of the three study years. The study design called for the interviews with each student to include parents, principal, and regular classroom teacher. Special education resource teachers and teacher aides were interviewed if assigned to support the program in the regular classroom.

This design allowed for a maximum of six parents, six principals and six regular classroom teacher interviews. Lesser numbers of interviews with special education resource teachers and teacher aides were expected as not all students would have such personnel working with them consistently.

The interview instrument was divided into five parts:

1. A single question designed to elicit the overall educational objective of the interviewee for the individual child;
2. A single question designed to have the interviewee divide the overall objective into social and academic components;

3. A series of questions focussing on social development within the family, local community, general community, regular classroom, and school;
 4. A series of questions focussing on academic development for physical and verbal capability, interaction with teacher and aide, reading, printing/writing, mathematics, and attention; and
 5. Two questions designed to determine interviewee time-frame when setting objectives as long- or short-term.
- (Actual questions appear under Findings and Discussion.)

Interviews with all respondents were conducted without reference to written individual plans. It was considered that the objectives foremost in the minds of respondents would be those stated without recourse to written materials.

Rationale for Data Collection Procedure and Interview Design

The field period of three years was set in order to permit the collection of data on objectives over a substantial period of time. Measurement of the change in the social and educational development of many students with challenging needs cannot be achieved over the short-term or through the use of routine norm-referenced or criterion-referenced instruments. It was hypothesized that change or lack of change in the objectives over time of those closest to the individual student's education would act as a measure of change or lack of change in the student.

As well, the three-year field period allowed for the gathering of information relating to any one student from a variety of principals, regular classroom teachers and others. Principals are re-assigned and new principals take over responsibility. Regular classroom teachers change as students are promoted from grade to grade with their peers. Both principals and teachers change if students change schools.

Lastly, practitioners and advocates of full inclusion assert that parents and educators must work together in bringing every student to the maximum realization of social and academic potential in the family, the community, and the school. The gathering of objectives from each group named previously allows for the comparison of degree of consonance or dissonance in objectives between parents and educators and among educators. The division of items along social and academic lines provides the opportunity to examine development in these two basic areas. The collection of data on objectives over time permits such comparisons to be made over time rather than at one static point.

Participant Pool

It was not possible to arrange six interviews with each interviewee. Interviews with some parents were difficult to arrange, and a number of parents indicated that they had no particular objectives for their children. They were pleased that their children were in community schools and hoped that the schools could do something for them. A number of students did not live with their parents but were in group homes under the care of child care workers. These workers tended to change rapidly and unexpectedly. Interviews were difficult to arrange. A number of parents agreed to one or two interviews but found that their schedules did not allow time for more. In summary, a limited number of parents participated in all or the majority of the planned total series of interviews.

This checkered pattern is suggestive of the responses one might expect of parents of any group of students attending the neighborhood school. Many parents do not maintain detailed knowledge of their children's lives at school. They are interested but accept that the system will educate their children as best as possible.

Interviews with principals and regular classroom teachers were arranged with little problem. Interviews with special education resource teachers and teacher aides were arranged when such personnel were assigned to work with children in the study. Such assignments were not made in every case, and in many cases, they were sporadic in nature, meeting specific needs as they arose.

A pool of eight students of the thirty-two in the study, whose parents, principals, and regular classroom teachers participated in all or almost all interviews form the basis for discussion. Information obtained from special education resource teachers and teacher aides was used when appropriate. These students at the beginning of the study were characterized through observation as follows:

Albert: A small, four-year-old, the youngest in his early childhood education class. Spends much of his time pouring water or other liquids from containers. Relates well to adults. Needs to work on peer relationships and become more confident. Does reading, math, and printing at grade level. Is challenged by speech clarity, attention skills, and large muscle activities.

Colin: A healthy looking ten-year-old in Grade 4. Working at developing friendships but bangs himself and hits others frequently. Listens well to stories and is beginning to make eye to eye contact. Will

gain more independence as he learns to do up zippers, tie shoes, and dress himself. Uses a number of signs and attempts verbalizations. Trying to improve printing of his name. Recognizes numbers to 31.

David: A smaller boy in his Kindergarten group. Initiates communication with peers in one word utterances. Learning to greet peers and to share. Eye contact is coming along as is tracing and printing his name. Has to be careful of physical activity due to a heart problem. Reacts impulsively to situations and yells out frequently. Can count by rote to five.

Mario: A happy Kindergarten lad learning to say "Hi," to get along with peers, and to share. Italian is spoken at home. Has three word utterances in English. Working on tracing and printing his name as well as walking and balance skills. Can count by rote to six. Enjoys looking at books but tends to hold them upside down.

Denise: A small girl in a split Grade 4/5 class. Has a temper and tends to be stubborn and to have outbursts. Working on hand over hand printing. Classroom is improving her walking skills and her fine and gross motor skills in general. Her program is focussed on acquisition of oral language, basic words, and pronunciation. She is learning to take care of her own belongings and to respect those of others. Working on numbers to ten and can match two objects with two others.

Brian: A five-year-old in an Early Childhood Education class. He is learning to verbalize and to follow simple oral directions. Enjoys listening to stories but does not read yet. Social skills are improving as eye to eye contact improves. Independence will grow as his toileting, dressing, and feeding skills grow. Enjoys trying to match shapes and colors.

Esther: In grade five. Learning to look after herself and to show respect for own belongings and those of others. Tends to be aggressive and to fight with peers with little cause. Working on attending to and completing tasks within a set time. Speech therapy showing some effect. Can do simple addition and subtraction. Working with money and on word recognition.

Bridget: A ten-year-old girl in Grade 4. Goes to Girl Guides and belongs to a wheelchair sports club. Prefers company of adults, younger children, and others in chairs. Working on building vocabulary from flashcards and work pattern books. Prints in block letters but has to learn to space. Reads at Grade One level with help of teaching aide. Working on attention and addition and subtraction less than 10.

Findings and Discussion

The findings are presented for each major category of the interview questions. Responses were examined for common elements across respondents as general analyses advanced. Clarifying examples are offered. Although analyses were based on responses to the full series of six interviews for each respondent, tabled examples focus on first and final interviews only. Example objectives for a parent and one of the educator group are set side by side. An examination of these two examples taken three years apart should provide the reader with insight into the degree of change over the study period.

Question 1. What is your general objectives for (student's name) in the regular educational setting? General objectives of parents and of educators for children of all ages emphasized the social side of full inclusion at the time full inclusion was initiated for any individual. Educators, particularly regular classroom teachers, frequently broke the general objectives into parts focussed on aspects of behavior and interaction (see Table 1).

Table 1

General Parent & Teacher Objectives for Colln

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To model from normal kids	To obtain social interaction To obtain acceptable behavior To have interaction with peers as well as teacher
6.	To become independent To be able to do basic math and printing	To adapt to regular school environment To be integrated in 6 activities to fullest extent

The objectives of all groups focussed on acceptance by peers and acquisition of normal behaviors. Interspersed in the parent statements were objectives aimed at specific characteristics of concern (see Table 2).

Table 2

General Parent & Principal Objectives for Albert

Interview	Parent	Principal
1.	To fit in socially To stop playing with jugs	To make him independent of adults To socialize with peers
6.	To improve social skills	To enable him to reach his fullest potential. To not set limits as is the case with peers.

At the end of the three-year study period, quite broad socially-focussed objectives remained. In many instances, these objectives were complemented by broad and/or specific objectives of an educational nature. The latter objectives were more evident in the objectives of teachers than of parents. This finding was interpreted as evidence that educators, and parents to a lesser degree, were no longer as concerned with the need for social change. Sufficient development had taken place in the social sphere to permit higher degrees of attention to academic progress.

Question 2. Can you divide your general objectives into social and educational components? When requested to divide broad general objectives into social and educational components at the initiation of full inclusion, parents experienced considerable difficulty.

Parents objectives remained focussed on the social sphere for students with challenging needs. Educators experienced similar difficulty in the case of some children, but for others, they were able to suggest broad educational objectives (see Table 3).

Table 3

Parent & Principal Social & Academic Objectives for Albert

Interview	Parent	Principal
1.	Social	
	To do things more normally Not to pour juice continually To play with others in class To relate to children more than to adults	For us to create more social situations to allow peer interaction
	Academic	
		To augment his communication skills
6.	Social	
	To use washrooms at school and not have accidents To make friends at school	To have him develop into a confident child. To feel at ease with peers
	Academic	
	To work with peers in class	To achieve his fullest potential

By the end of the study period, however, it was apparent that many of the students had progressed so well overall that programs of an academic nature accompanied the socially focussed efforts of parents and educators (see Table 4). This finding echoed and reinforced the more general finding of social focus and acceptable social development for question number one.

Table 4

General Parent & Teacher Social & Academic Objectives for Colln

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	Social	
	To learn to do what other children are doing	To act appropriately
	To learn from others	Learn to sit and wait
	To exhibit behavior similar to the norm	
	Academic	
	To communicate with others	To recognize primary numbers
	To talk if possible	To ask for and to get what he wants
		To obtain functional life skills.
6.	Social	
	To be able to take care of himself	To initiate social communication regarding desires and needs
		To be able to carry out personal tasks himself
	Academic	
	To have basic skills for what he needs in life	To comprehend and follow a schedule of academic activities

The dominance of social objectives over time is suggestive of slow change in the social ability of many students with challenging needs. Coupled with this was the indication by all concerned of the continued determination to work on the social area. Even so more specific objectives emerged, particularly those of an academic nature. This

...reaching of objectives, recognized achievement in the social area, and a need to switch focus. Other school- and home-related activities obtained prominence in the minds of those closest to the individual. Within this general framework, progress was highly individualistic.

Question 3. What are your long-term and immediate social objectives in terms of (a) relationships within the family; (b) relationships within the local community; (c) relationships with the general community; (d) relationships within the classroom; and (e) relationships within the school?

For the first three items, parents exhibited greater concern and subsequently more elaborated objectives than did educators at the initiation of full inclusion. It was through the objectives of parents that the degree of change in social development outside school was seen most clearly (see Table 5).

Table 5

Parent & Teacher Objectives for Esther In the Community

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To build a circle of friends To join in and mix in the general community To participate in after school activities	To know way to friends' house To be able to visit back and forth
6.	Has a circle of friends To keep her friends, one of whom in particular has To keep her friends, one of whom in particular has been marvelous	To apply life skills to the community To use the bus To know how to information

Educators did not appear as deeply concerned with objectives at the home and community level on the average at the initiation of full inclusion. It appeared that their attention was school-focussed. This focus may be seen as natural and expected. On the other hand, a major argument in favor of all children attending their neighborhood school is

acceptance in the larger community through inclusion in the community school. This finding of some difference between educators and parents may well form a commentary on the ability of parents and educators to work closely together in planning a program when a decision for full inclusion is first made.

Parental statements of objectives at the end of the three-year study period indicate considerable change in individual children in the home and some degree of change in the community. The effect of change on the family was evident in that some parents cried as they gave examples of occurrences. Statements such as "A friend called on the telephone. It was the first telephone call she ever got" or "One of his classmates came over to watch television. That had never happened before" or "She was invited to a birthday party. She couldn't believe it and neither could I" were scattered through the conversations sparked by the interview questions.

Educators became more aware of and involved in home activities as the study progressed. Objectives for the home and community, though generally broadly couched, indicated an appreciation of the need to be active in the home as well as in the school. At times, educators, too, wept as they recalled social advances beyond the school situation.

Table 6

Parent & Teacher Objectives for Esther In Classroom

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To maintain friendships	To get along with peers Not be aggressive Respect peer belongings To respect self
6.	Things going fine with circle of friends	To take more initiative in interacting with peers To initiate conversation in sentences To behave in socially acceptable ways

school community. Parents held quite general objectives for the classroom and school at the initiation of full inclusion and at the end of three years of integration. Despite the generality of objectives, progress in the social life of the classroom and school was evident to the parents (see Table 6).

Educators, particularly regular classroom teachers, had relatively elaborate objectives for social interaction and acceptance in the classroom. Objectives at the school level tended to be less delineated for both parents and teachers (see Table 7).

Table 7

Parent and Teacher Objectives for Marlo in School

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To react to others and defend self To be friends with more children out of class	To participate in school activities
6.	Same as above	No problems Participates and is well liked

Progress was apparent for many fully included students, indicating significant success in addressing the social development of students with challenging needs over time.

Question 4. What are your long-term and immediate educational objectives in terms of: (a) physical capability; (b) verbal capability; (c) interaction with teachers; (d) interaction with aide; (f) printing/writing; (g) mathematics; and (h) attention?

The objectives of parents and educators for activities of an educational nature were more similar and more specific than for the social area. This was true at the initiation of full inclusion on the average and at the end of three years of full inclusion.

those of parents and other educators and gave evidence of individual educational planning. This planning, as seen through stated objectives, was characterized by a framework of general objectives supported by specific objectives for activities of immediate and/or continuing teaching (see Table 8). Although the framework of objectives for parents and other educators was less elaborate from individual student to individual student, there was a greater degree of consonance than for social areas.

The analysis of objectives of parents and educators indicated progress in most or all academic or academically-related areas for all students (see Table 9).

Table 8

**Parent & Special Education Resource Teacher Objectives
for Colln for Physical Capabilities**

Interview	Parent	Resource Teacher
1.	To control his physical behavior To stop banging himself and hitting others	To start and stop running on demand To increase fine motor skills To use classroom equipment To run only in gym and outside
6.	To learn to skate To play games with others	To work on fine and gross motor To work on puzzles To work on computers and calculators

Table 9

Parent & Principal Objectives for David In Reading

Interview	Parent	Principal
1.	To read	To overcome second language factor and restricted home environment To experience prereading activities
6.	To be able to read To continue improvement	To increase vocabulary To continue Bridge reading program

The actual degree of change from month to month or even year to year was not pronounced, and it may not have been evident in the short-term for many students in the eyes and experience of parents and educators. It was only over the longer term of the study that increase in ability to use muscles, ability to make needs known, in number of signed words, ability to print one's name, or ability to maintain attention for longer periods became apparent. Likewise, changes in reading and mathematics were hard won (see Table 10).

Table 10

Parent & Teacher Objectives for Bridget In Mathematics

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To find a base and build on it	To rote count to 5
6.	To work on money concepts	To recognize numbers to 10 To have concepts to 5 To continue rote counting

A key aspect of full inclusion is the relationship of the individual student with the regular classroom teacher and with the teaching assistant if one is assigned. Through analysis of objectives for these relationships, it should be possible to determine the degree to which the regular teacher retains responsibility for the program for an individual student.

In the majority of situations studied, the regular classroom teacher appeared to be in control of the academic program (see Table 11).

Table 11

Parent and Teacher Objectives for David in Teacher Interaction

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	To respect the teacher	To be polite To put up his hand To follow oral direction To get eye contact when speaking
6.	None. Interacts well	To listen and respond appropriately Does not seem to hear what is said to him

Most teachers had definite objectives for the interaction of student and teacher and student and aide. The objectives tended to focus on student use of teacher and aide to increase involvement in academic activities by making needs known and responding to questions. A feature of some teacher objectives for student relationship with teaching assistants was a need to ensure that assistants worked effectively and firmly with students (see Table 12).

Although quite general on the average, parent and principal's objectives were supportive of teachers and teaching assistants. All of the parties involved had objectives in this area, and the quality of objectives did not alter radically over time as they did at times in social and academic areas. Parent and principal's objectives began and finished at a general level. Teacher's objectives began and finished at a comparatively

detailed level, suggesting teacher awareness of the need to establish a strong working relationship within the classroom if full inclusion were to succeed.

Table 12

Parent & Teacher Objectives for Bridget In Interaction with Aide

Interview	Parent	Teacher
1.	Has good interaction	To have comfortable relationship To firm and keep her on track To help with toileting
6.	Super interaction. No objectives	To do step by step instruction in short-term To provide general guidance through tasks in long-term

Summary

A close study of the objectives for individual fully included students with challenging needs over time indicated that it was feasible to track changes in social and academic development in situations where such tracking has proven difficult. Specific findings in this study were as follows:

1. Parents' objectives throughout focussed on development in the home and community. Educators demonstrated little concern for such objectives at the initiation of full inclusion. Awareness and accompanying objectives developed during the three years in many instances.

2. The initial focus of educators was social development in the classroom and the school. This focus paralleled that of parents, except for being in the academic situation rather than in the home and community.

3. Agreement between parents and educators was seen more in the academic area than in the social area both at the beginning and end of the three-year field phase of the study. Although academic objectives were sparse at the initiation of full inclusion, they flowered by the end of three years.

4. Regular classroom teachers were the primary persons in control of the program for and the instruction of fully included students with challenging needs. Others assisted the regular classroom teacher.

5. All groups were more specific in their statements about academic rather than social objectives. Regular classroom teachers were the most specific group in stating objectives, particularly academic objectives.

6. The focus of parents and educators at the initiation of full inclusion was on social development. Parents' objectives tended to be quite broad. In most cases, educator statements of objectives were similarly broad, but there was some evidence of attempts to couch objectives in terms of behavior and interaction.

7. At the end of three years, parent and educator's objectives continued to show a social focus; however, academic objectives accompanied social objectives. This alteration was more apparent in the case of educators than parents, and it was particularly evident in the case of regular classroom teachers.

8. Considerable development in social areas over the three years was documented by changes in objectives.

9. Individual academic progress was evident for every child. In some instances academic progress was marked.

Parents, principals, regular classroom teachers, and others do set guiding objectives for the social and academic progress of students with challenging needs. These objectives can be articulated readily without recourse to written individualized educational plans. In the sense that these appear to be objectives carried by parents and educators in their minds as opposed to on paper and appear to serve as a framework for short-term and long-term interaction, they may be considered superordinate objectives. It is such superordinate objectives which reflect the mind-set of those who will determine the success or failure of full inclusion as a practical educational policy. In the instance of the three educational systems studied, these superordinate objectives reflected a positive mind-set for all. Parents and educators viewed full inclusion of the students concerned as successful and practical.

The two groups shared objectives. Within this sharing, both parent and educator's objectives were socially focussed at the initiation of full inclusion. As full inclusion proceeded, both groups included more shared academic objectives, with educators showing a more greatly marked shift to the academic side as earlier social objectives for school and classroom were reached.

Regular classroom teachers accepted responsibility as primary educators for planning and implementing the social and academic programs of students with challenging needs. Principals and special education resource teachers were seen as resources to that planning and implementation. Teaching aides were employed as tools under the direction of the teacher for the accomplishment of objectives.

Social and academic objectives were interwoven in the program for any individual student. Social objectives were the focus of attention at the initiation of full inclusion for both parents and educators. As time passed and early social objectives were wholly or partially met, more academic objectives were set. Within this general pattern, social objectives remained a concern. This early and continued, though diminishing, focus on social objectives was viewed as acceptable by parents and educators.

In summary, parents and educators were able to redefine what a student is to the extent that students with challenging needs were seen as appropriate members of a regular classroom. Plans could be made and implemented to the mutual satisfaction of both groups. Observable and acceptable progress, over time, was made by all fully included students with challenging needs followed in this study.

References

- Biklen, D. (1985). *Achieving the complete school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- O'Brien, J., & Forest, M. (1989). *Action for inclusion*. Toronto, ON: Frontier College Press.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1989). Practical organizational strategies. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 71-87). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Slavin, R. (1989). Classroom organization for diversity among students. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 131-142). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

- Strully, J.L., & Strully, C.F. (1989). Friendships as an educational goal. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 59-68). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- York, J., Vandercook, T., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1990). Regular class integration at middle school: Feedback from classmates and teachers. *TASH Newsletter*, 16, 8.
- York, J., Vandercook, T., Caughey, E., & Heise-Neff, C. (1990). Regular class integration: Beyond socialization. *TASH Newsletter*, 16, 3.
- Vergason, G.S., & Anderegg, M.L. (1989). Bah, Humbug, an answer to Stainback and Stainback. *TASH Newsletter*, 15, 8, 10.
- Ysseldyke, J., & Christenson, S. (1986). *The instructional environment scale*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.