

past actions might not have an immediate impact on any individual weekly narrative, the overall effect was to expand the range of traits which characters might invoke in any given situation . . . the cumulative strategy offered a richness of narrative, moving beyond the simpler “who-done-it.”

Impact *Magnum, P.I.* introduced viewers to a new kind of Vietnam veteran, someone unlike the Rambo vigilante, someone scarred by Vietnam but not lost. Magnum’s heroic appeal was enhanced by his humanity and imperfections, and his investigations provided viewers with diverting mysteries to solve. The series captured Americans’ struggle to understand the past and the legacy of the Vietnam conflict, by insistently making reference to that past in order to make sense of the characters’ present.

Further Reading

Brooks, Tim, and Earle Marsh. “Magnum P.I.” *The Complete Directory to Prime Time Network and Cable TV Shows: 1946-Present*. 8th rev. ed. New York: Ballantine Books, 2003.

Haines, Harry W. “The Pride Is Back: Rambo, Magnum P. I., and the Return Trip to Vietnam.” In *Cultural Legacies of Vietnam: Uses of the Past in the Present*, edited by Richard Morris and Peter Ehrenhaus. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1990.

Renée Love

See also *Full Metal Jacket*; Miniseries; *Platoon*; Rambo; Television; Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

■ Mainstreaming in education

Definition Instructional practice in which all students of the same age learn together, regardless of capability

Mainstreaming was developed to ensure students with disabilities equal access to public education. Making it work required significant resources and reform of existing educational strategies.

From the 1920’s to the 1970’s, students with disabilities were taught separately from other students. That practice changed when Congress passed laws to ensure that disabled students were not discriminated against. In 1973, Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act. By 1975, that law was joined by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. These laws

aimed to allow disabled children to benefit from social associations with their peers (and vice versa). The strategy was called “mainstreaming.” Children with disabilities were allowed in regular classrooms for all or part of the school day. Activists began to explore the feasible boundaries of such inclusiveness. They took their cues from the civil rights era, hoping that no child would be sidelined into unacceptable “separate but equal” learning. They wanted to lessen the stigma for such children, advocating that each student receive an individualized education plan (IEP) tailored to his or her needs. These plans engaged all the stakeholders in a disabled child’s education: the child, the relatives, the school, and medical experts.

The Courts Weigh In In 1982, the Supreme Court issued a decision in *Board of Education v. Rowley*. The Court determined that schools are not obliged to provide services to maximize a child’s potential and that schools, rather than external arbiters, should decide what is appropriate educationally. During the 1980’s, the states further defined inclusion in such U.S. Court of Appeals cases as *Roncker v. Walter* (1983), *Devries v. Fairfax County School Board* (1989), and *Briggs v. Board of Education* (1989). By 1989, the federal courts began to order schools to institute mainstreaming. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Daniel R. R. v. State Board of Education* (1989) clearly expected schools to do more than make a token gesture. Instead, it said that the schools must be prepared to teach children with disabilities, by providing themselves in advance with the necessary aids and services.

Educators Face Problems in Mainstreaming While the courts were deliberating, educators saw three problem areas. First, boys were being classified as disabled much more often than were girls. Minority students, such as African Americans, Latinos, and non-native English speakers, were also classified more often. Educators wondered how poverty, gender, and race factored into the situation: Were these students really disabled, or were the schools’ assessment tools skewed?

Second, there were limits to the feasibility of mainstreaming. Perhaps a student with a behavioral disorder, despite much assistance, remained too disruptive to the rest of the class. Schools had to figure out what to do in such cases. Many schools tried “resource rooms,” where mainstreamed students could

go for part of the day for individualized tutoring or small-group instruction. Some schools brought another teacher into the classroom to give extra assistance to students who needed it. Throughout the decade, educators and parents sought to define the legal phrase “least restrictive environment,” which specified one of the requirements for disabled students. For each child, they tried to find out the type of setting that gave the greatest exposure to other students but that still provided that child with the best instruction.

Third, most American schools were simply not yet prepared to institute mainstreaming in practice, even once they figured out how to do so in theory. As a result, there could be no quick fix to the problem. Even those who were convinced that mainstreaming was the right thing to do did not yet understand what it entailed in terms of necessary resources and expenditures. Thus, schools instituting mainstreaming had to take careful stock of its impact on the classroom. They had to make sure that their teachers were adequately trained, that the classrooms were equipped with necessary physical aids, and that appropriate teaching assistance was provided. Teachers had to begin to learn how to teach in more dynamic, sensory ways. Schools started to realize that there were other issues to work on, such as engaging parents in the process, arranging transportation for students, funding programs in urban and rural areas, hiring qualified staff, and providing home tutoring. There was no consensus as to what kind of diploma a graduating mainstreamed student should receive.

Several institutes were set up to address all these questions. The Badger School, in Madison, Wisconsin, was created as a school for the severely handicapped, while the Juniper Garden Project at the University of Kansas conducted research focused on disabled students of color. Congress passed more laws to aid the adoption of mainstreaming. In 1983, Public Law 98-199 included funds to prepare disabled students for the transition from school to the workplace. In 1986, Public Law 99-457 expanded governmental intervention to aid disabled children, instituting programs designed to help such children from birth.

Impact Mainstreaming became the preferred method for educating students with disabilities. The courts defined the parameters of such students’ inclusion in mainstream classrooms and began to order that such inclusion take place. Schools started to

offer services from birth through the transition to employment, helping students with disabilities to become productive members of society without segregating them from the general student population.

Further Reading

- Allen, K. Eileen, and Glynnis Edwards Cowdery. *The Exceptional Child*. 5th ed. Clifton Park, N.Y.: Thomson Delmar Learning, 2004. Practical guidebook for parents and teachers; geared toward understanding and providing developmentally appropriate educational strategies.
- Burns, Edward. *The Special Education Consultant Teacher*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 2004. Explains how consultants help disabled children learn with their peers.
- Grenot-Scheyer, Marquita, Mary Fisher, and Debbie Staub. *At the End of the Day*. Baltimore: Brookes, 2000. Case studies of mainstreamed students with diverse disabilities, from preschoolers to high schoolers.
- Rawson, M. Jean. *A Manual of Special Education Law for Educators and Parents*. Naples, Fla.: Morgen, 2000. Explains the legal requirements governing education of disabled children.
- Rief, Sandra F. M. A., and Julie A. Heimburge. *How to Reach and Teach All Children in the Inclusive Classroom*. 2d ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006. Practical guide for mainstreaming, focused on addressing the needs of both students with and students without disabilities.
- Sands, Deanna J., Elizabeth Kozleski, and Nancy French. *Inclusive Education for the Twenty-First Century*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 2000. Introduces the ecological approach to mainstreaming in education.
- Ysseldyke, James E., and Bob Algozzine. *Working with Families and Community Agencies to Support Students with Special Needs*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin, 2006. Practical advice for teachers that focuses on extracurricular resources that they can bring to bear.

Jan Hall

See also Disability rights movement; Education in Canada; Education in the United States; Multiculturalism in education; *Nation at Risk, A*; National Education Summit of 1989; Racial discrimination; Standards and accountability in education; Supreme Court decisions; White, Ryan.