

## A STUDY OF COMMUNICATIVE PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY IN MAIN STREAM CLASSROOM.



**PURNIMA MISHRA \***

Research Scholar, Jodhpur National University,  
Jodhpur, INDIA

### ABSTRACT

In this study researcher observed communicative participation of student with disability in Mainstream classroom. In communicative participation of student with disability researcher seen that communicative participation of students with hearing impairment and visually impairment and also compared the communicative participation of students with disability (Hearing impaired and visually impaired) with student with non-disability.

In communicative participation researcher seen communication interaction means Communicative initiation and response with teachers and peers and include both verbal and non-verbal communicative interaction. For this researcher used survey research design and purposive sampling and selected 10 disabled students (five hearing impaired and five visually impaired) For data collection researcher used observation techniques. Through observation table researcher observed (communicative participation of disabled and non disabled students) that how many times they initiate and response with peer and teacher. For study to comparison of communicative participation of 10 disabled and 10 none disabled students. Researcher selects each pair (1

disabled& 1 non disabled) one day was fixed as observation schedule. Researcher used non-parametefic Mann Whitney U test and Analyze the data. For study the comparison of communicative participation of five students with hearing impaired and five students with visually impaired. Researcher used descriptive analysis and analyze the data and also comparison of communicative participation of student Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired with teacher. Researcher used descriptive analysis.

In comparison of communicative participation of student with disability and student with non-disability. Researcher found that communicative participation of student with non-disability is better mainstream classroom. In compression of communicative participation of student with Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired. Researcher found that communicative participation of Hearing Impaired was better than student with visually impaired in compression of communicative participation with teacher researcher found that communicative participation of Visually Children was better than communicative participation of Hearing Impaired.

## **Introduction**

### **What is mainstreaming**

Communication is integral to the emotional and social bond between teacher and students. Education means overall development of a human being. Overall development means development, in academic, social, behavioral, personality and communicative level. Disabled can easily get academic knowledge in special school but don't be able to get, social and communicative development. These development can easily achieve in general or mainstream classroom.

### **Integration-**

Normalization movement manifested itself in an increasing trend towards integration and Mainstreaming (jangira1987). General schools as the preferred mode of educational provision for disabled children is an accepted goal. In India Integrated education for disabled children was born out of the global trend on the one hand, and inadequate provision in special school on the other. Integration cannot be reduced simply to an educational issue, or an employment issue. Its achievement will require the successful coordination of a whole series of transitions for the handicapped ranging from early identification, to early intervention, to school programmers, to community, jobs and finally to community living.

An approach to integration that takes the individual needs of the special child into full consideration may result is one more of following **Physical integration** -Planning for the location of special programs in school buildings, with regular education programs.

### **Social Integration-**

Planning for regular personal interactions between students who have handicaps are those who do not

### **Academic Integration-**

Planning to ensure students with an without handicaps simultaneously use school resources.

### **Societal Integration-**

Planning designed to enable students with moderate and severe handicaps to work, live and spend leisure time with their fellow non handicapped.

## **Inclusion-**

As adopted in the Salamanca frame work for Action, articles7, The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, wherever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences that they may have. Inclusive school must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both difference styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnership with committees. There should be a continuum of support and services to match the continuum.

Johnson (1994) lists the following distinguishing features of inclusive education.

\*It preferably takes place in a regular class, in the students nearest, regular school.

\*separation from the regular class environment, whether partially or in exceptional cases fully, occurs only where there is evidence that education in a regular class, accompanied by supplementary support and services, fails to meet educational, emotional and social needs of such students.

## **Mainstreaming and communicative participation-**

The word communication has been derived from the Latin word communes, which means common. Communication involves the concept of transfer. Meaning and information is used as a process, which involves various elements through which two or more persons share meaning? Among themselves sometimes it is used in the context of a particular element of the process say message or the means thorough, which the message is passed. According to news strown and Davis-"Communication is the transfer of the information from one person to another person. It is away of reaching others by transmitting ideas, facts, thoughts feelings and values". By communicative participation means to have share in open talkative. To interact openly and share

ideas view comment freely. Through communicative participation every one became the part of society because interaction is the process by anyone can easily mix in society. As we earlier discuss mainstreaming is a process on which students with disability got appointing to develop his academics and social skills generally the students with disability hesitate and feel uncomfortable to communicate with students with non-disability. Communicative participation between disabled and students with non-disability plays an important role in success of mainstreaming. Communicative participation help the students with disability to share their feelings view and ideas with non disabled peers and teachers. The main aim of mainstreaming is to develop the social participation and academic achievement. This social participation depend on the development communicative participation of students with disability. Mainstreaming greatly enhances disabled students for opportunities to interact with his peers and general teachers when students with disability communication freely with peers their hesitation removed and after some time they (students with disability) thinks their self as a part of society.

### **Importance of Communicative participation in Mainstreaming**

Mainstreaming allow children to built social networks and mutual relationships a number of international studies home shown that children to built social networks and mutual relationships. A number of international studies have shown that children with disabilities generally do better when included in mainstream schools instead of special ones. The belief here is that interaction in the mainstream classroom meaningful.

Communicative participation plays a important role in the success of mainstreaming as much as children with disability interact with his non disabled peers and teachers his students with disability language problem academic and social problem will be solve. Due to much chance of communication student can easily mix up with his community.

If students with disability does not interact with other non disabled peer and teacher he will not be able to share his feeling and problem to other and will not as a part of his own community and class. Due to this interaction teacher can easily enders and student feeling and can easily mix up with his students with disability. Peers much as communicative with students with disability their gap ended. After some time disabled becomes a peer of peer group and fully mainstreamed with peers. So communicative participation plays a role for the successful mainstreaming.

### **Scientific Justification of the study**

Researcher already seeing that communicative participation plays important role in a success of mainstream education. In this study researcher seeing that without adequate communicative participation students with disability can not be participate academically and socially in the classroom. According to Mautley and other 1976 find that there is a large difference of social and communicative participation between children with disability and children with non-disability. This. study also include that there is a need to study the communicative participation of student with disability Indian context. In this study researcher wants to see communicative participation of student with hearing impaired, students with visually impaired and also student with non-impaired. Success of mainstreaming depends on social participation of student with disability.

A communicative participation plays an important role in a active social participation of student with disability. So this is the scientific justification of our study that there is a need to see communicative participation of student with disabilities In mainstreaming setup.

So the scientific Justification of our study is that there is a need to see communicative participation of students with disability in mainstreaming setup.

### **Mainstream in Indian context**

## History of mainstreaming

Kothari Commission (1966) and the national policy resolution 1968 also recommended education of disabled children in general school. The Department of social welfare govt. of India launched the centrally sponsored scheme of integrated education for disabled children In 1974 with hundred percent central assistance the scheme provided funding for rehabilitation aids and equipment educational material, training of resource teachers, establishment of preschool and parents counseling centers transport allowance removal of architectural barriers in school building act.

The response of the state governments to the IEDC was a rather low only a few states responded. Even before the scheme was fully accepted by the states, there was a setback. *The* hundred percent funding was reduced to fifty percent in 1979. Several states discontinued the scheme and those which had not launched the scheme felt wiser hundred percent central funding was restored in IEDC in 1981, Implementation of the scheme however continued to be sluggish because of the credibility gap created by fudgy funding [policy.]

There were several constraints that restricted implementation of IEDC on a large scale firstly it was a scheme funded by the department of social welfare running special schools having practically no infrastructure for supervision at the grass-root level. It required support from department of education managing general schools in which he scheme was to be implemented. The co-ordination needed at the state and substrate levels could not be built up. In 1982 however the scheme was transferred to department of education.

Lot of time was consumed in transitional activity secondly document of the scheme was prepared for funding. It was not operational enough for the implementers for administrators in Education Department who were new to special education for disabled it remained an enigma. Thirdly the funds were provided without developing capabilities to use fourthly. The scheme was introduced without infrastructural preparation for example no guide lines were available for general teachers.

Evolution of the scheme in Maharsatra by Tata institute of social sciences (Rane1983 and council for social development ESD.1982) Sponsored by the department of social welfare identified linear

approach of resource teacher modality lack of trained manpower, lack of orientation of general teachers non availability of appropriate learning material suited to special education need inadequate assessment and lack of awareness in community about the scheme as the factors adversely affecting its implementation. The rigidity of administrative procedures further complicated the situation (NCERT 1987). It has also been supported by evaluation of the scheme in Rajasthan and Bihar for the first time the national policy on education 1980 has provided a comprehensive statement on education of the handicapped in the section on equal education opportunity. The policy document does not specifically refers to education of visually handicapped. It has made a general statement that objective of education of the handicapped is develop confidence and integrate them fully as equal partners in community. To realize this goal the NPE suggests that education of children with locomotors handicap and with other mild handicaps should, as far as possible provided in common with other children school It also suggest residential special schools at district headquarters for severally handicapped children. It implies education of the partially sighted in general schools. The IPE recommended revise and revision of the centrally sponsored scheme of interacted recommendations relating to this sector.

The centrally sponsored scheme of integrated education which was initiated in 1974 is being implemented in various states of the country. More number of Government institutions are involved in integrated education than the non-government institutes. The enrolment pattern of disabled children at the primary , secondary and higher secondary levels in general schools I as per the sixth all India Educational survey (1998) I is indicated tables, 1 ,2 and 3 .

Over 1.24 lakh children with disabilities have been integrated in over 20,000 mainstream schools under the integrated Education for disabled children scheme of ministry of HRD.

At the elementary level , under the sarva shiksha Abhiyan program, over 14 lakh children with disabilities have been enrolled. All India Educational survey (1998) .

## RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study, the Communicative participation of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired was seen by Researcher to find out this social interaction. Researcher observed the interaction of students with disability and students with non-disability, students with disability Teachers and students with non-disability teachers.

Researcher observed how many times students with visually impaired and Hearing impaired students initiated with his non-disabled peer and teacher. How many times teachers and non disabled peers of visually impaired students/ Hearing Impaired initiated with students with visually impaired and hearing impaired.

Researcher was also keen to observe how many times students with visual impairment and hearing impairment got response from his teacher and initiated with teacher in comparison to their non disabled student.

### Subject selection

In this study the communicative participation of those students with disability was to be observed, who have placed in mainstreaming setup with non disabled. *"Was their communicative participation also as non disabled students"*? It's very important to know that their communicative participation is same as non disabled students.

This is an effort to search the answer of these questions. In the process of socialization of student, communication plays important role.

This type of communicative interaction join's the students with the society due to communication human becomes the part of society ( Hurlock I 1981)

## Data Collection

In this communicate participation of students with disability and students with non-disability was to be observed, so researcher observed communicative participation of students with disability and student with non-disability, putting before observation table. Researcher had two observation table for each pair of disabled and non disabled student.

In every observation schedule, as communicative participation of students happened, researcher made a tally mark in observation table.

Thus data of each, pair was collected in one day. In a day there were seven periods of observation.

## Data Analysis

For hypotheses and objective 1 Mann whitney u test researcher used for the data analysis. Researcher selected this method because data was too small. Researcher took only 20 students with disability and students with non-disability as the sample of the study. In this a comparison of total score of two groups was done.

For this comparison for step of communicative participation have used.

They were -

- Total Initiation of communicative participation
- Total Response of communicative participation
- Communicative participation of subject with peer.
- Communicative participation of subject with teacher.

In mann whitney U-test three aspect of statistical analysis was observed.

They are -

(i) Mean Rank

(ii) Sum of Mean Rank

(iii) Is there any significant difference between two group or not.

Thus in statistical analysis the answer of three question was searched

1. Is there any difference between the score of two group.
2. If there is difference, is this significant according to statistical view.
3. If there is significance difference, whose score is superior in both group

For second Hypotheses and objective descriptive Analysis was used because data was too small only five students with Visually Impairment and five students with Hearing Impairment was compared. Mean and S.D. of group was calculated.

For Third Hypotheses and objective, Mean and S.D. was calculated because this was descriptive study and only five students with Visually Impairment and five students with Hearing impairment was observed

## **CONCLUSION -**

Here is difference between the communicative participative of students with Visually Impairment and students with Hearing Impairment with teachers.

Communicative Participations of students with Hearing Impairment is less than communicative participation of students with Visually Impairment thus third Hypotheses is rejected.

In communicative participation it is also important to observe not only communication between disability and non disability but also important to observe communication between disabled and

teacher. In present study it was found that the communicative participation of hearing impaired was less than communicative participation of visually impaired. It was due to deafness of hearing-impaired student.

Antia (1994) found that general class, teacher got training to improve the communicative interaction between peer to peer.. Due to extra support and lack of proper training many time teacher himself fulfill communicative need of disabled. The result of this is loss of communication of disabled with peer. Visually impairment student felt comfortable to communicate with teacher because their language is more develop than hearing-impaired child. Visually impaired student can easily hear the instruction and initiation of communication of teacher and able to response the teacher more" than Hearing Impaired. Due to deafness and less developed language, hearing impaired fails much time in initiation and response of communication. Present study found that Visually impaired communicate with teacher 49 time while hearing impaired communicate with teacher only 29 times. **It** was also found that teacher was not trained in sign language so they failed many time to understand the sign of student and cannot fulfill students desires and needs.

## REFERENCES

- Allen. K.E. &Schwartz I.S. (1996) The Exceptional child Inclusion in Early Childhood Education. Delmar publisher.
- Antia ,S (1984) Social interaction of partially Mainstreamed Hearing Impaired children. American Annals of Deaf, 127, 18-25.
- Antia, S (1994) Strategies to Develop Peer Interaction in Young Hearing Impaired children, The Volta Review96,277 -290
- Berkson,Gershon, (1993) Children with handicapped A Review of behavioral research. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates publisher, New Jersey.

- Best J.W,&Kahn (2005) Reseach in Education Pearson Education.
- Hegarty S.(1993) Meeting Special Needs In Ordinary Schools: An overview. Briddles limited Guildford and kings Lynn. Great Britain's
- Jangira ,N.K. & Mani M.N.G. (1990) Integrated Education for Visually Handicapped Management Perspective. Academic press Gurgaun Haryana.
- Johnson w. David & Johnson 1. Roger, Learning Together and Alone. Printed in United States of America.
- Lewis, B. Rena,& Doorlag H. Donald ( 1999) Teaching Special Students in General Education classroom, Peerson Education
- Lindsay G. and Dickinson 0.(1987) Integration of Profoundly Hearing impaired Children into a nursery setting . Journal of British associations Teachers of the Deaf, 11, 1-7.
- Sharma,S (1999) Understanding and educating Blind. Kamla nagar ,Agra.
- The Persons with Disabilities (Equal opportunities, Protection of Right and full Participation) Act 1995, Chapter1 RP-2-3.
- Verma, V (1978), "Social Integration on the Handicapped ", Social welfare. Vol.25(7), 14-15.