A COLLECTIVE CASE STUDY: HOW REGULAR TEACHERS PROVIDE INCLUSIVE EDUCATION FOR SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY DEAF STUDENTS IN REGULAR SCHOOLS IN RURAL NEW SOUTH WALES

Jill Cameron Dip. Sp. Ed. (Deaf), M.Litt. (Linguistics)

Submitted to fulfil the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Education) from the University of Newcastle September 2005

| I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis is the result of original research and has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution | |
|---|--|
| Signed | |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the students, their parents, the class teachers, the itinerant teachers, teacher's aides and the schools for their ready participation in this project. In every case all those requested to participate, did so and willingly, gave of their time to engage in interviews, and allowed me to be present in their classes. Their contribution in every case was invaluable and all contributed to creating an account of what occurred in the educational experiences of the students.

I am indebted to my colleagues who offered support and encouragement and provided me with any information I requested. Especial thanks go to DET personnel not directly involved with the inquiry including Fran Kelleher, Dominic Whitcom, and Steve Colditz, who either offered encouragement in the case of Fran, or references, which they thought may have been of interest to me, in the case of Dominic and Steve. To all of the itinerant teachers in the inquiry region and the adjoining region who performed member checks on raw data adding a further insight into the analysis, my thanks are extended to them also. I am grateful for the tolerance the teachers I supervise have extended to me in my constant involvement with this project.

I owe a great debt to my supervisors. Dr Greg Leigh, who has managed to offer encouragement to see the project completed, has continually offered insight, and assisted with advice about the cohesion of the final document. His attention to detail in the production of the project has been invaluable. Also, Dr Phil Foreman was invaluable for his academic input and advice and I thank him for his encouraging remarks. Especial thanks go also to Dr Allyson Holbrook for her assistance in providing advice about qualitative methodology, without which I could not have proceeded.

Finally, especial thanks go to my husband Duncan for his ability to put up with my preoccupation with this project over such an extended period and my periodic absence intellectually and emotionally, if not physically, over the period. I also thank him deeply for the constant trips to Sydney and Newcastle that he has undertaken to take me to supervisory meetings when the travel burden became a

further challenge for me. My family have all endured my unavailability over an extended period, far longer than I anticipated and I thank them for their tolerance. Without their support this project would not have reached completion. It is therefore dedicated to them along with the deaf students I have taught in the past and present who inspired my interest in the difficult task of educating deaf children.

ABSTRACT

This thesis reports a collective case study of the school educational experiences of five severely and profoundly deaf students who were enrolled in regular schools in rural areas of New South Wales. The students ranged in age from 6 to 18 years. Three issues were examined:

- The impact of the philosophy of inclusive education and the question of why students with high degrees of deafness and high support needs were enrolled in regular schools in rural areas;
- (2) The specific linguistic an educational support needs of deaf students; and
- (3) The ability of the regular schools and teachers to cater for the educational needs of the deaf students in those settings.

The case studies revealed that to considerably varying extents in different situations, the students were afforded inclusive educational opportunities. The extent of inclusiveness of students' educational experiences was shown to vary according to a number of variables. The variables identified included: the type and quality of communication with the deaf student, teaching style, accessibility of content, particular lesson type, and the type and extent of curriculum adaptations employed.

As a result of the analysis of the data from the five cases, a number of generalistions were possible. These generalisations were that (a) students with the ability to access spoken communication auditorily were more easily included than students using manual communication; (b) reduction of linguistic and academic input occurred as a response to student inability to access class programs because of reduced linguistic capabilities, resulting in the deaf students receiving different and reduced information to the hearing students; (c) communication between a deaf student and his or her class teacher needed to be direct for the most successful inclusion to occur; (d) teaching style needed to be interactive or experiential for successful language learning and literacy development to occur; (e) curriculum adaptations needed to involve provision of visual support for lesson material to be highly effective; (f) lessons/subjects easily supported by visual means, such as mathematics or practical subjects, when taught hierarchically, going from the known to unknown in achievable steps, meant teaching style could be either transmission or interactive, for lesson activities to be considered inclusive; (g)

students with poor literacy skills were unable to successfully access an intact (i.e., unaltered and complete) high school curriculum; (h) the teaching style of the class teacher impacted on the support model possible for the itinerant teacher; (i) an interactive class teaching style allowed for cooperative teaching between class teacher and itinerant teacher who could then assist the class teacher with both the linguistic and academic needs of the deaf student; (j) a transmission style of teaching resulted in various levels of withdrawal for the deaf student unless the subject matter could be represented visually; (k) when curriculum content or expected outcomes were reduced, the deaf students did not have the same access to information as their hearing counterparts and consequently could not develop concepts or understandings in the same manner; and (l) language and literacy development were most facilitated when interactive teaching opportunities were established proactively for the deaf students rather than through the reduction of content as a response to their failure to successfully engage with the complete curriculum.

The conclusions suggest an alternative support proposal for deaf students in rural environments. The model of support proposed involves the targeting of specific preschools and primary schools with the provision of teachers identified to teach collaboratively and interactively. Under the proposed model several students with impaired hearing would be located within the one school with the itinerant teacher position becoming a full-time appointment in that school. Such a model would enable coenrolment, co-teaching, co-programming, creative grouping, and the provision of demonstration opportunities and support for other teachers within the school and district that had deaf students enrolled.

Finally, interactive teaching, based on a clearly defined theoretical model of language acquisition, development, and learning, is recommended for students with impaired hearing in such environments. It is argued that the support of linguistic development and academic learning could be facilitated concurrently, thus ensuring that by the time students had reached high school they would possess sufficient literacy skills to access a regular high school program successfully.

LIST OF TABLES

| 4.1 Summary of findings of major studies examined | 121 |
|---|-----|
| 6.1 Student detail | 171 |
| 7.1 Observations and Inclusiveness Rating | 245 |
| 8.1 Observations and Inclusiveness Rating | 303 |
| 9.1 Observations and Inclusiveness Rating | 341 |
| 10.1 Observations and Inclusiveness Rating | 380 |
| 11.1 Observations and Inclusiveness Rating | 431 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| 5.1 Theoretical models of language and learning | 140 |
|---|-----|
| 5.2 Linguistic skills considered necessary for successful school learning and discourse types | 159 |
| 6.1 Representation of LPD using Cartesian space created by the intersection of the x and y axes | 195 |
| 7.1 Language Performance summary for Todd | 235 |
| 7.2 Variables contributing to the highest level of inclusion in Todd's case | 246 |
| 8.1 Language Performance summary for Kelly | 286 |
| 8.2 Variables contributing to the highest levels of inclusion in Kelly's case | 305 |
| 9.1 Language Performance summary for Wayne | 337 |
| 9.2 Variables contributing to the highest level of inclusion in Wayne's case | 342 |
| 10.1 Language Performance summary for Maisie | 370 |
| 10.2 Variables contributing to a moderate level of inclusion in Maisie's case | 380 |
| 11.1 Language Performance summary for Michael | 418 |
| 11.2 Variables contributing to the highest levels of inclusion in Michael's case | 432 |
| 12.1 Summary of teaching and support models | 479 |
| 12.2 An alternative model of support service delivery for deaf and hard of hearing students in rural regions. | 492 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT | i |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| ABSTRACT | V |
| LIST OF TABLES. | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | viii |
| CHAPTER ONE | |
| OVERVIEW | 1 |
| 1.1 Positioning the inquiry in the tradition of qualitative methodology | 1 |
| 1.2 The inquiry design | 6 |
| 1.3 The areas of concern | 7 |
| 1.4 Organisation of thesis | 11 |
| 1.5 The rationale of the inquiry | 12 |
| 1.6 Conclusion. | 14 |
| 1.6.1 Summary of thesis and questions | 15 |
| SECTION 1 | |
| CHAPTER TWO | |
| THE INCLUSION MOVEMENT | |
| 2.1 Introduction | 19 |
| 2.2 What are the historical underpinnings of special education provisions in Ne South Wales? | |
| 2.2.1 What are the historical precedents of special education in New So Wales? | |
| 2.3 What were the philosophical substrates of inclusion? | 24 |
| 2.3.1 What is integration? | 24 |

| 2.3.2 What philosophical views formed the basis for special education reform internationally? |
|--|
| 2.3.3 What international legislation and statements impacted on special education in New South Wales? |
| 2.3.4 What is the terminology of inclusion?28 |
| 2.3.5 What was the Regular Education Initiative (REI) and debate?29 |
| 2.3.6 What are the significant paradigms of inclusion which define it?32 |
| 2.3.7. What significant studies have been carried out in New South Wales to examine special education in the past? |
| 2.4 What are the legislative imperatives governing special education provision for students with disabilities? |
| 2.4.1 What is the Australian situation in regard of anti-discrimination legislation?42 |
| 2.4.2 What is the current situation with anti-discrimination litigation in New South Wales? |
| 2.5 What are the current practices in implementing inclusion in New South Wales?.46 |
| 2.5.1 To what extent is current Department of Education and Training Policy consistent with legislation? |
| 2.5.2 What are current practices? |
| 2.6 Conclusion |
| CHAPTER THREE |
| LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND DEAFNESS |
| 3.1 Introduction |
| 3.2 How do children acquire language?54 |
| 3.2.1 What are the theories of language acquisition?54 |
| 3.2.2 What is the environmental model of language acquisition?55 |
| 3.2.3 What is the biological model of language acquisition?56 |
| 3.2.4 What is the social interactionist model of language acquisition?56 |

| 3.2.5 What is the impact of language on thought?59 |
|---|
| 3.2.6 What is the impact of language on thought for the deaf?60 |
| 3.3 How does language acquisition take place for hearing and deaf children61 |
| 3.3.1 What are the similarities between acquiring a visual and an auditory language? |
| 3.4 How does the process of language acquisition differ for deaf and hearing children 63 3.4.1 What are complicating factors for deaf infants learning to communicate? |
| 3.4.2 What are the characteristics of the spoken language of deaf children?65 |
| 3.5 What devices and methods are used to overcome the inability to hear speech67 |
| 3.5.1 What are auditory aids?67 |
| 3.5.2 What are visual aids?68 |
| 3.5.3 What are some benefits or criticisms associated with these methods?69 |
| 3.5.4 What are some difficulties associated with language learning using artificial methods? |
| 3.5.5 What are the problems associated with interpreting?74 |
| 3.6 How does literacy learning take place for deaf students?77 |
| 3.6.1 How do deaf children learn to read?77 |
| 3.7 Conclusion |
| CHAPTER FOUR |
| DEAF EDUCATION |
| 4.1 Introduction85 |
| 4.2 How were deaf students educated historically?87 |
| 4.2.1 How were deaf students educated in the past?87 |
| 4.2.2 What is decentralisation? |
| 4.2.3 What were residential segregated schools and what did they achieve?.91 |
| 4.2 4 How did the students differ across placement types?93 |

| 5.4 What are the different teaching styles? | 140 |
|--|-----|
| 5.5 What are the characteristics of inclusive schools? | 142 |
| 5.6 What practices can facilitate inclusion? | 148 |
| 5.6.1 What is differentiation? | 148 |
| 5.6.2 What is coenrolment? | 149 |
| 5.6.3 What are adhocratic solutions? | 150 |
| 5.7 What are the linguistic characteristics thought necessary for deaf students t able to access a regular class curriculum? | |
| 5.7.1 What are the different discourse types? | 153 |
| 5.7.2 What are conversational, narrative, and expository discourses? | 153 |
| 5.7.3 What is Initiation Response Evaluation (IRE)? | 155 |
| 5.7.4 What are narration, description, persuasion, comparison, and argument? | 155 |
| 5.7.5 How is mastery of discourse types achieved? | 160 |
| 5.8 Conclusion. | 163 |
| SECTION TWO | |
| CHAPTER SIX | |
| THE METHODOLOGY | |
| 6.1 Introduction | 167 |
| 6.2 Commencement of the inquiry | 169 |
| 6.2.1 The students and researcher | 169 |
| 6.2.2 Study design | 171 |
| 6.2.3 Validation techniques | 172 |
| 6.2.3.1 Validation techniques used | 172 |
| 6.3 The data sources. | 174 |
| 6.3 1 Classroom observation. | 175 |

| 6.3.2 Semi-structure interviews | 176 |
|--|-----|
| 6.4 The data set | 176 |
| 6.5 Data collection | 179 |
| 6.5.1 Classroom Observation Data collection | 179 |
| 6.5.2 Pilot study | 180 |
| 6.5.3 Semi-structured Interview Data collection | 181 |
| 6.6 Research Questions | 181 |
| 6.6.1 Classroom Observation Research Questions | 182 |
| 6.6.2 Semi-structured Interview Research Questions | 182 |
| 6.6.3 Language Performance Data | 183 |
| 6.7 Language Performance Data (LPD) collection | 185 |
| 6.7.1 Language Performance Data Research Questions | 185 |
| 6.8 Instruments for Language Performance Data collection | 186 |
| 6.8.1 Formal Language Test | 186 |
| 6.8.2 Conversational skills | 187 |
| 6.8.3 Writing skills | 188 |
| 6.8.4 Listening Test | 189 |
| 6.8.5 Reading | 191 |
| 6.9 Data management | 196 |
| 6.9.1 Data reduction | 199 |
| 6.10 Data analysis | 202 |
| 6.10.1 Explanation of classroom observation variables | 203 |
| 6.10.2 Semi-structured interview variables | 204 |
| 6.10.3 Explanation of variable evolution | 205 |
| 6.11 The second stage of analysis—categorical analysis | 207 |

| 6.11.1 Definitions of inclusion as defined by the researcher209 |
|---|
| 6.11.2 Formulation of the Inclusiveness Rating |
| 6.11.3 Categorical Inclusiveness Rating of the observed lessons213 |
| 6.12 Conclusion |
| CHAPTER SEVEN |
| CASE ONE |
| 7.1 Introduction |
| 7.2 History |
| 7.3 Attitudes and opinions of those interviewed about Todd's inclusion221 |
| 7.3.1 Anomalies |
| 7.4 Data collection |
| 7.5 Language Performance |
| 7.5.1 Language Performance Data |
| 7.5.2 Description of Todd's Language Performance |
| 7.5.2.1 Conversational exchanges |
| 7.5.2.2 Writing |
| 7.5.2.3 Formal Language Test232 |
| 7.5.2.4 Reading |
| 7.6 Description of the events and practices in the lessons observed for Todd235 |
| 7.6.1 Adaptations |
| 7.6.2 Communication with teacher |
| 7.6.3 Classroom performance and inclusion |
| 7.6.4 Teaching style |
| 7.7 Issues arising from the data analysis |
| 7.7.1 Issues arising out of the Classroom Observation Data analysis243 |

| 7.7.2 Issues arising out of the Interview Data analysis (school personn | el)244 |
|--|--------|
| 7.7.3 Issues arising out of the Interview Data analysis (parent) | 244 |
| 7.8 Summary of the stage 2 analysis of Classroom Observation Data—Inclusi Rating | |
| 7.9 Interpretations, assertions, and generalisations | 246 |
| 7.9.1 Theoretical views which contributed to understanding Case 1 | 246 |
| 7.9.1.1 Language and thought | 246 |
| 7.9.1.2 Language –at school in Todd's case | 250 |
| 7.9.1.3 Literacy in Todd's case | 254 |
| 7.9.1.4 Pedagogy in Todd's case | 256 |
| 7.9.1.5 Inclusion in Todd's case | 259 |
| 7.9.1.6 Definition of success in Todd's case | 261 |
| 7.10 Assertions | 261 |
| 7.10.1 Language learning opportunities | 261 |
| 7.10.2 Literacy learning | 262 |
| 7.10.3 Academic learning | 263 |
| 7.10.4 Social experiences | 263 |
| 7.11 Generalisations | 264 |
| 7.12 Conclusion. | 265 |
| CHAPTER EIGHT | |
| CASE TWO | |
| 8.1 Introduction | 267 |
| 8.2 History | 268 |
| 8.3 Attitudes and opinions of those interviewed about Kelly's inclusion | 271 |
| 8.4 Data collection. | 273 |

| 8.4.1 Language Performance Data collection | 274 |
|---|-----|
| 8.5 Description of Language Performance Data | 277 |
| 8.5.1 Conversational exchanges | 277 |
| 8.5.2 Writing | 278 |
| 8.5.3 Formal Language Test | 280 |
| 8.5.4 Reading. | 282 |
| 8.5.4.1 Description of Kelly's reading ability | 284 |
| 8.6 Description of the events and practices in the lessons observed for Kelly | 287 |
| 8.6.1 Adaptations | 287 |
| 8.6.2 Teacher communication | 289 |
| 8.6.3 Student interaction | 292 |
| 8.6.4 Classroom performance and inclusion | 294 |
| 8.6.4.1 Maths teacher | 294 |
| 8.6.4.2 Class teacher | 296 |
| 8.6.4.3 Teacher's aide | 299 |
| 8.6.4.4 Year 4 class teacher | 300 |
| 8.7 Teaching style | 300 |
| 8.8 Issues arising out of Classroom Observation Data analysis | 301 |
| 8.9 Issues arising out of Interview Data analysis | 302 |
| 8.10 Summary of stage 2 analysis of Classroom Observation Data –Inclusiver Rating | |
| 8.11 Interpretations, assertions, and generalisations | 305 |
| 8.11.1 Interpretations which contribute to understanding Case 2 | 305 |
| 8.11.2 Literacy learning in Kelly's case | 310 |
| 8.11.3 Pedagogy in Kelly's case | 312 |
| 8 11 4 Social interaction in Kelly's case | 317 |

| 8.11.5 Inclusive practices in Kelly's case | 318 |
|---|-----|
| 8.12 Assertions | 319 |
| 8.12.1 Language learning opportunities | 319 |
| 8.12.2 Literacy learning | 320 |
| 8.12.3 Academic learning | 320 |
| 8.12.4 Social experiences. | 321 |
| 8.13 Generalisations | 321 |
| 8.14 Conclusion. | 322 |
| CHAPTER NINE | |
| CASE THREE | |
| 9.1 Introduction | 325 |
| 9.2 History | 326 |
| 9.3 Attitudes and opinions of those interviewed about Wayne's inclusion | 328 |
| 9.4 Data collection. | 331 |
| 9.4.1 Description of Language Performance Data | 331 |
| 9.4.1.1 Conversational exchanges | 334 |
| 9.4.1.2 Writing | 334 |
| 9.4.1.3 Formal Language Test | 334 |
| 9.4.1.4 Reading | 335 |
| 9.5 Description of the events and practices in the lessons observed for Wayne | 338 |
| 9.5.1 Adaptations | 338 |
| 9.5.2 Teacher communication | 339 |
| 9.5.3 Student interaction | 339 |
| 9.5.4 Teaching style | 340 |

| 9.5.5 Classroom performance and inclusion | 340 |
|---|-----|
| 9.6 Issues arising out of Classroom observation and interview Data analysis | 341 |
| 9.7 Summary of results of stage 2 analysis of Classroom Observation Data – Inclusiveness Rating | 341 |
| 9.8 Interpretations, assertions, and generalisations | 342 |
| 9.8.1 Language in Wayne's case | 343 |
| 9.8.2 Inclusive practices in Wayne's case | 344 |
| 9.8.3 Literacy learning in Wayne's case | 345 |
| 9.8.4 Pedagogy in Wayne's case | 346 |
| 9.8.5 Social success in Wayne's case | 347 |
| 9.9 Assertions | 347 |
| 9.9.1 Language learning opportunities | 347 |
| 9.9.2 Literacy learning | 347 |
| 9.9.3 Academic learning | 348 |
| 9.9.4 Social experiences | 348 |
| 9.10 Generalisations. | 348 |
| 9.11 Conclusion. | 349 |
| CHAPTER TEN | |
| CASE FOUR | |
| 10.1 Introduction | 351 |
| 10.2 History | 353 |
| 10.3 Attitudes and opinions of those interviewed about Maisie's inclusion | 354 |
| 10.3.1 Anomalies | 361 |
| 10.4 Data collection. | 361 |
| 10.5 Language performance | 364 |
| 10.5.1 Language Performance Data | 364 |

| 10.5.1.1 Description of Language Performance Data | 366 |
|--|---------|
| 10.5.1.2 Conversational exchanges | 366 |
| 10.5.1.3 Writing | 367 |
| 10.5.1.4 Formal Language Test | 368 |
| 10.5.1.5 Reading | 368 |
| 10.6 Description of the events and practices in the lessons observed for Ma | isie370 |
| 10.6.1 Adaptations | 371 |
| 10.6.2 Communication | 373 |
| 10.6.3 Teaching style | 374 |
| 10.6.4 Accessibility of content and student participation | 374 |
| 10.6.5 Student interaction | 378 |
| 10.7 Issues arising out of Classroom Observation Data analysis | 378 |
| 10.8 Summary of stage 2 analysis of Classroom Observation Data – Inclusi Ratings | |
| 10.9 Interpretations, assertions, and generalisations | 381 |
| 10.9.1 Theoretical views which contribute to understanding Case 4. | 381 |
| 10.9.1.1 Language and thought | 381 |
| 10.9.1.2 Language and thought in Maisie's case | 385 |
| 10.9.1.3 Literacy learning in Maisie's case | 387 |
| 10.9.2 Pedagogy in Maisie's case | 388 |
| 10.9.2.1 Class teachers | 388 |
| 10.9.2.2 Itinerant teacher | 389 |
| 10.9.3 Adaptations in Maisie's case | 390 |
| 10.9.4 Inclusion in Maisie's case | 390 |
| 10.10 Assertions | 392 |

| 10.10.1 Language learning opportunities | 392 |
|--|---------|
| 10.10.2 Literacy learning | 393 |
| 10.10.3 Academic learning | 393 |
| 10.10.4 Social experiences | 394 |
| 10.11 Generalisations | 394 |
| 10.12 Conclusion. | 395 |
| CHAPTER ELEVEN | |
| CASE FIVE | |
| 11.1 Introduction | 399 |
| 11.2 History | 401 |
| 11.3 Attitudes and opinions of those interviewed about Michael's inclusion | 404 |
| 11.4 Data collection. | 409 |
| 11.5 Language Performance | 412 |
| 11.5.1 Description of Michael's Language Performance Data | 414 |
| 11.5.1.1 Conversational exchanges | 414 |
| 11.5.1.2 Writing | 415 |
| 11.5.1.3 Formal Language Test | 415 |
| 11.5.1.4 Reading | 415 |
| 11.5.2 Description of Michael's linguistic ability | 417 |
| 11.6 Description of the events and practices in the lessons observed for Mic | hael419 |
| 11.6.1 Adaptations | 421 |
| 11.6.2 Teacher communication | 423 |
| 11.6.3 Student interaction. | 425 |
| 11.6.4 Teaching style | 426 |
| 11.6.5 Accessibility of content | 426 |

| 11.7 Issues arising from the Classroom Observation and Interview Data analysis428 |
|--|
| 11.8 Summary of stage 2 analysis of Classroom Observation Data –Inclusiveness Rating |
| 11.9 Interpretations, assertions, and generalisations |
| 11.9.1 Theoretical views which contribute to understanding Case 5432 |
| 11.9.1.1 Literacy |
| 11.9.2 Communication in Michael's case |
| 11.9.3 Support staff in Michael's case |
| 11.9.4 Locus of control in Michael's case |
| 11.9.5 Pedagogy in Michael's case |
| 11.9.6 Inclusion in Michael's case |
| 11.9.7 Adaptations in Michael's case |
| 11.10 Assertions |
| 11.10.1 Language learning opportunities |
| 11.10.2 Literacy learning |
| 11.10.3 Academic learning |
| 11.10.4 Social experiences |
| 11.11 Generalisations |
| 11.12 Conclusion |
| CHAPTER TWELVE |
| DISCUSSION |
| 12.1 Introduction |
| 12.2 Discussion |
| 12.2.1 Issue 1. The inclusion movement and why deaf students with high |

| 12.2.3 | Issue 2. The linguistic and educational needs of deaf students457 |
|-----------------|---|
| 12.2.3 | Issue 3. Regular schools and teacher's ability to cater for the needs of deaf students |
| | sations about factors leading to inclusive educational opportunities for and profoundly deaf students |
| 12.3.1 | Audition |
| 12.3.2 | Interactive learning |
| 12.3.3 | Literacy |
| 12.3.4 | Teacher style and support modes |
| 12.3.5 | Direct communication |
| 12.3.6 | Visual subjects |
| | sations relating to practices which do not contribute to inclusive nal experiences |
| 12.4.1 | Support personnel |
| 12.4.2 | Opportunity for language development |
| 12.5 Summary | |
| 12.6 Extrapola | ations to proposals for future practice |
| 12.6.1 | An alternative model481 |
| | 12.6.1.1 Preschool |
| | 12.6.1.2 Primary school |
| | 12.6.1.3 High school |
| 12.7 Conclusion | on492 |
| REFERENC | E LIST 497 |
| | Nomenclature used to refer to individuals with a hearing |
| Appendix B | Explanatory statement and letter signed by inquiry participants517 |
| Appendix C | Semi-structured interview schedule |

| Appendix D | Selection of unanalysed Language Performance Data, Observation Data and Interview Data from across the five cases | |
|------------|---|------|
| Appendix E | Emic Issues Table | 533 |
| Appendix F | Example of summaries of Classroom Observations | 535 |
| Appendix G | Summary of Data Analysis | .541 |
| Appendix H | Proposal for alternative support practices for children with hearing impairment in a rural district of New South | 543 |