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CHAPTER I

The Problem

Introduction

Rationale

The most current and conspicuous trend in the field of special education, and perhaps in all of education today, is a concept in educating exceptional children called mainstreaming. Mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on the theory that each child should be instructed in the least restrictive educational environment which will meet that child's educational and related needs.

It is agreed by most who share in the educating of exceptional children that current trends, triggered by a variety of social forces, suggest that many, if not most, handicapped children will no longer remain segregated in special classes. Instead, they will attend school in regular classrooms.

The concept of mainstreaming is described in a variety of ways, such as integration, deinstitutionalization, non labeling and classification; it encompasses both community integration of the severely handicapped and educational mainstreaming of the mildly handicapped.
The concept is winning favor among many educators, particularly those in special education.

Birch States:

Mainstreaming is the enrolling and teaching exceptional children in regular classes for the majority of the school day under the charge of the regular class teacher, and assuring that the exceptional child receives special education of high quality to the extent it is needed during that time and at any other time.¹

Brenton noted that mainstreaming means moving handicapped children from their segregated status in special education classes and integrating them with "normal" children in the regular classrooms. Despite the fact that mainstreaming is not new nor is it in its primary stages, the current zest for it is new. Where mainstreaming is being implemented, handicapped children are achieving better both academically and socially. The exposure to handicapped children will help normal children understand individual differences in people; it will also help to diminish the stereotyping of the handicapped.² In essence, a regular school setting does a better job than a segregated setting of helping exceptional children adjust to and cope with the real world when they grow up.

Mainstreaming takes various forms: resource room instruction, individualization of instruction, team teaching, diagnostic-prescrip-


tive teaching and itinerate teaching arrangement. With mainstream-
ing, the resource teacher and the regular classroom teacher have
interlocking responsibilities. Communication between them is essen-
tial.

Every exceptional child cannot benefit from being mainstreamed
into the regular classroom. Hopefully, most responsible educators
are aware of this fact and do not intend to disregard it. However,
it is agreed by most supporters of the mainstreaming concept that
this condition appears to be not so much a function of the child's
handicaps as it is the extent to which special educators have made
the curriculums, instructional materials, and teaching procedures
sufficiently adaptable.

Barbara Milbauer asserts that exceptional children have a wide
range of special educational needs, varying greatly in intensity and
duration; that there is a need for a continuum of educational settings,
appropriate for an individual child's need; that to the maximum
extent appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with
non-exceptional children; and that special classes, separate school-
ing, or other removal of an exceptional child from education with
non-exceptional children should occur only when the intensity of the
child's special education and related needs is such that they cannot
be satisfied in an environment including non-exceptional children,
even with the provision of supplementary aids and services.¹

¹Barbara Milbauer, "The Mainstreaming Puzzle" Teacher 94 (May -
June, 1977): 44.
The variety of advantages ascribed to mainstreaming consist of removing the stigma associated with special classes, providing realistic situations in school to prepare the handicapped for experiences they will eventually face when they are no longer students, allowing regular and special classroom teachers to share their skills and knowledge in teaching the same children, and giving more children a cost-effective education.

Mainstreaming, which may not be new, is nonetheless still in its formulative stages. And mainstreaming like any growing movement, calls for changes in attitudes, behaviors and socioeducational structures.

The Tacoma experience, like that of other school districts where mainstreaming is working, indicates that one of the key factors in its success is attitude, especially teacher attitude. Edwin W. Martin, Deputy Commissioner of Education and Director of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, states: "It is our feelings we must deal with; our attitudes, fears and frustrations about the handicapped, about something that is a little different. In planning training programs, we must look at the attitudes of everyone involved and make those attitudes the focus of our efforts to change." ¹

The Education for all Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) signed by President Ford in November, 1975, mandates a national commitment to educating all handicapped children. The law requires that the state education agency be responsible for a "free, appro-

¹Ibid.
priate public education" to all handicapped children ages three
through 17 by September, 1978, and for ages three through 21 by
September, 1980.¹

The Council for Exceptional Children estimates that there are
presently about seven million handicapped pre-school age and school
age children in the United States. This figure includes physically
handicapped, mildly or severely retarded, and those with severe emo-
tional disturbances. Some 40 percent of all handicapped children
receive special schooling, either in segregated educational facilities
or in regular public schools. A very small number are in private
schools. More than 4 million either attend regular schools that do
not have the special services that are needed or they are totally
excluded from receiving an education.² Unmistakably the mainstream-
ing trend and the passage of Public Law 94-142 will make new demands
on both regular and special education teachers.

Evolution of the Problem

In the early seventies, a change was noted in the philosophy
of special education. In November, 1975, the Education of All Handi-
capped Children Act became Public Law 94-142. This law reflects a
major new commitment by the federal government to help educate all

¹Ibid.
²Brenton, p. 21
handicapped children. This change brought about a move away from special classes for mildly handicapped children to move toward reintegration of these children into the regular school program.¹

The recent widespread disenchantment with special education practices for mildly handicapped children has been evidenced in the activities of individuals and agencies. Pressure for this greater integration with the regular school program in special education was brought about by parents and minority groups who claimed that special education programs have been a dumping ground for their children.² These individuals have demanded a new program for their children. In this new program of integration, called "mainstreaming," special education teachers operate as resource teachers, sharing responsibility with the regular education teachers for the education of the exceptional child.³ The exceptional child may be one of the following: (a) speech impaired, (b) visually handicapped, (c) educable mentally retarded, (d) hard of hearing and deaf, (e) emotionally retarded, (f) crippled, (g) learning disabled and (h) gifted.⁴

As a result of the increasing attention on Public Law 94-142, specifying that all handicapped children be placed in the least restrictive environment, many educators have returned to their classrooms at the beginning of the school year to find children who once were in self-contained classes for the handicapped being mainstreamed into their regular classrooms.

During the school year 1975 - 76, the writer had a hard-of-hearing pupil placed in her classroom as a result of mainstreaming. While the writer considers the teaching of all children to be a challenge, this experience was exceptionally rewarding and enlightening.

However, the writer was deeply concerned about the fact that the pupil had not received any special services from trained special education personnel, prior to her placement into the regular classroom. It is for this reason, the writer has developed a deep interest and concern about the concept of mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.

Since the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped children into regular school programs has become a mandate of the federal courts, this study was undertaken in Atlanta, Georgia to determine, examine and interpret the prevailing attitudes of elementary regular classroom teachers toward this increasing practice for their school system.
It is hoped that the findings in this study will be of value to educators, especially those who have taken upon themselves the challenge of teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes. Also it is further hoped that:

1. This study will provide valuable information for potential and practicing elementary teachers for self-assessment in terms of positive attitudes towards professional development.

2. It will give insight into current trends and litigation surrounding these issues toward the education of handicapped children.

3. Educators will be able to utilize this information to reexamine their curricula in order to design or modify curricula relevant to the education of elementary classroom teachers with emphasis on attitudes.

4. The findings of this study will make available information that may be useful to assist not only educators, but school-community citizenry in helping to determine the feasibility of implementing mainstreaming in their schools.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study deals with the question: What are the expressed attitudes of elementary classroom teachers in Atlanta Public School System toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes?
Purposes of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship existing between the attitudes of elementary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with selected social-occupational variables and responses on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory.

More specifically, the purposes of this research were to determine:

1. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers categorized according to age.

2. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children between male and female elementary classroom teachers.

3. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers categorized by years of service.

4. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the number of academic courses taken in special and/or exceptional education.

5. If there are any significant differences in expressed atti-
tudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school community.

6. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the type of program(s) in their school for exceptional children.

7. If there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to having worked as a classroom teacher where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined according to their usage in this study.

Mainstreaming. The process of enrolling and teaching exceptional children in regular classes for the majority of the school day under the charge of the regular class teacher, and assuring that the exceptional child receives special education of high quality to the extent it is needed during that time and at any other time is called "mainstreaming" or "integrating."\(^1\) Inherent in this definition is the assumption that the regular classroom teacher is the primary agent responsible for the education of these children. The special educator may serve as the facilitator and/or consultant in the regular class.

Exceptional Children. Children who are classified by their school system as mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing and deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, crippled, gifted and learning disabled are exceptional and

\(^1\)Birch, p. 44
eligible for special education. These children are unable to function under ordinary classroom procedures and necessitates special education, either in conjunction with the regular class or in a special class or school, for this maximum development.¹

Regular Classes. Classes where exceptional children are taught with other children all or part of the day, receiving any combination of the following methods: nongraded, individualized instruction, enrichment-type, open classrooms, resource room, itinerant services and diagnostic-prescriptive services in the general school program.

Attitude. For the purpose of this study, attitude is defined as the regular classroom teacher's expressed feelings toward mainstreaming exceptional children as reflected in data on the **Mainstreaming Data Inventory**.

Mildly Handicapped Children. Children who are unable to adjust to or benefit profitably from a regular school program without the provision of special education services are classified as mildly handicapped. These children represent a large group of exceptional children who traditionally receive special education service in self-contained classes.² The mildly handicapped represent about 40 percent of the 7 million handicapped pre-school age and school age children in the United States.³

**Procedures**

Data for this investigation were analyzed using the descriptive survey technique employing an inventory. The instrument was mailed to the one-hundred (100) public elementary classroom teachers in the Atlanta System.

¹Love, p. 8.
²Love, p. 10.
³Brenton, p. 20.
The steps for gathering and analyzing the data included the following:

1. One-hundred (100) elementary classroom teachers were randomly selected.

2. The inventory with a cover letter was mailed to one-hundred (100) elementary classroom teachers employed by Atlanta Public School System, to collect data with respect to social-occupational characteristics and expressed attitudes toward exceptional children.

3. Responses on the inventory were compiled and grouped according to the teacher's expressed attitudes.

4. The data were tabulated, analyzed and assembled in percentages to show results for the designated variables.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways:

1. The involvement of mail questionnaire survey research in which the responses were not received from the entire group.

2. This study was conducted in the Atlanta Public Schools using only elementary regular classroom teachers. Therefore, the conclusions which were derived applied only to elementary regular classroom teachers in the Atlanta Public Schools.
Subjects and Locale of the Study

The subjects in this study were predominantly black elementary classroom teachers in the Atlanta Public Schools System, Atlanta, Georgia, who were employed during the 1978 - 79 school year.

The instrument used was an adapted form of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory.

Organization of Remaining Chapters and References

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter II deals with a survey of literature relating to the problem under investigation. This related information is used to set the study in its proper educational context.

Chapter III contains information about the selection of the sample, the instrument and statistical methods for analysis and treatment of data.

In chapter IV the data is presented and reviewed. This chapter includes descriptive analysis of data, testing of hypothesis, and tables of the information gathered on the instrument.

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, implications and recommendations. The summary contains statements of findings revealed in the study. The implications may provide specific suggestions for elementary classroom teachers and education. The recommendations, based on findings in this study, are made to be used by school systems,
and/or universities concerned with the mainstreaming process and teacher training programs.

The references cited and the appendices are the final portion of this study.

**Summary**

This study deals with the ascertainment, examination and interpretation of elementary classroom teacher's expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children in regular classes. Data obtained from seventy-three (73) teachers in the Atlanta Public School System provided information on the subject's perceptions of mainstreaming as a viable concept in education. Responses obtained from a data inventory consisting of social-occupational characteristics provided data for determining the teacher's expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

The review of pertinent and related literature will be presented under four major categories:

1. Overview of the Mainstreaming Concept of Exceptional Children into Regular Classes.

2. Attitudinal Studies Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children into Regular Classes.

3. Preparation of Teachers for Implementation of Mainstreaming.


Overview of the Mainstreaming Concept of Exceptional Children into Regular Classes

Because of the experience gained during the proliferation of special education classes in the twenty-five years following World War II, the field of special education has shifted its emphasis. Currently, it is negotiating a more integrated place for handicapped children in both public schools and communities under the aegis of mainstreaming. The movement is supported by a number of factors: the activities of militant parents' groups; the decrease in population growth; the cost of maintaining two parallel education systems;
the political climate; which has led to increased concern for children who are identified as handicapped and "disadvantaged;" a general disillusionment with the prospects of "curing" human ailments through the ministrations of specialists in clinical environments; technical developments in measurements and observation systems; and value changes that emphasize a greater awareness of the handicapped person's rights. Education is, of course, one of these rights.  

Since American education is being challenged within the profession as never before, special educators are now committed to the point of view that education's mode of address must change drastically from its present form if the precious uniqueness of each child's humanity is to be cherished. These challengers believe that not only must regular education practices change but that the program authorizing legislation, training programs focus, service delivery systems forms, and even the structures of special education must change.

Today, special educators deplore the proliferation of disability categories as ways of making better provision for children's needs. They are sure that the only meaningful category for educational purposes is the individual child. With this in mind, drastic changes must be implemented in schools.

---


Anderson elaborates further by insisting that the teacher is the crucial implementor of change in the classroom. In stressing the importance of a healthful school environment and the emotional atmosphere created in the school, Anderson states: "The most important thing in the environment is people, and the most important person is the teacher." Consequently, any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of education for exceptional children in the classroom depends primarily on the teacher.

Haring indicated that the attitudes and understandings teachers have about handicapped children are influential in determining the intellectual social and emotional adjustment of the children.\(^1\)

In order to fulfill this assignment successfully, the teacher should be knowledgeable of current trends and litigation in education, and of the special education service delivery system provided through mainstreaming. The reiteration of who these children are and the philosophy of the mainstreaming concept may have a significant impact on the attitude of teachers.

**Mildly Handicapped Children**

Children whose problems can be seen as relatively mild make up the large group who have been traditionally labeled as educable

---


mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, behaviorally disordered, educationally handicapped, learning disabled or brain injured. The one common characteristic is that these children have been referred from regular education programs because of some sort of teacher perceived behavioral or learning problem.¹

Children who have not been included in this definition are trainable mentally retarded, severely emotionally disturbed, multiple handicapped, or those who are so obviously deviant that they have never been enrolled in any kind of normal school program. Such children constitute a very small percentage of exceptional children.²

Philosophy of Mainstreaming

Haring³ summarizes the philosophy of mainstreaming, or integration as it has been referred to, as follows:

Exceptional children should have the benefit of experiences with their non exceptional peers whenever possible. Because these children will eventually be required to achieve a satisfactory adjustment within a predominately normal society, the experiences they have as children with the society are invaluable to them. Furthermore, normal children should be given the opportunity to understand, accept and adjust to children with exceptionalities.

²Ibid.
Mainstreaming will allow mildly handicapped students to be considered and treated according to their own unique educational needs. However, their rights, responsibilities and privileges will be the same as those of all other students in school.¹

Reasons for Change

Although programs for handicapped children expanded during the 1960's, they were still lacking in three respects. First of all, they provided separate facilities and separate teachers. Consequently, many handicapped students were labeled as "different." Such labels followed and often hindered students during their entire lives. Another problem was lumping all handicapped students, particularly mentally handicapped ones, under one category. As educators soon discovered, many suffered from environmental factors such as poverty or physical abuse, but they had not been born mentally deficient. A third problem rested on the lack of federal or state funds allocated to programs for handicapped students.²

As stated earlier in the paper, a number of factors are responsible for the changes that have come about in the education of exceptional children. However, the most basic issues concerning changes in special education for handicapped children are two-fold. First,

¹Keith E. Berry, Models for Mainstreaming, (Sioux Falls: Dimensions Publishing, 1972), p. 44.
²Reynolds and Rosen, p. 1.
to shift the emphasis away from the serving of handicapped children by disability labels to providing for the special educational needs of children within the framework of the regular program and secondly, to comply with legislative demands resulting from parental pressures to integrate labeled children into the regular school program.

Since evidence has accumulated over the years to indicate that mainstreaming is a valid alternative to self-contained special classes for appropriately selected pupils and teachers, a number of authors have discussed their findings on inappropriateness of special class placement and suggestive alternatives. Their studies investigated the efficacy of special class placement of disproportionate groups of children (including minorities), ability grouping, testing practices and labeling as well as suggestive alternative to special education placement. Among these investigators are Christophos and Renz;1 Dunn;2 Deno;3 MacMillan;4 Kirk;5 Johnson;6 Guskin and Spic-

---


2 Dunn, p. 5.

3 Deno, p. 229.


Lilly, p. 43.


Deno is responsible for one of the major alternative systems for change in providing services for handicapped children. This system is unique in its design which attempts to upgrade the effectiveness of the total pupil education effort. The system allows for a variety of ways of serving exceptional children, extending from placement in a regular class, with no need for special education, to special education that is provided in settings that may be the administrative responsibility of non-school agencies.

---


24 Deno, p. 229.
Pressures for Mainstreaming

Evidence does exist that parental pressure and litigation are two primary factors that have brought the mainstreaming concept to the surface in American education.

Birch asserts that the pressures toward mainstreaming spring from a complex group of motives of which at least eleven can be identified:

1. Parental concerns are being expressed more directly and forcefully.

Many parents never wanted their children to be placed in special classes and schools. They acceded to such placements only because they wanted their children to receive appropriate education and they knew of no possible alternatives. But their desire for the social benefits of educating all children together persisted. As parents learned that educators now know how to bring high-quality special education to large numbers of exceptional children in regular classes, their demand that the knowledge be applied has spread like wildfire.

2. The growing rejection of the labeling of children.

The belief has grown that if a child is called retarded, disturbed, slow, or handicapped, the label will influence the way in which he is treated by people around him and the way he perceives himself. For a long time, labels with negative implications have been associated with special education. The grouping
of labeled children in schools or classes that are identified as "special" seems to mark the child as being different in an undesirable way. Thus, it is argued, making special education an integral part of classes for all children minimizes the need for labeling and cancels many of its undesirable effects on children.

3. The capability to deliver special education anywhere has improved.

Much of the instructional apparatus of special educators has been made more mobile and less complex during the past 25 years. Standardized, mass produced, and packaged instructional materials are now available and they make for easier access and application. The number of self-instructional devices especially has grown in variety and applicability to children from pre-school through high school. In addition, a number of instructional approaches have been organized into systems which teachers can study and learn to use on their own or through inservice sessions; attending specialized courses on college campuses is not required. As a result, special education program directors have begun to apply the new approaches and materials to exceptional children in regular class settings in recent years with encouraging results.

4. Court actions have accelerated changes in special education procedures.

Some parents, notably those of mentally retarded children, found that severely and profoundly retarded children were being kept out of
school entirely on the basis of state regulations which were applied with the force of law. The same restrictions were applied to many retarded children in the more educable range of learning ability also. Consequently, the parents brought their complaint into court. The resulting consent agreement affirmed the right to full and free education for all children regardless of handicap. Moreover, the court followed the recommendations of special education leaders who testified that the most desirable setting for special education is the regular classroom, if it can be arranged. Thus an added stimulus for mainstreaming appeared from a most prestigious source, expert testimony accepted by the courts.

5. The fairness and accuracy of psychological testing have been questioned.

The validity of group and individual tests of intelligence and achievement has been challenged by many voices and particularly by the spokespersons for minority groups. Court actions and civil rights disputes have heightened the suspicion that such tests are unfair to children reared in cultural settings significantly different from those of the middle- and upper-class members of the dominant culture. Additional key reasons cited for the tests' lack of validity are the failure to include minority children in the test standardization groups and the application of the tests to minority children by majority persons. Since children have been placed in special education classes and special schools as a result of low test scores, the appropriateness of the placements has been brought into question.
6. Too many children were classified psycho-metrically as mentally retarded.

   Even before questions were raised in the courts about the accuracy of group and individual tests of learning capacity and achievement, a number of large-city school officials recognized that in their systems the number of children being classified as mentally retarded was three to four times greater, proportionately, than the national estimates. Whatever the reason for the discrepancy, it was clearly not feasible for such a large segment of a city's school population to be given negatively loaded labels and to be separated from their peers. One alternative was to make adaptations in the regular curriculum, adaptations that would build on the pupils' strength and correct the deficiencies that led to low scores on the standardized tests of intelligence and achievement. This alternative became the underlying premise of the compensatory education movement in many urban and rural centers of economic depression. It was also a straw in the wind blowing toward what is now called mainstreaming.

7. Civil rights actions against segregation uncovered questionable special education placement practices.

   Some school districts came under fire for allegedly violating children's civil rights by placing them in special classes which were operated as segregated school facilities. Segregation could be charged, for instance, if special education classes in a school
contained significantly greater proportions of American-Oriental, Black, Mexican-American, or Indian children than the rest of the school population.

8. Non-handicapped children are deprived if they are not allowed to associate with handicapped children.

Certain educators have argued that children without handicaps are deprived of important experiences if they are separated from their handicapped agemates in school. The same point has been made by some parents of both handicapped and non-handicapped children. Understanding, helpfulness, satisfaction of curiosity, overcoming of handicaps, acceptance of differences, are but a few of the concepts and feelings which can be developed among normal children through constructively managed interactions in school with the exceptional children who are their classmates.

9. The effectiveness of conventional special education was questioned.

The actual educational effectiveness of separate special schools and classes were equivocal. Comparative research rarely showed clear-cut academic or social advantages for handicapped children in special classes as opposed to other handicapped children who remained in regular classes and received no special help. Many educators interpret the studies as strongly suggesting that substantial numbers of handicapped boys and girls have achieved as well in regular classes as they might have in self-contained special education classes.
10. Financial Considerations foster mainstreaming.

In recent years, some states have made it equally or more feasible economically for local school districts to mingle exceptional children and others while still providing the special education to the children who need it. This approach reverses past policy in which school districts were rewarded for establishing separate classes and schools. Any movement like mainstreaming that offers the possibility of the multiple use of school facilities is welcomed by budget-minded officials.

11. American philosophical foundations encouraged diversity in the same educational setting.¹

Mainstreaming implements our philosophy of education. It is expected that the educational opportunities provided for American children and youth will:

Allow for the meaningful inclusion and appreciation of ethnic, racial, sexual, physical and ability variations without judgements about which course or method of study is more desirable. Individual differences are not to be viewed as deviations from the norm but as the basis on which the content and methods of a school curriculum are to be built.²

¹Birch, p. 2.

Parental Pressure

Parent groups have emerged as a powerful force for setting up the future directions of special education activities. Parental activity is more a modern revival of increased community concern than a new development. Parents of handicapped children began to organize about thirty years ago to obtain educational facilities for their offspring and to act as watchdogs of the institutions serving them.¹

Many parents, as well as educators, question the desirability of traditional self-contained classrooms for many exceptional children. Labeling, damage to self-concept, compartmentalization, concerns by minority groups, and loss of stimulating opportunities, as well as questions about the constitutionality of some current testing and grouping practices, are matters of increasing concern.

Working with parents may be one of the most important and significant activities that educators can engage in. Not only is the activity mandated by law but the development of consistency between school and home may make it possible for children to grow enough to function in society.²

With the advent of Public Law 94-142, parents as well as teachers need to learn how to confer. Some special educators have

¹Reynolds and Rosen, p. 5.
already started programs to teach parents how to prepare for conferences and how to be active participants in appraisal and review committee meetings. The assumption is that the more parents know about educational techniques and procedures, the more active they can be in the educational process.¹

**Litigation**

A "quiet revolution" is being fought within American education for the handicapped. Its purpose is to establish the same right for the handicapped that already exists for the non-handicapped throughout the United States. This recent movement is directed toward the number of children who will no longer be denied an education. Concern for the education of handicapped children has acquired a broad base in the American Society. It is the concern not only of parents and teachers, but of state and local governments. It now has become the concern of governmental officials at the highest level of the United States. This is reflected in the recent federal acts and appropriations for research training and services for handicapped children.²

Recent Litigation has resulted in formulation of the concepts "right to education," in addition to "right to treatment," and "freedom from involuntary servitude" in the area of mental health and special education.

---

¹Ibid.

According to Robert M. Gettings, the "right to education" suits suggest that no retarded child regardless of the degree of severity of his handicap, may be denied access to free public education geared to his own particular needs. The court states that abridgement of this right is clearly in conflict with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. This implies educational opportunity for all children; the right of each child to receive help in learning to the limits of his capacity, whether that capacity be small or great.

It is consistent with a democratic philosophy that all children be given the opportunity to learn whether they are average, bright, dull, retarded, blind, deaf, crippled, delinquent, emotionally disturbed, or otherwise limited or deviant in their capacities to learn.

The 1958 court ruling involving the Department of Public Welfare v. Hass which states that public schools are not responsible to provide education for the handicapped, especially the mentally retarded, is in direct contrast to the 1971 decisions concerning the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Pennsylvania and

---


3Ibid.
the 1972 Mills v. Board of Education, D. C. which affirms the "right to education" for all excluded children including the mentally retarded. The PARC, a landmark case involving exceptional children, was a class action suit which was filed to obtain and guarantee a publicly supported education for all mentally retarded children in the state of Pennsylvania. As a result of this case and in addition to guaranteeing the educational rights of mentally retarded children, it is also required that:

... the child and his family be provided the rights of notice and due process prior to any alternations in the child's educational status... these rights require that school districts notify parents of mentally retarded children that an alteration in their educational status is being considered... procedures such as the right to counsel, cross examination, presentation of evidence, and appeal, as well as others, must follow the placement process.2

An even more significant case, Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia was a suit of plaintiffs and their class against the welfare agency in behalf of all residents of institutions not receiving an education. The plaintiffs and their class sued the school board for children denied admittance to public school. In essence, this landmark established the right to an education for all children previously excluded from school.

---


According to Gettings, the "right to treatment" suits are claiming that the mentally retarded in publicly operated institutions have a basic constitutional right to adequate treatment and habitation services and that denial of this right should be interpreted as a major breach of the resident's entitlements under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution; it has also been argued in some of the cases that lack of public funds should not be a constitutionally adequate excuse for denying rights to retarded residents. ¹ Among the cases dealing with commitment and treatment procedures are Wyatt v. Stickney (1972) which infers the right to care and treatment of involuntarily committed mentally ill and the mentally retarded; Lake v. Cameron (1966) which state that procedures cannot overextend protection to the point of deprivation of personal liberty, consequently, a notice of continuum of services is required.² In the case of Donaldson v. O'Connor a damage award was upheld against the superintendent of a state hospital as well as a physician on staff for failure to provide the kind of treatment in that institution that would accord with minimal and generally accepted standards in that community.³ In the case of Jackson v. Indiana (1972) it was ruled that holding a handicapped indefinitely who is judged "incompetent" to stand trial is unconstitutional.⁴

¹Gettings, p. 22.


³O'Donnell and Bradfield, p. 16.

Since labeling and misplacement of handicapped children have become an overwhelming problem, as indicated earlier in this chapter, the court has declared that psychologists may release psychological reports to public agencies which deal with these children (Iverson v. Frandsen, 1956).¹ Court rulings in Larry P. v. Riles, 1972 and Hobson v. Hansen, 1967² declared that I.Q. test should not be used as the sole determiner for class placement. The 1972 case further asserts that if racial imbalance results, periodic re-evaluation is required.³ Additionally, it was ruled in 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education), that segregation of black children in public school education irrespective of the equality or asserted equality of tangible and material factors is a violation of the equal protection clause of the constitution.⁴

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) signed by President Ford in November, 1975, mandates a national commitment to educating handicapped children. The law requires that the state education agency must be responsible for a "free, appropriate public education" to all handicapped children, ages three through 21 by September, 1980.⁵

¹Collings, p. 29.
⁴O'Donnell and Bradfield, p. 11.
⁵Milbauer, p. 1.
The law makes a number of critical stipulations that must be adhered to by both the states and individual school districts. One requirement of particular interest to the classroom teacher, is the section that deals with placement of exceptional children into the "least restrictive environment."1 The law does not at anytime mention the word mainstreaming. However, many educators have contributed the "least restrictive environment" to mean all exceptional children should be mainstreaded. This is not the intention of the law, nor of most responsible educators.

Further, the law guarantees due process to parents of handicapped children regarding education, and integration of an exceptional child who has been placed back into the regular classroom, if it is not appropriate for meeting that child's needs. This act can be regarded as a violation of due process as it is stipulated in Public Law 94-142. There are safeguards against "wholesale mainstreaming" of exceptional children into regular classes.

Attitudinal Studies Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children Into Regular Classes

The attitudes, prejudices, needs and conflicts which teachers have are reflected in their behavior and influence strongly the social growth of exceptional children. Apparently, well-adjusted teachers are able to enhance the personal adjustment of the pupils whom they teach.2

1Ibid.
2Haring, Stern, and Cruickshank, p. 5.
The return of exceptional children to the regular classroom will be met with short lived success unless a program is initiated to modify the attitudes of all those concerned. Formerly, the educational system legally excluded children with exceptionalities. This exclusion was the written expression of mankind's attitudes toward its handicapped population, characterized by overwhelming prejudice.¹

Evidence of court cases (Mills v. Board of Education;² Donaldson v. O'Connor;³ Wyatt v. Stickney;⁴ Lori Case v. State of California;⁵ and Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania);⁶ substantiates that the handicapped are systematically isolated from the mainstream of society. From historical to the present time, physically, mentally and emotionally disabled individuals have been alternately viewed by society with suspicion and fear; and as dangers to be destroyed, or as burdens to be separated from the masses. Furthermore, these minorities' treatment

---

¹Weintraub and Abeson, p. 526.
²O'Donnell and Bradfield, p. 11.
³Ibid.
⁴Abeson, p. 65.
⁶Casey, p. 121.
results from a tradition of isolation unequal to non-handicapped America. Presently, the traditional ways of perceiving handicapped children must change if our educational systems are to be long lived.

Edwin W. Martin asserts that:

Over the last decade we have come to realize that educational opportunity for individuals with a handicap is not charity to be offered to the "have nots by the haves," but a basic right of every child in our nation. Experience has shown that all children, no matter how handicapped, can benefit from good education.¹

Additionally, Goldbert and Lippman state: Attitudes, Expectations and even values are in a state of rapid change in the United States today. They indicate that what was long taken for granted is now questioned and challenged.²

Because of this rapid change in our educational and judicial philosophy toward "Rights of Others," a number of attitudinal studies toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes are being undertaken. In spite of such obvious legal trends toward forced mainstreaming, many are still questioning the procedure.

Some educators and administrators are not keen on this practice because they fear that the gains made on behalf of handicapped children

¹Milbauer, p. 46.
will be wiped out once they are mainstreamed into regular classrooms. These opposing educators and administrators are not happy about the drastic changes their own accustomed professional approaches will have to undergo.¹

Many regular classroom teachers, who already feel pressured in many ways, often show resistance because they have never taught the handicapped and because they are concerned about their ability to cope with problems that could arise in teaching these children. But adequate training and resource support in schools where mainstreaming of exceptional children has been implemented, frequently turns resistance to enthusiasm.²

Some parents of handicapped children dislike the practice of mainstreaming. According to the Information Center for Handicapped Children, the primary reason is that these parents feel that they have worked hard to get their children special education programs, and they are afraid that with mainstreaming their children will either be dumped into regular classrooms without supportive services or that if the services are available at first, there is a possibility that these services will vanish if city and state budgets are cut.³

¹Brenton, p. 25.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
Recent investigation into the attitudes of teachers toward regular classroom integration of exceptional children are of significance to this study. Since teacher attitudes are important in determining the adjustment of the child, it would be significant to learn what factors lie behind the development of positive attitudes toward the exceptional child. Studies by Jones; Berry; Proctor; Combs and Harper; Haring; Guerin and Szatlocky; and Barngrover point out that attitudes of teachers toward mainstreaming handicapped children into regular classes are paramount for productive outcomes in education.

Proctor investigated classroom teacher's attitudes toward integrating exceptional children into regular classes and related this

---


2Berry. p. 62.


5Haring et. al., p. 117.


to knowledge of and experience with exceptional children. It was found that special class teachers were more realistic than were regular classroom teachers in their attitudes on integration.¹

Jones' study reports positive attitudes toward the mildly handicapped. Students in this category share the configuration of attitudes as are held for the non-exceptional.²

Want (1952) reports that teachers' attitudes toward school, children, and teaching did not seem to be effected by teaching experience. That their attitudes became more homogeneous with experience, while the degree of negativeness of positiveness appeared to remain constant.³

Additionally, Combs and Harper's study reveals that the amount of experience, rather than type of experience, helps a teacher to achieve a more realistic attitude towards educational placement of exceptional children.⁴ This study supports Haring's idea that orientation programs designed to develop knowledge and understanding about children is an effective approach to improvement of classroom integration for exceptional children.⁵

¹Proctor, p. 1721-A.
²Jones, p. 430.
⁴Combs and Harper, p. 402.
⁵Haring et. al., p. 117.
Modification Techniques of Attitudes

A substantial amount of literature is provided in this study supporting the assumption that the attitudes of teachers influence the attitudes of the children with whom they come in contact. It is assumed that if, through certain educational techniques, one can modify the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward a more realistic and humane acceptance of exceptional children, these attitudes of acceptance on the part of teachers will influence children in the direction of realistic acceptance.

According to Haring, the modification of teachers attitudes toward acceptance of exceptional children who are being mainstreamed into regular classes, involved various strategies of which at least three can be identified:

1. A more accurate and realistic knowledge and understanding of handicapped children, including their educational, physical, emotional, and social needs.

2. A greater understanding of teachers' own needs and how these needs affect behavior and attitudes toward handicapped children.

3. A greater opportunity for teachers to express freely their feelings toward children with impairments.1

The most widely used methods for modification of attitudes are films, group discussions, visitations, lectures, reading materials or any combination of these.2 Simulation games, and role playing

1Haring, p. 6.
2Ibid. p. 12.
are also methods used to modify attitudes.\footnote{Samuel Guskin, "Simulation Games on the Mainstreaming of Mildly Handicapped Children," in Viewpoints, ed. Sivasoilam Tiagarajan (Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, 1973), p. 87.}


Binnewies;\footnote{W. G. Binnewies, "Measuring Changes in Opinion," \textit{Sociology and Social Research} 16 (November-December, 1931): 143.} Cherrington and Miller;\footnote{Ben J. Cherrington, and L. W. Miller; "Change in Attitudes as the Result of a Lecture and of Reading Similar Material," \textit{Journal of Sociological Psychology} 4 (November, 1933): 479.} insist that a single method (lecture method) is more effective than others, but the evidence is not conclusive enough to suggest the identification of any single method for all situations. However, results from several experiments did indicate that lectures are a significant means of modifying attitudes.
Peterson and Thurston conducted a most impressive study indicating that motion pictures are an important influence on the attitudes of children. The findings from this study strongly suggest that the usage of motion pictures is an excellent technique for modifying teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes.

The greatest amount of research reports the use of instruction in some form or another as a means for modifying attitudes. However, evidence is contradictory as to the effectiveness of instruction in this area. Haring asserts: after closer inspection of the research one might conclude that the effectiveness of instruction in modifying attitudes is a function of the effort put forth by the instructor to modify attitudes in a given direction.

Haring and his collaborators concluded that by and large the most effective methods for changing attitudes appear to be favorable teaching methods. The method or methods used are not the only variables involved in the modification of attitudes. The instructor, lecturer of group discussion leader as an individual, plays a major role in this effort.

---

2Haring, et. al., p. 13.
3Ibid. p. 15.
Birch reports that the attitudes most conducive to success for mainstreaming include the following:

1. Belief in the right to education for all children.

2. Readiness of special education and regular class teachers to cooperate with each other.

3. Willingness to share competencies as a team in behalf of pupils.

4. Openness to include parents as well as other professional colleagues in planning for and working with children.

5. Flexibility with respect to class size and teaching assignments.

6. Recognition that social and personal development can be taught, and that they are equally as important as academic achievement.

Teachers influence and are influenced by the attitudes of each other, of administrators, and of the community. Mainstreaming as a principle and a process depends heavily upon positive attitudes of teachers for the most effective force for excellent teaching of exceptional children.¹

¹Birch, p. 94.

Preparation of Teachers’ for Implementation of Mainstreaming

Guskin suggests that the preparation of teachers—both regular and special class teachers who will be involved in mainstreaming can be categorized into three components: (1) effective, (2) cognitive, and (3) behavioral. The effective component emphasizes feelings and
emotions, viz: interest, attitudes, appreciation, methods of adjustment and willingness to work with handicapped children. The cognitive component involves an insight into the characteristics of handicapped children and their intellectual needs, such as knowledge, understanding and thinking skills. The behavioral component involves skills needed by teachers to work with these children. These skills include the teaching of academic and the coping with social, emotional and management problems.¹

The preparation should definitely include modification of attitudes on the part of the teacher and principal. They are encouraged to organize short, informal, teacher-to-teacher, and/or teacher to principal inservice sessions in their systems and schools. In the teacher-to-teacher session, for example, this type of meeting will allow teachers who have had success with mildly handicapped children in regular classes to describe and demonstrate their procedures. A similar type of discussion will apply to special education teachers who have been particularly helpful to regular class children with educational problems.²

Birch reports that inservice education is a requirement in the preparation for mainstreaming exceptional children. The preparation

¹Guskin, "Stimulation Games," p. 86.
²Haring, et. al., p. 14.
process begins by giving mainstreaming teachers the tools that are
needed to work with exceptional children, before they are actually
mainstreamed into their classrooms.¹

Seminars, workshops, conferences, special courses and continuing education must be conducted in local school systems for those teachers both regular and special, who are not ready for the new responsibilities of the mainstreaming process. Inservice education benefits the regular classroom teacher through a variety of methods, techniques and/or tasks, consultation, simulation, role playing, games, practicum experience, and research.

Inservice training of teachers might include the Consulting Teacher Approach to Special Education. This approach, designed by Lilly, is a teacher training based model of special education. It provides three levels of training to regular elementary classroom teachers, consultation, workshops and formal courses receiving University graduate credit. Training levels in this approach progress from specific and basic to complete and general specific education skills, all of which involve applications within a trainee's classroom.² The major tasks of consulting teacher are individua-

¹Birch, p. 94.
lized instruction, analysis of behavior, research and consultation training.¹

Inherent in the training based model for special education by Lilly is the "Zero Reject Model,"² meaning that once a child is enrolled into a regular education program within a school, it must be impossible to administratively separate him from that program for any reason. Removal from the mainstream educational program must be an administrative impossibility. A zero reject model accomplishes two very important goals. First, it places the responsibility for failure on the teacher rather than the taught, which solves a moral dilemma which has been called the critical issue for special education in the 70's. If a child fails to learn or irritates the teacher because of some behavior pattern, a zero reject model of education demands that the problem be dealt with by those most directly involved....

The second purpose of zero reject model is to deny ourselves (as educators) the possibility of ultimate failure with a child... In short, we need a zero reject system to protect ourselves from our tendency to blame and label children for failure and to provide acceptance of easy "solutions" to complex instructional problems.

¹Ibid., p. 8.

Additionally, the Identification Model and the Diagnostic Teaching Models may also be used in inservice training of teachers. The identification model ties into the training based model suggested by Lilly in that it would serve as the decision-making process for deciding which children were candidates for the regular class model.¹

This model indicates the competencies needed by teachers to make decisions concerning whether or not help from the special educator is required to maintain the child in the regular class, or if the child should be referred to another kind of special placement, or whether the teacher can handle the child in the regular class without any special consultation from the special educator.²

The basic set of global competencies required to carry out the identification model include the abilities to:

1. Specify the characteristics of handicapped children and describe the symptoms which are indicative of potential learning problems.

2. Screen all children in regular classroom programs for deviations and determine the extent of the interindividual differences.

3. Select and use for those children with deviations appropriate commercial and teacher constructed appraisal and diagnostic procedures in order to obtain more precise information on the nature of the deviation.


²Ibid.
4. Synthesize information by preparing individual profiles of each child's strengths and weakness on educationally relevant variables.

5. Evaluate the adequacy of the information available in order to make appropriate decisions about referral to specialists.

6. Prepare adequate documentation for the case if the decision to refer is affirmative.¹

The second model, the diagnostic teaching model, is currently the subject of a major curriculum development project in inservice training for regular class teachers. The diagnostic teaching model is important for the implementation of the suggested training based special education model (Lilly, "zero reject" model).

This teaching model is applicable both to preservice and inservice training of special educators and regular elementary teachers. The following eight objectives delineate the basic set of global competencies that are required to carry out the diagnostic teaching model:

1. Identify characteristics of individual children that indicate the need for special teaching or management procedures.

2. Specify relevant educational objectives for individual children.

3. Select technique for effective classroom management.

4. Choose and use specialized teaching strategies for reaching specific objectives for children with varying behavioral and learning characteristics.

5. Choose and use special materials in association with specific strategies.

¹Ibid.
6. Identify and use appropriate evaluation procedures.

7. Draw upon existing sources of information regarding specialized strategies.

8. Consult with available resource persons for assistance.¹

Lilly mentioned that the special educator should become an instructional specialist who imparts to the teacher in the regular classroom the skills that he needs to handle the problems within the classroom.² Cartwright suggests that the diagnostic teaching model could be used as the base for the instructional program designed to provide the regular classroom teacher with these skills that are necessary for handling problems in the classroom.³

The teacher would begin by focusing on the first objective and the first step of the diagnostic teacher model. After determining the specific educational needs and relevant learning characteristics for each child, she then moves on to objective two, step two, and continues through each level of the model successfully, until reaching objective eight with the eighth step and completion of the competency based program.

Some educators believe that both decision models should be a part of both the regular teachers’ and the special education teachers’


²Lilly, p. 43.

³Cartwright and Cartwright, p. 231.
preservice training. It is also strongly felt, that to the extent both regular teachers and special educators have not been trained in the competencies included in these models, inservice training should be provided. If a new breed of special educators is to appear, then a new breed of classroom teachers must also develop.

**Mainstreaming v. Special Classes**

Until the 1960's most educators, including those concerned largely with the problems of retarded students, felt that it was better for students and the school system alike for all exceptional children to be placed in special classes rather than to be placed in regular classes. Special classes in buildings with regular classes developed out of the special schools for retarded and/or physically handicapped children and were first established in the United States in the middle of the nineteenth century.¹

Such special classes enabled school systems to make economical use of supervisors and specialists in the education of the retarded, and allowed teachers to group and regroup their students flexibly on the basis of the students' handicaps and skills, and made it possible for teachers to involve the student in special activities that might not have been either suitable or necessary in a class composed largely

of nonretarded students.\textsuperscript{1} It was also thought that special classes provided a positive psychological environment for exceptional children. Supposedly, surrounded by other children on their own intellectual and emotional levels, they did not feel as alien or inferior as they would in a regular class in which they were a small minority surrounded by a larger group of nonretarded, more advanced students with whom they could not compete successfully.\textsuperscript{2}

Thus the most common form of special education of exceptional children generally come to be special, isolated classes housed in regular schools, although in some cases the children spent part of their time in regular classes and part of their time in special classes.\textsuperscript{3}

The reaction against special classes developed in the 1960's as more and more educators and social activists came to two realizations. The first was that special classes did not seem to improve the skills and learning rates of those labeled retarded. The second realization was that children were often being labeled as retarded or as having learning problems for reasons that were political and


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.

social, rather than educational. The combination of these two ideas is best stated by William Anderson:

There is disquieting evidence that special classes serve as a holding operation for many racial and economically deprived children who could receive a better education sharing classrooms with other students whose talents and backgrounds vary greatly.¹

Special education classes are increasingly criticized on the grounds that they do not do what they were designed to do; which is to provide exceptional children with education that enables them to fulfill their potential. The numerous studies on the effectiveness of special education classes reach contradictory conclusions. However, the very existence of studies that conclude that exceptional children do better in regular classes than in special classes demand consideration.²

The contradictions themselves demand close reappraisal of the philosophy of special education classes. Some critics of special classes believe that such classes are inherently inferior to regular classes because students are stigmatized by being placed in special classes.³


²Anderson, p. 6.

³Weintraub, p. 20.
According to other critics, tracking systems that route slow learners and exceptional children into special classes "tend to work to the disadvantage" of such students. These critics claim that in ungrouped or integrated classes slow learners are stimulated by more capable students and receive extra help from the other students as well as from the teacher.

While debate about the educational efficiency of special classes may have led to some changes in school-system provisions for exceptional students, the major changes have come about because of court cases such as the ones cited earlier in this paper. As more and more educators, parents, and other people concerned with the welfare of exceptional children came to feel that special classes were sometimes used as dumping grounds for culturally disadvantaged, bilingual, minority, or low social-status students, the question of class placement became a legal as well as an educational one.

Mainstreaming and Regular Class Activities

The teacher of a previously homogenous class of normal students may feel a certain amount of trepidation about the effect of an exceptional child on the rest of the class. Because special classes have been the preferred method of educating exceptional children,

---

1Dunn, p. 35.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
the teacher of a regular class often has no model to follow when the need arises to organize an integrated class.¹

In most school systems, however, the teacher has available numerous resources and supportive services. A mainstreamed exceptional child might spend part of the day (or term) in a temporary diagnostic classroom or, if emotional problems too adversely affect the student's reaction to a regular class, he would be placed in a specially oriented crisis classroom.² Teacher aides, counselors, psychologists, and itinerant specialists in fields such as reading and arithmetic can also be of invaluable assistance to the teacher who must respond to the differing levels and demands of a mixed class.

One trend that the classroom teacher can make use of when planning for an integrated class is the open classroom. While the stereotyped rigid classroom where everyone read the same paragraph or drew the same picture at the same time probably never was as prevalent as the mass media sometimes made it appear, individualized instruction and open classroom arrangements increasingly provide new and useful models for the teacher.


²Weintraub, Abeson, and Braddock, p. 20.
The ever increasing variety of individualized instructional material, including programmed workbooks and readers with simple vocabularies but subject matter geared to older students' interests and concept levels, also makes it easier for today's teacher to choose the most appropriate materials for each student in the class, regardless of the range of skills, abilities, and interests. Improved educational materials, changed class structure, and increased use of teachers' aides, team teachers, and supportive personnel mean that it is now possible (although not always easy) for a teacher to arrange a stimulating and smoothly run classroom in which numerous different activities and learning experiences take place simultaneously. One method frequently used is the individualized work-centers approach, in which various parts of the classroom contain materials for various subjects. The students proceed independently from one center to another, depending upon their skills, and the teacher's plans. Such a method is useful for students of all ability levels because each student can work at his level, and speed, and not be rushed or kept back by the facility or problems of other students. Such learning centers can also foster self-reliance and initiative,1 which are especially important attitudes for the exceptional child, whose fear of failure may cause overdependence upon adults.

The individualized open classroom can also reduce the exceptional child's sense of inadequacy because working individually, the learner is not in open competition with more advanced children. While it is true that students quickly learn to recognize the skills and weaknesses of their classmates, a classroom organized around individualized work-centers and personal learning experiences can do much to minimize the importance of group standards and to encourage each student to work up to his fullest potential. The teacher might attempt to include, as part of regular class activities, projects in which the exceptional child can participate on the same level as the normal child. Games, gross motor activities, songs, and some arts and crafts projects are examples of areas in which many exceptional children can function at the same level as normal children.¹

Motivation may be the major academic problem, that the teacher of exceptional children who are being mainstreamed into regular classes has to deal with. Because of the fact that previous experiences may have taught exceptional children that they are likely to fail whenever they attempt to function at the level expected of most children of the same age, the exceptional child may fear the teacher as an enemy who sets impossible standards.² When confronted with a new task, the exceptional child's major goal may be to avoid


²Rappaport, p. 215.
failure, not to achieve success.\textsuperscript{1} Exceptional children rarely trust their own skills or ideas and usually looks to their teachers or classmates for help, and may also seek clues in the physical environment for help in problem solving. The exceptional child is believed to be more outer-directed and more likely to imitate others than to have the self-confidence to initiate his own actions or try to think through a problem individually.\textsuperscript{2}

Thus the effective teacher quickly realizes that before the exceptional child can learn factual material or academic skills, he must acquire enough confidence in his own skills so that he is not afraid to participate and wants to learn. The child needs emotional reassurance and approval, the feeling that the teacher thinks he is worthwhile, before intellectual success can become adequate motivation for further intellectual activity.\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{Summary or Related Literature}

The implications from the literature on mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes seems to indicate that this current trend in the field of special education is gaining nearly

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{2}MacMillan, p. 581

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
total acceptance where it is being implemented in an effective manner. Although mainstreaming has been described in a variety of ways, the one most commonly accepted by educators, defines mainstreaming as a process of educating the exceptional child with his normal peers in the least restrictive setting, based on an assessment of his abilities and needs.

Additionally, mainstreaming is viewed by most responsible educators as a procedure that would first identify the individual, physical, and academic needs of each exceptional child, and assessing each child's readiness for integration on either a part-time or full time basis, plus preparing the mainstreamed schools and/or classroom teachers for the children's entry, in addition to providing all the backup services required, including resource teachers and facilities. It is agreed by most educators that to simply mainstream exceptional children into regular classes without some essential planning, or for the administrative convenience of the school system, will often lead to unfortunate results.

The literature indicates that children who are mainstreamed seem to be achieving success in regular classes; socially, emotionally, and academically. This seemingly supports the research, and position of parents and educators that exceptional children being taught in regular classes with their peers, achieve on a higher lever than exceptional children who have been placed in self-contained special education classes.
Most educators agree that many contributing factors are responsible for the new attitudes of society toward the handicapped. However, they also concur that evidence does exist that parental pressure and litigation are two primary factors that have brought the mainstreaming concept to the surface in American education.

The education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94 - 142) signed by President Ford in November, 1975, is one of the strongest pieces of legislation in support of educational rights for the handicapped. This law mandates a national commitment to educate all handicapped children. Parents of handicapped children who have long been disillusioned and troubled about the education their children were receiving in special education classes, have fought a long and untiring battle for better education and facilities for their children.

According to the research, attitudes is one of the key factors in successfully implementing the concept of mainstreaming in an effective manner. Teacher attitudes, and fears must be dealt with before placing exceptional children into regular classes. Recent studies indicate that some kind of in-service training can be done successfully by using lectures, simulation situations, movies, workshops, and even teacher to teacher discussions, to prepare teachers for the types of children they will be working with as a result of exceptional children being mainstreamed into regular classes.
In conclusion, the related literature indicates that mainstreaming creates more individualized and personalized programs in regular classrooms for the handicapped in which all educators, special and general bear the burden of meeting the needs of all children.
CHAPTER III

Methods and Procedures

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study is to ascertain, examine and interpret the existing attitudes expressed by elementary teachers toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classrooms. The secondary purpose is to determine if there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children in accordance with the null hypotheses of selected occupational characteristics on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory.

Selection of the Sample

The study is based on a sample of seventy-three elementary classroom teachers in the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia. The total number of elementary classroom teachers selected for the study was one-hundred (100) with seventy-three (73) responding to the inventory, fifty-eight (58) females and fifteen (15) males.

The subjects used in this study were seventy-three (73) elementary classroom teachers from the Atlanta Area who were selected by random sampling, and employed by the Atlanta Board of Education for the school year 1978-79. Following the random sampling, cover letters
along with copies of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory, and self-addressed envelopes were mailed to teachers. They were asked to complete the inventory and return it on or before March 19, 1979.

The Instrument

Purpose

For the purpose of this study, one instrument was used: an adapted form of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory. The original instrument was designed by E. Y. Forman to measure attitudes of Principals associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children.

The Mainstreaming Data Inventory

The adapted form of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory consists of two parts: Social-Occupational Characteristics and Mainstreaming Analysis.

The Social-Occupational Characteristics section contains seven items. Each item is concerned with the subject population's social and educational backgrounds and present school status in terms of provisions for exceptional children.

The Mainstreaming Analysis section contains two parts. Part one of this section consists of seven statements that are specifically designed to gather responses relating to mainstreaming based on the teachers' perceptions of the mainstreaming concept and their
willingness to integrate exceptional children into regular classes. The remaining section of Part II consists of eight (8) additional items that are also designed to gather responses relating more specifically to teacher attitudes toward integration of exceptional children into regular classes. In addition, teachers indicated the types of program(s) in their schools for exceptional children as well as other programs that were provided for these children.

Statistical Methods for Analysis and Treatment of Data

The task for data analysis was to measure the relationship of variables under investigation. Descriptive Analysis, on the other hand, represented the characteristics of the groups being observed.

The chi square ($\chi^2$) test is used to test the difference between a sample and a previously established distribution. It is also employed with numerical data.¹

For the purpose of testing the hypotheses of this study, chi square and cross-tabulation of the data were used to interpret and analyze the differences among the subjects as revealed by the selected socio-occupational characteristics on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory. In certain instances, the researcher used them ($X$), Standard deviation ($\sigma$) and frequency distribution ($f$) for the analysis of descriptive data.

Data collection from the instrument were thoroughly examined. A checklist was used to ascertain whether the responses from the subjects were complete.

In order to process the collected data, the information was transferred to Fortran coding sheeting and then to computer cards to be punched. Frequencies for all variables by groups were processed by the computer to collect the data necessary to test the null hypotheses of this study. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

Presentation of the Data

Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation of the collected data resulting from the questionnaire returned by elementary classroom teachers in Atlanta Public Schools. These teachers were employed during the 1978-79 school year in schools containing grades kindergarten through the seventh year, including special education classes.

The Mainstreaming Data Inventory was sent to one-hundred elementary school teachers during the spring of 1979. The total number of respondents was seventy-three (N=73), approximately 75 percent.

The subjects varied considerably in age, teaching experiences and in their attitudinal perceptions toward mainstreaming exceptional children into the regular classes.

Descriptive Data

The subjects in this study numbered seventy-three (73): 15 males and 58 females ranging in ages from 25 - 69. These data are reported in Table I.
Data in Table I reveal that 5 (6.8 percent) of the males were between the ages of 26 - 36 and 7 (9.6 percent) between 37 - 47. The three remaining subjects were between the ages of 48 - 69.

The male population of this group constituted 20.5 percent (N=15).

There were more females (79.5 percent) than males (20.5 percent). Only one female (1.4 percent) was 25 or under, with the majority of female teachers falling into the age range of 37 - 47 (N=25).

The 59-69 age group make up 2.7 percent (N=2) of the total number of subjects.

Table I

SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25-Under</th>
<th>26-36</th>
<th>37-47</th>
<th>48-58</th>
<th>59-69</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data regarding the teaching experience of the subjects showed that 6 (8.2 percent) of the males had served as classroom teachers for 11 - 15 years; 3 (4.1 percent) had taught for 6 - 10 years; and 2 (2.7 percent) had worked for 16 - 20 years; and 2 (2.7 percent) had served for 21 - 30 years; while 1 (1.4 percent) had 1 - 5 years of experience, and 1 (1.4 percent) had 31 or above years of experience.

Sixteen female subjects had served as classroom teachers for 11 - 15 years (21.9 percent), and 9 (12.3 percent) had worked for 21 - 30 years. Thirteen subjects had between 16 - 20 years of experience (17.8 percent), while 10 had been working for 6 - 10 years (13.7 percent). The remaining four females had worked for 31 or above years or 5.5 percent.

Table 2 shows a comparison by use of percents of the socioeconomic status of the elementary school communities (N=73) and the types of program(s) that are provided in these schools.

Socioeconomic status of the school community referred to a community where the families income ranged from $0 - $7,333 for low; $7,334 to $11,368 for middle and $11,369 to $16,582 for high.¹

### Table 2
Types of Programs and Socioeconomic Status of the School Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Program(s)</th>
<th>Low (N=49)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle (N=21)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Upper (N=3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreamed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the subjects (61.7 percent) responding to the questionnaire were employed in low socioeconomic areas. There were twenty-one subjects in the middle income area and only three respondents in the upper socioeconomic area. Any findings concerning the upper socioeconomic area are limited because of the small sample being represented.

The percentage (85.7) was high in the middle socioeconomic areas for mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes in comparison with the (55.1 percent) being mainstreamed in the low and upper (33.3 percent) socioeconomic communities. The largest percentage of resource room instruction for exceptional children was found in the low socioeconomic areas (79.6 percent).
One subject (2.4 percent) reported no special class programs for exceptional children. The subjects responding in the upper socio-economic communities indicated special education programs were being implemented through self-contained classes, resource room instruction, and mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classrooms.

Table 3 presents the data on special education courses completed by the teachers.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 13</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 1.4  | 37.0 | 43.8 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 100.0 |
The data indicated that approximately 29 percent of the subjects in the age range of 26 – 36 had taken 1 – 18 or above courses in special education and remaining 8.2 percent had not taken any special education courses. The 37 – 47 age group disclosed that approximately 33 percent of the subjects had taken 1 – 7 courses in the area while 11.0 percent had not taken any classes in special education. Subjects in the 48 – 58 age group reported the following: 2.7. percent had not taken any courses; 1.4 percent had taken 4 – 7 courses, and the largest percentage of teachers in this group (11.0 percent) had taken at least 1 – 3 classes in special education.

In summary, the majority of the elementary school teachers, fifty-one (69.9 percent, had taken 1 – 3 special education courses. Only two (2) subjects had taken 4 – 7 courses while one (1) each had taken 11 – 13, and 18 or above. Eighteen (18) subjects (24.7 percent) had not taken any courses.

Tables 4 and 5 contain data gathered with Part II, Mainstreaming Analysis, of the inventory. This section of the inventory was designed to assess responses that would support the subjects' positions based on their perceptions of the mainstreaming concept and their willingness to integrate exceptional children into regular classes. Statements that were evaluated in this section included letters a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and number nine through fifteen.

Statements being evaluated in table 4 are concerned with letters a – g. These statements are:
a. Court actions have accelerated changes in special education procedures.

b. Educational goals are individualized.

c. Parental concerns are being expressed more directly and forcefully.

d. The exceptional child cannot compete with other children.

e. There is a lack of effective screening and individualized decision-making in determining which child can function successfully within the regular classroom.

f. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences.

g. The self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced.

Table 4

Responses To The Mainstreaming Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Educational Goals</td>
<td>19 26.0</td>
<td>45 61.6</td>
<td>9 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The self-concept of exceptional child can be enhanced</td>
<td>25 34.2</td>
<td>45 61.6</td>
<td>3 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Exceptional child Cannot Compete</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>19 26.0</td>
<td>44 60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences</td>
<td>9 12.3</td>
<td>42 57.5</td>
<td>22 30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Court Actions</td>
<td>21 28.8</td>
<td>39 53.4</td>
<td>13 17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Parental Concerns</td>
<td>20 27.4</td>
<td>37 50.7</td>
<td>16 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Lack of effective screening making and decision-making</td>
<td>10 26.0</td>
<td>28 38.4</td>
<td>26 35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subjects were asked to identify pertinent variables in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes. They were asked to (1) strongly agree, (2) agree or (3) disagree with each of the seven (7) variables listed above. Data are reported according to the responses of each statement below in terms of importance to the highest percents for each variables.

1. Educational goals are individualized, $N=45$ (61.6 percent). Most of the teachers agreed with item b.

2. The self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced, $N=45$ (61.6 percent). The majority of classroom teachers were in agreement with this item.

3. The exceptional child cannot compete with other children, $N=44$ (60.3 percent). The majority of the classroom teachers disagreed with this item.

4. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences, $N=42$ (57.5 percent). Over half of the respondents agreed with this item.

5. Court actions have accelerated changes in special education procedures, $N=39$ (53.4 percent). Of the three (3) possible responses (strongly agree, agree, disagree) the majority of the classroom teachers agreed with this item.

6. Parental concerns are being expressed more directly and forcefully, $N=37$ (50.7 percent). Half of the subjects were in agreement with this statement.

7. There is a lack of effective screening and individualized decision-making in determining which child can function successfully within the regular classroom, $N=28$ (38.4 percent). The majority of responding classroom teachers agreed with this item.

Analysis of data regarding the identification of pertinent variables in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes is
continued to be evaluated in Table 5. Statements being evaluated in this table are concerned with responses given in items nine (9) through fifteen (15). These statements are:

9. As a regular classroom teacher you feel competent to teach (meet the educational needs of) exceptional children.

10. Teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed is a part of your job.

11. Basically, as a regular classroom teacher, you are responsible for teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes.

12. Working with the supportive services in your school would make a difference in your attitude toward teaching exceptional children.

13. As a regular classroom teacher you have the training and competency to teach exceptional children even if not provided with supportive services or help.

14. The classroom teacher, as well as her students should be prepared in advance for the types of exceptional children that will be placed in her class as a result of mainstreaming.

15. There is poor communication between special teachers and classroom teachers concerning the child's needs and accomplishments.
Table 5
RESPONSES TO THE MAINSTREAMING ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Responsible for exceptional children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supportive Services Influence Attitudes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Advance Preparation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Without Supportive Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Part of Your Job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Poor Communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Competent to Teach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each subject was asked to answer each of the seven (7) questions in the mainstreaming analysis section by choosing one answer (out of five possible responses): (1) strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Disagree (4) Strongly Disagree and (5) Uncertain. Data is reported according to rank order of each statement below in terms of importance according to the percents of those who responded to the various items.

1. Basically, as a regular classroom teacher, you are responsible for teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes. N=43 (58.9 percent). The largest number of classroom teachers answering this question agreed with it.

2. Working with the supportive services in your school would make a difference in your attitude toward teaching exceptional children. N=40 (54.8 percent). The respondents did agree with this item.

3. The classroom teacher, as well as her students, should be prepared in advance for the types of exceptional children that will be placed in her class as a result of mainstreaming. N=39 (53.4 percent). The subjects responding to this statement did so by strongly agreeing with it.

4. As a regular classroom teacher you have the training and competency to teach exceptional children even if not provided with supportive services or help. N=38 (52.1 percent). Most of the classroom teachers were in disagreement with this statement.

5. Teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed is a part of your job. N=33 (45.2 percent). The majority of the subjects responding were in agreement with this statement.

6. There is poor communication between special teachers and classroom teachers concerning the child's needs and accomplishments. N=31 (42.5 percent). The majority of classroom teachers do not feel that there is poor communication between classroom teachers and special teachers concerning the planning for the child's needs and accomplishments.
7. As a regular classroom teacher you have the training and competency to teach exceptional children even if not provided with supportive services or help. N=23 (31.5 percent). The subjects responding to this question did so by indicating that they do not agree with this statement.

Cross-Tabulation of Variables on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory

Tables in this section of the study present a cross-tabulation of data gathered on the inventory. Data in Table 6 denotes the sex of teachers and number of special education courses completed by the sample population in this study.

Table 6

Sex and Number of Special Education Courses Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Number of Special Education Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-five of the seventy-three teachers have taken courses in special education. There were eight male teachers who had taken
special education courses. All eight of the subjects had taken 1 - 3 special education courses, with the remaining seven subjects having taken no courses in this area.

Forty-seven female subjects had taken special education courses. Forty-three of the female teachers had completed 1 - 3 courses, two had taken 4 - 7, one had taken 11 - 13, and one had taken 18 or above. Eleven of the female subjects had not taken any courses in the area of special education.

Table 7 compared the number of special education courses completed and years of experience as teachers. Their experience as classroom teachers ranged from 1 - 31 or above years.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subjects within the 1 - 5 years of experience group indicated five teachers had taken 1 - 3 special education courses while two subjects had not taken any courses in special education. There were no teachers in this group who had taken as many as four courses.

Teachers with 6 - 10 years of experience included nine who had taken 1 - 3 courses and one who had taken 18 or above courses in the area. There were three teachers in this group who had not taken any special education courses. The total number of teachers who had taken special education courses in this group was ten.

Subjects within the 11 - 15 years of experience group indicated a high of thirteen who had taken 1 - 3 courses in special education. Two of the remaining subjects in this group had taken one course each in the area, while seven subjects indicated they had not taken any special education courses.

Within the 16 - 20 years of experience group, eleven subjects had completed 1 - 3 special education courses. One subject had taken 4 - 7 courses in the area and three teachers had not taken any special education classes. None of the teachers in this area had taken eight or more courses in special education. The total number of teachers who had taken courses in this area was twelve.

Five subjects represented the 31 or above year group and two had taken 1 - 3 courses in the area while three had taken no courses in special education.
In summary, the largest number of teachers (N=51) had taken 1 - 3 courses in the area. Two subjects had 4 - 7 courses, while one teacher had 11 - 13 courses and one had taken 18 or above courses with eighteen subjects indicating they had not taken any special education courses.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

This section of the study deals with testing of the following seven null hypotheses. The hypotheses is declared to be true if the calculated value exceeds the table value.\(^1\)

1. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among the responding elementary classroom teachers according to age.

Table 8 indicates that there is no significant expressed attitudinal differences according to age among the elementary classroom teachers.

---

Table 8

Age of Teacher and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Teacher</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-Under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 5       | 21      | 24        | 7                     | 16           | 73    |

f= absolute frequency

\[ X^2 = 12.41475 \] not significant at .05 level

The calculated value for chi square was 12.41475 and the table value was 26.30 with sixteen degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

2. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes towards mainstreaming exceptional children between male and female elementary classroom teachers.

Table 9 indicates that there is a significant expressed attitudinal difference between males and females.
Table 9

Sex and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute frequency

\[ x^2 = 10.08820 \text{ significant at } .05 \text{ level} \]

The calculated value for chi square was 10.08820 and the table value was 9.49 with four degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

3. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers categorized by years of service as a teacher.

Table 10 indicates that there is no significant expressed differences in attitude among the subjects according to their years of service as a classroom teacher.
Table 10

Years of Experience as Classroom Teacher and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming of Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience As Teacher</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute frequency

\[ X^2 = 9.74288 \text{ not significant at .05 level} \]

The calculated value for chi square was 9.742.88 and the table value was 31.41 with twenty degrees of freedom; therefore, null hypothesis was accepted.

4. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with
regard to the number of academic courses taken in special and/or exceptional education.

Table 11 indicated that there is a significant expressed attitudinal difference among the subjects with regard to the number of academic courses that they had taken in special education.

Table 11

Special Education Courses Completed and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute

$X^2 = 28.63048$ significant at .05 level
The calculated value for chi square was $28.63048$ and the table value was $26.30$ with sixteen degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

5. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school community.

Table 12 indicated that there is no significant expressed attitudinal difference among the subjects with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school community.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status of the Community</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The calculated value for chi square was 4.767949 and the table value was 5.99 with two degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

6. There are no significant difference in expressed attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the type of program(s) in their school for exceptional children.

Table 13 indicates no significant expressed differences in attitudes among classroom teachers according to types of programs of exceptional children in their schools.

### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Programs</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 21 24 16

f = absolute

$X^2 = 2.07002$ not significant at .05 level
The calculated value for chi square was 2.07002 and the table value was 9.49 with four degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

7. There are no significant difference in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to having worked as a classroom teacher where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children.

Table 14 indicates no significant expressed differences in attitudes among classroom teachers according to having worked where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience where Special Classes and/or Services are Provided</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience Working as a Classroom Teacher Where Special Classes and/or Services Were Provided for Exceptional Children and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children
f = absolute frequency

$X^2 = 2.66382$ no significant difference at .05 level

The calculated value for chi square was 2.66382 and the table value was 9.49 with four degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.
CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Introduction

This study was designed to obtain attitudes expressed by elementary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes.

Specifically, this study sought to:

1. Ascertain, examine and interpret the existing attitudes expressed by regular classroom teachers in Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia, during the 1978 - 79 school year.

2. To determine if there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children in accordance with the null hypotheses of selected social-occupational characteristics on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory.

Data Collection

This study was based on a sample population (N=73) of elementary classroom teachers in Atlanta Public School System during the 1978 - 79 school year.
Interpretation and Discussion

This section of the study presents a summary of the collected and analyzed data. The hypotheses and a discussion of each are as follows:

1. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among the responding elementary classroom teachers categorized according to age.

Data from chi square indicates that there are no significant differences in expressed attitude toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers categorized according to age. Chi square test result of 12.41475 revealed that the data were not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

One of the findings in this study was that teachers between 26 - 47 years of age agreed as well as disagreed more with mainstreaming of exceptional children into the regular program than any other age group.

The literature does not state that age is or is not a determining factor in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.

2. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children between male and female elementary classroom teachers.

The chi square value of 10.088 indicated that there is a significant expressed attitudinal difference between male and female, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. There is no mention
in the literature that supports sex as a factor in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.

3. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers categorized by years of service as teacher.

A result of 9.74288 on the chi square test indicated that there is no significant expressed attitudinal differences among the subjects according to their years of service as classroom teachers.

This hypothesis is supported by studies conducted by Want (1952), who reported that teachers' attitudes toward school, children, and teaching did not seem to be affected by teaching experience. That their attitudes became more homogeneous with experience, while the degree of negativeness or positiveness appeared to remain constant.¹

4. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the number of academic courses taken in special and/or exceptional education.

The chi square value of 28.63048 indicated that there is a significant expressed attitudinal difference among the subjects with regard to the number of academic courses that they had taken in special education. The findings showed that the subjects who had taken between 1 - 3 special education courses agreed as well as disagreed more with the mainstreaming of exceptional children into the regular program than any other group of respondents.

¹Want, p. 113.
Data collected by Birch,\textsuperscript{1} and Shotel, Iano and McGettigan\textsuperscript{2} in their investigations of training for teachers do not show that the number of academic courses in special education is a determinant of attitudes toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes. However, these authors suggest that inservice workshops, seminars, continuing education, conferences and special courses on methods and techniques for working with the handicapped might considerably affect these educators' attitudes and the success of the mainstreaming program.

5. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school community.

A chi square value of 4.67949 indicated that there is no significant expressed attitudinal differences among socioeconomic status of the school community.

A closer look at the data indicates that the range of agreement on items by the respondents working in low and middle income communities was very close, N=11 (low income area) and N=9 (middle income area). However, the subjects in the low income areas were in disagreement (N=22) in expressing their attitudes toward mainstreaming at an

\textsuperscript{1}Birch, p. 94.

exceptionally higher rate than the middle income area (N=2) and upper income area (N=0) subjects.

The findings in this area are obviously strongly related to teacher attitudes and their rejection of the labels culturally deprived and culturally disadvantaged which have been found to be associated with lower attitudes and expectations of children by teachers working in low socioeconomic areas, in contrast with high teacher expectation of pupils in middle and upper income areas.

Teacher expectations about the performance of children can come to serve a self-fulfilling prophecy. Studies by Herriott and St. John,\(^1\) (1966), reported that the lower the socioeconomic status of the schools the smaller the proportion of teachers who held favorable opinions about the motivation and behavior of their pupils.

6. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the type of program(s) in their school for exceptional children.

The chi square value of 2.07002 indicated that there is no significant expressed attitudinal difference according to types of programs in schools for exceptional children. One very important finding in this study was that 98.6 percent of the subjects were working in schools where there were numerous special programs being implemented for the purpose of enhancing the mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes.

7. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to having worked as a classroom teacher where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children.

The results of chi square 2.66382, indicate that there is no significant expressed attitudinal difference among the subjects with regard to working where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children.

The data revealed that 94.5 percent of the respondents were employed in schools where special classes or services were provided for exceptional children. The remaining 5.5 percent reported no provisions for special classes and/or services being available in their schools. Three of these subjects were employed in a low socioeconomic community with the remaining subject working in a middle class community. All three subjects in an upper class community reported having special classes and/or services for exceptional children.

Conclusions

The individual responses of the seventy-three (73) elementary classroom teachers revealed information that was directly related to the testing of the hypothesis.

1. Mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes was an extensively established educational practice in Atlanta Public Schools. The data revealed that the percen-
tage for mainstreaming in all three socioeconomic communities (low 55.1) Middle 85.7, and upper 33.3) was extensive.

2. Basically, the responding subjects N=31 (68.5 percent) do not consider themselves to be an "advocate" of mainstreaming. However, the subjects expressed favorable attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes by indicating they were willing to implement programs necessary for meeting the needs of exceptional children. Also, 35.6 percent were advocates of mainstreaming exceptional children.

3. Elementary schools within the three socioeconomic communities (low, middle, and upper) provided to some extent self-contained classes, mainstreaming, and resource room instruction for exceptional children. Schools within the middle socioeconomic communities had the largest percentage (85.7) of pupils being mainstreamed. The low socioeconomic communities retained the largest percentage (79.6) for resource room instruction.

4. Teachers between 37 - 47 years (43.8 percent) disagreed as well as agreed with the concept of mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes more than any other group.

5. Teachers in the low socioeconomic areas expressed strong attitudes toward rejection of the labeling of pupils in low socioeconomic areas as being culturally deprived and culturally disadvantaged. These labels have been found to be associated with lower attitudes and expectations of children by teachers working in low socioeconomic areas. The range of agreement on items concerning expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes by subjects working in low and middle income communities was very close.

6. Schools within the middle socioeconomic communities provided the widest array of programs for exceptional children, followed closely by the schools in the low socioeconomic communities.

7. The majority of the elementary classroom teachers N=51 (69.9 percent) had taken 1 - 3 special education courses.
The implications accruing from the findings of this study are stated below:

1. The finding that mainstreaming was an extensively established educational practice in Atlanta Public Schools, although sixty-eight percent of the sample population did not express favorable attitudes toward being an "advocate" of mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes implies that teachers should be included more in the decision-making, planning and implementation of programs that they are expected to effectively implement.

2. The finding that most teachers were willing to implement programs necessary for meeting the needs of exceptional children, although they were not "advocates" of mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes implies that teachers are willing to consider the needs of the children first.

3. The finding that elementary schools within the three socioeconomic communities (low, middle and upper) were providing adequate mainstreaming classes for exceptional children implies that economic status of a community does not dictate the extent of which a school's program will be implemented for meeting all the needs of its pupils.

4. The finding that teachers between 37 – 47 years of age agreed as well as disagreed more with mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular programs than any other age group implies that age was not a significant factor in contributing to the attitudes of teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes.

5. The majority of the elementary classroom teachers (N=51) had taken 1 – 3 special education courses implies that the Atlanta Public School System is in close agreement with the guidelines set forth in Public Law 94-142.
6. The finding that a majority of the teachers ranked the following variables as reasons for mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes: educational goals are individualized; the self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced; court actions; parental concerns and rejection of labeling of the children implies that the teachers are aware of the reasons (as revealed in the literature) for mainstreaming.

Recommendations

In accordance with the findings, conclusions and implications, it seems feasible to recommend:

1. That training sessions be instituted for the teachers of Atlanta Public Schools in the area of modification of attitudes, including methods and techniques for working with exceptional children.

2. That in-service workshops, institutes, seminars and especially simulation programs be organized for the teachers to better prepare them for meeting the needs of exceptional children who are being mainstreamed into regular classes.

3. That the planning and establishing of goals for exceptional children be done by involving the regular classroom teacher as well as other personnel that will be working with the exceptional child.

4. That considerable attention be given to the fact that teachers play a most significant role in establishing an effective program for mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes. Therefore, provisions for teacher input, group discussions and teacher to teacher conferences and discussions should be given top priority through out the school system.

5. That faculty in the school need support and assistance in developing mainstreaming and they are the best source of information about their needs.
6. That planning for mainstreaming should occur at the individual school level by those who will be responsible for the implementation of integrating exceptional children into regular classes.
Appendix A

Instructional Model for Mainstreaming
The Cascade System of Special Education Service

FIGURE 1. The cascade system of special education service. The tapered design indicates the considerable difference in the numbers involved at the different levels and calls attention to the fact that the system serves as a diagnostic filter. The most specialized facilities are likely to be needed by the fewest children on a long term basis. This organizational model can be applied to development of special education services for all types of disability.

Dear

As a graduate student pursuing a Specialist Degree in Special Education at Atlanta University, I must include in my thesis certain information which is to be obtained from select individuals. This inventory is part of the information I will need. It is designed to ascertain the attitudes of elementary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.

I realize that there are numerous demands on your time, but I sincerely wish that you would take time out of your busy schedule to fill this questionnaire out and return it to me.

By obtaining answers from a large number of classroom teachers to the questions submitted on the attached questionnaire, valuable information should be provided concerning teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Please answer this questionnaire with thoughtfulness, and promptness. Send it as soon as possible, on or before March 19, 1979. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your name or your school will not be used in interpreting the data from this questionnaire.

Please return to:

Mrs. Patricia S. Ward
Dean Rusk Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia 30310

Thank you for your help in this matter. Your time and contribution is truly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia S. Ward
DATA INVENTORY

Strictly Confidential

Directions: This data inventory consists of two parts:

- Part I: Social-Occupational Characteristics
- Part II: Mainstreaming Analysis

Please answer each question. Use a check mark to indicate your choice of only one answer in each question. If exact answers are not possible, give your best estimate.

PART I: SOCIAL-OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. What is your age?
   - 25 or under
   - 26-36
   - 37-47
   - 48-58
   - 59-69
   - 70 or older

2. What is your sex?
   - Male
   - Female

3. Number of years as a classroom teacher,
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-30
   - 31 or above
   - None
4. Number of courses that you have taken in Special Education and/or Exceptional Education.

   1-3
   4-7
   8-10
   11-13
   14-17
   18 or above
   None

5. Socioeconomic status of community where the school is located. (check one)

   ______ low     ______ middle     ______ upper

6. Types of program(s) in your school for exceptional children.

   ______ Self-contained classes
   _____ Mainstreamed classes
   ______ Resource room
   ______ None
   ______ Other (Specify): ____________________________

7. Have you worked as a classroom teacher where special classes and/or services were provided for exceptional children?

   ______ Yes     ______ No

PART II: MAINSTREAMING ANALYSIS

8. Please answer each question. Use a check (x) mark to indicate your choice of only one answer in each question.

   a. Court actions have accelerated changes in special education procedures.

      ______ Strongly agree
      ______ Agree
      ______ Disagree
b. Educational goals are individualized.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

c. Parental concerns are being expressed more directly and forcefully.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

d. The exceptional child cannot compete with other children.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

e. There is a lack of effective screening and individualized decision-making in determining which child can function successfully within the regular classroom.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

f. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

g. The self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced.
   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree

Please choose one answer for each of the following questions and place a check mark in the space provided.
9. As a regular classroom teacher you feel competent to teach (meet the educational needs of) exceptional children.

   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree
   ______ Strongly disagree
   ______ Uncertain

10. Teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed is a part of your job.

   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree
   ______ Strongly disagree
   ______ Uncertain

11. Basically, as a regular classroom teacher, you are responsible for teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes.

   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree
   ______ Strongly disagree
   ______ Uncertain

12. Working with the supportive services in your school would make a difference in your attitude toward teaching exceptional children.

   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree
   ______ Strongly disagree
   ______ Uncertain

13. As a regular classroom teacher you have the training and competency to teach exceptional children even if not provided with supportive services or help.

   ______ Strongly agree
   ______ Agree
   ______ Disagree
   ______ Strongly disagree
   ______ Uncertain
14. The classroom teacher, as well as her students, should be prepared in advance for the types of exceptional children that will be placed in her class as a result of mainstreaming.

____ Strongly agree
____ Agree
____ Disagree
____ Strongly disagree
____ Uncertain

15. There is poor communication between special teachers and classroom teachers concerning the child's needs and accomplishments.

____ Strongly agree
____ Agree
____ Disagree
____ Strongly disagree
____ Uncertain

16. Basically, do you consider yourself to be an advocate of mainstreaming of exceptional children in the regular classroom?

____ Strongly agree
____ Agree
____ Disagree
____ Strongly disagree
____ Uncertain
DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THE SURVEY

Because some of the terms used are subject to misunderstanding, a list of descriptive definitions of the terms used for the purposes of this survey are listed below.

1. **Exceptional Children** — Children who are classified by their school system as mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing and deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, crippled, gifted and learning disabled are exceptional and eligible for special education.

2. **Mainstreaming** — The process of integrating exceptional children in the regular grades for as much of the day as possible and providing high-quality special education on the basis of learning needs rather than categories of handicaps is called "mainstreaming" or "integrating."

   Inherent in this definition is the assumption that the regular classroom teacher is the primary agent responsible for the education of these children. The special educator may serve as the facilitator and/or consultant in the regular class.

3. **Regular Classes** — Classes where exceptional children are taught with other children all or part of the day, receiving any combination of the following methods: nongraded, individualized instruction, enrichment-type, open classrooms, resource room, itinerant services and diagnostic-prescriptive services in the general school programs.

4. **Attitude** — For the purpose of this study, attitude is defined as the regular classroom teachers expressed feelings toward mainstreaming of exceptional children as reflected in data on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory.
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