

**TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIAL
EDUCATION STUDENTS IN REGULAR CLASSROOMS**

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of
the Department of Education and Human
Development

State University of New York
College At Brockport

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
for the Degree of Masters of Science in Education

by
Gail Lysenko

State University of New York
College at Brockport
Brockport, New York
August 1992

SUBMITTED BY:

Gril Lysenko Aug. 1992
Candidate Date

APPROVED BY:

Arthur E. Smith 9/11/92
Thesis Advisor Date

Geneva Z. Ropy 9/15/92
Second Faculty Reader Date

Patricia C. Baker 9/15/92
Director of Graduate Studies Date

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of teachers toward special education students and toward integrating them into regular classrooms.

The subjects involved were 269 teachers from an upstate New York suburban school district. Of those 269 subjects, 247 were regular education teachers and 22 were special education teachers. They were from nine different schools within the district (5 elementary, 2 middle schools, and 2 high schools).

There were two different surveys used in this study, one for regular education teachers and one for special education teachers. They were asked to fill out the survey anonymously and choose the response (from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree") that best reflects their feeling about the statement. A space for teacher comments was also provided.

The findings reveal that 63% of the regular classroom teachers and 77% of the special education teachers believe

that special education students do benefit from being in a regular classroom. However, regular classroom teachers are concerned with class size, inadequate teacher training, increased demands on the classroom teacher, lack of time, and the lack of in-class support. They fear their classrooms will become a "dumping ground" for all special education students, and they suspect that the movement toward educational integration is really a cost-cutting measure designed to eventually eliminate special education teachers and therefore their support system. Many fears, resentments, concerns, and frustrations impact upon the attitudes of classroom teachers.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose	3
Questions to be Answered	3
Need for the Study	4
Definitions of Terms	5
Limitations of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Laws, Rules, and Regulations	9
Opposition to Integration	12
The Role of the Regular Education Teacher	23
Preparation of Special Education Teachers	27
Labeling	29
Concerns of Regular Education Teachers ...	35
Class Size	41
Time	42
Support Services	44
Training	48
Social Acceptance	54
Factors Affecting Positive Change	64
Communication, Input, and Teamwork	68
Benefits of Integration	76
Summary	79
III. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	82
Purpose	82
Research Questions	82

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
Methodology	83
Subjects	83
Instruments	83
Procedure	84
Analysis	85
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	86
Purpose	86
Results of the Regular Ed. Teacher Survey	86
Regular Education Teacher Comments	119
Results of the Special Ed. Teacher Survey	134
Special Education Teacher Comments	159
Tables: Regular Education Teacher Responses	165
Tables: Special Education Teacher Responses	182
Summary	191
V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	193
Conclusions	193
Implications for the Classroom	200
Implications for Further Research	202
Summary	203
REFERENCES	205
APPENDICES.....	218
A: Public Law 94-142	219
B: Distribution of Respondents	224
C: Regular Education Teacher Survey	226
D: Total Regular Education Teacher Responses	232

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
E: Elementary School Total, Regular Education Teacher Responses	235
F: Middle School Totals, Regular Education Teacher Responses	238
G: High School Totals, Regular Education Teacher Responses	241
H: Breakdown of Individual School Responses, Regular Education Teachers	244
I: Special Education Teacher Survey	263
J: Total Special Education Teacher Responses	267
K: Elementary School Totals, Special Education Teacher Responses	269
L: Middle School Totals, Special Education Teacher Responses	271
M: High School Totals, Special Education Teacher Responses	273
N: Breakdown of Individual School Responses, Special Education Teachers ..	275

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In 1975 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) was passed into law. This law has greatly influenced the education of handicapped students in this country. Since PL 94-142 requires that all handicapped students be educated in the least restrictive environment, many who had previously received services in special education classrooms have been placed in regular ("mainstream") classrooms for at least part of the school day (Aksamit, 1990).

More recently the idea of "blended" classrooms has become increasingly more popular. Proponents of the Regular Education Initiative (REI) have advocated an even more "inclusive" policy, in which many children now being served by special education would not be labeled, but would be reclaimed

by general education (Will, 1986). This trend virtually assures that sooner or later all regular education teachers will have special education students in their classrooms. How receptive are they to special education students? How well prepared are these teachers to meet the needs of the special education students in their classroom? Are they aware of the various teaching strategies necessary for the success of these students, and if so, would they be willing to use them? How thoroughly do they understand their students' individual problems, and how willing are they to make appropriate modifications to accommodate them?

Regular education teachers often have as many as 30 students in each of their classrooms. They have no classroom aides to help with individualized instruction, reinforcement, organization, paperwork, and the many other tasks that are so time consuming. These factors inevitably influence the attitudes of the mainstream teachers toward special education students.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students, to explore the implications of these attitudes for successful mainstreaming, and to apply those findings toward improvement of the educational system.

The purpose of a two-tier format for the surveys was to test the consistency of regular education teachers' expressed behaviors compared to their observed behaviors (as perceived by special education teachers). A discrepancy often exists between the two (Salend & Johns, 1983), frequently to the complete surprise of the participants.

Questions to be Answered

- 1) What are the expressed attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students in regular classrooms?

- 2) What do special education teachers perceive to be the attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students in regular classrooms?

Need for the Study

Although a minority in the regular classroom, the presence of special education students is a fact of life, more common today than ever before. According to Yanito, Quintero, Killoran, and Striefel (1987), the receiving teacher's attitudes and expectations can determine the success of mainstreaming for the student, teachers, non-handicapped peers, and parents. Brophy and Everton's survey (1981) seems to validate this point. They found that the success of mainstreaming is critically dependent upon the attitudes and expectations which teachers have toward mainstreaming and toward children with handicaps (Brophy & Everton, 1981; Walker, 1983).

Educators need to be aware of the attitudes and behaviors toward special education students, so that if any

problems do exist, they can be acknowledged and remedied. Since teachers' attitudes play such a major role in the success of students in the classroom, it is important to know exactly what these attitudes are. What messages are being sent to these students, and how are these messages perceived by others? Current information is needed. This study attempted to discern teachers' attitudes toward special education students in regular classrooms, to determine what problems, if any, exist, and to propose possible solutions.

Definition of Terms

least restrictive environment (LRE) - a legal term resulting from the passage of PL 94-142, requiring that "to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children are to be educated with children who are not handicapped" (34 Congressional Federal Register, Section 300.500 (b)(1).

special education student (handicapped, disabled) - a student who has been given one of several diagnostic labels describing

his/her predominant disability. In the past, this child was primarily served in a self-contained special education classroom.

mainstreaming - the integration of a special education student into a regular classroom with a regular education teacher.

"blended" classroom - a classroom which includes a combination of both special education students and regular education students, with both a regular education teacher and a special education teacher working together within the same classroom.

resource room - a pull-out program where a student needing support services can go for part of the day to get extra help (one-on-one or small group instruction) from a special education teacher.

"inclusion" - the integration of special education students with more severe disabilities who would not normally be mainstreamed or blended into a regular classroom. The rationale is that this is a diverse world made up of all kinds of

people, and therefore classrooms should reflect that same diversity. Advocates of "inclusion" believe in the need to recognize, respect, and accept each other's differences and appreciate our commonalities.

Limitations of the Study

As with any survey, the accuracy of the findings is dependent upon the honesty of the respondents. The subject's response is related to a number of factors which can influence his/her opinion at the time. Although to ensure valid results, complete anonymity was maintained, it is impossible to know for sure whether the subjects responded truthfully.

The survey was distributed toward the end of the school year, the busiest and most stressful time for teachers. This is a factor which no doubt affected the rate of return. Hectic schedules may have affected the amount of time the subjects spent doing the surveys. This may or may not have affected their responses.

The subjects in this study were all from a single suburban school district in upstate New York. The results should not be generalized to be representative of teachers' responses throughout the United States.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Laws, Rules, and Regulations

The passage of Public Law 94-142 and the subsequent implementation of state mandates for the appropriate education of all handicapped children have had a tremendous impact on education throughout the U.S. The federal regulation implementing P.L. 94-142, Education of the Handicapped Act, appears in Appendix A of this paper.

An important aspect of both federal and state legislation is the requirement for educating exceptional students in the "least restrictive environment." Within the context of an available continuum of program options, public schools are to ensure that handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other facilities, are educated with non-handicapped children to the maximum extent appropriate. Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of

handicapped children from the regular educational environment should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (Congressional Federal Register, 121a 550).

Individuals with exceptional needs must be provided the opportunity to participate with non-handicapped children in non-academic and extracurricular services and activities as well as academic activities (Congressional Federal Register 121a 553).

If modifications, that is, supplementary aids and services of the regular education program are necessary to ensure the child's participation in that program, those modifications must be described in the child's Individualized Education Plan (e.g. special seating, tape recorder, note-taker, etc.). This applies to any regular education program in which the student may participate, including physical education, art, music, and vocational education (Congressional Federal

Register, 1981).

Vocal parent organizations, litigation, and as a consequence the implementation of Public Law 94-142 changed the traditional special education delivery system considerably. A broader range of services has evolved for serving exceptional students: services are provided based upon student needs rather than labels; individual education plans are designed to ensure that students receive an appropriate education; due process procedures exist; parents are involved in the decision-making process; and comprehensive assessments are required prior to designing programs for students (Fairchild, 1982, p.14).

The word "mainstreaming" is an educational term. In the law, regulations, and rules, "least restrictive environment" is the term which is used. Mainstreaming is a concept where a special education student is part of a regular education setting to the fullest extent appropriate to the child's needs as opposed to a segregated special education setting. Some

special education students were appropriately mainstreamed before the passage of Public Law 94-142, but with this federal law, mainstreaming, being educated in a regular education setting, is now required for each special education student to the extent appropriate for the needs of that particular student. This means that regular education and special education staff must be trained and prepared to meet the needs of the special education student in order to meet the requirements of the law (Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study, 1984, p. 2).

The underlying assumption of the definition of "mainstreaming", according to Gillet (1983), is that the lack of success of a learner is not the sole result of a learner's failure, but the failure of the learning environment as well (Tillona, 1986, p. 7).

Opposition to Classroom Integration

Many educators still cling to what Maynard Reynolds used

to refer to as a "two-box" view of education: the regular class and the special class. These educators are reluctant to mix with special education students, feeling that these individuals should be served outside of the regular classroom. " 'I'm not trained to work with these children,' is an attitude which still persists among many regular teachers and principals. They resist or resent the proposition that special education students should remain in regular classrooms." (Junkala & Mooney, 1986, p. 220).

In order for mainstreaming to be effective, the regular classroom teacher must have a positive attitude toward the special education child as well as the special education program. Research completed by Bond and Dietrich (1982) suggests that those positive attitudes are rare. In 1979, Semmel, Gottlieb, and Robinson reviewed the attitudes of professionals toward mainstreaming, and found that teachers and principals generally held a pessimistic attitude toward mainstreaming. Furthermore, Yanito, Killoran, and Striefel

(1987) found that "mainstreaming often does not occur because the adults involved, most often teaching personnel, are not totally supportive of mainstreaming" (p.1).

Hudson, Graham, and Warner (1979) surveyed the attitudes of regular education teachers toward mainstreaming in two midwestern states. "Approximately two-thirds of the respondents preferred the special class placement for exceptional students to regular class placement. There was moderate agreement that mainstreaming would negatively influence teaching effectiveness and that exceptional pupils were an educational detriment" (Myles & Simpson, 1989, p.480).

Data from the Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study (1984) indicate that teacher attitude is a crucial factor in student success. This study also found that three out of every five regular education teachers were not supportive of mainstreaming.

Negative teacher attitude was felt to have hindered the placement of special education students in mainstream settings. Respondents also felt that teacher attitude had a very great effect on placement in a particular teacher's class. This suggests that students

may not get mainstreamed even if it is appropriate. Once in a class, teacher attitude was also felt to have a strong effect on social interaction, academic progress, and especially on emotional adjustment and self esteem (Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study, 1984, p.35).

A special education resource program, designed to support the mainstreamed special education student, can provide services that are generally beyond the scope of the regular classroom teacher. However, in their study, Bond and Dietrich (1982) found that 20 percent of the classroom teachers had negative attitudes toward the special education resource program. If the classroom teacher exhibits a negative attitude toward the special education program, it is likely that this negative attitude will be evident to the special education student. Also, "the chances are high that those same students will view the negative attitudes as being directed toward them rather than toward the program" (p.1).

Two professors from Memphis State University who were supervising student teachers found that even though student teachers began their teaching assignment with positive

attitudes toward special education resource programs, those attitudes soon became negative. Dietrich and Bond (1982) speculated that "the student teachers were modeling what they perceived as appropriate attitudes being exhibited by their cooperating teachers" (p.2).

The mainstreaming literature reveals that many regular education teachers are opposed to having exceptional children in their classrooms (Jamieson, 1984; Jones, Gottlieb, Guskin, & Yoshida 1978). Knoff (1985) asked regular education teachers in two eastern states if they would be willing to accept exceptional students if special education programs were discontinued. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents expressed an unwillingness to accommodate handicapped pupils. Other researchers, including Hudson, Graham, and Warner (1979) have reported similar findings.

A study by Horne in 1978 found that "teachers' behaviors toward a student were directly related to their positive or negative perceptions of that student. This has important

implications for mainstreaming because possible negative biases of teachers can hinder a successful mainstreaming experience" (Henfield & Stieglitz, 1981, p.3).

Research has shown that teachers exhibit different behavior patterns toward students perceived as either high or low achievers. Good (1980) and Brophy (1982) reviewed the main findings of 20 studies of teacher-student interactions, concluding that teachers often:

a) seat lows farther from the teacher's desk and/or in a group; b) pay less attention to lows in academic situations; c) call on lows less often to answer questions; d) allow less time for lows to answer; e) give lows the answer or call on someone else, rather than trying to improve their response through rephrasing or repeating the questions; f) criticize lows more frequently for incorrect responses; g) praise lows less frequently for correct responses; and h) fail more frequently to provide lows with feedback (Alves & Gottlieb, 1986, p.77).

Student achievement determines the attention which a child receives from a teacher (Brophy & Good, 1984; Hersh & Walker, 1983; Thompson & Morgan, 1980). Teachers direct greater attention to high achievers and less attention to low

achieving students. A child with handicaps, functioning at a delay of two years in contrast to non-handicapped peers, is likely to receive the same decreased amount of attention as the low achiever, as well as decreased cueing, prompting, praising and reinforcing. Even when attention is given, it is likely to be negative in nature (Brophy & Good, 1974; Thompson & Morgan, 1980). Such teacher behavior can create a self-fulfilling prophecy for children with handicaps, who themselves may already feel that they do not belong in a mainstream setting (Hersh & Walker, 1983; Walker & Rankin, 1983). "The student who is already functioning below peers and receives negative attention or decreased praise and reinforcement from a teacher, has an increased chance of failure in the mainstream" (Yanito, Quintero, Killoran, & Striefel, 1987, p.7).

Skeptics of the mainstreaming program have doubted that severely underachieving students could be successfully maintained in mainstream high school classes or that these

students would achieve passing grades. They quote literature which suggests that secondary school teachers in traditional high schools are, as a group, unresponsive to individual differences among students and are unwilling to alter teaching practices to accommodate learning disabled students (Cruickshank, 1977; D'Alonzo, 1983). They believe that learning disabled students who are extremely deficient in academic achievement might be served more appropriately in self-contained programs or in alternative high schools. In these more segregated settings, students would be more likely to achieve sufficient numbers of passing grades to graduate from high school (Siegel, 1974; Vance, 1977; Williamson, 1974-1975).

Hudson, Graham, and Warner (1979) researched the attitudes and needs of general education teachers in regard to mainstreaming exceptional students. Their findings indicate that teachers hold unfavorable attitudes toward mainstreaming and that they believe they do not have the

time, support, or training necessary for working with handicapped students in their classrooms effectively. In studying the issue of accommodation, Fagen (1985) concluded that "even though there exists a considerable amount of information on how and what to do in terms of modifications for handicapped students, general education teachers are not overly supportive of modifications, and limited implementation has evolved because they view accommodation as unreasonable" (Iowa State Department of Education project, 1986, p.3). Lombardi, Norotny, and Odell (1991) found that "to keep or place special needs students in regular classes without appropriate modifications may be compounding their 'at risk' status"(p.17).

The Policy Research Center of the Council for Exceptional Children (PRC/CEC) position indicates that "general education teachers should modify the classroom for mainstreamed handicapped students. The question remains, however, as to what the modifications should be. The PRC/CEC position

states that general education teachers are responsible for 'minor' modifications or accommodations while special education teachers are responsible for 'significant' modifications or accommodations. But what are 'minor' modifications? And when does a modification become a 'significant' accommodation" (Iowa State Department of Education project, 1986, p.3)?

In the second study done by Zigmond, Levin, and Laurie (1985), most of the teachers interviewed did not believe that the LD student placed additional burdens on them. "It soon became clear why many of the teachers interviewed did not feel it an extra burden to have these students placed in their regular classes; they did very little that was different or special for these students" (p.537). Teachers still planned only one lesson for the entire group of students. They still made heavy demands on all their students to read textbooks, workbooks, ditto pages, etc. and to formulate written responses. In other words, for most of the teachers

interviewed, "having an LD student in the class did not affect their planning for or implementation of instruction. If they made any modifications at all to accommodate their LD students, it was in their grading procedures to permit them passing grades" (p.537).

Nelson, Dodd, and Smith (1990) conducted a study in a northwestern college to assess the willingness of its faculty to make modifications and accommodations for their learning disabled students. Although the results showed a general willingness to make accommodations, "there are certain accommodations the faculty is unwilling to provide to students: extra credit assignments, alternative assignments, and copies of lecture notes." In addition, "faculty reported that they were not as willing to allow students to turn in tape recorded rather than written assignments, or to allow students the use of a proofreader" (p.188).

The Role of the Regular Education Teacher

Who, exactly, has the responsibility for the success or failure of the mainstreamed special education student? Most of the teachers in Hauptman's study (1983) were "willing to have special education students in their class as long as they did not have to take responsibility for them." They visualized them as "special education children who were mainstreamed, as opposed to children in their classroom who need supportive services" (p.34).

Clearly, an expected outcome of PL 94-142 is the inclusion of handicapped students in the general education program for all or part of the school day. While the spirit of the mandate is being satisfied, "controversy and disagreement abound about the role of general education teachers in the education of 'mainstreamed' handicapped students," and more specifically, "the extent to which the general education program should be adjusted or modified to meet the needs and abilities of handicapped students" (Iowa State Department of

Education project, 1986, p.2).

The Policy Research Center of the Council for Exceptional Children (PRC/CEC) prepared a position statement on mainstreaming that stated in part:

Whenever a handicapped child is placed in a regular classroom, the responsibility of the regular educator for that child is the same as for any other child in the classroom. Because all children differ with respect to amount of learning, rate of learning, and learning style, minor modifications in methodology, curriculum or environment are often necessary for both non-handicapped and handicapped children. Special education, which involves significant modifications in methodology, curriculum, or environment, may also be delivered to some handicapped children in regular classrooms. Whenever this arrangement is specified in the child's IEP, the development of such specially designed instruction is the responsibility of special educators. Regular educators are responsible for assisting the child in carrying out the program (Barresi & Mack, 1979).

Nevin (1981) says that perhaps the most critical finding of her study for special education policy is the determination that regular teachers play a large role in the education of most handicapped children. Yet current legislation defines the

role of the regular educator primarily by omission. That is, "special education policies say little regarding the activities of the regular educator in the IEP process. This results in highly variable treatment of these students, with unknown effects" (p.152).

Nevin (1981) feels that unless the role of the regular teacher is formally addressed in special and regular education policies, the goals and educational program for the handicapped child in the regular classroom will remain unspecified and therefore difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, "regular teachers will have to continue to educate the handicapped students in their classrooms without optimal support, recognition, and involvement until their role is addressed in educational policy" (p.153).

Mori (1979) states that in facilitating the integration of the mainstreamed child, the regular classroom teacher is the primary person in the success or failure of mainstreaming. The regular teacher has a greater role in the instruction of

handicapped children. He/she must work collectively with specialists to ease the way of the handicapped child into the mainstream. "He/she should foster positive attitudes concerning the rights of all children to an education, and particularly the handicapped, and respect for individual differences as they relate to the way the child learns or behaves" (Tillona, 1986, p.9).

The implementation of mainstreaming as a result of PL 94-142, and the call to integrate handicapped children into the mainstream of the educational system to the greatest extent possible will mean greater demands on the regular teacher. The regular teacher's role will require more than the traditional instructional role. Stainback, Stainback, Courtnage and Jaben (1985) summarize several important studies that concluded: "The only consistent findings indicate that mainstreaming works when regular classroom teachers are able to adapt instruction for the students in their classroom" (p.144). Therefore, "the role of the teacher and the

structure of the classroom must be altered in order for mainstreaming to be successful" (Tillona, 1986, p.8).

Preparation of Special Education Teachers

Mainstreaming requires the preparation of all participants in the process. The emphasis of this preparation, support, and assistance is usually focused upon the regular teacher who receives the child (Crisci, 1981; Masat & Schack, 1981; Saunders and Burch, 1982; Yanito, et al., 1987) in an effort to create a receptive learning environment for the mainstreamed child. However, Quintero, Killoran, and Striefel (1987) feel that preparation for mainstreaming should not focus on the regular educator alone. It must also include the preparation of the special educator as well.

It is often assumed that the special education teacher is a whole-hearted supporter of mainstreaming, when in fact, this may not always be true (Hughes & Hurth, 1984; Turnbull & Winston, 1983). "The special educator has mainstreaming

preparation needs that are frequently overlooked. This preparation must address knowledge deficits, emotional support needs, improved public relations and communication skills, and broader curriculum training "(Quintero, et al., 1987, p.5).

The special education student often remains in special education with the same teacher for years. Over time, "the teacher and student form a bond which can promote student dependence upon the teacher, and can also lead to overprotection of the student by the teacher" (Hughes & Hurth, 1984, p.17). "As a result, special educators can experience ambivalent feelings about mainstreaming their students" (Quintero, et al., 1987, p.8).

"Special education teachers generally do not perceive their students as being as independent as other students their age. Special education teachers also feel that their students need more teacher attention than most other children their age" (Henfield & Stieglitz, 1981, p.21).

It appears that in the future, fewer students will be labeled mildly handicapped, and regular education teachers will become increasingly more responsible for serving children with mild learning and behavior problems within general education. "It is essential that (special education teachers, as well as regular education) teachers be prepared for mainstreaming if they are to effectively do the work they are called upon to do in today's schools" (Aksamit, 1990, p.28).

Labeling

The question of whether teacher willingness to mainstream exceptional students is influenced by diagnostic labels continues to be an issue for debate. Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) suggest that teachers' expectations of students may become self-fulfilling prophecies . Similarly, Dunn (1968) suggests that children with identified disabilities may fail because of teachers' lowered expectations. The controversy over whether diagnostic labels influence

students' performance continues (Myles & Simpson, 1989).

The three types of handicapped students that are most often mainstreamed are learning disabled, behaviorally impaired, and speech impaired students. Although there are many more mentally retarded than behaviorally impaired children identified in schools, a greater percentage of behaviorally impaired students than mentally retarded students are mainstreamed (U.S. Office of Education, 1986). Williams and Algozzine (1979) reported that mainstreaming rejection rates among regular classroom teachers were highest for mildly retarded (EMH) and behaviorally disordered (BD) students and lowest for children with learning disabilities (LD). National figures show that learning disabled students account for 42% of all handicapped children (U.S. Office of Education, 1986), and the great majority are mildly handicapped and are mainstreamed for at least part of the day (Hagarty and Abramson, 1987).

In order for a student to be considered eligible for

special education programs and services under the category of learning disabled (LD), one of the criteria which must be met is that the discrepancy between ability and achievement functioning must be a severe one. " 'Severe discrepancy' is indicated by a marked difference between a student's ability level and achievement level in one of seven areas: oral expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, mathematics calculations or mathematical reasoning" (Ehlert, 1982, p.23). This difference must be statistically significant and have educational importance as determined by the Child Study Team (Ehlert, 1982). "Individuals with learning disabilities exhibit difficulties or deficits in a variety of areas. The areas most frequently discussed in the literature are behavior, academics, motor skills, receptive and expressive skills, and organizational and study skills" (Iowa State Department of Education project, 1986, p. 125).

At the intermediate level, the handicapped student is

much more aware of special education. He has acquired more knowledge about special education the more he has been involved with it. "The use of derogatory terms seems to increase at this level as compared to the elementary" (Barrick, 1978, p.34). In Barrick's study (1978), "the intermediate special education student was satisfactorily integrated academically, but socially he was not. More labels were used (often in a demeaning way) to describe the special education student" (p.35).

In a study which demonstrated bias and the strong negative influence of a label, Foster, Ysseldyke, and Reese (1975) reported that "special education college students, when told a non-handicapped child shown on a videotape was learning disabled or behaviorally disordered, rated him lower in academic performance and social adjustment" (Myles and Simpson, 1989, p.480).

The use of labels has been criticized because labels are associated with preconceived notions about behaviors and

characteristics which can often lead to negative attitudes (Gajar, 1983). Hannah and Pilner (1983) found that children with emotional disturbances were viewed by teachers as unmotivated to learn, unfriendly, dishonest, and aggressive. Children with learning disabilities were viewed by teachers as aggressive, disruptive, academically low functioning, and angry. "These assigned negative attributes can carry over into classroom interaction between teachers and mainstreamed students "(Yanito, et al., 1987, p.7).

Hannah and Pilner (1983) assessed the reactions of teachers to a list of handicapping conditions using the Semantic Differential Paradigm. With the use of the Personal Attributes Inventory, "the same authors found a wide range of reactions to handicapping labels. This range of reactions reiterates the problems of multiple interpretations of handicapping labels" (Yanito, et al., 1987, p. 8).

The problem of multiple interpretations of handicapping labels can be alleviated by providing specific descriptions of

the behaviors and characteristics of persons with handicaps, rather than referring to a group of persons by a handicapping condition. The use of labels with accompanying descriptions decreases the chance for multiple interpretation, but the likelihood remains that teachers will continue to associate different behaviors and characteristics with a label based upon prior experience and exposure to a limited number of students with handicaps, unless specifically trained to recognize handicapping conditions and characteristics associated with each (Donaldson, 1980; Naor and Melgram, 1980; Stephens and Braun, 1980; Yanito, et al., 1987).

Furthermore, in their study, Myles and Simpson (1989) found that "when teachers were not given the opportunity to suggest mainstreaming modifications, the diagnostic label of the child appeared to take on greater importance" (p. 487).

"There were a rather large number of students whom educators knew were special education students but did not know their categorical label. This could be a reflection of the

trend towards a generic classification of special needs students" (Lombardi, et al., 1991, p.18). Thornburgh (1980) states that "Most mainstreamed kids aren't that different from some of the children teachers have been teaching all along" (p.161). "The label," he contends, "frightens the regular classroom teacher" (Tillona, 1986, p. 7).

Concerns of Regular Education Teachers

In general, the impact of P.L. 94-142 on schools was considerable. Regular class teachers in general reported "they had not been prepared for the change in role required to include special education students," and they commonly expressed worries about "time consumed in helping exceptional students, their own ignorance about how to instruct handicapped students, and the extra work required" (Nevin, 1981, p.29).

The idea of mainstreaming special education students into regular classrooms frightens many regular educators.

"These fears can stem from a lack of understanding about the mainstreaming process. Some teachers envision a wholesale return of all handicapped children to regular classes all day long and without essential support services" (Yanito, et al., 1987, p.14). Teachers must be educated to view mainstreaming as a continuing process rather than a discrete event (Guralnick, 1983).

In the study done by Zigmond, Levin, and Laurie (1985), 68% of the teachers felt that having an LD student in the mainstream placed additional demands on the teacher. They stated that LD students required more attention, more extensive lesson preparation, more time for contact with the special education staff, and more adjustments in the grading policy. "While many teachers were tolerant of the idea of integrating LD students into mainstream classes, most of the teachers would have preferred not to have them" (p.536).

In America it is true that an overwhelming number of regular classroom teachers feel ill-equipped to deal with

handicapped children. Hudson, Graham and Warner (1979) found that elementary school regular class teachers were not supportive of the mainstreaming concept. The results of their study showed that "teachers felt that they did not have the time, support services, or necessary training to effectively teach exceptional students" (Hauptman, 1983, p.6).

In Oakland County's study (1982), general education teachers were asked to list some reasons why they might oppose the mainstreaming of a special education student in their classroom. The following is a list of the reasons given:

- (1) Requires too much teacher time (paperwork meetings, lesson plans, preparation time)
- (2) Special education student lacks the skills necessary to succeed in the class
- (3) Disruptive behavior
- (4) General education teacher feels a lack of training to deal with special education student
- (5) Lack of information about student and/or lack of support provided by special education personnel or administration
- (6) Lowers class standards, slows class progress
- (7) Too many special education students already in class
- (8) Lack of materials
- (9) Increase in class size

(Brozovich & Kotting, 1982, p.20)

The findings of the Special Education Council on Mainstreaming study (1984, p.1) include the following:

Special education staff are seen as most interested, knowledgeable, and supportive of mainstreaming, though the implementation responsibility or "burden" of mainstreaming falls on regular education teachers. Most respondents feel a need for more resources. Class size and teacher workloads are of great concern. Regular education staff are more concerned about the effects of mainstreaming on the regular education student and consider the teacher's attitude less important to the success of that student with special education needs. Special education staff are more concerned about mainstreaming effects on the special education student and, in general feel that the more handicapped the student, the more importance teacher attitude has on the success of the experience.

In the section of Hauptman's study (1983) dealing with the academic accomplishments of the special education child in the mainstream class, there was much uncertainty on the part of the regular classroom teachers. "Most of those professionals questioned felt that students should be mainstreamed only if they could meet certain academic standards within the mainstream. They did not feel that

children should be placed in regular classes for purely social purposes" (Hauptman, 1983, p.32).

The elementary teachers in Barrick's study (1978) viewed the integration of special education students into the regular classroom as a worthy goal. However, "although the teachers desired to help children with exceptional needs, they were often frustrated by their inability to serve both the exceptional student and the rest of the students in their class" (p.14). "The regular teachers were also concerned that there were more students with needs than teachers to meet their needs" (p.30).

In a study carried out by Henfield and Stieglitz (1981), it was found that "teachers' concerns centered on adequate preparation for mainstreaming, the amount of support they would get from staff and administrators, and on the amount of teacher time and attention both the handicapped and non-handicapped students would receive" (p.12). Teachers' concerns may well be justified. Yanito, et al. (1987) found

that "students with deficits in self-help, cognitive and communication skills are greatly disadvantaged in a regular classroom when a teacher is not adequately prepared to manage these deficits" (p.21).

The academic area seems to be the primary area of concern at the secondary level. Teachers feel that academic criteria must be established for each child placed in a regular classroom. This, too, could cause a ripple effect. "Other children in the classroom resent special handling of handicapped students. They want to know "how they can get away with" lack of homework inadequate grades, and poor classroom participation" (Hauptman, 1983, p.32).

Yanito and others concluded from their study (1987) that in order to change teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children and mainstreaming, one must first identify the factors which affect these attitudes. The unwillingness of some teachers to accept children with handicaps into the regular classroom can result from:

a) teachers' lack of knowledge about the laws protecting people with handicaps; b) lack of knowledge about handicapping conditions; c) lack of understanding about the mainstream process; d) lack of training to teach the mainstreamed child; e) lack of incentive by school districts for teachers to accept such children; f) characteristics of children with handicaps which may affect attitudes; and g) the amount of support services and technical assistance available for the mainstreaming teacher (Yanito, et al., 1987, p.12).

Class Size

"In an age of increasing classroom sizes, it may appear necessary to withhold mainstreaming from a student's program because receiving classrooms are overcrowded. However, classroom size is not acceptable legally as a reason for not mainstreaming" (Quintero, et al., 1987, p.11).

The teachers involved in Barrick's study (1978) seemed to think that class size is what kept him/her from doing as well as he had liked. The "needs of the class" was seen as the dominating factor. The needs of the special education student were then considered. "The larger class size resulted in little time being given to the special education student. The

increase of class size also decreased the instructional flexibility" (Barrick, et al., 1978, p.13).

In the Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study (1984), 71% of the teachers indicated that class size often hinders placement in mainstream classes. This figure suggests that more students might benefit from mainstreaming but are kept out because of the number of students in the class. "Mainstream classes are too large. It's not fair to expect special attention to handicapped kids when they have 4 to 6 in a class plus regular kids." "The mainstreamed student in a regular education classroom should count for a minimum of 2-3 regular education students" (Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study, 1984, p.52). Teachers expressed frustration over the fact that they did not have time to meet the needs of all the students in their classes.

Time

In Hauptman's study (1983), "most of the teachers felt they did not have the time to spend individualizing instruction,

time to spend helping individual children within the classroom, time to plan strategies with the special education teacher and administration" (Hauptman, 1983, p.34). Many felt they needed more time to adequately handle special education youngsters in their mainstream class.

Time for instructional planning and individual instruction was identified as a critical factor in implementation, according to several studies (Craig, Miller, Wujek, & Hershberger, 1980; Safer, Kaufman, & Morrissey, 1979; Stearns, Greene, & David, 1979). The findings indicated that the more planning time available to teachers, the more likely IEP objectives were translated into individualized instructional activities.

Many general education teachers oppose receiving mainstreamed students primarily because it would require too much additional teacher time to accommodate mainstreamed students. This suggests a role for special education teachers in facilitating the acceptance of mainstreamed students. By

developing systematic methods and procedures to minimize the extra time required to accommodate a mainstreamed student, special education teachers could alleviate this concern. This finding also suggests that "those people responsible for delivering inservice programs related to mainstreaming should focus more attention on the issue of time involvement required by the general education teacher" (Brozovich & Kotting, 1982, p.38).

Teachers need adequate time for instructional planning, attending IEP meetings, meeting with special education personnel and parents to discuss programs, and learning new special education teaching techniques. "Administrators should recognize this need and assist teachers in making time for the necessary activities." (Nevin, 1981, p.141).

Support Services

The amount of support services and technical assistance which is available to a regular classroom teacher is a major factor contributing to positive teacher attitudes toward

mainstreaming and children with handicaps (Donaldson, 1980; Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Lombardi, Meadowcroft & Strasburger, 1982).

"Teacher Assistance Teams can help teachers conceptualize and understand the nature of individual handicapped children's learning and behavior problems and create a more positive attitude among regular teachers with respect to working with handicapped children who learn differently" (Chalfant, Pysh, & Moultrie, 1979, p.94).

Gillet (1983) cites examples of successful mainstreaming programs used throughout the United States. One of these programs included the use of trained paraprofessionals and volunteers to provide individual instruction, repetition, and reinforcement. A second program made use of "peer tutoring, where students in the mainstream regular classroom supplied the necessary academic reinforcement as well as the by-product of social interaction " (Tillona, 1986, p.11).

In the Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study

(1984), teachers expressed the need for classroom aides to help them meet the needs of their students (p.52). The presence of teacher aides allows the regular teacher more time to develop and implement individualized instructional activities for their handicapped student (Safer, et al., 1979).

Myles and Simpson (1989) found that the most desired modifications related to mainstreaming were reduced class size and support services. In addition, "the majority of the teachers noted that the availability of a paraprofessional (classroom aide), for at least half of each school day, was needed for successful mainstreaming" (p.486). The data in the Oakland County study (1982) indicate that "the quality of supportive services for general education teachers is a key factor related to general education teachers' perceptions of the educational and social benefits of mainstreaming" (Brozovich & Kotting, 1982, p.39). In a study by Hudson, Graham & Warner (1979), the teachers felt that they did not receive the support services necessary to enable them to work

with a special child.

Data from the Oakland County study (1982) indicate that general education teachers who do not feel they are receiving adequate support services desire increased consultation with special education staff. "Special education staff need to be aware that their consultation with general education teachers appears to be a significant factor related to the acceptance of mainstreaming" (Brozovich & Kotting, 1982, p.39).

The Olympia Consulting Model was designed to provide appropriate services to low-performing and mainstreamed handicapped students. The rationale for a consulting model was based on the need to prevent learning problems and maintain a greater number of special needs and handicapped students within regular education classrooms. A consultant model was therefore designed to offer instructional support resources and strategies to regular education teachers. The primary goal of these services was to assist classroom teachers and adopt alternate instructional practices (Moore &

Zeller, 1982).

As Wang, Rubenstein, and Reynolds (1986) state, "by providing regular education teachers with the necessary support system to educate all children successfully, we are strengthening our educational system as a whole" (p.62).

Training

"There is concern about the placement of special education students in the regular class. The regular teachers are viewed as inadequately prepared for these students" (Barrick, 1978, p.28). In Barrick's study (1978) the "regular high school teachers seemed to have a general lack of knowledge of special education and special education students. Often the teachers expressed a feeling of inadequacy in dealing with the handicapped students assigned to them" (p.44).

Federal and state governments are presently supporting special education programs for approximately 8% of the school population. Most of these students will be enrolled, at some time in their school careers, in some kind of vocational

education, a subject of particular importance to this group because of their limited career options. "This puts increasing pressure on vocational teachers, most of whom have never received any special training for this added responsibility" (Ottman, 1982, p.ii).

Perhaps most critical to the training of regular educators is the observed relationship between special education and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills and IEP implementation patterns. "Experience with special education skills was associated with participation in inservice training programs. Clearly, regular teachers would benefit from training in special education and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching techniques" (Nevin, 1981, p.143).

Bond and Dietrich (1982) found in their study that teachers who had taken at least one special education class had more positive attitudes than those with no course work in special education. They believe it is therefore essential to require at least one special education class at the

undergraduate level for teacher certification. Furthermore, they believe that "a graduate level special education course should be required for all graduate degree programs in education. Consideration should be given to course work designed to promote an understanding of and acceptance toward those children with handicapping conditions" (p.10).

"The fact that teachers reported needing more training in the area of classroom management and that they especially felt unprepared to work with behaviorally impaired students suggests a breakdown in the mainstreaming system" (Aksamit, 1990, p.26).

In Aksamit's study (1990) there was a recommendation by the majority of teachers to require one or more special education courses for all elementary and secondary teachers. Requiring a special education course is now the most prevalent approach to preparing classroom teachers, often as the result of a state law (33 states require such a course). "There is little evidence, however, that such courses alone adequately

prepare teachers for the various curricular and instructional needs of handicapped and other 'at risk' students" (Aksamit, 1990, p.27).

A dual major, in which students complete both the regular education and special education programs, has been a strategy suggested for preparing teachers to work effectively with mainstreamed and other "at risk" students. "Teachers with a dual major are more likely to be confident in their ability to teach students with learning and behavior problems" (Aksamit, 1990, p.28).

Thompson and Morgan (1980) conducted a study on the interaction patterns between teachers and students in groups of students classified as high-achievers, low-achievers, learning disabled, and behaviorally handicapped. Significant differences were found among teacher interaction patterns with the four groups of students. Teacher-student interaction and teacher feedback occurred most often with the students labeled behaviorally handicapped. Thompson and Morgan

suggested from this finding that "teachers were attending more often to inappropriate behaviors, thus reaffirming the need for teacher training in behavior management and serving the needs of children with handicaps" (Yanito, et al., 1987 p.11).

According to Nevin's study (1981), direct instructional methods and behavior management techniques were identified as the areas in which teachers most desired training. "Consultation with and observation of special education teachers surfaced as the preferred mode of inservice training. Inservice training programs should address these areas and modalities accordingly" (p.144).

In Farrer and Guest's study (1970), a training program involving 18 experienced teachers and 36 adults trained as teacher aides was implemented. This was done in an attempt to meet the needs of regular education teachers with handicapped and educationally disadvantaged students in their classrooms. The training program involved seminars on the

intellectual and emotional development of children, methods of observing and recording behavior, methods of interpreting observation records for evaluation and curriculum planning, use of educational media, and team teaching and planning. The results indicated that "participating teachers and aides improved their knowledge of and attitudes toward special education, and their students made significant gains in achievement. The use of well-trained classroom aides was a significant factor in the success of the program" (p.1).

Inservice training was ranked fourth in the list of items needed to support mainstreaming. It was generally not seen as high a priority as aides, materials, and support from special education staff. However, the survey responses indicate that "regular education teachers are poorly informed about mainstreaming, have inadequate knowledge about disabilities and are not particularly supportive of mainstreaming. These factors strongly suggest the need for inservice education, assuming it can have an impact on knowledge and attitudes"

(Special Education Council Mainstreaming, 1984, p.61).

Social Acceptance

Walker and Rankin (1982) found that the greatest reason for failure of students with mild or moderate handicaps in a mainstream environment is typically the exhibition of inappropriate classroom behaviors (e.g. noncompliance, self-abuse, physical aggression). It has long been accepted that students who are learning disabled are at risk for low peer acceptance and deficits in socially appropriate behavior as well as poor academic performance (Bennerson, McIntosh, & Vaughn, 1991, p.3). In fact social skills deficits are viewed as one of the disorders associated with learning disabilities (Kavanagh & Truss, 1988).

A majority of exceptional children, regardless of their handicapping conditions, exhibit social skills deficits. Handicapped children have been described as frequently exhibiting maladaptive social behavior and lacking

satisfactory interpersonal relationships (Kneedler, 1982; Strain, 1982). Hallahan and Kauffman (1978) pointed to social adjustment problems as one of the major commonalities of behavioral-disordered, learning-disabled, and mildly retarded children. These interpersonal behavior deficits have come under close scrutiny since the advent of mainstreaming. "Handicapped children's social interaction patterns, peer acceptance, and acceptance by teachers all appear to be areas of concern" (Gresham, Elliott, & Black, 1987, p.81).

"The research concerning mainstreaming indicates that handicapped students are generally poorly accepted by their non-handicapped peers because of their lack of social skills. As a result, there is little social integration in the regular classroom" (Tillona, 1986, p.31). However, problems of adjustment to the mainstream can be avoided to some extent by proper introduction of the handicapped student to the class. It is critical that the teacher initiate and reinforce the concept through his/her behavior toward the handicapped child

(Tillona, 1986, p.11).

In Tillona's study, it was found that many mainstreaming plans failed because very few plans provided for teaching social skills to the mainstreamed special education students, and they were not closely monitored. Many plans just placed the special education students in a regular classroom with little preparation or on-going monitoring of their needs (Tillona, 1986). Gresham (1982) states that the assumption is that handicapped students, placed in the mainstream without social skills, can learn them through modeling. He stated, "It should be obvious that many handicapped children do not have the initiative skills to model certain behaviors in the classroom" (p.425).

Many studies have suggested that handicapped children do not adjust to a regular classroom because of social ineptness. Teachers interviewed in Enell's study (1982), however, said "they learned to help their handicapped children become more socially accepted by offering social skills training to them.

Disabled children responded well to role models in the regular classroom, and to reinforcement of their acceptable sociable behavior by the teachers" (Enell, 1982, p.19).

If mainstreaming efforts of handicapped students are to be successful in decreasing social rejection by non-handicapped peers and teachers, then the factors which lead to social rejection must be identified. Social rejection may well result from exhibitions of inappropriate behaviors by the integrated handicapped student. Gottlieb, Semmel, and Veldman (1978) state that "there is little doubt that observable behavior in the presence of others affects social status." They go on to say that "social rejection is related to the expression of negative behavior and is not simply the absence of positive behavior "(Doris & Brown, 1980, p.1).

Gresham (1984) argues that increased focus and consideration on social skills in the mainstream process is needed. He contends that "mainstreaming alone has little effect on the social competencies of handicapped students."

He calls for "increased attention to improving social skills through social skills training based on an instructional model" (Tillona, 1986, p.14).

The goal of a program developed by McGinnis and Goldstein (1984) is "not simply to teach the students to conform, but rather teach them positive ways of dealing with social conventions, with their own feelings, the feelings of others, and with stressful and conflict situations" (p.161).

"Educating children with behavior problems involves more than the formal goals of established limits and academic skills. These students require the teaching of interpersonal and social needs" (McGinnis, Sauerby & Nichols, 1985, p.60). These children are told what they should not do. However, educators must substitute prosocial skills in their place, if they are expected to abandon unacceptable antisocial behaviors. "One of the reasons that handicapped children were placed in self-contained classrooms was that they failed to gain acceptable social behavior through incidental learning or

because they had insufficient practice of this acceptable behavior "(Tillona, 1986, p.12).

Teachers in mainstreaming settings continue to be highly reactive to the demands imposed by handicapped children's needs (Hunter, 1978). The conflict between these two perspectives is nowhere in greater evidence than in relation to the social behavior performances of mainstreamed handicapped children. The majority of regular teachers have very low tolerance levels for such social behavior, even from handicapped children. As a result, regular teachers may conclude that a handicapped child, who is perceived as having unacceptable social behaviors, does not belong in a mainstream setting and cannot succeed within it. Even though such may not be the case, the teacher's attitude might make it a self-fulfilling prophecy! Further, regular teachers often argue that the child's social behavior (a) is disruptive to the classroom atmosphere, (b) disturbs other children, and (c) deprives other children in the class of needed teacher time and attention. The

extent to which these teacher arguments actually reflect reality (with respect to the handicapped child's behavior) varies from case to case. However, the simple possession of such attitudes will have a profound impact upon the way in which teachers respond to handicapped children and accommodate their needs (Brophy & Evertson, 1981; Brophy & Good, 1970, 1974).

How should the educational community respond to this problem of negative attitudes and low tolerance levels on the part of classroom teachers? One approach would be to attempt to change their attitudes and to broaden their tolerance levels and expectations of handicapped children. To date, only meager efforts in this area have been reported in literature. According to Walker and Hersh (1982), much stronger, more immediate, and more direct measures are required to cope with the situation as it exists today. They found that the social behavior standards and expectations of regular educators must be taken into account systematically in the mainstreaming

process.

Procedures must be developed that will provide for a one-to-one correspondence between the social behavior concerns of receiving regular teachers and the social behaviors of mainstreamed handicapped children. Once a receiving teacher's social behavior standards and expectations are identified, procedures must be established to (a) assess the handicapped child's behaviors with respect to these standards; (b) reduce and/or eliminate specific social behaviors the teacher views as unacceptable in the regular classroom; and (c) teach the child those positive social behaviors that the teacher may consider essential to a successful adjustment within his/her class. Once the handicapped child has adjusted successfully to the mainstream setting, procedures must be implemented to train the regular teacher to manage the child's behavior successfully with only minimal or no support. This is an extremely crucial component of any strategy designed for long term maintenance of handicapped children within less restrictive settings (Walker & Hersh, 1982, p.43).

"Each child to be mainstreamed would be taught a standard set of peer-to-peer social skills designed to improve social competence and hopefully acceptance by peers." In addition "each child would be instructed in each of five adaptive skills and competencies appropriate to academic

settings" (Walker & Hersh, 1982, p.50).

One section of Hauptman's study (1983) focuses on the relationships established among peer groups of learning disabled and regular students. She says that the problem of social acceptance, sensitivity, awareness of special needs, and social integration with mainstream students is of prime importance when considering whether or not to allow handicapped children in a regular classroom. There have been many rationalizations made by regular educators to justify their negative feeling toward the mainstreaming concept. One of the most frequently used arguments is that special education youngsters cause disturbances in the classroom, whether because of their inability to sit still, or because their presence causes an adverse effect on the other children in the classroom. However, the results of Hauptman's study were very positive. All of the teachers in her study felt that "special education youngsters posed no additional burdens upon the behavioral attitudes of the class" (Hauptman, 1983, p.31).

In Bennerson's study (1991), social skills intervention was used in an effort to increase peer acceptance of students with learning disabilities. While the results of the peer ratings and teacher ratings of social skills are not overwhelmingly positive, there are indications that intervention proved successful. Far more striking were the comments by the teacher and students. "The teacher interview was extremely positive, noting changes, not only for the targeted students, but for the class as a whole. One hundred percent of the students in the classroom said they wanted to become a social skills trainer" (Bennerson, et al., 1991, p.24).

One of the major concerns in educating children with exceptional needs in the regular classroom is the extent to which these children are socially accepted by teachers and peers. It has been suggested that the teacher may influence student's perceptions of handicapped children and that attempts to improve the social position of these children depend upon the teacher (Doris & Brown, 1980).

Gottlieb, et al. (1978) suggest that since perceptions of misbehavior lead to social rejection, social status can most easily be improved by reducing rejection through modifying misbehaviors. This modifying of misbehavior must occur prior to placement in the regular class, because once a child is integrated and perceived to manifest inappropriate behavior, it is very difficult to change social status (Bryan, 1976).

Factors Affecting Positive Attitude Change

A teacher's positive attitude and feelings of success in his/her work have been linked to academic progress demonstrated by that teacher's students (Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). Since the educational progress of children with handicaps is usually slower than the progress made by non-handicapped peers, a teacher may feel discouraged with a child's slow progress (Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). "The slow progress and behavior deficits which are characteristic of students with

handicaps can negatively affect teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming" (Yanito, et al., 1987, p.19).

The attitude of the regular teacher toward exceptional children is a powerful influence in the successful development of student ability in the regular classroom. Research evidence indicates, fortunately, that teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and toward children with handicaps can be changed (Guerin & Szatlocky, 1974; Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Harasymiw & Horne, 1976; Hersh & Waler, 1983; Stainback and Stainback, 1981). Higgs (1975) found that a high degree of contact with exceptional children leads to more positive attitudes toward them.

Teacher attitudes are more positive toward those students with whom they experience success (Hersh & Walker, 1983; Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). Furthermore, when a mainstreamed student was perceived by teachers as demonstrating success, they encouraged continued placement in the mainstream, and they described the

student with handicaps as having needs which were within the normal range for the class (Yanito, et al., 1987).

In a study by Salend and Johns (1983), using direct observation to assess teachers' attitudes, they noted the positive changes that occurred over a 17-week period of time. As the students' (labeled emotionally disturbed) inappropriate behaviors decreased and positive participation in classroom activities increased, teacher comments and descriptions of the student reflected a more positive attitude. "Teacher attitudes improved as a result of their increased confidence in teaching the child. The teachers received support services and the training needed to better prepare them for teaching a mainstreamed child with emotionally disturbing behavior" (Yanito, et al., 1987, p.10).

Junkala and Mooney (1986) found that when people feel more capable of dealing with situations, they feel better about themselves, and their attitudes toward the situations become correspondingly more positive. "When regular teachers are

given even minimal support services to assist them with their special students, their attitudes toward themselves and their students frequently undergo positive changes" (p.220).

Guerin and Szatlocky (1974) found that "the attitudes of special education teachers influence the attitudes of the regular teachers with whom they have contact. Therefore, it would behoove special education teachers to examine carefully their attitudes toward special students and conscientiously model positive attitudes" (Candler & Sowell, 1980, p.3).

Singleton (1976) showed that teachers receiving direct assistance changed their attitudes about working with handicapped youngsters. McNamara (1981), Seidenberg (1981), and Hauser (1979) all state that "a mainstream program's effectiveness can be measured by the extent to which it is integrated into the whole school organization" (Hauptman, 1983, p.16).

Communication, Input, and Teamwork

Hauptman (1983) concluded that the implementation of PL 94-142 must be the responsibility of the entire school, faculty, administration, and community. "A communication system between regular classroom teachers and special education teachers must be established. A classroom environment has to be created where the special education student can be integrated as a member of that class" (p.14).

"There seems to be a need for more communication between the special education staff and the regular education teaching staff" (Barrick, 1978, p.26). "Communication between the special education teacher and the regular classroom teacher is, in all probability, the one area that can lead to either success or failure of a mainstreaming approach for exceptional students" (South Carolina's Child Service Demonstration Center, p.50). "This communication between special education teacher and regular classroom teacher cannot be over-emphasized. Formal and informal

communication is essential for total program effectiveness" (Hauptman, 1983, p.3). "Studies have shown that if communication is present, teacher attitudes toward special education youngsters will improve, student work will improve, and mainstream teachers will become more aware of the needs of the handicapped youngster "(Hauptman, 1983 , p.16).

"Communication between regular and special education teachers can enhance the learning of the student, provide for the best use of the expertise of both professionals, and magnify the opportunities for self-realization and a more abundant adult life for students in a world made up of individual differences "(Candler & Sowell, 1980, p.13).

Communication on paper is not enough. There must be verbal exchange, a meeting of the mind and face. Ottman (1981) states that there must be constant communication between the teachers both in the development of the Individualized Education Plan (I.E.P.) and in the accomplishment of academic and social goals within the mainstream class. In

Singleton's study (1976), it was shown that "those teachers who received direct assistance and communicated with special education personnel, felt more positive in their ability to help handicapped individuals" (Hauptman, 1983, p.36).

If a learning disabled student is to benefit from a mainstream class, the regular classroom teacher must be willing to modify instructional practices to accommodate this student, whose learning style or ability may be deviant from the majority of student in the class. There must be a coordinated effort to construct a program which will integrate the efforts of both mainstream classroom teachers and special education teachers. The regular educator must know exactly why the child is being mainstreamed, what are the specific goals, and how mastery is to be demonstrated. Regular educators should be able to read the student's IEP. They should be able to communicate so that they know exactly what can and cannot be done. They must have a specific time to discuss mainstream students with the special education teachers during the school day (Hauptman, 1983, p.4).

Hauptman (1983) found that the state of willingness of individuals to participate fully as a team member is important to the issue of education. The teacher must feel full partnership in the team, if he/she is to become a valuable member

(p.5). Bauer (1975) suggests that "there should be a viable contract between regular and special education teachers concerning, time, responsibilities, tradeoffs, and services. This 'working alliance' provides for an ongoing communication system and meaningful evaluation of the programs" (Candler & Sowell, 1980, p.4).

The most significant finding in the study done by Myles and Simpson (1989) was the general willingness among regular classroom teachers to accept exceptional children into their classrooms contingent upon consideration of their mainstreaming recommendations. When denied the opportunity for such input, teachers overwhelmingly voiced opposition to mainstreaming exceptional children. The data suggest that regular education teachers' active participation in planning and implementing the mainstreaming process is an important factor. Myles and Simpson go on to say that "willingness to mainstream may be strengthened when regular classroom teachers are provided opportunities to select specific

mainstreaming-related modifications that meet the needs of individual students" (p.486).

Ann Nevin's study (1981) examines the involvement of the regular education teacher in IEP development and the implementation process. P.L. 94-142 mandates that a teacher be present at IEP meetings. However, to which teacher this refers is unclear. Some administrators believe regular teachers should be included in the development process, while others feel they should not be involved (Craig, Miller, Mujek, & Hershberger, 1980). Marver and David (1978) reported the role of the regular teacher in IEP development: "Rarely did the regular classroom teacher play a formal role in writing IEP's" (p.25). Furthermore, "teachers who were responsible for implementing IEP's but had not participated in developing the plans expressed considerable resentment" (Nevin, 1981, p.12).

Ottman (1981) maintains that the integration of special needs students into the regular classroom requires both special educators and regular classroom teachers to assume

new roles. "Before a handicapped student is integrated into a regular classroom, the special educator should offer to assist the regular teacher in defining and assessing any possible problems" (Hauptman, 1983, p.10). The regular classroom teacher should be provided with background of the student's needs and a description of the major components of his/her handicapping conditions. The regular classroom teacher should be invited to attend the Individualized Education Program (I.E.P.) conference, in which the goals are developed for the mainstreamed student. The special educator should aid the regular teacher in the measurement of goals and provide appropriate instruments to gather such data as a behavior checklist. If there is a behavioral consideration, the special educator can help to set up and implement a program to increase and/or maintain the student's appropriate behavior. Ottman feels that "enlisting the aid and cooperation of the regular classroom teacher before mainstreaming begins, is a necessity to ensure a smooth transition for the handicapped

student" (Hauptman, 1983, p.11).

Whenever possible, regular teachers should be included in IEP meetings...They should be provided with a personal copy of the IEP for each handicapped child placed in their classrooms...Regular teachers need training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills, special education techniques, collaboration skills, available special education services and relevant legislative requirements Consultation with and observation of special education teachers is the preferred mode for providing such training (Nevin, 1981, pp.143-144).

Effective education reform requires input from all participants. Will (1986) observed that "special programs and regular education programs must be allowed to collectively contribute skills and resources to carry out individualized education plans based on individualized educational needs" (p.413).

The comments from special education teachers and regular teachers who work with the handicapped suggest that "they are learning new teaching techniques from one another, and sharing appropriate methods of helping the disabled children to adjust to the regular classroom situation" (Enell,

1982, p.20).

As Myles and Simpson concluded (1989), regardless of whether regular and special education programs maintain their independence or organize into a single model, mildly handicapped students will continue to be served within regular education classrooms. Regular classroom teachers may be willing to accommodate mildly handicapped children in their classrooms, but "their willingness appears to be dependent upon the opportunity to participate in the mainstreaming decision-making process. Educational administrators must recognize that teachers need a voice in the decision-making process in order to ensure the success of mainstreaming" (p.488).

Creating a classroom environment where the learning disabled student is not merely present, but is integrated as a member of a mainstream class, is the goal set by the special education teacher, and is the overall philosophy of the mainstreaming concept. Creating an educational environment

where true involvement is promoted calls for relationships between professionals marked by mutual purpose, collaborative effort, and recognition of interdependence (Luchow 1981).

Benefits of Integration

In Tillona's study (1986), "all of the regular education teachers involved, as well as all the special education teachers, believed that the integration of regular education students and special education students helps to improve understanding and acceptance of their differences" (p.56).

Lombardi, et al. (1991) found that as a general rule, "special students enrolled in regular classes function at a higher level than their counterpart who attend special classes or special schools" (p.7). Farrer and Guest (1970) reported "gains in achievement and self-concept among special education students integrated into a regular classroom setting" (p.11). In the study by Henfield and Stieglitz (1981),

regarding the value of mainstreaming, "approximately 80% of the respondents believe that it is socially beneficial to have non-handicapped and disabled in the same classes "(p.12). As a group, the teachers in Hauptman's study (1983) felt that a special education student will develop a more positive attitude toward school when mainstreamed with regular students.

Two positive effects of mainstreaming were perceived by teachers in the Oakland County study (1982):

- 1) It results in special education students as being perceived as "normal" by others and themselves.
- 2) It improves self-confidence of special education students (Brozovich & Kotting, 1982, p.24).

Teachers who took part in Enell's study (1982) stated confidence about assimilating special students into their regular classrooms. They revealed their tendencies to have lower expectations of special education students at first. They discovered that some of these children had the same

academic potential as regular students. "Handicapped students, they learned, expressed the same feelings and desires as regular students, and with the proper motivation from their teachers, could accomplish the same kinds of educational objectives as their peers" (Enell, 1982, p.19).

Regular teachers reported that when they began to deal with special education students, they had to learn new ways to teach them. Through learning techniques from special education teachers, and devising new methods on their own, teachers discovered that children learned in many different ways. "Regular students benefitted from the new learning techniques, too. One teacher disclosed, he felt he had become a more effective instructor because he was reaching more students with his use of new learning techniques" (Enell, 1982, p.ii).

While there were significant concerns about the implementation of mainstreaming, there was strong support for the values and principles involved. Over 80% of the entire

group felt there were positive impacts on regular education students, and over 90% noted positive impacts on special education students. Comments indicated that "regular education students benefit by improving their understanding and acceptance of others and that special education students benefit by increasing their socialization, being exposed to the real world, and by learning to accept themselves" (Special Education Council Mainstreaming. Study, 1984, p. 33).

Summary

The passing of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, brought greater freedom and opportunities to children with disabilities in our schools. However, these changes also brought many concerns for our educators. Much of the responsibility for implementing the mainstreaming process has been left on the shoulders of the regular education teachers. His/her role has dramatically changed, and most were caught unprepared for what lay ahead.

It is not surprising then, that there has been such wide-spread opposition and resistance to integrating special education students into regular classrooms.

Teachers' concerns must be taken seriously if mainstreaming is to succeed. Most regular education teachers have had little, if any, experience with handicapped students, and most have not had any special education courses. Many feel that their lack of training and knowledge makes them inadequately prepared to teach this population of students.

Teachers are concerned about overcrowded classrooms and the ability to meet the needs of all their students. Without a classroom aide to help ease their burden, most regular classroom teachers feel they simply do not have the time to spend on a child with special needs.

Although one of the reasons for mainstreaming special education students is to help them gain social acceptance from their peers, literature shows, that for the most part, this simply does not happen. Inappropriate behavior leads to

rejection from their classmates and teachers. However, studies have shown that the teaching of social skills has been successful, especially when it is done prior to entry into the regular classroom.

Teachers need all the support services that the school district has to offer. Regular and special education teachers should work together as part of a team, sharing ideas, knowledge, and skills. There needs to be communication and input from all involved in order to be effective.

Success breeds positive change, even for those whose attitudes had been negative for so long. The benefits of integration are worthy of the challenge to bring it about.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students, to explore the implications of these attitudes for improvement of the educational system.

Research Questions

There were two major questions explored in this study.

- 1) What are the expressed attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students in regular classrooms?
- 2) What do special education teachers perceive to be the attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students in regular classrooms?

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects involved in this study are 269 teachers from an upstate New York suburban school district. Of those 269 subjects, 247 are regular education teachers, and 22 are special education teachers. They are from nine different schools within the district (5 elementary, 2 middle schools, and 2 high schools). The subjects have various years of experience and diverse teaching backgrounds. Participation was strictly voluntary and all respondents were anonymous.

Instruments

There were two different surveys used in this study, one for regular education teachers and one for special education teachers. The surveys were developed by the author of this study. Some of the statements were borrowed from the study by Bond and Dietrich (1982) and the study by Hauptman (1983). In both surveys, the teachers were asked to respond to statements, 23 for regular teachers and 16 for special

education teachers. The participants were asked to circle the response that best reflects their feeling about the statement. The five response choices for each ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." At the end of each survey sheet was a space for teachers to express their comments, concerns, and suggestions. This survey was designed with the intention of gaining information and gleaning insight into the attitudes of teachers toward integrating special education students into regular classrooms.

Procedure

After obtaining permission from the superintendent of schools and then from the principals of each of the schools involved, the researcher distributed the surveys to all the teachers in those nine schools. A cover letter was attached requesting the voluntary participation of the teachers in this study. They were instructed to fill out the survey anonymously and place it in a designated box in the main office of their school. A one week time limit was given. The

researcher then collected all the boxes and recorded the survey data. There was a survey response rate of 44%.

Analysis

All responses were recorded for each school, regular education teacher surveys separate from special education teacher surveys. The raw data were then converted to percentages. All teacher comments were read and recorded. Both descriptive and statistical analyses were then carried out to answer the two questions posed by this study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of regular education teachers toward special education students in regular classrooms, to determine what problems, if any, exist, and to propose possible solutions. The purpose of a two-tier format was to test the consistency of regular education teachers' expressed behaviors compared to their observed behaviors (as perceived by special education teachers).

A total of 269 teachers (247 regular education and 22 special education teachers) responded to the two surveys. Both descriptive and statistical analyses of each statement were completed.

Results of the Regular Education Teacher Survey

The statistical analysis of the Regular Education Teacher Survey is contained in Tables 1-8 at the end of this chapter. Percentages have been computed and rounded off to the

nearest percent. The raw data for this survey are contained in Appendices D - H.

Statement 1: Special education students benefit from being mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 19% of the regular education teacher respondents strongly agree, 44% agree, 26% are undecided, 10% disagree, and 1% strongly disagree. There is a further statistical breakdown according to grade level in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Thirty-four percent of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, as compared with 17% of the middle school teachers and only 6% of the high school teachers. Forty-five percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary teachers are undecided, as compared with 32% of the middle school teachers and 27% of the high school teachers. Four percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with that statement,

as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. None of the elementary school teachers or high school teachers, and only 2% of the middle school teachers, strongly disagree with that statement.

Table 5 shows that an overwhelming number of respondents agree or strongly agree (63%) as opposed to those who disagree or strongly disagree (11%). A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 shows that while a majority of the respondents at all grade levels agrees with that statement, elementary school teachers feel especially so (79%).

Statement 2: Regular education students benefit from having special education students mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 16% of the respondents strongly agree, 39% agree, 25% are undecided, 15% disagree, and only 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 26% of the elementary school teachers strongly

agree, compared with 15% of the middle school teachers and 7% of the high school teachers. Forty-five percent of the elementary school teachers agree, compared with 34% of the middle school teachers and 41% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 28% of middle school teachers and 29% of the high school teachers. Eleven percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 17% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Only 1% of the elementary school teachers, 7% of the middle school teachers, and 6% of the high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 5 shows that 55% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, as opposed to 20% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 shows that while about half the middle school and high school teachers (49% and 48% respectively) agree or strongly agree, a full 71% of the

elementary school teachers agree.

Statement 3: Regular education students do not learn as well when special education students are mainstreamed or blended into their classrooms.

Table 1 shows that 4% of the respondents strongly agree, 12% agree, 26% are undecided, 40% disagree, and 18% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 1% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 1% of the high school teachers. Eleven percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 21% of the high school teachers. Twenty-four percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 31% of the middle school teachers and 23% of the high school teachers. Thirty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 43% of the middle school teachers and 40% of high school teachers. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary

school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 13% of middle school teachers and 14% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that only 16% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while 58% disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 shows that at all three levels, teachers definitely disagree with that statement.

Statement 4: Special education students are usually disruptive while in the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 1% of the respondents strongly agree, 14% agree, 23% are undecided, 49% disagree, and 13% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 1% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 2% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Eighteen percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 13% of the middle school teachers and 10% of the high school teachers. Twenty percent

of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 29% of the middle school teachers and 20% of the high school teachers. Forty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 45% of the middle school teachers and 56% of high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 12% of middle school teachers and 14% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 15% of the respondents agree or agree strongly, while 62% disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 6, 7, and 8 shows similar results at the elementary and middle school levels. At the high school level, only 10% agree with the statement, while 70% disagreed.

Statement 5: Having special education students in regular classrooms places additional demands on the classroom teacher.

Table 1 shows that 52% of the respondents strongly

agree, 38% agree, 6% are undecided, 2% disagree, and 1% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4, 55% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 53% of the high school teachers. Thirty-six percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 42% of the middle school teachers and 37% of the high school teachers. Five percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 4% of the high school teachers. Three percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 1% of the middle school teachers and 4% of the high school teachers. In the category of "strongly disagree", all three grade levels scored 1%.

Table 5 shows an overwhelming 90% of all respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement. A further statistical breakdown by grade levels in Tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals similar findings.

Statement 6: Special education students would learn more if they were placed in a self-contained special education class.

Table 1 shows that 4% of the respondents strongly agree, 19% agree, 43% are undecided, 24% disagree, and 10% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 3% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 3% of the high school teachers. Sixteen percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 17% of the middle school teachers and 26% of the high school teachers. Thirty-eight percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 43% of the middle school teachers and 47% of the high school teachers. Twenty-nine percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 22% of the middle school teachers and 21% of high school teachers. Thirteen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement,

compared with 12% of middle school teachers and 3% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 23% of all respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while 34% disagree or disagree strongly. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 show that a higher percentage (42%) of elementary school teachers disagree with this statement.

Statement 7: Special education students should be expected to complete the same assignments as the other students in the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 7% of the respondents strongly agree, 27% agree, 21% are undecided, 36% disagree, and 9% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 3% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 9% of the middle school teachers and 10% of the high school teachers. Fourteen percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 9% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Seventeen

percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 23% of the middle school teachers and 24% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 32% of the middle school teachers and 26% of high school teachers. Sixteen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 4% of middle school teachers and 7% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 34% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement, compared with 45% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals that a much higher percentage (66%) of elementary school teachers disagree with this statement.

Statement 8: The additional help and support that a mainstreamed or blended special education student receives from the special education teacher gives him/her an unfair advantage over the other students in

a regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 1% of the respondents strongly agree, 2% agree, 9% are undecided, 58% disagree, and 30% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 0% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 2% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 5% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 14% of the middle school teachers and 10% of the high school teachers. Fifty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 52% of the middle school teachers and 69% of the high school teachers. . Thirty-nine percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 28% of middle school teachers and 21% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that an overwhelming percentage of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree with this statement (88% compared with 3%). In a further statistical breakdown by grade levels (Tables 6, 7, and 8), similar results were found.

Statement 9: Special education students tend to be quiet and withdrawn in the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 0% of the respondents strongly agree, 11% agree, 32% are undecided, 46% disagree, and 11% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 0% of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly agree. Four percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 9% of the middle school teachers and 20% of the high school teachers. Twenty-nine percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 31% of the high school teachers. Fifty-three percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 44% of the middle school teachers and 43% of

high school teachers. Fourteen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 13% of middle school teachers and 6% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows 57% of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, as opposed to 11% who agree or strongly agree. A further statistical breakdown shows an 18 point percentage spread between the elementary school teachers who disagree (67%) and the high school teachers who disagree (49%).

Statement 10: Mainstreamed or blended special education students are socially accepted by their regular education classmates.

Table 1 shows the 7% of the respondents strongly agree, 46% agree, 29% are undecided, 17% disagree, and 2% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 8% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 6% of the high

school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 42% of the middle school teachers and 47% of the high school teachers. Twenty-six percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 24% of the high school teachers. Sixteen percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 13% of the middle school teachers and 23% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 4% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 53% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement, compared with 19% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals similar findings with the highest percentage of those in agreement being elementary school teachers (58%).

Statement 11: The regular classroom teacher should make modifications to meet the needs of the special education students in his/her classroom.

Table 1 shows that 13% of the respondents strongly agree, 53% agree, 20% are undecided, 10% disagree, and 4% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Table 2, 3, and 4), 25% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 12% of the middle school teachers and 6% of the high school teachers. Sixty-one percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 44% of the middle school teachers and 44% of the high school teachers. Seven percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 46% of the high school teachers. Five percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 4% of high school teachers. Three percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 0% of

middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 66% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement, compared with only 14% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals that while at every grade level the "agrees" far outweigh the "disagrees", there is quite a percentage difference between grade levels. Eighty-six percent of elementary school teachers agree, compared with only 47% of high school teachers.

Statement 12: The average classroom teacher should not be expected to teach a special education student.

Table 1 shows that 6% of the respondents strongly agree, 17% agree, 28% are undecided, 38% disagree, and 11% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 1% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 4% of the high school teachers. Twenty-five percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 11% of the middle

school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Twenty percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 31% of the middle school teachers and 34% of the high school teachers. Forty-two percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 36% of the middle school teachers and 36% of high school teachers. Twelve percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 13% of middle school teachers and 9% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 49% of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree, compared with 23% who agree with this statement. There were similar findings at each grade level (Tables 6, 7, and 8)

Statement 13: A special education student will likely form a positive relationship with the regular classroom teacher.

Table 1 shows that 12% of the respondents strongly agree, 48% agree, 34% are undecided, 6% disagree, and 1%

strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 17% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 12% of the middle school teachers and 6% of the high school teachers. Fifty-eight percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 44% of the middle school teachers and 44% of the high school teachers. Twenty-one percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 46% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 4% of high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 0% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows an overwhelming 60% of the respondents agree or strongly agree, as opposed to only 7% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade

level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals that greatest disparity at the elementary school level, 75% agree and only 2% disagree with this statement.

Statement 14: With special education students in a regular classroom, there will likely be an increase in the number of behavior problems among the other children.

Table 1 shows that 2% of the respondents strongly agree, 17% agree, 32% are undecided, 38% disagree, and 11% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 0% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 5% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Twenty-one percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 16% of the middle school teachers and 13% of the high school teachers. Twenty-six percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 36% of the high school teachers. Thirty-nine percent of the

elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 34% of the middle school teachers and 44% of high school teachers. Thirteen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 13% of middle school teachers and 7% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 19% of the respondents agree or strongly agree, compared with 49% who disagree or strongly disagree. Fairly similar results were found at all grade levels.

Statement 15: A special education student will develop a more positive self-concept as a result of being in the regular classroom.

Table 1 shows that 19% of the respondents strongly agree, 42% agree, 28% are undecided, 8% disagree, and 2% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 25% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 23% of the middle school teachers and 9% of the high school teachers. Forty-six percent of the elementary

school teachers agree, as compared with 38% of the middle school teachers and 44% of the high school teachers. Twenty-one percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 38% of the middle school teachers and 36% of the high school teachers. Eight percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 10% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 5% of middle school teachers and 1% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 61% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while only 10% disagree or strongly disagree. While 53% of the high school teachers agree, it is interesting to note that 71% of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement.

Statement 16: Special education students are not as highly motivated to learn as regular education students.

Table 1 shows That 2% of the respondents strongly agree, 4% agree, 18% are undecided, 54% disagree, and 21% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 1% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 3% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 4% of the high school teachers. Thirteen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 18% of the middle school teachers and 24% of the high school teachers. Sixty-three percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 52% of the middle school teachers and 49% of high school teachers. Twenty-one percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 21% of middle school teachers and 23% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows an overwhelming 75% of the respondents disagree or disagree strongly with this statement, compared

with 6% who agree or strongly agree. The greatest disagreement is at the elementary level, where 84% disagree, compared with only 2% who agree with this statement.

Statement 17: Referrals for disciplinary action will probably occur more frequently for special education students.

Table 1 shows that 0% of the respondents strongly agree, 11% agree, 26% are undecided, 49% disagree, and 14% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 0% of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly agree. Fourteen percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 12% of the middle school teachers and 7% of the high school teachers. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 31% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Forty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 42% of the middle school teachers and 60% of

high school teachers. Eleven percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 16 % of middle school teachers and 16% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 11% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while 63% disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 6, 7, and 8 shows that the highest percentage of disagreement is at the high school level (76%).

Statement 18: Special education students are more apt to display inappropriate social behavior.

Table 1 shows that 2% of the respondents strongly agree, 22% agree, 28% are undecided, 39% disagree, and 9% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 1% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 3% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 21% of the middle

school teachers and 20% of the high school teachers. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 34% of the middle school teachers and 20% of the high school teachers. Thirty-seven of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 33% of the middle school teachers and 51% of high school teachers. Seven percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 9% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 24% of the respondents agree or strongly agree, compared with 48% who disagree or disagree strongly. A further statistical breakdown by grade level (Tables 6, 7, and 8) shows that the percentage of high school teachers who disagree is the greatest of all levels (60%).

Statement 19: Regular education teachers are adequately trained at the college level to teach special education students in their classrooms.

Table 1 shows that 1% of the respondents strongly agree,

2% agree, 12% are undecided, 41% disagree, and 43% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 0% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 1% of the middle school teachers and 3% of the high school teachers. Five percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 1% of the middle school teachers and 1% of the high school teachers. Twelve percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 12% of the middle school teachers and 13% of the high school teachers. Forty-seven of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 35% of the middle school teachers and 43% of high school teachers. Thirty-six percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 52% of middle school teachers and 40% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that only 3% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, as opposed to 84% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown

by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 shows similar findings for all grade levels.

Statement 20: There should be continuous communication between the special education teacher and the regular classroom teacher concerning the mainstreamed or blended special education student.

Table 1 shows that 67% of the respondents strongly agree, 28% agree, 3% are undecided, 1% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 75% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 68% of the middle school teachers and 59% of the high school teachers. Twenty-one percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 28% of the middle school teachers and 37% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 4% of the middle school teachers and 4% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as

compared with 1% of the middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 0% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows an overwhelming 95% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, as opposed to a mere 1% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 6, 7, and 8 reveals nearly identical findings at all levels.

Statement 21: The academic progress of the mainstreamed or blended special education student is the joint concern of the regular classroom teacher and the special education teacher.

Table 1 shows that 59% of the respondents strongly agree, 33% agree, 6% are undecided, 1% disagree, and 1% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 71% of the elementary school teachers strongly

agree, compared with 51% of the middle school teachers and 43% of the high school teachers. Twenty-four percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 39% of the middle school teachers and 34% of the high school teachers. Three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 9% of the middle school teachers and 6% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 3% of high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 2% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows an overwhelming 92% of the participants agree or strongly agree with this statement, as opposed to only 2% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 6, 7, and 8 shows the greatest disparity between the high school and

elementary school agreement percentages. Ninety-five percent of elementary teachers agreed, compared with 77% of the high school teachers.

Statement 22: Most special education teachers are willing to help the regular classroom teacher deal with mainstreamed special education students.

Table 1 shows that 26% of the respondents strongly agree, 45% agree, 20% are undecided, 6% disagree, and 3% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Table 2, 3, and 4), 36% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 25% of the middle school teachers and 16% of the high school teachers. Forty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 42% of the middle school teachers and 49% of the high school teachers. Sixteen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 23% of the middle school teachers and 21% of the high school teachers. One percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement

as compared with 7% of the middle school teachers and 9% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 4% of middle school teachers and 6% of high school teachers.

Table 5 shows that 71% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 9% who disagree or disagree strongly. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 6, 7, and 8 shows the greatest disparity between the high school "agree" percentages (65%) and those of the elementary teachers (83%).

Statement 23: Given a choice, would you prefer having special education students in your classroom?

Table 1 shows that 45% of the participants responded "Yes", while 40% said "No", and 15% are undecided. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 2, 3, and 4), 49% of the elementary teachers responded "Yes", compared with 44% of the middle school teachers and 43% of the high school teachers. Forty-

three percent of the elementary teachers said "No", as compared with 38% of middle school teachers and 39% of high school teachers. Eight percent of the elementary school teachers were undecided, compared with 19% of middle school teachers and 19% of high school teachers.

Regular Education Teacher Comments

At the end of the teacher survey a space was set aside for teachers to express their comments, concerns, and suggestions regarding the placement of special education students in regular classrooms. The teacher comments were as follows:

"I feel that special ed. students should be mainstreamed into classes where they are able to do the same work as their regular ed. classmates. I don't feel that mainstreaming is acceptable purely for socialization purposes."

"Mainstreamed in small numbers, yes. Blended with a totally mixed class, no."

"I believe special ed. children deserve the chance to have classes (some classes) with the other students not in special ed. This puts greater demands on the teacher. Just as it would putting a gifted child in a regular class...You need to make extra plans to keep him interested and challenged...the special ed. student needs extra plans to provide for his disability. I

don't believe in day long totally blended classes."

"Blended works well if all involved are trained, willing, and carefully chosen. Having it stuffed down your throat (child's and teacher's) is out of the question."

"I feel there are certain areas in which special ed. students would blend nicely. I do not feel that they should be totally mainstreamed or blended."

"I have had very little experience with special education students. I do know, however, that the few I have dealt with have required a greater amount of patience and guidance than my "average" students."

"I am very concerned about the move toward blending. Having been involved in the placement of many special ed. students over the years into small, self-contained classrooms, I don't understand the benefits of going back! Most of the students I see in special ed. classes need a smaller group, more individual attention, more structure, and a slower pace than regular students. Am I wrong? I have 27 children (5 ADD,

2 auditory processing disabilities). That's more than I can handle now! And from what I hear about the blended situations at some schools, it isn't working too well. Why have special ed. teachers at all if we're going to "blend" all of the students?"

"Not all special ed. students are disruptive! Blending is terrific if numbers are kept low and there is an instructional aide along with the special ed. teacher and the classroom teacher."

"If heterogeneous groupings are the way to conduct education, then all teachers need to be trained in special ed. skills, methods, etc., and in gifted needs, skills, learning styles, etc. That, it seems to me, rather takes away the reason for the existence of special education teacher specialists."

"All students, regardless of where they are on the learning spectrum, have special needs. I don't think we should treat some at the expense of others unless as a society we put our resources where we will obtain the greatest return for the

expenditure. Putting large amounts of time and money into programs for people who will not, regardless of effort, be able to make significant gains or contributions to society is an unwise investment. If blending limited ability learners detracts from the growth of above average thinkers, and high stimulation and high level programs are not available for those that can benefit from them, then blending is too expensive to society for what its benefits are."

"I am concerned about the attitudes of the adults in charge of these mainstreamed classrooms. I also feel that adequate training, support, and time MUST be provided for the classroom teacher or none of these attempts will be successful!"

"I do believe that Option 3 children (those with extreme emotional/behavioral/ physical disabilities) need to begin in "special classes", but should be mainstreamed whenever and wherever possible."

"I support blended/mainstreaming of special ed. students,

but I feel strongly about the need for team teaching, in-class help, and consultation services of special ed. teachers. Communication between teachers with the same student needs to be easy and frequent."

"Both student populations have much to gain. The learning environment approximates the environment of their daily lives. Support and resources allocated to blended or mainstream classrooms need to be carefully planned and monitored. Regular class teachers and special ed. teachers can develop a peer support system for each other."

"I don't mind students with different learning styles. I am uncomfortable with students with emotional needs that drain attention away from regular students. Different learning styles can be accommodated. Exact classification is necessary. Some special needs cannot be addressed in a mainstream setting."

"Diversity is an asset. All students can learn and deserve the opportunity to be challenged. Special ed. students in a

regular classroom allow an opportunity for everyone involved to become sensitive to others' talents."

"Mainstreaming is a great idea! However, I feel it is not appropriate for all students. Discretion should be used when making such a decision. It boils down to teaching our kids in the least restrictive environment. When it works, I'm all for it. If it doesn't work after a period of time, and strategies have been exhausted, then the student should return to a self-contained setting."

"Children with special needs that are so varying from Option I to Option III deserve qualified and experienced teachers. Mainstreaming is an option for children who have learning disabilities but real strengths in certain areas that would allow them to comfortably work in a regular classroom. Each child needs to be considered and placed in an environment where he/she can best learn and feel good about himself!"

"Teachers in a regular classroom are not prepared for teaching special education. Blended classrooms and extra

staff development and most of all "attitude change" could be very helpful if special ed. students are mainstreamed. Children with severe behavior management problems may need smaller classes at first to develop skills."

"Mainstreaming alienates the special ed. child because it removes him/her from his peer group and home base only to thrust him into an unfamiliar setting where he stands out."

"Blended classrooms allow both the special ed. child and the regular ed. child to accept each other as equal peers, while providing a consistent and familiar base which aids self-concept."

"The placement strongly depends on the degree of disability and the make-up of the regular class. Often the mainstreamed students are motivated, conscientious, and in some cases, quite a positive role model."

"I would like some training regarding special ed. needs and strategies for teaching. With training, I would like the opportunity to mainstream or blend."

"As a special area teacher, I enjoy special ed. children and classes. I do not feel, however, that blended classrooms appear to be the answer. It's great for the special ed. students, but I'm not pleased with the academic and social progress of the regular students in their class. I'm not able to challenge them to the degree that I would normally do so. I also feel that rather than acting as positive role models, they often pick up negative behavior from some of the special ed. students."

"Obviously there are many unanswered questions regarding blending of special ed. students. The concept makes sense and sounds appropriate. In concept I believe these students should not be shut off in a separate program. But in reality, what about the rights of the "regular" students to the teacher and her time? If blending is to work, the classroom teacher must receive in-class support. Otherwise how can they be expected to meet the needs of such a diverse group."

"I strongly agree with the concept of blended classrooms,

but I have some reservations about placement. The district tends to dump without adequate support or training."

"Placement too often is driven by scheduling constraints and contractual agreements regarding teacher planning time ("You have to take him or I won't get a break!!"). There should be time provided for regular meetings with special ed. and regular teachers sharing the same children. IEP's and expectations should be communicated. Regular teachers should have some voice in determining what is appropriate and what isn't. The kids belong in mainstreamed or blended classrooms, but we need to do a much better job of looking at how, why, and when they end up where they do."

Some students work beautifully in mainstreamed/blended classrooms. Behavior-wise and skill-wise, they have positive role models to feed off. The drawback is the attention they need but don't get in a larger regular classroom."

"I think that when you try to blend special ed. students into a regular classroom, you short-change both groups. It

takes an extraordinary amount of time and effort dealing with special ed. kids. Someone is going to get ignored."

"I feel I am not adequately trained to teach special ed. students. I regret that I did not take any special ed. courses."

"Special ed. kids add so much! But many "old" teachers who are set in their ways find special ed. students a nuisance."

"Planning time with special ed. consultant teacher is difficult and often short due to so many meetings, lack of sufficient time, and uncommon planning times."

"Special ed. students should have an aide with them if blended in the regular classroom. If blending is done in the regular classroom, it should be for a limited time (30-45 minutes), not all day. Training for teachers is beneficial. Also, communication between teachers and parents is very needed."

"Training, communication, and proper assistance are the keys to a successful mainstreaming situation."

"I like the idea of blending ___ good for the special ed.

student academically and socially. I don't know if it's good academically for a "high" or accelerated student. With such a wide range of skill levels, you may need 2 teachers in the room, not 2 teachers on paper only."

"I am not against blending of special ed. students if conditions are optimal:

1. students are ready to be blended
2. special ed. teacher works with regular classroom in and out of class.
3. the teachers are willing to do so
4. teachers' personalities complement each other.
5. time is set aside during the instructional day to meet/plan
6. regular classroom teacher is trained in area of blending and special ed.
7. Grading students is shared by both teachers."

"The question is not whether the child should be in a regular class, but rather how this should fit into the child's best interest. When is it appropriate, and when is it an

unrealistic expectation of teachers, peers, and most importantly, the child."

"Especially concerning P.E., individuals must look at safety, tendencies, aggression."

"At times I think it holds regular students back academically ___ if there is lack of instructional staff or unwillingness on a teacher's part."

"My fear is that blended classes will eventually end special ed. classes, no matter what they tell you!! I truly suspect the ultimate goal is to cut back teachers and support staff for kids who deserve and need the Extra! Let's be careful what we 'buy' into."

"Until regular teachers are equal partners in decision-making, I see little change. A regular class of 24 cannot be turned upside-down to accommodate a few special ed. kids."

"A suggestion would be to moderate blending or mainstreaming in a cautious manner. Going slowly with special ed. students into core or specials classes will enable

the regular classroom teacher to work within their comfort level."

"One of the most important factors that I see involving the placement of a special ed. student into a mainstreamed or blended classroom is the attitude and willingness of the classroom teacher. Under no circumstances should a class be placed with a teacher who does not want or is opposed to the idea."

"I worry about my regular ed. students. Sometimes it seems they receive a 'watered down' program."

"As a regular ed. teacher, I do not want to have students that I worked to get labeled (for the additional support that they need) suddenly just dumped back into my room without any additional support."

"I have special ed. students in a self-contained class and in a blended class. Their productivity and behavior increase and are very positive in the blended situation. In self-contained that is not always the case."

"Blending can work when both regular and special ed. teachers cooperate, plan, and share responsibility for both blended and regular students. Both teachers must choose to blend ___ not be assigned. "

"With appropriate training and an aide, I once had 32 students in one class, including 8 special ed. kids. I had no time to give them the extra help that they needed. This was a great shame. They really needed more of me."

"As a 'specials' teacher with mainstreamed kids, a wish a formal review could be scheduled each quarter to review needs of kids and methods of instruction."

"I strongly agree that their needs to be constant communication with the program manager and the teacher. This does not always happen. I think the concept would work better if everyone involved knew what their individual responsibilities were to the student and followed through with them."

"Special Ed. students should be blended only in the areas

where they excel. It would not make sense to blend them otherwise."

"Time to prepare, to do the job ___ where will it be found?"

"If a special ed. student is placed in a regular classroom, he should be able to handle the work with the same instruction and help that every other student receives."

"All 3 professionals (regular classroom teacher, special ed. teacher, and classroom aide) should plan and implement lessons. The 3 should be in class together, working with the students."

"Working with all types of kids in a blended situation for 2 years, I have discovered that this is the most humane method of educating the total population. The benefits to special ed. kids and regular kids are too numerous to list. You need to live it to understand it."

Results of the Special Education Teacher Survey

The statistical analysis of the Special Education Teacher Survey is contained in Tables 9-16 at the end of this chapter. Percentages have been computed and rounded off to the nearest percent. The raw data for this survey are contained in Appendices J - N.

Statement 1: Special education students benefit from being mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.

Table 9 shows that 27% of the special education teacher respondents strongly agree, 50% agree, 18% are undecided, 5% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 67% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the

elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary middle school and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 77% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with only 5% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 show 67% of the high school and elementary school teachers agree with this statement as compared with 90% of the middle school teachers.

Statement 2: Regular education students benefit from having special education students in the regular classroom.

Table 9 shows that 27% of the respondents strongly

agree, 50% agree, 18% are undecided, 5% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 50% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers.

Zero percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 77% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while only 5% disagree or

strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 14, 15, and 16 shows great disparity in the responses. Onehundred percent of elementary school teachers agreed with this statement, compared with 80% of middle school teachers and only 50% of high school teachers.

Statement 3: Most regular classroom teachers make modifications for their mainstreamed or blended special education students.

Table 9 shows that 5% of the respondents strongly agree, 36% agree, 27% are undecided, 27% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 17% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of

the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 33% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 41% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement, compared with 32% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 67% of elementary school teachers agree, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers.

Statement 4: Most regular classroom teachers implement specific strategies for teaching their mainstreamed or blended special education students.

Table 9 shows that 5% of the respondents strongly agree, 14% agree, 32% are undecided, 41% disagree, and 9% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 17% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 67% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 20% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 19% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 50% who

disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows quite a difference between the elementary school teachers responses and those of the middle school and high school teachers. Sixty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement, while 0% of both middle school and high school teachers agree. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 70% and 67% of the middle school and high school teachers respectively.

Statement 5: Most classroom teachers are understanding and tolerant of their special education students' weaknesses and limitations.

Table 9 shows that 5% of the respondents strongly agree, 41% agree, 27% are undecided, 23% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 17% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the

high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 46% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 28% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 67% of the elementary teachers agree, compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree, compared

with 50% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers.

Statement 6: Mainstreamed or blended students are given as much praise and positive reinforcement from the regular classroom teacher as are the other students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree, 27% agree, 36% are undecided, 27% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 60% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this

statement as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 36% of the respondents agree or agree strongly with the statement, compared with 27% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 67% of the elementary school teachers agree, compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. There is less disparity in the "disagree" percentages.

Statement 7: Regular classroom teachers encourage positive social interaction between their special education students and the other students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree, 50% agree, 23% are undecided, 18% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree,

compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 60% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 59% of the respondents agree or strongly agree, compared with 18% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 83% of elementary school teachers agree, compared with 60% of middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary teachers disagree with this statement, compared

with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers.

Statement 8: most regular classroom teachers form a positive relationship with their special education students.

Table 9 shows that 14% of the respondents strongly agree, 36% agree, 36% are undecided, 9% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 50% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 67% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 33% of high school

teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 50% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with only 14% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 100% of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers.

Statement 9: Most regular classroom teachers allow their special education students additional response time.

Table 9 shows that 14% of the respondents strongly agree, 27% agree, 18% are undecided, 41% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and

0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 80% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, or high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 41% of the respondents agree or strongly agree, and 41% disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level shows that 83% of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared

with 80% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, or high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Statement 10: Most regular classroom teachers encourage their special education students to be active participants in the classroom.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree, 50% agree, 32% are undecided, 9% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 60% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared

with 10% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 59% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with only 9% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that the greatest disparity lies between the percentages of high school and elementary school respondents. Sixty-seven percent of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement, compared with 50% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 17% of the high school teachers.

Statement 11: Most regular classroom teachers are willing to repeat and rephrase questions for their special education students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree,

45% agree, 23% are undecided, 23% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Fifty percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary, middle school, and high school teachers strongly disagree with this statement.

Table 13 shows that 54% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 23% who disagree or disagree strongly. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15 and 16 shows that 83% of

elementary school teachers agree, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers.

Statement 12: In the area of discipline, the special education students are treated the same as the others by the regular classroom teacher.

Table 9 shows that 5% of the respondents strongly agree, 45% agree, 14% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 17% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 67% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers.

Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 20% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 50% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that teachers at the elementary and middle school levels are evenly divided in their opinions, but at the high school level 67% of the teachers agree, while 17% disagree with this statement.

Statement 13: Most regular classroom teachers are receptive to any help and/or suggestions of the special education teacher regarding the mainstreamed or blended students in his/her classroom.

Table 9 shows that 14% of the respondents strongly agree, 41% agree, 32% are undecided, 9% disagree, and 5%

strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 67% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 17% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 55% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 14% who disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown

by grade level shows that 67% of elementary school teachers and 67% of high school teachers agree with this statement, compared with 40% of the middle school teachers.

Statement 14: There is continuous communication between the special education teacher and the regular classroom teacher concerning the mainstreamed or blended special education students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree, 23% agree, 18% are undecided, 45% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11., and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 17% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary

school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 83% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 32% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, while 50% disagree or strongly disagree. A further breakdown by grade level (Tables 14, 15, and 16) shows that 67% of the elementary school teachers agree with this statement, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Seventeen percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 83% of the high school teachers.

Statement 15: Most regular classroom teachers express a positive attitude toward their mainstreamed or blended students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree,

32% agree, 32% are undecided, 23% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 10% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 50% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that 41% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement, compared with 28% who disagree or disagree strongly. A further statistical breakdown

by grade level (Tables 14, 15, and 16) shows that 67% of elementary school teachers agree with this statement, compared with 50% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary teachers disagree with this statement, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 50% of the high school teachers.

Statement 16: Regular classroom teachers and special education teachers work together as equal partners for the benefit of their special education students.

Table 9 shows that 9% of the respondents strongly agree, 23% agree, 36% are undecided, 27% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree. In the grade level breakdown (Tables 10, 11, and 12), 33% of the elementary school teachers strongly agree, compared with 0% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers agree, as compared with 30% of the middle

school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Thirty-three percent of the elementary school teachers are undecided, as compared with 40% of the middle school teachers and 33% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree with this statement as compared with 20% of the middle school teachers and 67% of high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers strongly disagree with this statement, compared with 10% of middle school teachers and 0% of high school teachers.

Table 13 shows that respondents were evenly divided, 32% agree or strongly agree, and 32% disagree or strongly disagree. A further statistical breakdown by grade level in Tables 14, 15, and 16 shows that 67% of the elementary school teachers agree, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 0% of the high school teachers. Zero percent of the elementary school teachers disagree, compared with 30% of the middle school teachers and 67% of the high school

teachers.

Special Education Teacher Comments

At the end of the teacher survey a space was set aside for teachers to express their comments, concerns, and suggestions regarding the placement of special education students in regular classrooms. The special education teacher comments were as follows:

"Not enough communication between regular and special educators. A great deal of regular education teachers feel that the special ed. student can be a deterrent. They hold up instructional time, either with comprehension problems or disruptive behavior."

"We've had special ed. self-contained classrooms for almost 20 years. I don't believe these students have benefitted enough to become part of the academic mainstream. Socially they have remained isolated and inept at dealing with large group activities similar to those they must deal with in

real life situations."

"Regular ed. teachers are afraid of special ed. students. They feel they don't know how to teach these kids and that it is an imposition to have them in their classes. They resent having to 'share' student information with special ed. teachers, and they have a 'your' kids, 'my kids attitude."

"Most regular teachers lack the training necessary to make them feel comfortable teaching special ed. students."

"Personality, beliefs, personal flexibility, and classroom management skills seem to be major determinants to consider when placing a student, not rigid house or team staffing."

"Mainstreaming and blending may be appropriate for some students but not appropriate for others. IEP track special ed. students have different needs and abilities than local diploma special ed. students."

"There must be options. Some students are not prepared for blending and need a more structured setting. There must be cooperation between teachers. A teacher forced to blend is

unhappy and unproductive."

"Many mainstream teachers are uncomfortable with the special ed. LD student. They will try to make allowances for testing etc. but they usually must be reminded throughout the year. Many don't want to change how they teach a class, so the various learning styles are not always addressed. Obviously, this limits where you can mainstream a student because you want it to be a successful experience, not another failure."

"There are so many variables that can make or break the mainstream experience. Structure and consistency needs of special ed. student are a big problem. Parent contact can be a problem. At the high school level, there are so many more teaching styles and personalities to deal with in a student's day."

"I think that regular ed. teachers have not received nearly enough in-service training in working effectively with special ed. students and teachers."

"The success of 'blending' depends on the skill and

willingness of the regular teachers to participate. The burden of making the program a success is usually put on the shoulders of the special ed. teachers to 'sell' the program. Regular teachers (for the most part) believe 1) special ed. teachers have it easy now and want their jobs to be even easier by pawning off their students on the regular teachers, 2) special ed. students are very difficult to teach, and with high numbers in classrooms (25 + students), individual attention and other modifications are not possible. Finally, I believe many students are in the special ed. program because they are easily distracted and need many other social modifications. If you add 6 or more special ed. students to a 20-25 student regular class, you have multiplied the distractions. Regardless of how many adults are in that classroom, the special ed. student won't benefit as much as from a pull-out program. The regular ed. students will be distracted as well."

"I feel more positive about a child being mainstreamed for all areas all day, because that regular classroom teacher

has a greater opportunity to get to know that student and learn more about how to make the experience a successful one. I think they also view that student as 'theirs' vs. a special ed. student coming in for one academic area from a special ed. classroom."

"Although regular education teachers understand special ed. students' needs, they do not always make the necessary modifications for that child. They also need to realize that the special ed. student may not progress as far or as quickly as others in the class, and that it does not , or should not, reflect on their teaching ability."

"My concern is that this 'blending' is becoming the 'popular' thing to do and it is not appropriate for all special ed. students nor, for that matter, for all teachers, (special ed. or regular)."

"Special ed. children need to be placed carefully in blended classrooms. An L.D. child may do well academically in blended, but there is a real need for the teacher to structure

the class for social needs and attention needs. A large class that is confusing with many teacher directions may just blow that special ed. kid out of the class!"

"If a group of teachers has a belief that all children can learn, and are willing to instruct in the manner that students learn best, then the classroom experience is successful. Teaching the blended class is not like a recipe. It needs to be adjusted with the kinds of teachers, students, and support it has. Any good teacher can teach a blended classroom if they have these qualities: flexibility, willingness to share ownership, and a "can do" attitude."

Regular Education Teacher Survey Responses

Table 1

PERCENTAGES REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	19%	44%	26%	10%	1%
2.	16%	39%	25%	15%	5%
3.	4%	12%	26%	40%	18%
4.	1%	14%	23%	49%	13%
5.	52%	38%	6%	2%	1%
6.	4%	19%	43%	24%	10%
7.	7%	27%	21%	36%	9%
8.	1%	2%	9%	58%	30%
9.	0%	11%	32%	46%	11%
10.	7%	46%	29%	17%	2%
11.	13%	53%	20%	10%	4%
12.	6%	17%	28%	38%	11%
13.	12%	48%	34%	6%	1%
14.	2%	17%	32%	38%	11%
15.	19%	42%	28%	8%	2%
16.	2%	4%	18%	54%	21%
17.	0%	11%	26%	49%	14%

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	2%	22%	28%	39%	9%
19.	1%	2%	12%	41%	43%
20.	67%	28%	3%	1%	0%
21.	59%	33%	6%	1%	1%
22.	26%	45%	20%	6%	3%
23.	<u>YES</u> 45%	<u>NO</u> 40%	<u>U</u> 15%		

Table 2

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	34%	45%	17%	4%	0%
2.	26%	45%	17%	11%	1%
3.	1%	11%	24%	37%	28%
4.	1%	18%	20%	47%	17%
5.	55%	36%	5%	3%	1%
6.	3%	16%	38%	29%	13%
7.	3%	14%	17%	50%	16%
8.	0%	1%	3%	57%	39%
9.	0%	4%	29%	53%	14%
10.	8%	50%	26%	16%	0%
11.	25%	61%	7%	5%	3%
12.	1%	25%	20%	42%	12%
13.	17%	58%	21%	1%	1%
14.	0%	21%	26%	39%	13%
15.	25%	46%	21%	8%	0%
16.	1%	1%	13%	63%	21%

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0%	14%	28%	47%	11%
18.	1%	28%	28%	37%	7%
19.	0%	5%	12%	47%	36%
20.	75%	21%	1%	1%	1%
21.	71%	24%	3%	1%	1%
22.	36%	47%	16%	1%	0%
23.	<u>YES</u> 49%	<u>NO</u> 43%	<u>U</u> 8%		

Table 3

MIDDLE SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	17%	40%	32%	10%	2%
2.	15%	34%	28%	17%	7%
3.	7%	7%	31%	43%	13%
4.	2%	13%	29%	45%	12%
5.	50%	42%	7%	1%	1%
6.	7%	17%	43%	22%	12%
7.	9%	9%	23%	32%	4%
8.	2%	5%	14%	52%	28%
9.	0%	9%	35%	44%	13%
10.	7%	42%	35%	13%	4%
11.	12%	53%	24%	10%	2%
12.	10%	11%	31%	36%	13%
13.	12%	44%	35%	10%	0%
14.	5%	16%	35%	32%	13%
15.	23%	38%	38%	7%	5%
16.	3%	7%	18%	52%	21%

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0%	12%	31%	42%	16%
18.	3%	21%	34%	33%	10%
19.	1%	1%	12%	35%	52%
20.	68%	28%	4%	1%	0%
21.	51%	39%	9%	0%	2%
22.	25%	42%	23%	7%	4%
23.	<u>YES</u> 44%	<u>NO</u> 38%	<u>U</u> 19%		

Table 4

HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	6%	50%	27%	17%	0%
2.	7%	41%	29%	17%	6%
3.	1%	21%	23%	40%	14%
4.	0%	10%	20%	56%	14%
5.	53%	37%	4%	4%	1%
6.	3%	26%	47%	21%	3%
7.	10%	33%	24%	26%	7%
8.	0%	0%	10%	69%	21%
9.	0%	20%	31%	43%	6%
10.	6%	47%	24%	23%	0%
11.	1%	46%	30%	14%	9%
12.	4%	17%	34%	36%	9%
13.	6%	44%	46%	4%	0%
14.	0%	13%	36%	44%	7%
15.	9%	44%	36%	10%	1%
16.	0%	4%	24%	49%	23%

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0%	7%	17%	60%	16%
18.	0%	20%	20%	51%	9%
19.	3%	1%	13%	43%	40%
20.	59%	37%	4%	0%	0%
21.	43%	34%	6%	3%	0%
22.	16%	49%	21%	9%	6%
23.	<u>YES</u> 43%	<u>NO</u> 39%	<u>U</u> 19%		

Table 5

PERCENTAGES REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	63%	11%
2.	55%	20%
3.	16%	58%
4.	15%	62%
5.	90%	3%
6.	23%	34%
7.	34%	45%
8.	3%	88%
9.	11%	57%
10.	53%	19%
11.	66%	14%
12.	23%	49%
13.	60%	7%
14.	19%	49%
15.	61%	10%
16.	6%	75%
17.	11%	63%

AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE

DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE

18.	24%	48%
19.	3%	84%
20.	95%	1%
21.	92%	2%
22.	71%	9%

Table 6

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	79%	4%
2.	71%	12%
3.	12%	65%
4.	19%	64%
5.	91%	4%
6.	19%	42%
7.	17%	66%
8.	1%	96%
9.	4%	67%
10.	58%	16%
11.	86%	8%
12.	26%	54%
13.	75%	2%
14.	21%	52%
15.	71%	8%
16.	2%	84%

AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREEDISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE

17.	14%	58%
18.	29%	44%
19.	5%	83%
20.	96%	2%
21.	95%	2%
22.	83%	1%

Table 7

MIDDLE SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	57%	12%
2.	49%	24%
3.	14%	56%
4.	15%	57%
5.	92%	2%
6.	24%	34%
7.	18%	36%
8.	7%	80%
9.	9%	57%
10.	49%	17%
11.	65%	12%
12.	21%	49%
13.	56%	10%
14.	21%	45%
15.	61%	12%
16.	10%	73%

AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREEDISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE

17.	12%	58%
18.	24%	43%
19.	2%	87%
20.	96%	1%
21.	90%	2%
22.	67%	11%

Table 8

HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	56%	17%
2.	48%	23%
3.	22%	54%
4.	10%	70%
5.	90%	5%
6.	29%	24%
7.	43%	33%
8.	0%	90%
9.	20%	49%
10.	53%	23%
11.	47%	23%
12.	21%	45%
13.	50%	4%
14.	13%	51%
15.	53%	11%
16.	4%	72%

AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREEDISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE

17.	4%	72%
18.	20%	60%
19.	4%	83%
20.	96%	0%
21.	77%	3%
22.	65%	15%

Special Education Teacher Survey Responses

Table 9

PERCENTAGES SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	27%	50%	18%	5%	0%
2.	27%	50%	18%	5%	0%
3.	5%	36%	27%	27%	5%
4.	5%	14%	32%	41%	9%
5.	5%	41%	27%	23%	5%
6.	9%	27%	36%	27%	0%
7.	9%	50%	23%	18%	0%
8.	14%	36%	36%	9%	5%
9.	14%	27%	18%	41%	0%
10.	9%	50%	32%	9%	0%
11.	9%	45%	23%	23%	0%
12.	5%	45%	14%	23%	14%
13.	14%	41%	32%	9%	5%
14.	9%	23%	18%	45%	5%
15.	9%	32%	32%	23%	5%
16.	9%	23%	36%	27%	5%

Table 10

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
2.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
3.	17%	50%	33%	0%	0%
4.	17%	50%	33%	0%	0%
5.	17%	50%	33%	0%	0%
6.	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
7.	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
8.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
9.	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
10.	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
11.	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
12.	17%	33%	0%	33%	17%
13.	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
14.	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
15.	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
16.	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%

Table 11

MIDDLE SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%
2.	30%	50%	20%	0%	0%
3.	0%	30%	20%	40%	10%
4.	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%
5.	0%	40%	10%	40%	10%
6.	0%	10%	60%	30%	0%
7.	0%	60%	20%	20%	0%
8.	0%	50%	40%	0%	10%
9.	10%	10%	0%	80%	0%
10.	0%	60%	30%	10%	0%
11.	0%	50%	20%	30%	0%
12.	0%	40%	20%	20%	20%
13.	10%	30%	40%	10%	10%
14.	0%	30%	20%	40%	10%
15.	0%	50%	10%	20%	10%
16.	0%	30%	40%	20%	10%

Table 12

HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0%	67%	17%	17%	0%
2.	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%
3.	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%
4.	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%
5.	0%	33%	50%	17%	0%
6.	0%	50%	17%	33%	0%
7.	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%
8.	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%
9.	0%	33%	50%	17%	0%
10.	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%
11.	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%
12.	0%	67%	17%	17%	0%
13.	0%	67%	17%	17%	0%
14.	0%	0%	17%	83%	0%
15.	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
16.	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%

Table 13

PERCENTAGES SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

STATEMENT	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	77%	5%
2.	77%	5%
3.	41%	32%
4.	19%	50%
5.	46%	28%
6.	36%	27%
7.	59%	18%
8.	50%	14%
9.	41%	41%
10.	59%	9%
11.	54%	23%
12.	50%	37%
13.	55%	14%
14.	32%	50%
15.	41%	28%
16.	32%	32%

Table 14

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	67%	0%
2.	100%	0%
3.	67%	0%
4.	67%	0%
5.	67%	0%
6.	67%	17%
7.	83%	0%
8.	100%	0%
9.	83%	0%
10.	67%	0%
11.	83%	0%
12.	50%	50%
13.	67%	0%
14.	67%	17%
15.	67%	0%
16.	67%	0%

Table 15

MIDDLE SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	90%	0%
2.	80%	0%
3.	30%	50%
4.	0%	70%
5.	40%	50%
6.	10%	30%
7.	60%	20%
8.	50%	10%
9.	20%	80%
10.	60%	10%
11.	50%	30%
12.	40%	40%
13.	40%	20%
14.	30%	50%
15.	50%	30%
16.	30%	30%

Table 16

HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTAGES
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AGREE/DISAGREE

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
1.	67%	17%
2.	50%	17%
3.	33%	33%
4.	0%	67%
5.	33%	17%
6.	50%	33%
7.	33%	33%
8.	0%	33%
9.	33%	17%
10.	50%	17%
11.	33%	33%
12.	67%	17%
13.	67%	17%
14.	0%	83%
15.	0%	50%
16.	0%	67%

Summary

The responses of all 269 participants were recorded, and the raw data for both teacher surveys is contained in the Appendix. This raw data were then used to compute percentages, which were rounded off to the nearest percent. Using this information, 16 tables were constructed, 8 related to the Regular Education Teacher Survey and 8 related to the Special Education Teacher Survey.

Table 1 gives an overview of all the responses of the regular education teachers. Tables 2, 3, and 4 break down those figures by grade levels for easy comparison. Table 5 uses the percentages from Table 1 to form a more simplified "either/or" comparison. This table gives a clear cut picture of where their opinions lie. They either agree to some degree or disagree to some degree. Tables 6, 7, and 8 break down those figures by grade level so that further conclusions can be drawn. Tables 9-16 serve the same purpose as Tables 1-8, but refer instead to the responses of the special education

teachers in this study.

Examining the tables, certain patterns emerge. It becomes evident that in many areas respondents at the elementary level view teaching quite differently from those at the high school level. A major concern of high school teachers is academics, curriculum, grades, and achievement, while elementary teachers are more concerned with the self-esteem and social acceptance of the young developing child. There appears to be more flexibility at the lower grade levels and great difference of opinions at all levels.

Teachers' comments are very revealing, as they cover such a broad spectrum of opinions, everything from complete separation of student populations to widespread inclusion. Teachers voiced their opinions freely, expressed their resentment, fears, concerns, suspicions, joys, suggestions and hopes for the future in education.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

This study substantiates much of the earlier related research reported in the literature on teachers' attitudes toward integration of special education students into regular classrooms. The current findings, however, reflect years of experience with mainstreaming and, in some cases, blending. Some new insights, suspicions, and suggestions were revealed along with concerns and frustrations.

Most of the regular education teachers surveyed (63%) agree that special education students do benefit from being mainstreamed or blended into a regular classroom. Even more of the special education teachers (77%) believe this statement to be true.

Not quite as many (55%) of the regular education teachers believe, however, that this integration is beneficial

to the regular education students. Special education teachers, on the other hand, feel it is equally beneficial to both populations of students.

It is interesting that despite what has been said in the past concerning the negative behavior of special education students, most teachers in this study do not agree with that characterization. Most regular classroom teachers do not believe that special education students are disruptive in class or cause increased behavior problems of the regular students. Neither do they believe that they will be writing out more referrals due to the special education students.

Although about half the regular classroom teachers feel that they should be expected to teach special education students, 90% of these teachers said it put increased demands on them. A mere 3% felt they were adequately trained to teach these students. This clearly shows the root of some of the problems. Increased demands are being place on teachers who obviously feel they have been inadequately trained to teach

special education students.

Regular teachers do realize that the additional support a special education student receives is necessary to his "survival" in the regular classroom. However, a full third of these teachers feel that the expectations should be the same for all the students in the class. How can this be? Are modifications being made to meet the needs of these special education students? According to regular classroom teachers, 66% feel that they should be made but only 41% of the special education teachers believe that these modifications are actually being made by most teachers. Furthermore, 80% of the special education teachers are not convinced that any specific teaching strategies are being used for these special students by most classroom teachers.

Despite the fact that almost a quarter of the regular classroom education classroom teachers feel that special education students are more apt to display inappropriate social behavior, more than twice that number believes these

students are socially accepted by their peer. The great majority of special education teachers agree that the regular classroom teachers do encourage social interaction.

Although most classroom teachers agree that being in a regular classroom is good for special education students' self-esteem, when asked if they would prefer having them in their classroom, teachers were nearly evenly divided, pro and con.

Most special education teachers perceive most regular classroom teachers to be understanding and tolerant of special education students' weaknesses and limitations, encouraging special education students to be active participants in the classroom, forming positive relationships with their special education students, and willing to repeat and rephrase question for them. They are also seen as receptive to any help or suggestions from the special education teachers concerning their mainstreamed or blended students. However, those same teachers are perceived as unwilling to make modifications to meet the needs of these students.

Special education teachers are evenly divided in their perceptions of regular classroom teachers' fair treatment of special education students in the areas of discipline and positive reinforcement.

Although nearly all the regular classroom teachers feel there should be continuous communication between them and the special education teachers concerning the mainstreamed or blended students, only about a third of the special education teachers say that this communication actually exists. Communication then is obviously an important area that is being neglected and needs attention.

While nearly all the regular teachers believe that blended and mainstreamed students should be the joint concern of both them and the special education teachers, only about a third of the special education teachers say that they work together as equal partners.

Teachers' comments were most revealing, particularly when individual schools were compared. It became very clear

that although there is some difference of opinion within a school, that there is a general positive or negative attitude that pervades each school. Nevertheless, considering the responses of all the teachers involved in this study, there is a general belief in the philosophy of integrating special education students into regular classrooms. However, there are many concerns which effect teachers' willingness to do so.

Regular classroom teachers are concerned with class size, inadequate teacher training, increased demands on the classroom teacher, lack of in-class support, and lack of time. They do not feel that students should be blended or mainstreamed purely for social reasons. Nor do they feel that mainstreaming is appropriate for every child. Many feel that the academic needs of a special education student cannot be met in the regular classroom. Others question the benefits to the regular education students. Teachers fear they won't be sufficiently challenged with a "watered down" version of the curriculum. There is resentment among the teachers that their

classrooms are becoming "dumping grounds," and that integration of special education students is being "shoved down their throats." Teachers are suspicious of school districts' motives for blending and mainstreaming. Many believe that the schools' goal is to eventually eliminate special education classrooms and then special education teachers altogether. This cost-cutting measure would result in no support for regular classroom teachers with special education students.

Special education teachers believe that regular classroom teachers are afraid of special education students and feel they have inadequate training. Many special education teachers also believe that some regular classroom teachers simply do not want to change their methods of teaching or make modifications for the special education students.

One thing that both special and regular education teachers agree on is that there must be options. Not any one plan is suitable for all. There are students who simply cannot

function in a large classroom, and need the structure and individualized program that a small class can offer.

Probably the most important finding of this study is that the teachers who are most committed to the concept of blending and mainstreaming are the ones who have met with the most success. The attitude and the mind set of the teachers involved are the determining factors in any educational program.

Implications for the Classroom

Information gained from this study clearly shows what teachers' attitudes and concerns are involving special education students and their integration into regular classrooms. These findings are worthless, however, unless applied toward improving the educational system as it exists today.

Teachers need to be listened to and their concerns taken seriously. They do not want a wholesale "dumping" of all

special education students into regular classrooms. They want other options available to these students as well, and they want them placed into the most appropriate setting for their needs. Regular classroom teachers want the necessary specialized training to prepare them for the demands for teaching special education students. They also want the in-class support of a special education teacher and a classroom aide in order to meet the needs of all their students. Class size must be kept at a workable level or success is doomed. Regular classroom teachers must be given a voice in the decision-making process involving his/her special education students. Regular classroom teachers and Special education teachers must work together as equal partners.

If all these things are done, then perhaps classroom integration has a chance. Perhaps our young people can be successfully educated our young people in an environment which more closely resembles the rest of society, one which includes all kinds of people regardless of their differences.

Implications for Further Research

Ever since the passing of PL 94-142, a wealth of reasearch has been done on mainstreaming. This study substantiated many of these findings, but raised some new questions to be answered.

In what direction are we going with special education and for what reasons? What will become of special education teachers? In what ways will their roles change? Is integration best for all special education students, or are some better served in a self-contained classroom? What are the effects of classroom size on students with special needs?

This study could be duplicated on a larger scale using samples of teachers from various school districts and comparing their responses.

A longitudinal study could be conducted over a period of years to determine if teachers' attitudes change over time with experience and training.

There is a need for more research into the integration of special education students into regular classrooms, because this move affects all teachers and all students within a school. We need to know that the decisions that effect so many are the decisions that are best for all.

Summary

A teacher's concern should be for each and every student in his/her classroom, regardless of that child's level of ability. The messages that are sent, however subtle, can have a tremendous impact on these young developing minds.

We are still struggling with the challenges of mainstreamed and blended classrooms, and now we must consider also the possibility of "total inclusion." Some suggest that this is the only way to prepare the handicapped for life in the real world. If this becomes the wave of the future, then many changes will be needed in our educational system. The roles of the regular and special education

teachers will become dramatically different, and their attitudes must change in order to welcome and accommodate the handicapped into the regular classroom.

REFERENCES

- Aksamit, D.L. (1990). Practicing teachers' perceptions of their preservice preparation for mainstreaming. Teacher Education and Special Education, 13 (1), 21-29.
- Alves, A.J., & Gottlieb, J. (1986). Teacher interactions with mainstreamed handicapped students and their non-handi-capped peers. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 9 (1), 77-83.
- Barresi, J., & Mack, J. (1979). Responsibilities of regular classroom teachers for handicapped students. Reston Virginia: Policy Research Center, the Council for Exceptional Children.
- Barrick, S., Enell, N., & Walker, C. (1978). Report on the district-wide interviews in special education: Teacher satisfaction, student integration, and student satisfaction, Spring 1978. San Juan Unified School District. Carmichael, California. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 192472)
- Bauer, H. (1975). The resource teacher --a teacher consultant. Academic Therapy, 10 (3), 299-304.
- Bennerson, D., McIntosh, R., & Vaughn (1991). Increasing positive interpersonal interactions: A social intervention for students with learning disabilities in the regular classroom. Paper pre-sented at the Annual Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children. Atlanta, Gerogia. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 333666)
- Bond, C.L., & Dietrich, A. (1982). Regional survey of teacher

attitudes toward special education resource programs. Memphis State University. Memphis, Tennessee. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 228-772)

Brophy, J.E., & Evertson, C. (1981). Student characteristics and teaching. New York: Longman.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 365-374.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T. (1974). Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Brozovich, R., & Kotting, C. (1982). A description and analysis of high school education programs as perceived by administrators, general and special education teachers, and special education students. Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 246570)

Bryan, T.H. (1976). Peer popularity of learning disabled children ___ a replication. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 9, 307-311.

Candler, A, & Sowell, V. (1980). Mainstreaming special educators: Interface between regular and special education. Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 187076)

Chalfant, J., Pysh, M., & Moultrie, R. (1979). Teacher assistance teams: A model for within building problem solving.

Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 2, 85-96.

Congressional Federal Register, 45 (121a), July, 1980.

Congressional Federal Register, 46 (12), January, 1981.

Craig, P., Miller, C., Wujek, M., & Hershberger, A. (1980). Independent evaluation of the California master plan for special education. Menlo Park, California: SRI International.

Crisci, P.E. (1981). Competencies for mainstreaming: Problems and issues. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 16, 175-182.

Cruickshank, W.M. (1977). Learning disabilities in home, school, and community, New York: Syracuse University Press.

D'Alonzo, B.J. (1983). Educating adolescents with learning and behavior problems. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation.

Donaldson, J. (1980). Changing attitudes toward handicapped persons: A review and analysis of research. Exceptional Children, 46, (7), 504-514.

Doris, S., & Brown, R. (1980). Toleration of maladaptive classroom behaviors by regular and special educators. California State University. Fresno, California. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 211 456)

Dunn, L. (1968). Behavior disorders: Theory and practice, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.

Ehlert, B.J. (1982). Identifying learning disabled students in

Idaho. Report from July 1982 Assessment Conference. Eugene, Oregon. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 236829)

Enell, N.C. (1982). The effects of regular classroom integration for special education students with visual, auditory, physical, and mental impairments. San Jose Unified School District. San Jose, California. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 229 963)

Fagen, S. A. (1984). Promoting successful mainstreaming: Reasonable classroom accommodations for learning disabled students. Rockville, Maryland: Montgomery County Public Schools.

Fairchild, T.N. (1982). The school psychologist's role as an assessment consultant. Report from July 1982 Assessment Conference. Eugene, Oregon. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 236829)

Farrer, K., & Guest, E. (1970). A cooperative instructional services program for improving educational personnel to teach special education students in the regular classroom. Director's Final Report, June 1970. Utah State University. Logan, Utah. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 043 598)

Foster, G. G., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Reese, J.H. (1975). "I wouldn't have seen it if I hadn't believed it." Exceptional Children, 41, 469-473.

Gajar, A. (1983). The relevance of problems encountered in attitudinal research: A personal perspective. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16, 586-587.

Gillet, P. (1983). Model for mainstreaming. The Journal for

Special Educators, 19 (1), 1-12.

Gottlieb, J., Semmel, M.I., & Veldman, D.J. (1978). Correlates of social status among mainstreamed mentally retarded children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 396-405.

Gresham, F.M. (1982). Misguided mainstreaming: The case for social skills training with handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 48 (5), 422-432.

Gresham, F.M. (1984). Social skills and self-efficacy for exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 51 (3), 253-261.

Gresham, F.M., Elliott, S.N., & Black, F.L. (1987). Factor structure replication and bias investigation of the teacher rating of social skills. Journal of School of Psychology, 25 (1), 81-92.

Guerin, G.R., & Szatlocky, K. (1974). Integration programs for the mildly retarded. Exceptional Children, 41 (3), 173-179.

Guralnick, M.J. (1981). Programmatic factors affecting child-child social interactions in mainstreamed pre-school programs. Exceptional Child Quarterly, 1 (4), 74-91.

Hagerty, G.J., & Abramson, M. (1987). Impediments to implementing national policy change for mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 53, 315-324.

Hallahan, D.P., & Kauffman, J.M. (1978). Exceptional children: Introduction to special education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall.

Hannah, M.E., & Pilner, S. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward

handicapped children: A review and synthesis. School Psychology Review, 12, 12-25.

Harasymiw, S.J., & Horne, M.D. (1976). Integration of handicapped children: Its effects on teacher attitudes. Journal of Special Education, 10 (4), 393-400.

Hauptman, E. (1983). Communication between special educators and the mainstream teachers. Paper presented at Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children. Detroit, Michigan. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 231173)

Hauser, C. (1979). Evaluating mainstream programs: Capitalizing on a victory. The Journal of Special Education, 3 (2), 107-129.

Henfield, P., & Stieglitz, M. (1981). Comparisons of parent and teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming. Albertson, New York: Human Resources Center. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 207-281)

Hersh, R.H., & Walker, H.M. (1983). Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. Policy Studies Review, 2 (1).

Higgs, R.W. (1975). Attitude formation ___ contact or information? Exceptional Children, 41 (7), 496-497.

Horne, M.D. (1978). Teacher attitude, a factor to consider in mainstreaming. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association. Toronto, Canada.

Hudson, F., Graham, S., & Warner, M. (1979). Mainstreaming: an examination of the attitudes and needs of regular classroom teachers. Learning Disabilities Quarterly,

2 (3), 58-62.

- Hughes, J.H., & Hurth, J.L. Handicapped Children and Mainstreaming: A mental health perspective. Rockville, Maryland: MS Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, National Institute of Mental Health.
- Hunter, M. (1978). Mainstreaming students with exceptional needs: Implications for the school. UCLA Educator, 20 (2).
- Jamieson, J.D. (1984) Attitudes of educators toward the handicapped. In R.L. Jones (Ed), Attitudes and attitude change in special education: Theory and practice (pp. 206-222). Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Jones, R.L., Gottlieb, J., Guskin, S., & Yoshida, R.K. (1978). Evaluating mainstreaming programs: Models, caveats, considerations, and guidelines. Exceptional Children, 44, 588-601.
- Junkala, J., & Mooney, J.F. (1986). Special education students in regular classes: What happened to the pyramid? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 19 (4), 218-221.
- Kavanagh, J.F., & Truss, T.J. (1988). Learning disabilities: Proceedings of the national conference. Parkton, Maryland: York.
- Kneeder, R.D. (1982). The use of cognitive training to change social behaviors. In P. Strain (Ed.), Social development of exceptional children. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems.
- Knoff, H.M. (1985). Attitudes toward mainstreaming: A status

report and comparison of regular and special educators in New York and Massachusetts. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 411-418.

- Lombardi, T., Meadowcroft, P., & Strasburger, R. (1982). Modifying teacher trainers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48 (6), 544-545.
- Lombardi, T.P., Novotny, D.E., & Odell, K.S. (1991). Special education and students at risk: Findings from a national study. Remedial and Special Education (RASE), 12 (1), 56-62.
- Luchow, J.P. (1981). Preparing the classroom teacher for mainstreamed students. The Educational Digest, Nov., 9-11.
- Marver, J., & David, J. (1978). Three states' experiences with individualized education program requirements similar to P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C. : Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, California: Project 4537, Research Report EPRC 23).
- Masat, L.J., & Schack, F.K. (1981). The mainstream teacher: Training is not enough. Principal, 61, 28-30.
- McGinnis, E., & Goldstein, A. (1984). Skillstreaming the elementary school child. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press.
- McGinnis, E., Sauerby, L., & Nichols, P. (1985). Skill-streaming: Teaching social skills to children with behavioral disorders. Teaching Exceptional Children, 17 (3), 160-167.
- McNamara, B.E. (1981). Communicating effectively with regular

educators. Forum, Spring, 20-22.

Moore, C.J., & Zeller, R.W. (1982). Report from the July 1982 Assessment Conference. Eugene, Oregon. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 236829)

Mori, A.A. (1979). The handicapped child in the mainstream: New roles for the regular educator. Education, 99 (3), 243-249.

Myles, B.S., & Simpson, R.L. (1989). Regular educator's modification preferences for mainstreaming mildly handicapped children. Journal of Special Education, 22 (4), 479-491.

Naor, M., & Milgram, R.M. (1980). Two preservice strategies for preparing regular class teachers for mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 47 (2), 126-129.

Nelson, J.R., Dodd, J.M., & Smith, D.J. (1990). Faculty willingness to accommodate students with learning disabilities: A comparison among academic divisions. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23 (3), 185-189.

Nevin, A., & Semmel, M. (1981). Implementing individualized education programs: Analysis of the role of the regular classroom teacher. California University. Santa Barbara, California. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 221971)

Ottman, R.A. (1981). Before a handicapped student enters the classroom: What the special educator can do. Teaching Exceptional Children, Sept., 41-43.

Ottman, S.R. (1982). Special education training needs of

vocational teachers. Santa Barbara Applied Research, Inc., California State Department of Education. Sacramento, California. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 217 669)

Quintero, M., Killoran, J., & Striefel, S. (1987). Mainstreaming: A new role for the special educator. Utah State University. Logan, Utah. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 290- 291)

Reynolds, M.C. (1962). A framework for considering some issues in special education. Exceptional Children, 28, 367-370.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Safer, H., Kaufman, M., & Morrissey, P. (1979). Implementation of I.E.P.'s: New teacher roles and requisite support systems. Instructional planning for exceptional children. Denver: Love Publishing Co.

Salend, S., & Johns, J. (1983). A tale of two teachers: Changing teacher commitment to mainstreaming. Teaching Exceptional Children, 14 (2), 82-85.

Saunders, R.L, & Burch, B.G. (1982). Reconceptualizing and restructuring an undergraduate teacher education program. In B.L. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's grants projects: Challenge and change in teacher education (pp.45-59). Washington, D.C. : American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Schleifer, M.J., & Klein, S.D. (1978). The teacher and mainstreaming. The Exceptional Parent, pp.53-56.

Seidenberg, P.L. (1981). Meeting the challenge of PL94-142: A view from a dean's grant. Forum, Spring, 12-14.

Semmel, M., Gottlieb, J. & Robinson, N. (1979). Mainstreaming: Perspective on educating handicapped children in public school. Review of Research in Education, 7, 223-279.

Siegel, E. (1974). The Exceptional Child Grows Up. New York: E.P. Dullen and Company, Inc.

Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study (1984). St Paul Public Schools, Minnesota. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 268 753)

Stainback, W., Stainback, S., Courtnage, L., & Jaben, T. (1985). Facilitating mainstreaming by modifying the mainstream. Exceptional Children, 52 (2), 144-152.

Stearns, M., Greene, D., & David, J. (1980). Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: First year report of a longitudinal study. Menlo Park, California: Education Research Center, SRI International.

Stephens, T.M., & Braun, B.L. (1980). Measures of regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 46 (4), 292-294.

Strain, P. (1982). Social development of exceptional children. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems.

Thompson, R.H., & Morgan, D.P. (1980). Interaction patterns of regular classroom teachers with mildly handicapped students in mainstreamed classrooms. (Tech. Rep. No.47).

Thornburgh, J. (1980). Into the mainstream. Contemporary

Education, 51 (3), 161-163.

- Tillona, S. (1986). Enhancing success of mainstream elementary special education students by teaching social skills and monitoring behavior and academic progress. Nova University. Fort Lauderdale, Florida. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 289 332)
- Turnbull, A.P., & Winton, P. (1983). A comparison of specialized and mainstreaming preschools from the perspective of parents of handicapped children. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 8, 57-71.
- U.S. Department of Education (1986). Eighth Annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.
- Vance, H.B. (1977). Trends in secondary curriculum development. Academic Therapy, 13, 29-35.
- Walker, H.M. (1983). Initial analysis of the accepts curriculum: Efficacy of instructional and behavioral management procedures for improving the social adjustment of handicapped children. Analysis and Intervention in Development Disabilities, 3, 105-127.
- Walker, H., & Hersh, R. (1982). Social behavior survival: Preparing handicapped children for the realities of mainstream classrooms. Report from July 1982 Assessment Conference. Eugene, Oregon. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 236829)
- Walker, H.M. & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectation demands of the less restrictive settings. School Psychology Review, 12, 274-284.

- Wang, M., Rubenstein, J., & Reynolds, M. (1985). Clearing the road to success for students with special needs, Educational Leadership, 43 (1), 62-67.
- Will, M.C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 441-415.
- Williams, R.J., & Algozzine, B. (1979). Teachers attitudes toward mainstreaming. The Elementary School Journal, 80 (2), 63-67.
- Williamson, A.P. (1974-75). Career education: Implications for secondary LD students. Academic Therapy, 10, 193-200.
- Yanito, T., Quintero, M., Killoran, J., & Striefel, S. (1987). Teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming: A literature review. Utah State University. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 290 290)
- Zigmond, N., Levin, E., & Laurie, T. (1985). Managing the mainstream: An analysis of teacher attitudes and student performance in mainstream high school programs. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18 (9), 535-541.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Public Law 94-142,
Education of the Handicapped Act

Least Restrictive Environment

P 300.550 General.

- (a) Each State educational agency shall insure that public agency establishes and implements procedures which meet the requirements of P 300.500-300.556.
- (b) Each public agency shall insure:
 - (1) That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and
 - (2) That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of

supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (20 U.S.C. 1412 (5xB); 1414 (a) (1) (c) (iv))

P 300.551 Continuum of alternative placements.

- (a) Each public agency shall insure that a continuum of alternate placements is available to meet the needs of handicapped children for special education and related services.
- (b) the continuum required under paragraph (a) of this section must: (1) include the alternative placements listed in the definition of special education under P 300.13 of Sub-part A (instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions)

and (2) Make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement.

(20 U.S.C. 1412 (5) (B))

P 300.552 Placements.

Each public agency shall insure that:

- (a) Each handicapped child's educational placement: (1) Is determined at least annually, (2) Is based on his or her Individualized Education Program (I.E.P.), and (3) Is as close as possible to the child's home;
- (b) The various alternative placements included under P 300.551 are available to the extent necessary to implement the individualized

educational program for each handicapped child;

- (c) Unless the handicapped child's individualized education program required some other arrangement, the child is educated in the school which he or she would attend if not handicapped; and
 - (d) In selecting the least restrictive environment, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services which he or she needs.
- (20 U.S.C. 1412 (5) (B))

Appendix B

Distribution of Respondents

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

Grade Level	School	Total#	Special Education	Regular Education
Primary (K-2)	A	14	1	13
	B	15	2	13
Intermediate (3-5)	C	19	0	19
	D	19	2	17
School of Choice (K-5)	E	15	1	14
Elementary School Totals		82	6	76
Middle School (6-8)	F	64	7	57
	G	47	3	44
Middle School Totals		111	10	101
High Schools (9-12)	H	44	4	40
	I	33	2	30
High School Totals		77	6	70
Grand Totals		269	22	247

44% return

Appendix C

Regular Education Teacher Survey

Teacher Survey
Teacher Background

1. What level do you teach ?
 primary intermediate middle school high school
2. How many years have you been teaching? _____
3. Which of the following degrees do you have?
 Bachelors Masters Doctorate
4. Have you ever taken a special education class?
 yes no If so, how many? _____
5. Do you now or have you ever had any special education (labeled) students in you classroom?
 yes no If so, approximately how many? _____

How would you rate your knowledge about:

- a) Disabilities and their implications for children's learning and adjustment?
 very good good fair poor
- b) The specific skills, weaknesses, and needs of special education students?
 very good good fair poor
- c) Special methods of teaching children with disabilities?
 very good good fair poor

Teacher Opinions

There are no correct answers to the following statements. Please circle the number under the column that best reflects your feelings toward each statement.

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

U = Undecided

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

Opinions

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. Special education students benefit from being mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Regular education students benefit from having special education students mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Regular education students do not learn as well when special education students are mainstreamed or blended into their classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Special education students are usually disruptive while in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Having special education students in regular classrooms places additional demands on the classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
6. Special education students would learn more if they were placed in a self-contained special education class.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Special education students should be expected to complete the same assignments as the other students in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The additional help and support that a mainstreamed or blended special education student receives from the special education teacher gives him/her an unfair advantage over the other students in a regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Special education students tend to be quiet and withdrawn in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Mainstreamed or blended special education students are socially accepted by their regular ed. classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The regular classroom teacher should make modifications to meet the needs of the special ed. students in his/her classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The average classroom teacher should not be expected to teach a special ed. student.	1	2	3	4	5
13. A special ed. student will likely form a positive relationship with the regular classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
14. With special ed. students in a regular classroom, there will likely be an increase in the number of behavior problems among the other children.	1	2	3	4	5
15. A special ed. student will develop a more positive self-concept as a result of being in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Special ed. students are not as highly motivated to learn as regular ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Referrals for disciplinary action will probably occur more frequently for special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Special ed. students are more apt to display inappropriate social behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Regular education teachers are adequately trained at the college level to teach special education students in their classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
20. There should be continuous communication between the special ed. teacher and the regular classroom teacher concerning the mainstreamed or blended special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The academic progress of the mainstreamed or blended special ed. student is the joint concern of the regular classroom teacher and the special ed. teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

- | | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 22. Most special ed. teachers are willing to help the regular classroom teacher deal with mainstreamed special ed. students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Given a choice, would you prefer having special ed. students in your classroom?
___ yes ___ no | | | | | |
-

Regarding the placement of special ed. students into regular classrooms, please feel free to express your comments, concerns, and suggestions.

Appendix D

Total Regular Education Teacher Responses

REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

TOTAL = 247

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	47	109	64	25	2
2.	40	97	61	37	12
3.	9	30	65	99	44
4.	3	34	58	120	32
5.	129	95	14	6	3
6.	11	47	105	60	24
7.	18	67	53	88	21
8.	2	6	23	143	73
9.	0	26	79	114	28
10.	17	113	72	41	4
11.	32	131	50	24	10
12.	14	42	70	93	28
13.	29	119	83	14	2
14.	5	41	80	93	28
15.	48	104	69	20	6
16.	4	11	45	134	53
17.	0	28	64	120	35

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	4	56	69	97	21
19.	3	6	30	101	107
20.	166	70	8	2	1
21.	145	81	15	3	3
22.	63	112	50	14	8
23.	<u>YES</u> 111	<u>NO</u> 98	<u>U</u> 38		

Appendix E

Elementary School Totals

Regular Education Teacher Responses

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TOTALS
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 76

STATEMENTS	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	26	34	13	3	0
2.	20	34	13	8	1
3.	1	8	18	28	21
4.	1	14	15	36	13
5.	42	27	4	2	1
6.	2	12	29	22	10
7.	2	11	13	38	12
8.	0	1	2	43	30
9.	0	3	22	40	11
10.	6	38	20	12	0
11.	19	46	5	4	2
12.	1	19	15	32	9
13.	13	44	16	1	1
14.	0	16	20	30	10
15.	19	35	16	6	0
16.	1	1	10	48	16

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0	11	21	36	8
18.	1	21	21	28	5
19.	0	4	9	36	27
20.	57	16	1	1	1
21.	54	18	2	1	1
22.	27	36	12	1	0
23.	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>U</u>		
	37	33	6		

Appendix F

Middle School Totals

Regular Education Teacher Responses

MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTALS
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 101

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	17	40	32	10	2
2.	15	34	28	17	7
3.	7	7	31	43	13
4.	2	13	29	45	12
5.	50	42	7	1	1
6.	7	17	43	22	12
7.	9	33	23	32	4
8.	2	5	14	52	28
9.	0	9	35	44	13
10.	7	42	35	13	4
11.	12	53	24	10	2
12.	10	11	31	36	13
13.	12	44	35	10	0
14.	5	16	35	32	13
15.	23	38	38	7	5
16.	3	7	18	52	21

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0	12	31	42	16
18.	3	21	34	33	10
19.	1	1	12	35	52
20	68	28	4	1	0
21.	51	39	9	0	2
22.	25	42	23	7	4
23.	<u>YES</u> 44	<u>NO</u> 38	<u>U</u> 19		

Appendix G

High School Totals

Regular Education Teacher Responses

HIGH SCHOOL TOTALS
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 70

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	4	35	19	12	0
2.	5	29	20	12	4
3.	1	15	16	28	10
4.	0	7	14	39	10
5.	37	26	3	3	1
6.	2	18	33	15	2
7.	7	23	17	18	5
8.	0	0	7	48	15
9.	0	14	22	30	4
10.	4	33	17	16	0
11.	1	32	21	10	6
12.	3	12	24	25	6
13.	4	31	32	3	0
14.	0	9	25	31	5
15.	6	31	25	7	1
16.	0	3	17	34	16

	SA		A		U	SD
17.	0	5	12	42	11	
18.	0	14	14	36	6	
19.	2	1	9	30	28	
20.	41	26	3	0	0	
21.	30	24	4	2	0	
22.	11	34	15	6	4	
23.	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>U</u>			
	30	27	13			

Appendix H

Breakdown of Individual School Responses

Regular Education Teachers

SCHOOL "A" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 13

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	3	7	2	1	0
2.	2	6	2	3	0
3.	0	1	5	5	2
4.	0	5	2	5	1
5.	5	7	1	0	0
6.	0	3	3	5	2
7.	0	2	2	6	3
8.	0	0	1	7	5
9.	0	1	4	7	1
10.	2	7	1	3	0
11.	2	9	1	1	0
12.	0	5	5	3	0
13.	3	8	2	0	0
14.	0	4	3	6	0
15.	3	6	3	1	0
16.	0	1	2	9	1
17.	0	3	4	5	1

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	0	5	4	4	0
19.	0	1	1	6	5
20.	10	2	0	0	1
21.	7	3	2	1	0
22.	2	9	1	1	0
23.	<u>YES</u> 6	<u>NO</u> 7	<u>U</u> 0		

SCHOOL "B" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 13

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	4	9	0	0	0
2.	3	5	3	1	1
3.	0	2	4	5	2
4.	0	2	5	5	1
5.	7	6	0	0	0
6.	0	0	6	4	3
7.	0	0	1	10	2
8.	0	0	0	8	5
9.	0	1	3	8	1
10.	1	8	4	0	0
11.	1	10	0	1	1
12.	0	1	3	6	3
13.	2	9	1	0	1
14.	0	3	5	5	0
15.	3	9	1	0	0
16.	0	0	2	6	5
17.	0	2	5	4	2

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	0	5	3	4	1
19.	0	0	1	8	4
20.	11	2	0	0	0
21.	11	2	0	0	0
22.	5	7	1	0	0
23.	<u>YES</u> 5	<u>NO</u> 5	<u>U</u> 3		

SCHOOL "C" REGULAR EDUCATION

Total = 19

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	5	10	3	1	0
2.	4	11	3	1	0
3.	0	3	3	9	4
4.	0	3	4	11	1
5.	11	4	1	2	1
6.	0	6	9	3	1
7.	1	4	5	8	1
8.	0	0	1	9	9
9.	0	0	9	8	2
10.	1	8	8	2	0
11.	4	11	2	2	0
12.	0	4	5	8	2
13.	3	9	7	0	0
14.	0	2	6	8	3
15.	2	9	5	3	0
16.	0	0	4	12	3
17.	0	4	6	8	1

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	0	5	8	5	1
19.	0	2	4	6	7
20.	12	6	0	1	0
21.	14	5	0	0	0
22.	8	7	4	0	0
23.	<u>YES</u> 11	<u>NO</u> 6	<u>U</u> 2		

SCHOOL "D" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 17

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	2	6	8	1	0
2.	1	8	5	3	0
3.	1	2	5	6	3
4.	1	4	3	9	0
5.	13	4	0	0	0
6.	2	3	10	2	0
7.	0	2	2	9	4
8.	0	0	0	13	4
9.	0	1	5	9	2
10.	0	5	5	7	0
11.	4	10	2	0	1
12.	1	7	2	5	2
13.	1	10	4	1	1
14.	0	5	6	4	2
15.	2	6	7	2	0
16.	1	0	2	11	3
17.	0	2	5	10	0

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	1	5	6	5	0
19.	0	0	0	8	9
20.	11	5	6	0	0
21.	9	7	0	0	6
22.	5	7	5	0	0
23.	<u>YES</u> 2	<u>NO</u> 14	<u>U</u> 1		

SCHOOL "E" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total =14

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	12	2	0	0	0
2.	10	4	0	0	0
3.	0	0	1	3	10
4.	0	0	1	6	7
5.	6	6	2	0	0
6.	0	0	1	9	4
7.	1	3	3	5	2
8.	0	1	0	6	7
9.	0	0	1	8	5
10.	2	10	2	0	0
11.	8	6	0	0	0
12.	0	2	0	10	2
13.	4	8	2	0	0
14.	0	2	0	7	5
15.	9	5	0	0	0
16.	0	0	0	10	4
17.	0	0	1	9	4

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	0	1	0	10	3
19.	0	1	3	8	2
20.	13	1	0	0	0
21.	13	1	0	0	0
22.	7	6	1	0	0
23.	<u>YES</u> 13	<u>NO</u> 1	<u>U</u> 0		

SCHOOL "F" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 57

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	11	25	14	7	0
2.	9	17	17	11	3
3.	3	4	19	22	9
4.	1	7	19	23	7
5.	29	22	5	0	1
6.	2	11	24	12	8
7.	3	17	11	24	2
8.	1	2	7	29	18
9.	0	5	21	24	7
10.	6	26	18	6	1
11.	7	29	17	3	1
12.	5	8	17	22	5
13.	9	25	17	6	0
14.	3	9	19	17	9
15.	19	20	10	5	3
16.	1	3	9	30	14
17.	0	8	17	22	10

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	2	14	16	17	8
19.	1	0	8	23	25
20.	42	13	2	0	0
21.	31	20	5	0	1
22.	14	19	16	11	2
23.	<u>YES</u> 23	<u>NO</u> 25	<u>U</u> 9		

SCHOOL "G" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 44

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	6	15	18	3	2
2.	6	17	11	6	4
3.	4	3	12	21	4
4.	1	6	10	22	5
5.	21	20	2	1	0
6.	5	6	19	10	4
7.	6	16	12	8	2
8.	1	3	7	23	10
9.	0	4	14	20	6
10.	1	16	17	7	3
11.	5	24	7	7	1
12.	5	3	14	14	8
13.	3	19	18	4	0
14.	2	7	16	15	4
15.	4	18	18	2	2
16.	2	4	9	22	7
17.	0	4	14	20	6

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	1	7	18	16	2
19.	0	1	4	12	27
20.	26	15	2	1	0
21.	20	19	4	0	1
22.	11	23	7	1	2
23.	<u>YES</u> 21	<u>NO</u> 13	<u>U</u> 10		

SCHOOL "H" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 40

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	2	20	9	9	0
2.	5	15	12	5	3
3.	0	8	8	18	6
4.	0	5	7	23	5
5.	24	13	0	2	1
6.	2	7	22	8	1
7.	5	12	10	9	4
8.	0	0	3	28	9
9.	0	9	12	16	3
10.	4	20	8	8	0
11.	1	19	10	4	6
12.	1	4	17	14	4
13.	4	16	19	1	0
14.	0	4	12	22	2
15.	4	18	14	3	1
16.	0	0	11	22	7
17.	0	2	5	27	6

	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	0	7	5	25	3
19.	2	1	5	16	16
20.	24	15	1	0	0
21.	26	11	3	0	0
22.	5	18	11	4	2
23.	<u>YES</u> 20	<u>NO</u> 14	<u>U</u> 6		

SCHOOL" REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 30

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	2	15	10	3	0
2.	0	14	8	7	1
3.	1	7	8	10	4
4.	0	2	7	16	5
5.	13	13	3	1	0
6.	0	11	11	7	1
7.	2	11	7	9	1
8.	0	0	4	20	6
9.	0	5	10	14	1
10.	0	13	9	8	0
11.	0	13	11	6	0
12.	2	8	7	11	2
13.	0	15	13	2	0
14.	0	5	13	9	3
15.	2	13	11	4	0
16.	0	3	6	12	9

	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	0	3	7	15	5
18.	0	7	9	11	3
19.	0	0	4	14	12
20.	17	11	3	0	0
21.	14	13	1	2	0
22.	6	16	4	2	2
23.	<u>YES</u> 10	<u>NO</u> 13	<u>U</u> 7		

Appendix I

Special Education Teacher Survey

Special Education Teacher Survey
Teacher Background

1. What level do you teach?
___ primary ___ intermediate ___ middle school ___ high school
2. How many years have you been teaching? _____
3. Which of the following degrees do you have?
___ Bachelors ___ Masters ___ Doctorate

Teacher Perceptions

There are no correct answers to the following statements. Please circle the number under the column that best reflects your feelings toward each statement.

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

U = Undecided

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. Special education students benefit from being mainstreamed or blended into the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Regular education students benefit from having special ed. students in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Most regular classroom teachers make modifications for their mainstreamed or blended special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
4. Most regular classroom teachers implement specific strategies for teaching their mainstreamed or blended special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Most classroom teachers are understanding and tolerant of their special ed. students weaknesses and limitations.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Mainstreamed or blended students are given as much praise and positive reinforcement from the regular classroom teacher as are the other students.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Regular classroom teachers encourage positive social interaction between their special ed. students and the other students.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Most regular classroom teachers form a positive relationship with their special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Most regular classroom teachers allow their special ed. students additional response time.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Most regular classroom teachers encourage their special ed. students to be active participants in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Most regular classroom teachers are willing to repeat and rephrase questions for their special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
12. In the area of discipline, the special ed. students are treated the same as the others by the regular classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Most regular classroom teachers are receptive to any help and/or suggestions of the special ed. teacher regarding the mainstreamed or blended students in his/her classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
14. There is continuous communication between the special ed. teacher and the regular classroom teacher concerning the mainstreamed or blended special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Most regular classroom teachers express a positive attitude toward their mainstreamed or blended students.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Regular classroom teachers and special ed. teachers work together as equal partners for the benefit of their special ed. students.	1	2	3	4	5

Regarding the placement of special ed. students into regular classrooms, please feel free to express your comments, concerns, and suggestions.

Appendix J

Total Special Education Teacher Responses

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 22

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	6	11	4	1	0
2.	6	11	4	1	0
3.	1	8	6	6	1
4.	1	3	7	9	2
5.	1	9	6	5	1
6.	2	6	8	6	0
7.	2	11	5	4	0
8.	3	8	8	2	1
9.	3	6	4	9	0
10.	2	11	7	2	0
11.	2	10	5	5	0
12.	1	10	3	5	3
13.	3	9	7	2	1
14.	2	5	4	10	1
15.	2	7	7	5	1
16.	2	5	8	6	1

Appendix K

Elementary School Totals

Special Education Teacher Responses

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TOTALS
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 6

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	2	2	2	0	0
2.	3	3	0	0	0
3.	1	3	2	0	0
4.	1	3	2	0	0
5.	1	3	2	0	0
6.	2	2	1	1	0
7.	2	3	1	0	0
8.	3	3	0	0	0
9.	2	3	1	0	0
10.	2	2	2	0	0
11.	2	3	1	0	0
12.	1	2	0	2	1
13.	2	2	2	0	0
14.	2	2	1	1	0
15.	2	2	2	0	0
16.	2	2	2	0	0

Appendix L

Middle School Totals

Special Education Teacher Responses

MIDDLE SCHOOL TOTALS
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 10

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	4	5	1	0	0
2.	3	5	2	0	0
3.	0	3	2	4	1
4.	0	0	3	5	2
5.	0	4	1	4	1
6.	0	1	6	3	0
7.	0	6	2	2	0
8.	0	5	4	0	1
9.	1	1	0	8	0
10.	0	6	3	1	0
11.	0	5	2	3	0
12.	0	4	2	2	2
13.	1	3	4	1	1
14.	0	3	2	4	1
15.	0	5	1	2	1
16.	0	3	4	2	1

Appendix M

High School Totals

Special Education Teacher Responses

HIGH SCHOOL TOTALS
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES
Total = 6

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	4	1	1	0
2.	0	3	2	1	0
3.	0	2	2	2	0
4.	0	0	2	4	0
5.	0	2	3	1	0
6.	0	3	1	2	0
7.	0	2	2	2	0
8.	0	0	4	2	0
9.	0	2	3	1	0
10.	0	3	2	1	0
11.	0	2	2	2	0
12.	0	4	1	1	0
13.	0	4	1	1	0
14.	0	0	1	5	0
15.	0	0	3	3	0
16.	0	0	2	4	0

Appendix N

Breakdown of Individual School Responses

Special Education Teachers

SCHOOL "A" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 1

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	1	0	0	0
2.	0	1	0	0	0
3.	0	1	0	0	0
4.	0	1	0	0	0
5.	0	1	0	0	0
6.	0	1	0	0	0
7.	0	1	0	0	0
8.	0	1	0	0	0
9.	0	1	0	0	0
10.	0	1	0	0	0
11.	0	1	0	0	0
12.	0	1	0	0	0
13.	0	1	0	0	0
14.	0	1	0	0	0
15.	0	1	0	0	0
16.	0	1	0	0	0

SCHOOL "B" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 2

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	1	0	1	0	0
2.	2	0	0	0	0
3.	1	0	1	0	0
4.	1	0	1	0	0
5.	1	0	0	0	0
6.	1	0	1	0	0
7.	1	0	0	0	0
8.	2	0	0	0	0
9.	1	0	1	0	0
10.	1	0	1	0	0
11.	1	0	1	0	0
12.	1	0	0	0	0
13.	1	0	1	0	0
14.	1	0	1	0	0
15.	1	0	1	0	0
16.	1	0	1	0	0

SCHOOL "D" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 2

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	1	1	0	0
2.	0	2	0	0	0
3.	0	2	0	0	0
4.	0	2	0	0	0
5.	0	1	1	0	0
6.	0	1	0	1	0
7.	0	1	1	0	0
8.	0	2	0	0	0
9.	0	2	0	0	0
10.	0	1	1	0	0
11.	0	2	0	0	0
12.	0	0	0	2	0
13.	0	1	1	0	0
14.	0	1	0	1	0
15.	0	1	1	0	0
16.	0	1	1	0	0

SCHOOL "E" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 1

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	1	0	0	0	0
2.	1	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	1	0	0
4.	0	0	1	0	0
5.	0	0	1	0	0
6.	1	0	0	0	0
7.	1	0	0	0	0
8.	1	0	0	0	0
9.	1	0	0	0	0
10.	1	0	0	0	0
11.	1	0	0	0	0
12.	0	0	0	0	1
13.	1	0	0	0	0
14.	1	0	0	0	0
15.	1	0	0	0	0
16.	1	0	0	0	0

SCHOOL "F" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 7

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	4	2	1	0	0
2.	3	3	1	0	0
3.	0	2	2	2	1
4.	0	0	3	3	1
5.	0	3	1	2	1
6.	0	0	5	2	0
7.	0	4	2	1	0
8.	0	3	3	0	1
9.	0	1	0	6	0
10.	0	4	2	1	0
11.	0	3	1	3	0
12.	0	1	2	2	2
13.	1	1	3	1	1
14.	0	2	1	3	1
15.	0	3	1	2	1
16.	0	1	3	2	1

SCHOOL "G" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 3

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	3	0	0	0
2.	0	2	1	0	0
3.	0	1	0	2	0
4.	0	0	0	2	1
5.	0	1	0	2	0
6.	0	1	1	1	0
7.	0	2	0	1	0
8.	0	2	1	0	0
9.	1	0	0	2	0
10.	0	2	1	0	0
11.	0	2	1	0	0
12.	0	3	0	0	0
13.	0	2	1	0	0
14.	0	1	1	1	0
15.	0	2	1	0	0
16.	0	2	1	0	0

SCHOOL "H" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 4

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	2	1	1	0
2.	0	2	1	1	0
3.	0	1	1	2	0
4.	0	0	1	3	0
5.	0	2	2	0	0
6.	0	2	1	1	0
7.	0	1	2	1	0
8.	0	0	3	1	0
9.	0	2	1	1	0
10.	0	3	1	0	0
11.	0	2	1	1	0
12.	0	3	1	0	0
13.	0	2	1	1	0
14.	0	0	1	3	0
15.	0	0	2	2	0
16.	0	0	1	3	0

SCHOOL "I" SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER RESPONSES

Total = 2

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	0	2	0	0	0
2.	0	1	1	0	0
3.	0	1	1	0	0
4.	0	0	1	1	0
5.	0	0	1	1	0
6.	0	1	0	1	0
7.	0	1	0	1	0
8.	0	0	1	1	0
9.	0	0	2	0	0
10.	0	0	1	1	0
11.	0	0	1	1	0
12.	0	1	0	1	0
13.	0	2	0	0	0
14.	0	0	0	2	0
15.	0	0	1	1	0
16.	0	0	1	1	0