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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The concept of mainstreaming is described in a variety of ways, such as integration, deinstitutionalization, nonlabeling and classification; it encompasses both community integration of the severely disabled and educational mainstreaming of the mildly disabled. The concept is now widely favored among many educators, particularly those in special education.

Birch States:

Mainstreaming is the enrolling and teaching exceptional children in regular classes for the majority of the school day under the charge of the regular class teacher, and assuring that the exceptional child receives special education of high quality to the extent it is needed during that time and at any other time (Birch 1977, 44).

Brenton noted that mainstreaming means moving handicapped children from their segregated status in special education classes and integrating them with "normal" children in the regular classrooms. Despite the fact that mainstreaming is not new nor is it in its primary stages, the current zest for it is new. Research indicates that mainstreaming has allowed handicapped children to achieve better progress both in academic and social performance.
The exposure to handicapped children has helped normal children to understand individual differences in people; it has also helped to diminish the stereotyping of the handicapped (Brenton 1984). In essence, a regular school setting does a better job than a segregated setting of helping exceptional children adjust to and cope with the real world when they grow up.

Most recently (Evans 1990, 73) described mainstreaming as:

Soughting to end a system that ignored many children with critical needs and warehoused others in residential schools; it sought to expand the rights of these students and their parents; and it sought schools where children would be seen not as better or worse but as different kinds of learners and where teachers would adapt their pedagogy to a wide range of learning styles.

Mainstreaming takes various forms: resource room instruction, individualization of instruction, team teaching, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching and itinerant teaching arrangement. With mainstreaming, the resource teacher and the regular classroom teacher have interlocking responsibilities. Communication between them is essential.

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

Barbara Milbauer asserts that exceptional children have a wide range of special educational needs, varying greatly in intensity and duration; that there is a need for a continuum of educational settings, appropriate for an individual child's needs; that to the maximum extent appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with non-exceptional children; and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of an exceptional child from education with non-exceptional children should occur only when the intensity of the child's special education and related needs is such that they cannot be satisfied in an environment including non-exceptional children, even with the provision of supplementary aids and services (Milbauer, 1977).

The variety of advantages ascribed to mainstreaming consist of removing the stigma associated with special classes, providing realistic situations in school to prepare the disabled for experiences they will eventually face when they are not longer students, allowing regular and special classroom teachers to share their skills and
knowledge in teaching the same children, and giving more children a cost-effective education.

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

The Tacoma experience, like that of other school districts where mainstreaming is working, indicates that one of the key factors in its success is attitude, especially teacher attitude. Edwin W. Martin, Deputy Commissioner of Education and Director of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, states: "It is our feelings we must deal with our attitudes, fears and frustrations about the disabled, about something that is a little different. In planning training programs, we must look at the attitudes of everyone involved and make those attitudes the focus of our efforts to change" (Milbauer 1977).

The Education for all Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) changes title to "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act" (IDEA) of 1990 (PL 101-476), and makes the same change in other laws which currently make reference to the EAHCA (Education for the Handicapped Law Report 1990, sec. 602 (a)) was signed by President Ford in November, 1975, mandates a national commitment to educating all handicapped children. The law requires that the state
education agency be responsible for a "free, appropriate public education" to all handicapped children ages three through 17 by September, 1978, and for ages three through twenty-one by September, 1980 (Milbauer 1977).

Presently there are more than eight million disabled pre-school age and school age children in the United States. This figure includes physically disabled, mild or severely intellectually disabled, and those with emotional/behavior disorders. Prior to the advent of mainstreaming 40 percent of all disabled children received special schooling, either in segregated educational facilities or in regular public schools. A very small number were educated in private schools. More than 4 million either attended regular schools that did not have the special services that were needed or were totally excluded from receiving an education (Brenton 1984). Unmistakably the mainstreaming trend and the passage of Public Law 94-142 now titled Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 has caused significant changes in the delivery of services to disabled children. Since the emerge of mainstreaming the delivery of educational services to disabled children has changed dramatically. Current estimates indicate that two out of three disabled children are a part of regular education, a sharp contrast to the educational environmental conditions of the disabled prior to the landmark legislation embodied in PL 94-142 now PL 101-476 which created the impetus for
mainstreaming. It is precisely these conditions that create an unprecedented challenge for education personnel.

**Evolution of the Problem**

In the early seventies, a change was noted in the philosophy of special education. In November 1975, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act now Individual With Disabilities Education Act of 1990 became Public Law 94-142. This law reflects a major new commitment by the federal government to help educate all handicapped children. This change brought about a move away from special classes for mildly handicapped children to move toward reintegration of these children into regular school program (Kaufman, Semmel, and Agard 1973).

The recent widespread disenchantment with special education practices for intellectually disabled children has been evidenced in the activities of individuals and agencies. Pressure for this greater integration with the regular school program in special education was brought about by parents and minority groups who claimed that special education programs have been a dumping ground for their children (Dunn 1968). These individuals have demanded a new program for their children. In this new program of integration, called "mainstreaming," special education teachers operate as resource teachers, sharing responsibility with the regular education teachers for the education of the exceptional child (Affleck, Lehning,
The exceptional child may be one of the following: (a) speech impaired, (b) visually disabled (c) intellectually disabled (mild, moderate), (d) hard of hearing and deaf, (e) emotional/behavior disorders, (f) crippled, (g) learning disabled (h) gifted and with the change of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) of 1975 to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 adds two new categories of disability: (i) autism and (j) traumatic brain injury (Education for the Handicapped Law Report 1990).

As a result of the increasing attention on Public Law 94-142, specifying that all handicapped children be placed in the least restrictive environment, many regular educators have found children who once may have been placed in self contained classes for the disabled now mainstreamed into their regular classroom.

Since the mainstreaming of mildly disabled children into regular school programs has become a mandate of the federal courts, regular educators are working with disabled children in great number. Today to find disabled children in a regular classroom setting is not the exception, it is the rule. As a special education resource teacher the writer has found that many regular education teachers have expressed concern to her about their reluctance to plan and implement instruction for disabled students in their classroom. The writer is concerned about the attitudes
of the regular educators who have been personally encountered and is interested in determining the prevalence of the attitudes of regular educators in the wider professional community.

This study was undertaken in Atlanta, Georgia to determine, examine and interpret the prevailing attitudes of elementary regular classroom teachers toward this increasing practice for their school system.

**Contribution to Educational Knowledge**

It is hoped that the findings in this study will be of value to educators, especially those who have taken upon themselves the challenge of teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes. Also it is further hoped that:

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

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

3. Educators will be able to utilize this information to re-examine their curricular in order to design or modify curricula relevant to the education of elementary classroom teachers with emphasis on attitudes.
4. The findings of this study will make information that may be useful to assist not only educators, but school-community citizenry in helping to determine the feasibility of implementing mainstreaming in their schools.

**Statement of the Problem**

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

**Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship existing between the attitudes of elementary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of disabled children with selected social-occupational variables and to further investigate the relationship of these attitudes.

**Research Questions**

The research questions generated for this study are:

1. Is there any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of disabled children among elementary classroom teachers categorized based on age?
2. Is there any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children based on sex?
3. Is there any significant differences in expressed
attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children among elementary classroom teachers based on years of service?

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

5. Is there any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school community?

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

7. Is there any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children and/or based on exposure to disabled children?

**Research Hypotheses**

The null hypotheses tested in this study are:

1. There is no significant difference in the expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on age.

2. There is no significant difference in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on sex.

3. There is no significant difference in the expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on years of service.
4. There is no significant difference in the expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on the number of academic courses taken.

5. There is no significant difference in the expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on the socioeconomic status of the school community.

6. There is no significant difference in the expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on type of program(s) in their school.

7. There is no significant difference in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming based on exposure to disabled children.

**Definition of Terms**

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

**Mainstreaming.** A concept that seeks to modify conditions in the learning environment that interfere with efforts to meet the learning needs of the individual child (Deno, Maruyama, Espin, and Cohen 1990). Mainstreaming is a way to teach disabled students in environments that do not restrict their educational potential, including placing disabled students in the regular classroom with their nondisabled peers (Wood and Reeves 1989).

**Exceptional Children.** Children who are classified by their school system as mentally handicapped are now intellectually disabled (mild, moderate, severe/profound), behavior disordered and severely emotional disturbed will be emotional/behavioral disorders, orthopedically handicapped will be orthopedically impaired, and preschool handicapped will be preschool special education. Terminology for other disability areas (speech impaired, visually disabled, gifted and learning disabled will remain the same are exceptional and eligible for special education according to the new law PL 101-476 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Atlanta Public
A child who differs from the average or normal child in (1) mental characteristics, (2) sensory abilities, (3) communications abilities, (4) social behavior, or (5) physical characteristics. These differences must be to such an extent that the child requires a modification of school practices, or special educational services to develop to maximum capacity (Kirk and Gallagher 1989).

Regular Classes. Classes where exceptional children are taught with other children all or part of the day, receiving any combination of the following methods: nongraded, individualized instruction, enrichment-type, open classrooms, resource room, itinerant services and diagnostic-prescriptive services in the general school program. A place where cooperative learning is creating an effective learning environment for exceptional children through the use of nondisabled peers teaching exceptional students (Kirk and Gallagher 1989).

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

Mildly Disabled Children. Children who perform poorly in the areas of understanding and remembering associated concepts and facts and then applying and demonstrating mastery of these concepts and facts (Ellis and Lenz 1990). Frequently, students with mild educational disabilities are served in regular class settings. Depending on the type of disabling condition, the student is seen by the regular teacher from part of the school day to, in some cases, all of the school day. These children comprise the largest group of students served in mainstreamed settings (Wood, Reeves, and Miederhoff 1989).

Research Design

The research design employed in this study was the descriptive survey method. Descriptive research was defined by Ary et al. (1990) as studies designed to obtain information concerning the status of a phenomenon. They are directed toward determining the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study. (Leedy 1989, 40)
further defined descriptive research in this manner:

To behold is to look beyond the fact; to go beyond the observation. Look at a world of men and women, and you are overwhelmed by what you see; select from the mass of humanity a well chosen few, and these observe with insight, and they will tell you more than multitudes together. This is the way we must learn, by sampling judiciously, by looking intently with the inward eye. Then from these few that you behold, tell us what you see to be the truth. This is the descriptive-normative-survey method.

The descriptive survey research design was appropriate for this research project it allowed the researcher to examine present conditions and describe systematically a situation or an area of interest factually and accurately.

**Research Procedures**

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

The steps for gathering and analyzing the data included the following:

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

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

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

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

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways:

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

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

Subjects and Locale of the Study

The subjects in this study were predominantly elementary classroom teachers in the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia who were employed during the 1990-91 school year.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was designed in a questionnaire format that consisted of 16 questions with multiple choice answers. The instrument consisted of two parts: Part I: Social-Occupational Characteristics and Part II: Mainstreaming Analysis. The instrument stated that all information would be kept confidential and the
directions for participants were to check only one answer in each question.

Organization of Remaining Chapters and References

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

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

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

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

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

The study sought to examine and interpret elementary classroom teacher's expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of disabled children with specific attention to those variables affecting teacher attitudes. Data obtained from seventy-three (73) teachers in the Atlanta Public School System provided information on the subject's perceptions of mainstreaming as a viable concept in education. Responses obtained from a data inventory consisting of social-occupational characteristics provided data for determining the teacher's expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the review of pertinent and related literature under three major categories:

1. Review of Legislation and Background Establishing Mainstreaming Disabled Students Into the Regular Classroom.
2. Attitudinal Studies Toward Teachers Mainstreaming Disabled Students Into the Regular Classroom.
3. Adaptations of Teachers for Implementation of Mainstreaming.

Legislation

The experience gained during the proliferation of special education classes and the field of special education shifted emphasis in support of a more integrated place for disabled children in both public schools and communities under the aegis of mainstreaming. The movement generally referred to as the "support for mainstreaming" was generated by a number of factors: the activities of militant parents' groups; the decrease in population growth; the cost of maintaining two parallel education systems; increased concern in the political
climate for children who are identified as disabled and "disadvantaged"; a general disillusionment with prospects of "curing" human ailments through the ministrations of specialists in clinical environments; technical developments in measurements and observation systems; and value changes that emphasize a greater awareness of the disabled person's rights (Chester and Grants 1990).

Essentially, the majority of special educators begin to recognize the negative inputs resulting from the proliferation of disability categories as a way of making better provision for children's needs. They are sure that the only meaningful category for educational purposes is the individual child. With this in mind, drastic changes have been implemented in schools. Much of which has been the result of federal legislation.

Federal legislation which clearly established the regal of disabled children to receive a free and appropriate education. The basic right to education is established in The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA), signed into law by President Ford in 1975. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 was usually referred to as P.L. 94-142 in educational circles (Yell and Espin 1990) until the change from P.L. 94-142 Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) became P.L. 101-476 Individuals with Disabilities

The least restrictive environment provision of P.L. 101-476 creates a presumption in favor of educating children with handicaps in regular education environments. Placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) has been discussed and contested in advocacy efforts, professional literature, the courts, countless due process hearings, and in the regulation development process since the law's signing. PL 101-476 also, implemented transition services in the school year 1991-92. It requires that IEP's written during the 1991-92 school year must address transition services for appropriate students. The statement on transition services must be reviewed annually or more frequently as necessary for appropriateness in accordance with all other IEP requirements. The statute and implementing regulations require that, first, educational services appropriate for each child be defined annually
in an Individualized Education Program (IEP); and the educational placement be selected from a continuum of alternatives so that the individually appropriate education can be delivered in the setting that is least removed from the regular education environment and that offers the greatest interaction with children who are not disabled. To assist in implementing the least restrictive environment requirement, federal monitoring, discretionary grants, and technical assistance efforts have been designed to build the capacity of regular educational environments to serve children with disabilities (Danielson and Bellamay 1989).

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) is the sine qua non of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA). For special education there is no document more significant to districts, agencies, administrators, teachers, parent and educational advocates, and students. Intended as the cornerstone of the EAHCA, the IEP was considered the necessary component from which to monitor and enforce the law. The IEP supports individualized instruction based on egalitarian views of mankind with the intent of providing adequate educational opportunities for children and youth with handicapping conditions. Succinctly, the EAHCA was intended to provide administrators with proof of compliance, teachers with formalized plans, parents with a voice, and students with
an appropriate education. Thus, the importance of IEPs to children's education cannot be minimized or ignored. As a process and document, the IEP was designed to carry into implementation the law's intent. That is, the IEP should be an essential component of instructional design and delivery that enhances and accounts for students' learning and teachers' teaching (Smith 1990).

The changes which were brought forth as a result of P.L. 94-142 were the most dramatic changes effecting education in the modern decade. All segments of the educational environment have been affected. Most visible changes have been realized in the structure of the classroom setting and the functions of the classroom teacher. Anderson indicates that the teacher is the crucial implementor of change in the classroom. In stressing the importance of a healthful school environment and the emotional atmosphere created in the school, Anderson states: "The most important thing in the environment is people, and the most important person is the teacher". Consequently, the changes resulting from P.L. 94-142 which intended to alter the quality of education for exceptional children in the classroom depends primarily on the teacher. Haring (1958) indicated that the attitudes and understandings teachers have about disabled children are influential in determining the intellectual social and emotional adjustment of the children and consequently
the success of mainstreaming. In order to fulfill this adjustment successfully, the teacher should be knowledgeable of current trends and litigation in education, and of the special education service delivery system provided through mainstreaming. The reiteration of who these children are and the philosophy of the mainstreaming concept may have a significant impact on the attitudes of teachers.

Background for Change

Haring (1958) summarizes the philosophy of mainstreaming, or integration noting that:

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

Mainstreaming allows mildly disabled students to be considered and treated according to their own unique educational needs. However, their rights, responsibilities and privileges are the same as those of all other students in school (Berry 1972).

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

A number of factors are responsible for the changes that have come about in the education of exceptional children. However, the most basic issues concerning changes in special education for disabled children are two-fold. First, to shift the emphasis away from the serving of disabled children by disability labels to providing for the special educational needs of children within the framework of the regular program and secondly, to comply with legislative demands resulting from parental pressures to integrate labeled children into the regular school program.

Since evidence accumulated over the years to indicate that mainstreaming would be a valid alternative to self-contained special classes for appropriately selected pupils and teachers, a number of authors have discussed their findings on inappropriateness of special class placement and suggestive alternatives. These classic studies investigated the efficacy of special class placement
of disproportionate groups of children (including minorities), ability grouping, testing practices and labeling as well as suggestive alternatives to special education placement. Among these investigators are (Cohen 1978); (O'Donnell and Bradfield 1976); (Jones 1974); (Bruininks 1972); (Love 1972); (Barksdale and Atkinson 1971); (Haywood 1971); (Lilly 1971); (MacMillian 1971); (Cegelka and Tyler 1970); (Deno 1970); (Kidd 1970); (Milazzo 1970); (Christophos and Renz 1969); (Dunn 1968); (Guskin and Spicker 1968); (Goldstein 1967); (Combs and Harper 1967); (Wright 1967); (Rubin, Senison, and Betrull 1966); (Hodgson 1964); (Kirk 1964); (Johnson 1962).

The major alternative systems for change in providing services for disabled children was first purposed by Deno. This system which form the basis for the current structure of educational alternative for disabled children, is unique in its design and attempts to upgrade the effectiveness of the total pupil education effort. Deno cascade of educational alternative which provides for the structure of special education placement to date allows for a variety of approaches for serving exceptional children, extending from placement in a regular class, with no need for special education, to special education that is provided in settings that may be the administrative responsibility of non-school agencies (Deno 1972).
Pressures for Mainstreaming

Educational scholars agree that parental pressure and litigation were the two primary factors which brought the mainstreaming concept to the surface in American education.

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

1. Parental concerns were expressed more directly and forcefully.
2. The rejection of the labeling of children.
3. The capability to deliver special education anywhere has improved.
4. Court actions which accelerated changes in special education procedures.
5. Questions regarding the fairness and accuracy of psychological testing.
6. The proliferation of children classified psycho-metrically as mentally retarded.
7. Civil rights actions against segregation which uncovered questionable special education placement practices.

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

8. The argument that non-disabled children were deprived if they are not allowed to associate with disabled children.

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

9. The programs questioned effectiveness of conventional special education.

10. Financial Considerations foster mainstreaming.

11. American philosophical foundations which encouraged diversity in the same educational setting (Birch 1977). (Reynolds and Rosen 1976) suggest that parent groups emerged as a powerful force for setting up the directions of special education activities toward mainstreaming.
Parents of disabled children began to organize to obtain educational facilities for their offspring and to act as watchdogs of the institutions serving them.

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

A "quiet revolution" was fought within American education for the disabled that already exists for the non-disabled throughout the United States. This recent movement was directed toward the number of children who were denied an education. Concern for the education of disabled children continues to acquire base in the American Society. It is the concern not only of parents and teachers, but of state and local governments. It now has become the concern of governmental officials at the highest level of the United States.

Litigation has resulted in formulation of the concepts "right to education," in addition to "right to treatment," and "freedom from involuntary servitude" in the area of mental health and special education (Kirk 1968).
Attitudinal Studies Toward Teachers  
Mainstreaming Handicapped Students  
Into the Regular Classroom

In the past decade, a host of studies have explored the relationship between teachers' expectations and student achievement. Research strongly suggests that higher performance expectations by teachers do stimulate more effort on the part of both teachers and students, and lead to increased student achievement (Gersten, Walker, and Darch 1988). Since the mid-1980's, there has been considerable discussion regarding greater accommodation of disabled students within a mainstream setting and the integration of regular special education (Reynolds et al. 1987).

(Banks 1990) suggests that some regular education teachers feel that it is wasteful to use 40% of their time to teach students who are not going to learn anything anyway. However, "experts say the evidence is irrefutable that disabled children taught in integrated settings display better social development and a higher mastery of skill than segregated students." In a similar study reported by Chester and Grants (1991), an investigation on teacher's attitudes towards mainstreaming severely learning disabled students reported by Chester (1991) results indicated that the majority (60%) of teachers "agreed that mainstreaming severely learning disabled students demands more teacher
Research also suggests that teacher expectations are highly connected to student success in the academic environment. In a classic study conducted by both Edmonds (1979) and Brookover (1981) the researchers found that teachers and administrators in successful inner-city schools demonstrated consistently high expectations for students in academic, social, and behavioral domains. Recently, there has been a concurrent move in inservice education programs to stress high expectations (e.g., Clark and McCarthy 1991) and to urge teachers to increase their standards and expectations in the hope of raising student achievement.

Lower expectations and negative teacher attitudes may partially account for the negative experiences of many disabled children who have been integrated into regular classroom under the provision of Public Law 94-142 now Public Law 101-476 (Gresham 1990). It is possible that the most successful teachers, those with the highest expectations and standards for their students, tend to resist placement of a child with obvious behavioral or learning problems, social skill deficits, or other atypical characteristics. Such children are typically perceived as difficult to teach, as demanding of teacher time and resources, and as having low potential achievement levels (Gerber and Semmel 1984).
Teachers are usually indirect and sometime evasive about the placement of disabled students in their classrooms, perhaps suggesting that the child "really would do a lot better in the room across the hall" or alluding to how the teacher cannot find an appropriate reading group for the student. Several researchers have explored this phenomenon. Ysseldyke and his colleagues (Thurlow et al. 1983) conducted studies in which teachers were asked what they would do if a child with a certain problem (e.g., a drooler or a well-behaved, charming child who read well below grade level) were placed in their classroom. Possible determinants of these simulated decisions were analyzed. Ysseldyke and Thurlow (1983) argued that teachers who anonymously tell a researcher that they will actively resist placing a problem child in their classroom will likely do this in practice.

Walker and Rankin (1983) also explored the issue of teachers' resistance to placing handicapped students in their classrooms as part of a larger program of research into the social integration of handicapped children in less restricted settings (Walker 1988). The Walker and Rankin results indicated that those teachers most likely to succeed with low performing students were also those who (a) expected the most adaptive behavior, (b) tolerated the fewest maladaptive behaviors, and (c) showed the least reluctance to have handicapped children placed in their
classrooms. The researchers have also found that "effective" teachers, those with high standards and low tolerance for deviant behavior are those most likely to seek help in dealing with deviant behavior and who efficiently use their instructional time. Therefore, one reason for the type of resistance reported by Walker may be the effective teachers' attempt to guard against inefficient use of academic instructional time, which could result in an overall decreased level of student performance (Walker in press).

Other researchers have reported similar findings (Kauffman, Wong, Lloyd, Hung, and Pullen 1988) have reported that most or all children with disabilities might be assumed to be at risk to have a considerably higher than average chance of failure, at least without special accommodation for their disabilities.

The results of these studies suggest that the teachers who would be most likely to maximize the achievement gains of students with learning and behavior problems were also those likely to resist their placement in their classes. Low performing students who have intensive instructional or management needs may have difficulty accessing the most skilled teachers in school settings.

Little is known about how teachers judge pupils to be at risk in the context of their expectations and demands for classroom conduct, although the link between disordered
behavior and risk of school failure has been noted (Lombardi, O'dell, Novotny 1991), (Cuban 1989), (Shinn, Ramsey, Walker, Stieber, and O'Neill 1987). Previous research has explored the demands and expectations of teachers for handicapped pupils in their classrooms, the adaptive behaviors they consider critical for success and the maladaptive behaviors they consider unacceptable (Walker and Rankin in press), (Kauffman, Lloyd, and McGee 1989), (Walker and Lamon 1987), (Kerr and Zigmond 1986). Nevertheless, research has not addressed questions regarding the relationship between teachers' expectations and demands for classroom behavior and their judgments of handicapped pupils.

Distinctions between students with disabilities and those who are called at risk are not currently clear, as evidenced by controversy regarding the extension of special services to at risk pupils among special educators and proponents of school reform. Nevertheless, it is clear that many children not identified for special education as well as those with disabilities carry an elevated risk for school failure (Speece and Cooper 1990).

The finding that teachers discriminate between behavior violating their own personal standards and behavior that is likely to lead to school failure regardless of who the child's teacher might be suggests directions for future research. Studies are needed to (a) clarify the
relationship between teachers' personal standards and their perceptions, (b) determine the predictive validity of teachers' judgments of the behavior that places pupils at risk, (c) assess the accuracy of teachers' predictions about behavior that would place children at risk in other teachers' classrooms, and (d) determine the relationship between teachers' judgments and their instructional and behavior management strategies (Kauffman, Lloyd, McGee 1989), (Walker and Lamon 1987), (Kerr and Zigmond 1986), (Walker and Rankin 1983, in press).

**Teacher Attitudes Toward the Implementation of Mainstreaming**

Increasing numbers of children with mild learning problems are being declared eligible for special education services. However, most of these students continue to spend the majority of their school day in mainstream classrooms. Essentially, their education is the responsibility of mainstream teachers, who are faced with the added problem of having to devise educational arrangements for students who leave the classroom for anywhere from 30 minutes to 3 hours to receive special education services. It is generally agreed that participation in regular education settings is important for students with handicaps, and the assumption is that classroom teachers use a variety of procedures and arrangements to adjust for these students' needs.
Little is known about either the instructional arrangements teachers use for students with mild handicaps in regular education settings or the effectiveness of various instructional arrangement are teachers attitudes toward these modifications. The only factors for which information is available are class size and student-teacher ration (Thurlow, Ysseldyke, and Wotruba 1987) and grouping practices (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Christenson, and McVicar 1988). Yet special educators increasingly are being asked to work with classroom teachers to help them identify optimal ways of helping students with mild handicaps succeed in general education classrooms (Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg 1987), (Stainback and Stainback 1984). As a result, special educators must pay special attention to existing instructional arrangements for students with mild handicaps in regular classrooms.

Instructional arrangements and teacher's perceptions was examined by a questionnaire sent to 240 special education teachers across the United States who were asked to pass it on to their regular education colleagues. The two-page questionnaire was based on literature about adapted education and instruction, focusing on the use of alternative instructional arrangements to meet the needs of individual students in regular education classrooms. The questionnaire asked for information about teachers' practices and opinions regarding structural arrangements
and adaptive instruction for students with mild handicaps.

The two least desirable adaptations were "modifying tasks until student makes no errors or only infrequent mistakes" (average rating = 5.5) and "using other goals to instruct failing student" (average rating = 5.6).

The majority of both elementary and secondary teachers (58% and 51% respectively) reported no differences in their classroom instructional arrangements due to the presence of students with handicaps. Most teachers (58% elementary, 64% secondary) indicated that the primary method of instruction did not differ when students with handicaps were in the classroom.

The results of this survey provide little indication that teachers change their instructional methods when students with handicaps are placed in their classrooms. This holds true for both elementary and secondary teachers, although secondary teachers seem to encounter greater numbers of students with handicaps during a school day.

The ratings of elementary teachers were slightly higher than the ratings of secondary teachers for both desirability and ability to do.

These results suggest that general education teachers either do not see a way to alter the classroom environment to accommodate students with handicaps, or are unable to implement potential changes for one reason or another.
The results of this survey provide an interesting, although limited, picture of some of the practices employed by regular education teachers in teaching students with mild handicaps (Ysseldyke, Thurlow, Wotruba, et al. 1990). In a similar study reported by Schumm and Vaughn (in press) teachers' perceptions of the desirability and feasibility of adaptations for mainstreamed students in their regular education classes were examined. Of particular interest was how teachers of different grade levels would respond to adaptations. It was hypothesized that some adaptations such as establishing a personal relationship with the mainstreamed students would be more desirable and feasible than other adaptations such as adapting their tests or other procedures for evaluation. The teachers were also asked to rate (excellent, good, fair, poor) their knowledge and skills for planning for regular education students and mainstreamed students. Ninety-eight percent of the teachers rated their planning for regular education students as either excellent or good and 41% of the respondents rated their planning for mainstreamed students as either excellent or good. Results indicate that regular classroom teachers identify adaptations in materials and instruction as neither desirable nor feasible when teaching special learners in the regular classroom. This information is particularly relevant in light of the emphasis on educating special education students in the regular classroom. The
assumption is that regular classroom teachers are willing to make instructional, curricular, and planning adaptations. The results of this survey also suggest that regular classroom teachers do not perceive these types of adaptations as highly desirable or feasible.

Similar results are reported by Zigmond and Baker (1990) in a school based analysis of regular classroom teachers' instructional adaptations for special learners. Though the teachers in their target elementary school appeared ready for the full integration of special education students, they made few adaptations in their instructional style. The analysis of Zigmond and Baker found that teachers reported a need to reorganize daily routines and integrate alternative instructional practices to accommodate special learners. They concluded that "fundamental changes in mainstream instruction must occur if the regular education initiative is to work in this school." Zigmond and Baker also suggest that regular classroom teachers do not find instructional and curricular adaptations feasible. Teachers are willing to include mainstreamed students within the whole class activities and to provide encouragement and support for their academic. They are less willing to make specific modifications for their instruction, use of materials, or environment. Few differences were found among grade groupings with elementary, middle, and high school teachers providing
similar overall patterns of responses. These findings also indicate that the expectation that regular classroom teachers will make planning, instructional, and environmental adaptations for the special learners in their classroom may not be realistic (Zigmond and Baker 1990).

The research regarding the attitudes of regular educators regarding integration of handicapped students and their willingness to make adaptations is inconclusive as (Phillips and McCullough 1990), (Tindal, Shinn, and Rodden-Nord 1990), (Idol 1988). These researchers suggest that while it is possible that appropriate support services such as those provided by specialized consultation and collaborative programs could increase teachers' willingness to make these adaptations, the extent to which regular classroom teachers accept the responsibility for making adaptations they are willing to make needs to be further explored (Jenkins, Pious, and Jewell 1990).

An analysis of the research in this area suggests that regular education and special education teachers problems with the mainstreaming of students focused on three major factors that reduced the effectiveness of mainstreaming were: (1) teachers' preparedness for new roles, (2) the adequacy of their knowledge about mainstreaming, and (3) their attitudes. Several authors suggest that inservice training may be the vehicle for prompting changes in teacher attitudes.
"Project Mainstream" was initiated as an Inservice Program to help improve the attitudes of teachers and to help them work effectively with mainstreamed students by providing both regular and special education teachers to visit each other's room for observation of teaching strategies.

The results showed that "Project Mainstream" did produce a change in teacher attitudes about mainstreaming. For example: Regular education teachers were now able to see similarities of regular and special education students as compared to extreme differences, positive change of attitudes of mainstreamed students versus negative attitudes and rejection of mainstreamed students. Regular and special education teachers felt that they no longer required as much training to successfully teach mainstreamed students.

"Both groups of teachers indicated that visiting each other's classrooms during the program improved their attitude toward and respect for each other's jobs. Project Mainstream proved to be a worthwhile way to improve a school's mainstream program by addressing the issue of teacher attitudes" (Dileo and Meloy 1990). Researchers have investigated the need to examine the definition of the Regular Education Initiative Jenkins, Pious, and Jewell (1990) suggesting that is not fair to hold the teacher primarily responsible for the educating students' with
disabilities as well as regular education students using a "normal developmental curriculum." Other authors suggest a narrowing of the definition of the Regular Education Initiative (REI). A future 21st century definition reports that in order to prepare for the 21st century school administration are needed to work in conjunction with teachers to prepare students for the 21st century curriculum, "how to concentrate on learning how to learn, and how to be life long learners, rather than learning momentarily correct facts." They state that in order for this to occur that teachers must change their attitudes towards working with heterogeneous groups and that "they will be eclectic-knowledgeable in instructional methods and curricula with origins in general and special education." They will be experimenters and inventors picking, choosing, combining and recombining methods to actively engage students in their own and others' acquisition of (a) humanistic, public service ethics (b) communication, information-seeking, and problem solving skills, and (c) core curricula deemed essential by the community (Thousand 1991).

Schumm's examined general education teachers' perceptions and feelings about planning for mainstreamed students as well as their planning practices. The questionnaire consisted of six sections: (1) demographics, (2) feelings about planning, (3) information sources,
(4) facilitators and barriers to planning, (5) planning practices, and (6) comments (optional).

Subjects included 775 elementary, middle, and high school teachers representing 39 schools in a metropolitan school district in the Southeast. Respondents paralleled school district demographic profiles in terms of ethnicity, gender, years of teaching experience, and level of education. Expressed feelings of the respondents about planning for mainstreamed students were generally positive with no fewer than 65% of teachers identifying their feelings as positive or somewhat positive; however, teacher planning practices did not necessarily reflect their overall positive feelings about planning. Grade grouping (e.g., elementary, middle school, high school) differences emerged in the planning practices subscale with higher ratings for planning and instructional adaptations for mainstreamed students among elementary teachers, lower for middle school teachers, and even lower for high school teachers. Similarly, middle and high school teachers were less likely to use a variety of information sources when planning for mainstreamed students. One striking result was the lack of use of the IEP as an information source. Classroom teachers viewed fellow professionals (e.g., special education teachers, school based curriculum specialists such as reading resource teachers, and guidance counselors) as those who abet the
planning process. Budgetary factors, access to equipment and materials, and physical environment in the classroom and school were identified as barriers to planning for mainstreamed students (Schumm and Vaughn in press).

A similar study by Haager, investigated teachers' perceptions of the desirability and feasibility of adaptations for mainstreamed students in their regular education classes. Of particular interest was how teachers of different grade levels would respond to adaptations. Results indicated statistically significant differences between the mean desirability and feasibility ratings of each inventory item with all adaptations perceived as more desirable than feasible. Surprisingly few differences between grade groupings surfaced. Finding are discussed in light of relative teacher preferences for various adaptations (Haager in press).

Future research related to the adaptation of mainstreaming students is being conducted by Vaughn. The purpose of the proposed research is to present a two step research program that will (1) determine how teachers collect and use student performance data in daily and long range curricular and instructional planning, and (2) develop and field test interventions that increase classroom teachers' skills, confidence, and motivation in planning for handicapped students in the regular classroom. The focus of this research program is to evaluate planning
processes, not the relationship between planning and student outcomes per se. The proposed project is inclusive of all grade levels of regular classroom teachers, kindergarten through senior high school. This research will be conducted in two phases over a four year period.

The benefits that will result from these studies include: (1) a more comprehensive understanding of preplanning, interactive planning, and postplanning activities used by general education teachers for special education students, (2) a set of materials and procedures for increasing effective planning, and (3) a better understanding of the efficacy of interventions designed to affect teachers' planning and adapting of curricula for special education students (Vaughn In press).

Summary of Related Literature

The implications from the literature on teacher attitudes towards the mainstreaming of handicapped children into the regular classroom indicates that teacher attitudes, perceptions, planning and adaptations greatly effect the success of handicapped students in the mainstream.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) now Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Public Law 101-476) provided the impetus for integration of disabled students and outlined provisions for a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive environment that will
meet each disabled child's individual needs.

Studies relating to teacher attitudes and adaptations toward mainstreaming disabled students and the necessary planning and making adaptations for mainstreamed disabled students in the regular classrooms do not support the EAHCA of 1975 now IDEA of 1990 in the majority of the literature researched in this paper. However, few research studies are reported in this area suggesting the need for further study. Research suggests that teachers' in general did not want to have disabled children in their classrooms and that if they had a choice, they would choose for disabled students to be sent to another teacher's classroom. Research in this area is also limited suggesting a need for further study. Limited research suggests that teachers actually enjoy the responsibility of having disabled children in their classes. Literature reviewed indicate limited teachers planning of instruction and a general unwillingness to make adaptations in their academic curriculum for disabled students in the mainstream. Further research is needed in this area giving the limited amount of research available to date.

Little research was found which supported that teachers actually plan and make adaptations positively if at all in their instructional academic curriculum for mainstreamed students. At least one study by Schumm (in press) found teachers perceptions toward planning for mainstreamed
students as more positive than negative. In contrast, Haager reported that teachers' perceptions of adaptations for mainstreamed students were desirable but not realistically feasible.

The related literature indicates that further research is needed regarding teacher perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs toward disabled students in the mainstream and their perceptions about planning and making accommodations for the instructional academic curriculum for mainstreamed disabled students. The research regarding teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming peeked in the mid-eighties without conclusions. The research available suggests that teacher attitudes must improve by becoming more positive versus negative in order for mainstreamed disabled students in the regular classroom to grown socially and academically.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study is to ascertain, examine and interpret the existing attitudes expressed by elementary teachers toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classrooms. The secondary purpose is to determine if there are any significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children based on the findings of earlier researchers as reported in the literature.

Method of Research

The descriptive survey method of research was used to collect data for this project. This research method was appropriate because this type of survey determines the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study (Ary 1990), and allows for examining present conditions and describes a situation factually and accurately (Leedy (1989).

Selection of the Sample

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

The subjects used in this study were seventy-three (73) elementary classroom teachers chosen from the Teacher's Directory from the Atlanta Area. Each subject received a letter sent to their home by random sampling, subjects selected were employed by the Atlanta Board of Education for the school year 1990-91. Following the random sampling, cover letters along with copies of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory, and self-addressed envelopes were mailed to these teachers. They were asked to complete the inventory and return it on or before March 19, 1991.

The Instrument

Purpose

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

The Mainstreaming Data Inventory

The adapted form of the Mainstreaming Data Inventory consists of two parts: Social-Occupational Characteristics and Mainstreaming Analysis.
The Social-Occupational Characteristics section contains seven items. Each item is concerned with the subject population's social and educational background and present school status in terms of provisions for exceptional children.

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

Statistical Methods for Analysis and Treatment of Data

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

The chi square ($X^2$) test is used to test the difference
between a sample and a previously established distribution. It is also employed with numerical data (Popham 1967).

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

Data collection from the instrument were thoroughly examined. A checklist was used to ascertain whether the responses from the subjects were complete. Frequencies for all variables by groups were processed by the computer to collect data necessary to test the null hypotheses of this study. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation of the collected data resulting from the questionnaires returned by elementary classroom teachers in Atlanta Public Schools. These teachers were employed during the 1990-91 school year in schools containing grades kindergarten through the seventh year, including special education classes.

The Mainstreaming Data Inventory was sent to one-hundred randomly selected elementary school teachers during the spring of 1991. The Atlanta Public Schools Personnel Directory of Elementary School Teachers was the source for selecting of the target population. The total number of respondents was seventy-three (N=73), approximately 75 percent. The subjects varied considerably in age, and teaching experiences.

Descriptive Data

The subjects in this study numbered seventy-three (73): 15 males and 58 females ranging in ages from 25 - 69. These data are reported in Table I.

Data in Table I reveal that 5 (6.8 percent) of the
males were between the ages of 26 - 36 and 7 (9.6 percent) between 37 - 47. The three remaining subjects were between the ages of 48 - 69. The male population of this group constituted 20.5 percent (N=15).

There were more females (79.5 percent) than males (20.5 percent). Only one female (1.4 percent) was 25 or under, with the majority of female teachers falling into the age range of 37 - 47 (N=25). The 59 - 69 age group make up 2.7 percent (N=2) of the total number of subjects.

Table 1
SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>25 or Under</th>
<th>26-36</th>
<th>37-47</th>
<th>48-58</th>
<th>59-69</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data regarding the teaching experience of the subjects showed that 6 (8.2 percent) of the males had served as classroom teachers for 11 - 15 years; 3 (4.1 percent) had taught for 6 - 10 years; and 2 (2.7 percent) had worked for 16 - 20 years; and 2 (2.7 percent) had served for 21 - 30 years; while 12 (1.4 percent) had 31 or above years of experience.

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

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

Socioeconomic status of the school community referred to a community where the families income ranged from $0 - $17,420 for low; $17,421 to $34,000 for middle and $34,001 to $52,480 for high (United States Department of Labor 1991).
Table 2

Types of Programs and Socioeconomic Status of the School Community

| Socioeconomic Status of the School Community | Low | | | Middle | | | | | Upper | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| Types of Program(s)                         | N=49 | Number | Percent | N=21 | Number | Percent | N=3 | Number | Percent |
| None                                        | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Self Contained                              | 11 | 22.4 | 11 | 52.4 | 2 | 66.7 |
| Mainstreamed                                | 27 | 55.1 | 18 | 85.7 | 1 | 33.3 |
| Resource                                    | 39 | 79.6 | 11 | 52.4 | 2 | 66.7 |
| Other                                       | 3 | 6.1 | 3 | 14.2 | 0 | 0.0 |

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

The percentage (85.7) was high in the middle socioeconomic areas for mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes in comparison with the (55.1 percent) being mainstreamed in the low and upper (33.3 percent) socioeconomic communities. The largest percentage of resource room instruction for exceptional children was
found in the low socioeconomic areas (79.6 percent).

One subject (2.4 percent reported no special class programs for exceptional children. The subjects responding in the upper socioeconomic communities indicated special education programs were being implemented through self-contained classes, resource room instruction, and mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classrooms.

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

Table 3
Percentage of Special Education Courses Completed Based on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>25-Under</th>
<th>26-36</th>
<th>37-47</th>
<th>48-58</th>
<th>59-69</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Completed</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Course</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 Courses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 Courses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 13 Courses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above Courses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicated that approximately 29 percent of the subjects in the age range of 26 - 36 had taken 1 - 18 or above courses in special education and remaining 8.2 percent had taken 2 - 3 special education courses. The 37 - 47 age group disclosed that approximately 33 percent of the subjects had taken 1 - 7 courses in the area while 11.0 percent had taken 2 - 3 classes in special education. Subjects in the 48 - 58 age group reported the following: 2.7 percent had taken 2 - 3 courses; 1.4 percent had taken 4 - 7 courses, and the largest percentage of teachers in this (11.0 percent) had taken at least 1 - 3 classes in special education.

In summary, the majority of the elementary school teachers, one (1), had taken 1 special education course. Only two (2) subjects had taken 4 - 7 courses while one (1) had taken 11 - 13, and one (1) subject 18 or above. Eighteen (18) subjects (24.7 percent) had 2 - 3 courses.

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

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

b. Educational goals are individualized.

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

d. The exceptional child cannot compete with other children.

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

f. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences.

g. The self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced.
### Table 4

**Responses To The Mainstreaming Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Educational Goals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The self-concept of exceptional child can be enhanced</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Exceptional Child Cannot Compete</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Exceptional children become more sensitive to their differences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Court Actions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Parental Concerns</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Lack of effective screening and decision-making</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects were asked to identify pertinent variables in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes. They were asked to (1) strongly agree, (2) agree or (3) disagree with each of the seven (7) variables listed above. Data are reported according to the response of each statement below in terms of importance to the highest percents for each variables.
1. Educational goals are individualized, N=45 (61.6 percent). Most of the teachers agreed with item b.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Responses To The Mainstreaming Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num- Per- Num- Per- Num- Per- Num Per- ber cent ber cent ber cent ber cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Responsible for exceptional children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 12.3</td>
<td>43 58.9</td>
<td>16 21.9</td>
<td>3 4.1</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supportive Services Influence Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 15.1</td>
<td>40 54.8</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Advance Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 53.4</td>
<td>28 38.4</td>
<td>4 5.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Without Supportive Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5.5</td>
<td>12 16.4</td>
<td>38 52.1</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>9 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Part of Your Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 11.0</td>
<td>33 45.2</td>
<td>19 26.0</td>
<td>5 6.8</td>
<td>8 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Poor Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 15.1</td>
<td>22 30.1</td>
<td>31 42.5</td>
<td>5 6.8</td>
<td>4 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Competent to Teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5.5</td>
<td>21 28.8</td>
<td>23 31.5</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>15 20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each subject was asked to answer each of the seven (7) questions in the mainstreaming analysis section by choosing one answer (out of five possible responses):
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Agree (3) Disagree (4) Strongly Disagree and (5) Uncertain. Data is reported according to rank order of each statement below in terms of importance according to the percents of those who responded to the various items.

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

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

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

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

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

6. There is poor communication between special teachers and classroom teachers concerning the child's needs and accomplishments. N=31 (42.5 percent). The majority of classroom teachers do not feel that there is poor communication between classroom teachers and special teachers concerning the planning for the child's needs and accomplishments.

7. As a regular classroom teacher you have the training and competency to teach exceptional children even if not provided with supportive services or help. N=23 (31.5 percent). The subjects responding to this question did so by indicating that they do not agree with this statement.

Cross-Tabulation of Variables on the Mainstreaming Data Inventory

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

Sex and Number of Special Education Courses Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Special Education Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-five of the seventy-three teachers have taken courses in special education. There were eight male teachers who had taken special education courses. All eight of the subjects had taken 2 - 3 special education courses, with the remaining seven subjects having taken 1 course in this area.

Forty-seven female subjects had taken special education courses. Forty-three of the female teachers had completed 2 - 3 courses, two had taken 4 - 7, one had taken 11 - 13, and one had taken 18 or above. Eleven of the female subjects had taken 1 course in the area of special education.
Table 7 compared the number of special education courses completed and years of experience as teachers. Their experience as classroom teachers ranged from 1 - 31 or above years.

Table 7

**Years of Experience as Classroom Teacher and Special Education Courses Completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>Years of Experience As Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject within the 1 - 5 years of experience group indicated five teachers had taken 1 special education course while two subjects had taken 2 - 3 courses in special education. There were no teachers in this group who had taken as many as four courses.
Teachers with 6 - 10 years of experience included nine who had taken 1 course and one who had taken 18 or above courses in the area. There were three teachers in this group who had taken 2 - 3 special education courses. The total number of teachers who had taken special education courses in this group was thirteen.

Subjects within the 11 - 15 years of experience group indicated a high of thirteen who had taken 1 course in special education. Two of the remaining subjects in this group had taken one course each in the area, while seven subjects indicated they had taken 2 - 3 special education courses.

Within the 16 - 20 years of experience group, eleven subjects had completed 1 special education course. One subject had taken 4 - 7 courses in the area and three teachers had taken 2 - 3 special education classes. None of the teachers in this area had taken eight or more courses in special education. The total number of teachers who had taken courses in this area was fifteen.

Five subjects represented the 31 or above year group and two had taken 1 course in the area while three had taken 2 - 3 courses in special education.

In summary, the largest number of teachers (N=51) had taken 1 course in the area. Two subjects had 4 - 7 courses, while one teacher had 11 - 13 courses and one had taken 18 or above courses with eighteen subjects.
indicating they had taken 2 - 3 special education courses.

Testing the Hypotheses

This section of the study deals with testing of the following seven null hypotheses. The hypothesis is declared to be true if the calculated value exceeds the table value (Alder 1984).

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

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

Table 8
Age of Teacher and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Teacher</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - Under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expressed Attitudes

Strongly Agree (f) Agree (f) Disagree (f) Strongly Disagree (f) Uncertain (f)
Table 8 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Teacher</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37-47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( f = \) absolute frequency

\( X^2 = 12.41475 \) not significant at .05 level

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

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

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

Sex and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

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

f = absolute frequency

$$X^2 = 10.08820$$ significant at .05 level

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

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

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

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

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

f = absolute frequency

\( x^2 = 9.74288 \) not significant at .05 level

The calculated value for chi square was 9.74288 and the table value was 31.41 with twenty degrees of freedom; therefore null hypothesis was accepted.

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

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

Table 11

Special Education Courses Completed and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Courses Completed</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute frequency

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

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

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

Table 12

Socioeconomic Status of the Community and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status of the Community</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute frequency
\[ X^2 = 4.67949 \text{ not significant at } .05 \text{ level} \]

The calculated value for chi square was 4.67949 and the table value was 5.99 with two degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

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

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

**Table 13**

**Special Education Programs and Expressed Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Exceptional Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressed Attitudes</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Special Programs</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ f = \text{absolute frequency} \]
\[ x^2 = 2.07002 \text{ not significant at .05 level} \]

The calculated value for chi square was 2.07002 and the table value was 9.49 with four degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressed Attitudes</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (f)</th>
<th>Agree (f)</th>
<th>Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (f)</th>
<th>Uncertain (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Work Experience Where Special Classes and/or Services are Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = absolute frequency

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

The calculated value for chi square was 2.66382 and the table value was 9.49 with four degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to obtain attitudes expressed by elementary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes following the implementation of the requirements mandated by P.L. 94-142. Few studies have sought to investigate the attitudes of educators toward mainstreaming since the period recently following program implementation in the early eighties.

Specifically, this study sought to:

1. Ascertain, examine and interpret the existing attitudes expressed by regular classroom teachers in Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia, during the 1990-91 school year.

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

This study was based on a random sample population (N=73) of elementary classroom teachers in Atlanta Public School System during the 1990-91 school year.

Interpretation and Discussion

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

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

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

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

The literature does not state that age is or is not a determining factor in mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes.
2. There are no significant differences in expressed attitudes toward mainstreaming of exceptional children between male and female elementary classroom teachers.

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

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

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

This hypothesis is supported by studies conducted by Want (1982) who reported that teachers' attitudes toward school, children, and teaching did not seem to be affected by teaching experience. That their attitudes became more homogeneous with experience, while the degree of negativeness or positiveness appeared to remain constant.

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

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

Data collected by (Birch and Shotel and Iano and McGettigan 1978) in their investigations of training for teachers do not show that the number of academic courses in special education is a determinant of attitudes toward mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes. However, these authors suggest that inservice workshops, seminars, continuing education, conferences and special courses on methods and techniques for working with the handicapped might considerably affect these educators' attitudes and the success of the mainstreaming program.

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

A chi square value of 4.67949 indicated that there is no significant expressed attitudinal differences among socioeconomic status of the school community.
A closer look at the data indicates that the range of agreement on items by the respondents working in low and middle income communities was very close, N=11 (low income area) and N=9 (middle income area). However, the subjects in the low income areas were in disagreement (N=22) in expressing their attitudes toward mainstreaming at an exceptionally higher rate than the middle income area (N=2) and upper income area (N=0) subjects.

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

Teacher expectations about the performance of children can come to serve a self-fulfilling prophecy. Studies by Herriott and St. John (1985) reported that the lower the socioeconomic status of the schools the smaller the proportion of teachers who held favorable opinions about the motivation and behavior of their pupils.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Elementary schools within the three socioeconomic communities (low, middle, and upper) provided to some extent self-contained classes, mainstreaming, and resource room instruction for exceptional children. Schools within the middle socioeconomic communities had the largest percentage (85.7) of pupils being mainstreamed. The low socioeconomic communities retained the largest percentage (79.6) for resource room instruction.
4. Teachers between 37 - 47 years (43.8 percent) disagreed as well as agreed with the concept of mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes more than any other group.

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

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

7. The majority of the elementary classroom teachers N=51 (69.9 percent) had taken 1 special education course.

Implications

The implications occurring from the findings of this study are stated below:

1. The finding that mainstreaming was an extensively established educational practice in Atlanta Public Schools, although sixty eight percent of the sample population did
not express favorable attitudes toward being an "advocate" of mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes implies that teachers should be included more in the decision-making, planning and implementation of programs that they are expected to effectively implement. This finding also suggests the need for further training in the area of special education. It does not appear that one special education course significantly impacts or promotes a positive attitude in teachers regarding mainstreaming.

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

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

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

5. The finding that a majority of the teachers ranked the following variables as reasons for mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classes: educational goals are individualized; the self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced; court actions; parental concerns and rejection of labeling of the children implies that the teachers are aware of the reasons (as revealed in the literature) for mainstreaming.

**Recommendations**

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

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

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

3. That the planning and establishing of goals for exceptional children be done by involving the regular classroom teacher as well as other personnel that will be working with the exceptional child.
4. That considerable attention be given to the fact that teachers play a most significant role in establishing an effective program for mainstreaming of exceptional children into regular classes. Therefore, provisions for teacher input, group discussions and teacher to teacher conferences and discussions should be given top priority throughout the school system.

5. That faculty in the school need support and assistance in developing mainstreaming and they are the best source of information about their needs.
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APPENDIX
Appendix A

Instrument
DATA INVENTORY

Strictly Confidential

Directions: This data inventory consists of two parts:

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

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

PART I: SOCIAL-OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

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

2. What is your sex?
   _____ Male  _____ Female
3. Number of years as a classroom teacher.
   _____ 1-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ 11-15
   _____ 16-20
   _____ 21-30
   _____ 31 or above
   _____ None

4. Number of courses that you have taken in Special Education and/or Exceptional Education.
   _____ 1-3
   _____ 4-7
   _____ 8-10
   _____ 11-13
   _____ 14-17
   _____ 18 or above
   _____ None

5. Socioeconomic status of community where the school is located (check one).
   _____ low     _____ middle     _____ upper
6. Types of program(s) in your school for exceptional children.

_____Self-contained classes
_____Mainstreamed classes
_____Resource room
_____None
_____Other (Specify): ______________________

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

_____Yes  _____No

---

PART II: MAINSTREAMING ANALYSIS

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

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

_____Strongly agree
_____Agree
_____Disagree

b. Educational goals are individualized.

_____Strongly agree
_____Agree
_____Disagree
c. Parental concerns are being expressed more directly and forcefully.
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree

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

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

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

  g. The self-concept of the exceptional child can be enhanced.
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree
Please choose one answer for each of the following questions and place a check mark in the space provided.

9. As a regular classroom teacher you feel competent to teach (meet the educational needs of) exceptional children.
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree
   ____ Uncertain

10. Teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed is a part of your job.
    ____ Strongly agree
    ____ Agree
    ____ Disagree
    ____ Strongly disagree
    ____ Uncertain

11. Basically, as a regular classroom teacher, you are responsible for teaching exceptional children who have been mainstreamed into regular classes.
    ____ Strongly agree
    ____ Agree
    ____ Disagree
    ____ Strongly disagree
    ____ Uncertain
12. Working with supportive services in your school would make a difference in your attitude toward teaching exceptional children.

[Blank] Strongly agree
[Blank] Agree
[Blank] Disagree
[Blank] Strongly disagree
[Blank] Uncertain

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

[Blank] Strongly agree
[Blank] Agree
[Blank] Disagree
[Blank] Strongly disagree
[Blank] Uncertain

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

[Blank] Strongly agree
[Blank] Agree
[Blank] Disagree
[Blank] Strongly disagree
[Blank] Uncertain
15. There is poor communication between special teachers and classroom teachers concerning the child's needs and accomplishments.

_____ Strongly agree
_____ Agree
_____ Disagree
_____ Strongly disagree
_____ Uncertain

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

_____ Strongly agree
_____ Agree
_____ Disagree
_____ Strongly disagree
_____ Uncertain
Dear

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

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

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

Please answer this questionnaire with thoughtfulness, and promptness. Send it as soon as possible, on or before March 19, 1991. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

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

Please return to:

Ms. Felicia Ward
Peterson Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia 30316

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

Sincerely yours,

Felicia Ward