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For decades, the general attitude of society toward the handicapped has been one of neglect, rejection and denial. The handicapped have been denied the right to (1) education, (2) job training, and (3) employment for many years. However, such negative attitudes on the part of society are now beginning to change. With the passing of time, new legislation, acts of congress and presidential policy statements, society has come to realize that the handicapped population is here to stay and that the handicapped represent a new force to be reckoned with.

The major purpose of the study was to investigate the attitudes of 84 vocational teachers toward mainstreaming handicapped students in vocational training programs. More specifically, the study purports:

1. To determine the general attitudes of a group of vocational teachers toward mainstreaming.

2. To determine the specific attitudes of a group of vocational teachers toward handicapped students participating in vocational training programs.

3. To determine if there is a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels of teachers.

4. To determine if there is a significant difference between attitudes and instructional areas of teachers.

The respondents involved in this study were 84 vocational teachers selected by the writer from a staff of approximately 120 teachers. The
84 respondents were selected because they had all completed the HB-671 class (a general course in the education, identification and classification of handicapped students required for certification in Georgia), conducted by the writer. The approximate years of teaching experience of the respondents range from a low of 3 years to a high of 27 years. The educational levels of the respondents range from the vocational permit level with no college training to the Education Specialist with 6 years of college training.

The descriptive survey method of research was used to conduct this study. The data were gathered through the use of a locally prepared research instrument entitled: *Vocational Teacher's Attitude Scale*. The instrument consisted of 20 statements which required a positive (strongly agree or agree) or negative (strongly disagree or disagree) response. The statistical procedures and techniques of frequency distribution, percentiles, Chi-square and grid analysis were utilized for data interpretation and analysis.

**Selected Findings**

1. The general attitude of these vocational teachers toward mainstreaming was positive.
   a. There was a significant difference between general attitudes and educational levels of these teachers. The difference in the case of the vocational permit teachers proved significant.
   b. There was a significant difference between general attitudes and instructional areas. The difference in the case of the Business Education, Child Development, Health Occupations, Skill Trades, Home Economics and Personal Service teachers proved significant.
2. The specific attitude of these vocational teachers toward handicapped students participating in vocational training programs was negative.

   a. There was a significant difference between specific attitudes and attitudes of these teachers. The difference in the case of the vocational permit, Bachelor degree and Education Specialist proved significant.

   b. There was a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels. The difference in the case of the Business Education, Construction/Technical, Health Occupations, Home Economics and Personal Service proved significant.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The history of mankind's care and concern for the handicapped is sad indeed. For decades, the general attitude of society toward the handicapped has been one of neglect, rejection and denial. The handicapped as a group have been systematically denied their civil rights—the right to education, training, jobs and housing. For too long, the handicapped have experienced almost complete isolation from the mainstream of society with little hope for change in the attitudes of society toward them.

As a minority group, the handicapped have traditionally had to operate in an environment filled with prejudice—an unequal treatment resulting from society's negative attitudes toward them. Such negative attitudes presented themselves in the schools, in city, state and federal governmental agencies, in business and in industry. One only has to examine the record to see the gross neglect or failure on the part of the schools to provide for accurate and appropriate labeling, classification and training, to be convinced that attitudes have played a significant role in decisions made by educators regarding the handicapped student population.

City, state and federal governmental agencies have demonstrated out-right neglect and exclusion of the handicapped in terms of assessibility, availability and equality of opportunity in all aspects of
services provided for the handicapped by these agencies. By and large, the most blatant incidences of prejudice toward the handicapped has occurred in business and industry. The handicapped have been almost non-existent in any appreciable numbers in employment. The greatest indictment on business and industry, however, has been their failure to make their services and products easily accessible to the handicapped.

Such negative attitudes on the part of society are changing. Some positive changes have taken place during the past few years. Even so, the handicapped still do not have full access to an equal opportunity to (1) education, (2) job training, (3) employment and (4) the pursuit of happiness resulting from living a productive life as contributing members of society.

With the passing of time, new legislation, Acts of Congress and presidential policy statements, society at last, has at least come to realize, that the handicapped population is here to stay and that they represent a new force to be reckoned with. The handicapped themselves have demonstrated their unwillingness to remain a silent minority. Organizations for the handicapped have banded together throughout this country to demand equality of opportunity. Likewise, parents of handicapped children are no longer keeping their children from public view. Gone are the days when handicapped children are locked in dark closets like dark secrets to be buried and forgotten or placed in attics and dark rooms completely isolated from the public, family and friends.

Today, the handicapped are no longer looked upon as hopeless burdens by society. The increasing efforts on the part of President Jimmy Carter and members of organizations for the handicapped represent
hope for the future. Such efforts are sources of courage for many handicapped persons to face the future with optimism. This courage is demonstrated by the presence of handicapped persons, in increasing numbers, in job skill training programs, in employment and in many other areas of the mainstream of life as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The time for dramatic change is now upon us. Public laws and policies have been established at the local, state and federal levels to protect the rights of the handicapped. Even the courts have spoken to the issue of equality of opportunity for the handicapped. In the early 1970's, in Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, the courts ruled that those states "could not apply any local policy that would either postpone, terminate or deny any handicapped person access to a publicly supported education. The courts further decreed that the states must provide a free education for all handicapped children between the ages of 6 and 21." 1

Following those precedent setting cases, all but two states, by 1975, had adopted some form of mandatory law designed to insure the handicapped the right to a publicly supported education. Today, all 50 states have enacted such legislation. However, with the passage of Public Law (P.L.) 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974 and the requirements of the act, caused many states to have second thoughts. The requirement that in order for states to participate in the financial assistance available under the act, programs of full educational opportunities for all handicapped children, had to be established. This

caused many states to refuse the financial assistance rather than comply with the act.

Approximately one year and three months following passage of P.L. 93-380, on November 29, 1975, Public Law (P.L.) 94-142 was passed. "The law is not revolutionary in terms of what it requires, nor is it revolutionary in terms of a role for the federal government. P.L. 94-142 represents the standards that have over the past eight years been laid down by the courts, legislation and other policy-making bodies of our country. Much of what was set forth in P.L. 94-142 was set forth in P.L. 93-380."¹

Neither public policy, legislation, Acts of Congress, the courts nor presidential policy statements can legislate the attitudes of society toward the handicapped. Such is the case with P.L. 94-142 which represents the beginning of the end of the final phase of the revolution to achieve public policy affirming the right of the handicapped to an education.

This law does not deal with the larger problems of attitudes of educators toward the handicapped and the effects of the present level that training teachers have to meet the special and unique needs of the handicapped. The act also does not attempt to deal with the effects of teacher attitudes on the success of the handicapped student. It would seem that significant emphasis should be placed on these major concerns. It appears, however, that the Congress deemed it more appropriate for state legislators to address these issues. The failure of Congress to

address affects of attitudes and teacher training may reflect the varying
degrees and kinds of attitudes the members of the United States Congress
have toward the handicapped.

However, three distinguished Georgia State Representatives, Burton
of the 47th, Patten of the 146th and Noble of the 48th Districts, gained
passage of House Bill (HB) 671 which requires that all educators complete
a course of five or more quarter hours in the education, identification
and classification of students who have special educational needs. This
bill was designed to prepare educators for the mainstreaming of handi-
capped students.

Although HB. 671 does not attempt to deal with attitudes, in this
writer's viewpoint, the act clearly reveals the implication that the act
will provide an opportunity for all educators to acquaint themselves
with the handicapped students and their special and unique needs. The
bill also provides the opportunity for educators in Georgia to engage in
activities designed to foster acceptable attitudes while developing skills
and resources to meet the needs of the students.

What affects, if any, have the laws, bills, acts and/or policies
had on the attitudes of educators—maybe time will tell. One thing is
certain, however, neither the laws nor the courts will really make the
significant difference. The real difference comes only when those persons
responsible for providing education and training for the handicapped
fully accept the handicapped as human beings with the same basic needs,
desires, hopes and dreams as regular students—who desperately need and
want to be loved, respected and accepted.

The handicapped have rarely experienced such love and acceptance.
School administrators and teachers alike, tend to find convenient ways to discriminate against the handicapped. It seems that teachers fear that the presence of the handicapped will impede the progress of regular students. Some teachers tend to feel that the handicapped should be taught by specially trained teachers in special classes and special schools. Still others tend to feel that handicapped students, regardless of their training, will not enter the job market—a major concern of vocational teachers.

While educators struggle with this dilemma, the handicapped student continues to be banned from much of the mainstream of society in large numbers—despite the policies and laws. This trend will continue to exist until those persons whose job it is to teach and train the handicapped, fully understand their own attitudes toward the handicapped. Once that has been accomplished, educators can accept as part of their professional commitment, responsibility for improving the lives of the weakest members of our society—the handicapped.

What then, is the role of mainstreaming in this commitment? There is a pressing need for understanding among educators as to what is meant by mainstreaming as it relates to P.L.-94-142. For the purposes of the law, "mainstreaming means that handicapped students will be allowed to participate in training programs with regular students and that segregated classes can be used only if it is more appropriate than the integrated class."

"This does not mean that all handicapped students will be "unloaded" on regular teachers and regular students or that special education classes will or should be eliminated. It does mean—or should mean—that those
handicapped students who, after careful screening, are considered able to profit from learning with regular students without detriment to either group, would be assigned to regular classes. For some handicapped students, this might merely mean integration with other students for non-academic work, such as physical education. For others, it might mean almost the opposite—assignment to a regular class plus special education as appropriate, e.g., intensive language training.¹

Once special and regular educators reach an agreement as to the implications of mainstreaming as it applies to P.L. 94-142, it is likely that regular educators would support mainstreaming for the handicapped.

Some vocational educators are not familiar with the laws affecting education of the handicapped other than the Education Amendments of 1976. This law simply requires that 10 percent of Federal Vocational funds going to the states be spent on vocational education for the handicapped. Many vocational schools satisfy the requirements of this law by providing special classes for the handicapped usually of a pre-vocational nature or academic remediation. Thus, many vocational teachers do not understand that P.L. 94-142 is designed to provide a free and appropriate public education for all handicapped students, including special education and related services.

It seems to this writer that the greatest barrier to mainstreaming of the handicapped has been lack of communication among special educators and regular vocational educators. It is therefore, incumbent upon these two groups to initiate an aggressive articulation program whereby regular

and special teachers share in designing favorable learning experiences both for handicapped and for regular students in the vocational school. This can be achieved if both regular and special educators work together to achieve a common goal.

This is not to suggest that P.L. 94–142 mandates mainstreaming; it does not. But, the law clearly states that handicapped students should be educated with students who are not handicapped unless the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Evolution of the Problem

The writer has observed that many vocational teachers in certain training programs probably do not want handicapped students to be mainstreamed in vocational training programs. The writer has heard vocational teachers in certain training programs make such statements as the following:

1. Handicapped students should be trained in special classes for the handicapped.

2. Handicapped students want to attend school just to draw state checks.

3. It is too dangerous for handicapped students to be in my shops and labs.

4. Handicapped students in regular classes impede the progress of regular students.

5. Handicapped students take-up too much of my time.

6. Handicapped students will never get a job in my field.

7. I am not trained to teach the handicapped.
8. My curriculum is not designed for handicapped students, and

9. Handicapped students do not want to be mainstreamed.

The writer is of the opinion that a study of the attitudes of vocational teachers toward the handicapped and toward mainstreaming is needed in order to move toward an acceptable procedure for implementing P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act as mandated by Congress.

Statement of the Problem

Do Vocational Teachers Have Positive or Negative Attitudes Toward Handicapped Students?

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of the study was to investigate the attitudes of a group of vocational teachers toward mainstreaming. More specifically, this study purports:

1. To determine the general attitudes of a group of vocational teachers toward mainstreaming.

2. To determine the specific attitudes of a group of vocational teachers toward handicapped students participating in vocational training programs.

3. To determine the relationship of educational levels and attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped and mainstreaming.

4. To determine the relationship of instructional areas and attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped and mainstreaming.

Definition of Terms

There seems to be a general lack of understanding of certain basic terminology as it relates to special education among regular and special
educators. It seems appropriate then, to define the following terms used in the study for purposes of clarity.

1. "Attitude—refers to the sum total of one's inclinations and feelings—prejudiced or biased, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats and convictions about or toward any defined person or group."

2. "Handicapped Student—refers to the mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed or students with specific learning disabilities who require special educational and related services."

3. Attitude Scale—refers to the instrument designed by the writer to gather data for this study. The instrument consisted of twenty statements which required a positive or a negative response.

4. Vocational Permit—refers to the type of certificate issued to vocational teachers that have not received any college training. These teachers are high school graduates or have earned the G.E.D. Certificate. The State Department of Vocational Education requires teachers with vocational permits to earn ten quarter hours college credit and/or in-service training annually in order to renew the permit to teach.

5. "P.L. 94–142—refers to the Education for the Handicapped Act of 1975. The '94' indicates that the law was passed by the 94th Congress. The '142' indicates that the law was the 142nd law passed by the Congress and signed by the president in 1975."

---


3 Georgia's Vocational Education State Plan (Georgia State Department of Vocational Education, 1975): 2.

4 Joseph Ballard and Jeffrey Zettel, p. 178.
6. "Section 504—refers to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973. Section 504 is a basic civil rights provision with respect to terminating discrimination against America's handicapped citizens."1

7. "HB. 671—refers to The 1976 Bill, Entitled An Act, Which Amended the 'Adequate Program for Education In Georgia Act' by adding subsection (C) which states that: After July 1, 1976, any person certified as a teacher, principal or guidance counselor pursuant to passage of the Bill shall have satisfactorily completed a course of five or more quarter hours in the education, identification and classification of children who have special educational needs."2

8. Mentally Retarded—refers to individuals whose rate of intellectual development is significantly less than the normal rate and their potential for academic achievement is estimated to be markedly less than that expected of persons with a normal rate of intellectual development.

9. Hard of Hearing—refers to individuals who can hear and understand speech, but with difficulty. The speech must be loud and the individual must use a hearing aid, or lip reading along with a hearing aid, to supplement his own hearing.

10. Deaf—refers to individuals who are unable to hear and recognize all speech sounds. Even the amplification of sound provided with a hearing aid will not enable these individuals to hear and recognize sounds.

11. Orthopedically Impaired—refers to individuals who have a limited ability in self-mobility, sitting in a classroom, and/or using materials or equipment for learning because of muscular, skeletal, or neuro-muscular impairment.

12. Other Health Impaired—refers to individuals who have limited strength, vitality and alertness because of chronic health problems such as heart conditions, tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, infectious hepatitis, asthma, epilepsy, leukemia, diabetes, and other illnesses.3

---

1 Ibid., p. 178.
2 Georgia's Vocational Education State Plan, p. 2.
13. Speech Impaired—refers to individuals who have speech patterns that differ from the normal to an extent which is noticeable. Some speech disorders are articulatory, vocal, stuttering, delayed speech, and speech disorders associated with cleft palate, hearing impairment, or cerebral.

14. Visually Handicapped—refers to individuals severely limited in their ability to see or whose vision is limited even with correction to the extent that modifications must be made in program, equipment, materials, and/or facilities if they are to be able to succeed in a vocational program.

15. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed—refers to individuals who suffer from psychiatric disturbances which limit their ability to govern their own behavior. These disturbances are of such a nature and severity as to require one or more special educational or other type of services.

16. Specific Learning Disabilities—refers to individuals who exhibit a disorder in one or more basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written language. These processes may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or simple computing. The term includes conditions which have been referred to as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, dyslexia, development asphasis, etc.1

17. Core program—refers to the instructional program in which the student receives the major portion of his instruction in a planned program of study in the vocational school where the respondents of the study are employed.

18. Mainstreaming—refers to moving handicapped students from their segregated status in special education classes and integrating them with regular students in regular classes.

19. Vocational education—refers to organized educational programs that are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment or for additional preparation for a career requiring less than a college degree.

20. Free and appropriate education—refers to the concept that handicapped students will be provided, at no extra cost to the student, education which is as much like that provided for other students as possible.

1Ibid., pp. 14-16.
21. Least restrictive environment—refers to the learning environment provided by the school to meet the unique needs of the handicapped—it may well mean that "least restrictive" for some students will be a separate, protective environment.

22. Special education—refers to vocational education consisting of instruction specially designed to meet the unique needs of handicapped students.²

23. Related Services—refers to transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services including speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, and medical and counseling services, except that such medical services shall be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only as may be required to assist a handicapped student to benefit from special education.³

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to data collected by the writer from eighty-four vocational teachers employed in the school where the study was conducted. Each of the respondents had been enrolled in the HB-671 class conducted by the writer in the spring of 1976.

The major limitation imposed upon this study was the validity of the responses by the respondents. This was due largely to the fact that attitudes are subjective and to the perhaps questionable validity and reliability of the instrument used to gather the data.

Therefore, the writer assumes that the responses made by the respondents are valid or, at best represented their attitudes toward the handicapped and mainstreaming at the time the study was conducted.

¹National Education Association, Today's Education, pp. 18-19.
³Ibid.
Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in a selected vocational school in a large metropolitan city. The school has an enrollment of approximately fifteen hundred students of which approximately 15 per cent are handicapped. The curriculum consists of approximately 40 core programs clustered into the divisions of Business Education, Child Development Construction/Technical, Food Services, Graphic Arts, Health Occupations, Home Economics, Personal Services and Skill Trades.

Description of Respondents

The respondents involved in this study were eighty-four vocational teachers selected by the writer from a staff of approximately one hundred and twenty teachers. Eighty-four teachers were selected from the staff who completed the HB-671 in-service class conducted in the spring of 1976. The approximate years of teaching experience range from a low of three years to a high of twenty-seven years. The educational levels of the respondents range from "0" years of college training with a vocational permit to teach, to a high of six years of college training with an Education Specialist Degree and the six-year certificate to teach.

Method of Research

The descriptive Survey Method of research was used to conduct this study. The statistical procedures and techniques of frequency distribution, percentiles, chi square and grid analysis were utilized for data interpretation and analysis.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The writer experienced great difficulty in locating research that deals with vocational education and the handicapped in general and attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped in particular. It seems that very little research has been conducted to determine attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped. The literature which appeared to be pertinent to this study and which seemed most likely to make any significant contribution to this study was reviewed, organized and presented as follows:

1. Attitudes of Teachers and Other Professionals Toward the Handicapped.

2. Attitudes of Peers Toward the Handicapped.

3. Attitudes of Parents and Siblings Toward the Handicapped.

4. Community Attitudes Toward the Handicapped.

**Attitudes of Teachers and Other Professionals Toward the Handicapped**

Brooks and Bransford in a study of 30 regular classroom teachers, used a semantic differential to measure perception toward 8 special education concepts, concluded that regular teachers held negative attitudes toward special education.
Citing Dunn, (1968) Brooks and Bransford report that opponents of mainstreaming are adamant in their rejection to handicapped students attending classes with regular students. The attitudes of opponents to mainstreaming did not appear to be affected by teaching experience or knowledge of the handicapping condition.¹

Combs and Harper, citing Harrings' study (1967) found that the attitudes and understanding teachers have about the handicapped are influential in determining the intellectual, social and emotional adjustment of the handicapped student.²

Combs and Harper, citing Wandts' study of teachers' attitudes toward teaching the handicapped, found that attitudes did not seem to be affected by teaching experience. However, Wandts' study revealed that attitudes toward the handicapped as a group became more homogeneous with experience, while the degree of negativeness or positiveness appeared to remain constant.

Combs and Harper (1967) conducted a study to determine the effects of labels on attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped and the relationship of attitudes and teaching experience. The results revealed that no significant difference was found between experienced and inexperienced teachers in their description of the handicapped. However, both groups showed more negative attitudes toward the handicapped students whose labels were known by the respondents than toward those whose labels were not known.

²Ronald H. Combs and Jerry Harper, "Effects of Labels on Attitudes
Combs and Harper, citing Majors' (1961) study report that experience may actually increase some teachers' rejection of the handicapped. Majors found that teachers with many years of teaching experience tended to have less favorable attitudes toward the handicapped than teachers with only a few years of teaching experience.

Semmal, (1969) studying the attitudes of regular and special teachers regarding mental deficiency found that special teachers had more knowledge of the subject, and that regular teachers lacked a knowledge of both medical and vocational ramifications of the condition. The results revealed that both groups showed an equally high positive attitude score. Semmal's findings questioned the implied relationship between correct information and positive attitude scores as reported by some researchers.

Warren and Turner's study (1966) to ascertain attitudes toward the handicapped of students planning on entering professions which focus on services to the handicapped and on personnel presently engaged in the profession, revealed some startling results. The study revealed that the retarded are the least preferred by all professionals and pre-professionals except for those teachers currently teaching the retarded and are well acquainted with all handicapping conditions.

Warren and Turner (1967) found that education students tend to prefer

---

1Ibid., p. 403.

2M. J. Semmal, "Teacher Attitudes and Information Pertaining to Mental Deficiency," American Journal of Mental Deficiency 63 No. 3 (March 1959): 566-574.
to work with the academically talented and prefer not to work with the mentally retarded and the brain injured. Direct experiences with the blind, hearing-impaired and retarded resulted in more favorable attitudes toward the blind and hearing-impaired, but resulted in even more negative attitudes toward the retarded.¹

Using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the professional information section of the National Teachers' Examination, LaBue (1969) found a significant correlation between classroom attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped and the amount of professional information they possessed. The results also revealed more favorable attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped in situations outside the classroom.²

Warren and Turner, reporting on Polonsky's study, (1961) which described belief and opinion of psychiatric technicians concerning mental deficiency, found that there was only a slight difference in the direction of greater knowledge ability of technicians as compared with laymen. Polonsky used the Mental Deficiency Misconception Scale to gather data from psychiatric technicians and laymen. The results do not support LaBue's findings that there is a significant correlation between attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped and the amount of professional information they possessed. The results also suggest that opinions are but one aspect of general ideological orientation toward the handicapped.³

³Warren and Turner, p. 137.
Bellizia, writing in *Today's Education*, noted that her experience with mainstreaming of the handicapped students in her resource room "has been beneficial beyond her expectations". She states "that children who sat in classrooms feeling stupid are now happier and they understand their learning problems better". Further, she states that, "psychologically, the handicapped students are benefitting. I think they feel 'special' rather than dumb." She noted, however, that mainstreaming is both a help and a hindrance.¹

Although Bellizia expressed a favorable attitude toward mainstreaming, she quickly pointed out that handicapped students create enormous work loads for teachers in terms of extra reports, additional paper work and the constant checking and monitoring of student progress. However, Bellizia did note that teachers may be rewarded beyond their expectations because the work is challenging and the handicapped student is so eager to learn and shows his appreciation and gratefulness in such nice ways that the teacher is more than rewarded for the extra work.

Major, writing in *The Elementary School Journal*, contends that too much emphasis and resources are focused on changing attitudes of teachers toward the handicapped, changing the attitudes of the handicapped toward themselves and changing the attitudes of parents, siblings and peers toward the handicapped. In fact, Major rejects the notion that an attitudinal problem toward the handicapped exists. She feels that the

---

problem lies in inadequate teaching materials and resources being made available to teachers, insufficient assistance from special education specialists provided for regular teachers, and class size and effects of the handicapped student on the teacher's time.

Major does concede, however, that many teachers feel that they have made heavy investments to become teachers and that it will not be easy for them to accept the handicapped because they are deemed to be disruptive to the point of destroying the teacher's image, good record and relationships with regular students.¹

Joslin believes that mainstreaming of the handicapped can have a positive affect on the relationship between regular and special teachers as well as regular and special students. Mainstreaming tends to provide a "social promotion" for the special teachers and both groups benefit from the partnership as they work together to meet the needs of special learners.²

McGrath's attitude toward mainstreaming is that all students have special needs of one kind or another and he has become sensitive to that fact. He blames shortsightedness in the extreme on the part of teachers for their negative attitudes toward the special needs learner.³

¹Iris Major, "How Do We Accept the Handicapped?" The Elementary School Journal 61 No. 6 (March 1961): 361-378.


Although McGrath is in favor of mainstreaming the handicapped, he agrees with the findings of researchers that handicapped students in regular classes place enormous demands on regular teachers who have neither training or adequate resources to meet the special needs of handicapped students.

Clark (1976) describes problems encountered by the California School System relating to Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children with Handicaps as a result of that system's Master Plan for Special Education. Clark describes the attitudes of the teachers as initially being objectionable to teaching the handicapped. However, she noted that after providing appropriate in-service for teachers, the feelings of uncertainty and insecurity on the part of the teachers diminished. The teachers no longer feared failure on their part as to what harm they may have on the development of the handicapped if they failed to offer optimal instruction.

Direct experiences of teachers with the handicapped resulted in more positive attitudes. It became apparent to many teachers that a child has more in common with the population of all children than in common with others who share a handicap.¹

Halloran found attitudinal barriers among vocational educators toward the handicapped as reflected by national enrollment figures. In 1975, only 1.7 percent of the total enrollments in vocational programs were handicapped. Further, two-thirds of the vocational programs provided were pre-vocational, non-skilled, diagnostic, mobility training

or sheltered workshops. Of the handicapped students enrolled, 70 percent were placed in special vocational classes.¹

Thus the need is great for training vocational educators to work with the handicapped and to provide experiences that will help them reduce their apprehensions about working with handicapped students. One change that would help is for non-handicapped people to become aware of their tendency to focus on individual disability, on what handicapped persons are unable to do, rather than upon their abilities. This negative perception, with its expectations of limits and failure, must be changed if handicapped students are to be encouraged to reach their potential.²

Harth (1971) conducted a survey of 146 professionals to determine the extent to which there was support for undergraduate programs in emotional disturbance from professionals concerned with the preparation of teachers; to determine the reasons these professionals either favored or did not favor such programs and to determine the number of colleges and universities that were either operating an undergraduate program or anticipated developing one in the near future.

The results of the survey indicated that 55 percent of the respondents favored undergraduate preparation programs in emotional disturbance. Twenty-five percent of the respondents were not in favor of such programs. Six percent of the respondents were either undecided. Finally, 14 percent of the selected professionals did not participate in the survey. The major reasons given by the professionals for favoring undergraduate

²Ibid.
programs revolved around manpower issues and curricular issues. The manpower category reflected the feeling that undergraduates are a potentially useful manpower supply. The curricular issue reflected the notion that the four years of training at the undergraduate level is more desirable than the one year at the master's level.

The major reason presented for not favoring undergraduate preparation revolved around curricular issues. The concerns here were that the undergraduate years are not long enough and that the programs are too specialized for undergraduates. The opinion was also expressed that undergraduate education should focus on normal children and graduate education should focus on deviant children.¹

Guerin and Szatlocky (1974) investigated the attitudes of educators toward integrating the mildly retarded with regular students. The study examined 8 California school districts. Interviews were conducted with 17 administrators and 31 teachers. Four program models were identified and an index of integration was developed and applied to each program model.

The first model consists of partial integration. Students were assigned to special classes but were programmed into regular classes for blocks of time by subject areas. The second model consists of a combination class, special students were enrolled in small sized regular classrooms. Special materials were available, and also aides were provided. The third model consists of the Learning Resource Center. The special

¹Robert Harth, "Attitudes Concerning Undergraduate Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of the Emotionally Disturbed," Exceptional Children 33 No. 7 (March 1971): 540-544.
teacher functioned as the specialist. Special students from regular classes used the center for evaluations, prescriptions, planning and tutorial assistance. The fourth model consists of the learning disability group. The students were members of a regular classroom and were seen by the special teacher for supplementary education. Aides and special materials were provided.

The results revealed that the attitudes of the staff toward the integrated programs and the handicapped were positive. All but one of the administrators held positive attitudes. In the one exception, the administrator expressed a neutral attitude. Teachers, however, were less consistent. Positive attitudes were held by 62 percent of the teaching staffs. Another 19 percent held neutral attitudes, while 19 percent were negative. There was also great similarity of attitudes among those teachers who worked on the same staff. Hence, a negative attitude on the part of a special teacher was associated with negative attitudes on the part of the regular teachers on the same staff. When special teachers on the same staff held different attitudes, the regular teachers held attitudes similar to those of the special teacher with whom they directly worked.¹

Gegelka cites lack of special educator's/vocational educator's cooperation as the major problems confronting handicapped youths and adults seeking training and employment. "Despite federal mandates to the contrary, cooperative efforts toward providing improved career preparation

opportunities to the handicapped are not yet a widely prevalent practice." The historical orientation and training of both special educators and vocational educators has not been toward programing for the adolescent and adult handicapped person. Vocational educators have developed programs for non-impaired youth while special educators have concentrated most of their efforts on programing for young children. Consequently, few professionals in either discipline have been trained to meet the unique needs of the handicapped youth and adult. Neither the skills nor the attitudes required for such an orientation have been developed nor has either group been particularly motivated to venture into this new arena."

Attitudes of Peers Toward the Handicapped

Bellizia asked her regular class students to write anonymously what they felt about having a few students in the class go to special lessons. Most of the class said that special lessons were good and necessary, but the average student expressed resentment at having his lessons oriented around the special-needs students. They also said they wanted to use the special equipment such as recorders and film loops which are reserved for the special-needs student.

It is interesting to note that this group used almost the same

1Patricia Gegelka, "Individualizing Education Programing At The Secondary Level," Teaching Exceptional Children 10 No. 3 (Spring 1978): 84-87.

language as that used by parents of non-handicapped students and teachers in expressing their objection to handicapped students being enrolled in regular classes. It is also significant to note that the children in this group are elementary school children in Boston. The Boston school system has gained national acclaim for its progressive programs for the handicapped.

Johnson and Kirk reviewed two studies made at the University of Illinois to determine whether the handicapped are accepted, isolated or actively rejected by their peers.

In one study, twenty-five classes were selected from two school systems. There were 698 students in the twenty-five classes. The handicapped N was 39 and the typical student N was 659. To determine the acceptance, isolation, or rejection of the handicapped, a sociometric rating was made by interviewing each of the 698 subjects.

The results showed that the handicapped group had a significantly higher number of rejectees than the typical group. The handicapped had a comparatively smaller number accepted, 1.4 percent compared to the typical group's 79.08 percent. The most alarming results showed that the handicapped group's isolates number was more than twice the number for the typical group.¹

Johnson and Kirk's review of the second study conducted in a school system that had received some prominence for the school's progressive methods to determine if these classes were so academic and so traditional that they failed to emphasize social adjustment sufficiently to produce an acceptance of the handicapped.

According to Martin, the young girl expressed her grievance that the retarded girl was given too much of the teacher's time and that the retarded girl should be put "somewhere else, a suitable place." The young girl stated in her letter that "after all she is different, she trouble us in deep, unexplainable, irrational ways, and we would like to see her somewhere else, not cruelly treated, of course, but out of sight and out of mind."

Martin believes that the attitude of the young girl represents the general societal patterns of responses to the handicapped. He disagrees with the young girl of course. Martin says that "we must attempt to have handicapped students in sight, in mind, and in settings where they will receive the fullest measure of our educational resources. But, he states, the question of attitudes, fears, anxieties, and possibly overt rejection which handicapped students will face from schoolmates, and adults in the schools is a problem. Principals, teachers, and teacher aides, after all, are only human. Their attitudes are created by their experiences and most have had no formal training or experience with the handicapped. In fact, the records will reveal, that efforts to include such training when revisions are made in college curriculums for regular educators have been fiercely resisted for the most part."

---

**Attitudes of Parents and Siblings Toward the Handicapped**

Attitudes of parents and siblings toward the handicapped members of their family have invariably been described as leaving much to be

---

The results were similar to those in the previous study. There were no handicapped stars in the progressive schools studied, whereas, 6.13 percent of the typical students were stars. A significantly larger number of the handicapped were isolates and an even more significantly larger number were rejectees.¹

Clark in his study of peers' perception of the handicapped was made with 107 male and 107 female students in the New York school system. The stimulus "objects" were 13 handicapped students, 10 boys and 3 girls, all of whom had been classmates of the subjects.

Each subject was interviewed individually, asked to look at photographs of the handicapped students who were identified as "some students in the school," then to select the photograph of the one(s) known by the subject.

The study revealed that the handicapped student is a variable rather than a constant stimulus "object" within the students' peer culture of the school. More impressive than the variability noted, was the sex cleavage. No male subjects selected either of the three female handicapped students as best known. Whereas, six of the ten male handicapped students were selected by 43 percent of the female subjects.²

Edwin W. Martin, Deputy Commissioner for Education of the Handicapped, citing a letter he received from a seventh or eighth grade girl asking him to find a special school for a retarded girl in her class, as the general attitude of society.

¹Ibid.

desired. This writer's experiences over the past ten years with parents and siblings has resulted in the conclusion that attitudes and perceptions of parents and siblings toward the handicapped are as negative as the attitudes and perceptions of society in general.

Katz, (1961) and Thurston, (1960) as reported by Williams and Fishell, found that attitudes of parents toward their handicapped children had negative effects on the rehabilitation of the handicapped child. In a paper read before the New York State Welfare Conference, Williams and Fishell noted that the first element in society that the handicapped comes in contact with is the family group where the parents, of course, are the protagonists. If they do not act positively, the handicapped child is doomed.\(^1\)

Holt (1968) as reported by Zuk, concluded from a study of families of mentally handicapped children that the ideal parents were those who, while sufficiently intelligent to appreciate the needs of the handicapped child and to have insight into his difficulties, did not have great ambitions, and so they did not constantly display their disappointment with the handicapped child. They did not encourage the retarded child to seek goals beyond his potential. They were perhaps rather fatalistic in their outlook. They looked upon the retarded child as a gift for which to be thankful whatever the condition. Whereas, the upper class, highly intelligent parents were usually ambitious for their

---

children. Most alarming was the parents' inability to overcome their
disappointment and to conceal their frustrations from the retarded
child.\(^1\)

Baum, reporting on a study (Solnuit and Stark, 1972), of the
mother's reaction to the birth of a mentally retarded, defective infant,
described this event, in part, as the "sudden loss" of the baby that was
expected. They saw in the mother's reactions, an expression of grief
for the "lost" child, the perfect baby, and the onset of a mourning
process which must inevitably extend over a long period of time. Despite
differences, they found certain similarities to the reactions of mothers
to the defective child. Feelings of loss, intense longings for the
desired child; resentment of the cruel blow that life's experiences had
dealt; and the guilt that the defective child may evoke by representing
the consequences of unacceptable feelings or thoughts.\(^2\)

Although mothers tend to show more emotions and outward feelings
than fathers at the birth of a defective child, fathers too, suffer and
experience similar feelings of frustration, guilt and anger. Often
such feelings result in conflicts in the marriage. Frequently, such
traumatic experiences result in parents "blaming" each other for the
birth of the defective child.

Hersh (1961) as reported by Baum, found fathers more removed,

\(^1\) G. H. Zuk, "The Dilemma of Parents," Exceptional Children 25

\(^2\) Marian Hooper Baum, "Some Factors Affecting Family Adjustment
To The Handicapped Child," American Journal of Mental Deficiency 68
No. 6 (May 1962): 387-392.
less emotionally involved, more objective and less expressive of their feelings. The problems of fathers when a handicapped child is presented at birth, often result in aggressive and disapproving behavior toward the mother. Such behavior is sometimes directed toward other children in the home. Fathers who respond in this manner to the birth of a handicapped child can and often are helped to overcome their frustrations and anger if they seek help.

More difficult to help, is the father who smothers and denies the existence of a handicapped child. Such fathers frequently smother and deny the handicapped son his right to experience a "normal" and happy childhood and in later years, his manhood. The handicapped son is often denied any father-son relationships and shared experiences.¹

Hohman and Zuk (1969) as reported by Baum, observed that parental needs to prove the normality of the handicapped child are expressed in pressures for achievement that often is frustrating, overwhelming and likely to produce emotional instability in the child. Reality often serves the cause of denial, to some extent; defective handicapped children are often require much maternal energy and attention; families may be limited in size; the special child may be an only child. Thus, the opportunities for comparison of development with that of "normal" siblings are limited. Consequences to the handicapped child of continued denial and avoidance used as mechanisms of defense by parents may be permanently damaging.²

¹Ibid., pp. 392-398.
²Ibid., pp. 399-404.
There is general agreement among educators, physicians, psychologists and psychiatric workers that attitudes and emotions displayed by parents can have a lasting affect on the development and the social and emotional adjustment of the child. It would seem that this would be equally as important for the handicapped child, if not more so than for the "normal" child.

Weingold and Harmath (1963) as reported by Williams and Fishell, described parents' attitudes toward their handicapped children as "unrealism." Initially, all parents experience emotional upset and anxiety when they learn they have a handicapped child. They characterized these parents as highly sensitive, suspicious, anxious and unhappy individuals, the opposite of what might be desired for any child—especially the handicapped child.¹

In a study by Grebler (1961) with parents of handicapped children, it was revealed that there was a significantly high degree of rejection toward the handicapped child. Many parents, the study revealed, reacted to their child's handicap with hostility toward the environment as well as toward the child. More astonishingly, was the high rate of rejection by the parents studied—99 percent showed some degree of rejection.²

Condell used the Thurston Sentence Completion Form to investigate the attitudes of parents of handicapped children toward mental retardation. The study revealed that most parents knew that their child was


²Annie Marie Grebler, "Parental Attitudes Toward Handicapped Children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency 60 No. 3 (July 1950): 475-483.
retarded, but found it hard to accept the presence of retardation. Sixty-five percent of the parents studied stated that they try to help the "normal" siblings in the home accept the retarded child, but usually, the "normal" child will deny any knowledge of retardation. Knowledge, however, did not alter the parents' behavior. Many parents were guilty of over-protecting the retarded child, some were guilty of displaying negative attitudes, while others were guilty of sheer neglect and abusive treatment. The study further revealed that parents' attitudes were reflected in the attitudes of children toward their retarded siblings.¹

The significance of parental attitudes emerged in a study by Cruickshank (1965) of the factors influencing the adjustment of retarded children. The most single factor in determining whether anxiety would become an important element seemed to be the parental attitudes. When the parents, or the dominant parent, usually the mother, were most fearful of over-protecting, the child seemed least able to make the sort of adjustment that permitted constructive relationships with siblings and peers. The amount of anxiety and the manner in which it found expression seemed more related to the parents' own particular emotional needs, and basic attitudes toward the child than to realistic elements of the defective child.²

Barsh (1966) conducted a study with 119 children between the ages

---


of four and twelve with organic damages. The children were divided into four groups according to the primary problem of the child. The groups were classified Behavior group, 30 children; Symbolic group, 30 children; Immature group, 31 children, and Sensori-Motor group, 28 children. The Behavior group children were of average or better intelligence. The Symbolic group was composed of children with expressive and receptive language problems. The Immature group were educable mentally retarded. The Sensori-Motor group were children with random purposeless and untestable behavior.

The study revealed that parents of a child who deviates from the normal expectancies of childhood are under some pressure to explain the child's action (to society) in order to achieve some level of understanding on the part of neighbors, relatives, and other acquaintances.

Further, the study revealed that parents tend to use the term brain injured as a descriptive label, and regardless to the degree of retardation, the parents use the same explanation. It showed also that parents placed no significance on the problems encountered by siblings explaining the retarded child to their peers.

Finally, the study revealed that "normal" children explained the retarded child in the same general terms expressed by their parents. Usually, however, as a result of embarrassment, indifference and the like, the "normal" siblings refused to make any explanation for the retarded child in the home. Many parents feel that they are not obligated to explain their defective child to anyone. This unwillingness on the part of parents to explain the defective child depended greatly
upon the relationships of parents and neighbors, parents and friends, and parents and relatives.¹

**Community Attitudes Toward The Handicapped**

Sithea and Watts (1966) in a study of attitudes toward special education for the retarded in two community groups to determine the nature of community information and attitudes was obtained by household interviews of a random sample (N=188) and another (N=24) in which a child was enrolled in a special class for the handicapped.

The special sample, the non-caucasians of both samples and those of "liberal-causal" religions showed more acceptance of the retarded child, less willingness to send him away, and more advocacy of public school provisions. Support for special provision for the retarded in school was voiced by only one-half of the random sample.

Surprisingly, many felt that the retarded should not attend any school, and those who felt that the retarded should be allowed to attend school felt that special schools were more feasible than public schools.

The study also revealed that families with children in special classes are more willing to accept the retarded child and make special provisions for him than the special sample. Respondents with membership in a religious group generally calling for orthodoxy of belief were less accepting than those whose identification with religion was of a liberal or casual sort.²


In general, the study revealed that there is a lack of understanding of the needs and potentials of the retarded, thus resulting in negative and indifferent attitudes toward the handicapped.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter analyzes a step-by-step account of the research procedures necessary to secure data, carry out the purpose of this study and to test certain basic assumptions. The purpose of this study was to secure special needs students data on the following questions:

1. What are the **general attitudes** of vocational teachers concerning the mainstreaming of handicapped students?
2. What are the **specific attitudes** of vocational teachers concerning handicapped students participating in vocational programs with regular students?

General and specific attitudes were tested in terms of educational levels and instructional areas. Also, statistical tables and grids were used in the presentation of the data. The grids were used in order to give a total view of this study in a compact form.

Instrumentation

The data for this study were gathered through the use of a research instrument entitled: **Vocational Teachers' Attitudes Scale on Mainstreaming**. The instrument consisted of 20 statements which required a positive or negative response. The aim of the instrument was to gather descriptive
and predictable information on a select population of 84 vocational teachers. For research purposes, the statements were divided into two categories: General and Specific Attitudes and sub-divided into sub-variables as follows:

**General Attitudes**

Sub-Variable I.: Mainstreaming

A. Handicapped students should be mainstreamed in vocational training programs.

B. If vocational teachers had a choice, they would not accept handicapped students in vocational training programs.

C. Handicapped students do not want to be mainstreamed.

Sub-Variable II: Special Vocational Classes for the Handicapped

A. Handicapped students should not be required to attend special vocational classes for the handicapped.

Sub-Variable III: Specially Trained Teachers

A. Handicapped students should be taught by specially trained teachers only.

Sub-Variable IV: Effects of HB-671 Classes

A. The special training vocational teachers received in the HB-671 class enables them to provide appropriate instruction for the handicapped students in their classes.

B. Special training beyond what is required by HB-671 is not necessary in order to provide special education instruction for handicapped students.

Sub-Variable V: Curriculum Design

A. Vocational curriculums are not designed for handicapped students.
B. Vocational teachers are constantly revising, modifying and changing their curriculums to meet the special needs of handicapped students in regular classes.

Sub-Variable VI: Rights of Students

A. Public Law 94-142, The Handicapped Act of 1975 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 protects the rights of the handicapped students by infringing upon the rights of the regular students.

Sub-Variable VII: Attitudes Toward The Handicapped

A. My attitude toward the handicapped is the same today as it was three years ago.

Specific Attitudes

Sub-Variable I: Effects of Handicapped Students on Progress of Regular Students

A. Handicapped students in vocational classes do not impede the progress of regular students.

Sub-Variable II: Responsibility for Job Placement

A. The only objection vocational teachers have to mainstreaming handicapped students is the added responsibility for their job placement.

Sub-Variable III: Hazard for All

A. Handicapped students create a hazard for themselves and others when working with vocational tools, equipment, machines and materials required by the training programs.

Sub-Variable IV: Effects on Instruction

A. Vocational teachers experience no serious difficulty in teaching the handicapped along with regular students.

B. Vocational teachers could provide more effective instruction if handicapped students were not in their regular classes.
C. Vocational classes are so highly individualized that handicapped students can be successful in vocational training programs with regular students.

D. Vocational classes are so large that teachers are not able to give any special assistance to handicapped students.

Sub-Variable V: Effects on Teachers' Time

A. It does not require any more time in preparation to teach the handicapped than to teach the regular students.

B. Handicapped students take up too much of the teachers' time.

Sub-variable statements under both main variables were equal in weight in terms of positive (strongly agree and agree) and negative (strongly disagree and disagree) responses. Because of this assigned equal weight, an average value was computed and rounded off to the nearest whole number, thus, giving a constant N value of 84.

Research Design

The research design for this study shows the direction and relationship of main variables to the sub-variables. The classification, identification, and analysis of these variables are of paramount statistical consideration. In order to assure data clarity, this design was divided into two main parts, variable one analyzes (General Attitudes) and variable two analyzes (Specific Attitudes) according to educational levels and instructional areas.

Analysis of Data

The statistical procedures and techniques of frequency distribution, percentiles, chi-square and grid analysis were utilized for data interpretation and analysis. The main task of data analysis was to examine the
relationships of each sub-variable in reference to educational levels and instructional areas of the respondents.

**Operational Steps and Collection of Data**

The procedural steps employed in conducting this study were as follows:

1. January 12, 1978—Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the proper officials.

2. January 13–31, 1978—The literature which seemed to be related to this study was reviewed, summarized and organized for presentation in the final thesis copy.

3. February 9, 1978—The proposed Attitude Scale was submitted to the writer's thesis committee for approval.

4. February 13–15, 1978—The Attitude Scale was examined by 10 professionals to determine clarity of statements and length of time required to complete the instrument.

5. February 16, 1978—The Attitude Scale was approved by the writer's thesis committee.

6. February 20, 1978—The Attitude Scale was distributed to the 84 respondents. Seventy-seven of the respondents returned the completed instrument. Seven respondents requested and received permission to return the completed instrument the following day.

7. February 21, 1978—The remaining 7 respondents returned the completed instruments.

8. February 22–March 16, 1978—The responses were tabulated to determine the frequency of each response for tabular analysis.
9. March 16–March 29, 1978—The frequency distributions, percentiles, Chi-square and grid procedures were completed for analysis of the data in accordance with the purposes of the study.

10. March 30, 1978—The findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations derived from the study are reported in this thesis copy.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The assignment of instrument statements under general and specific attitudes was made in order to facilitate sound and acceptable data evaluation procedures. The data were interpreted in terms of educational levels and instructional areas. Strongly agree and agree responses were grouped under positive responses with strongly disagree and disagree under negative responses. Once again, frequency distribution, percentiles, Chi-square and grid analysis were utilized as the statistical tools in data analysis and interpretation.

Variable One Analysis

Variable One: "General Attitudes of Teachers Toward Mainstreaming Handicapped Students." The variable was classified into seven sub-variables.

1. Mainstreaming
2. Special Vocational Classes for the Handicapped
3. Specially Trained Teachers for the Handicapped
4. Effects of HB-671 Class on Teacher Attitudes
5. Curriculum Design
6. Rights of Handicapped Students
7. Teacher Attitudes Toward the Handicapped.
Each sub-variable was evaluated in order to determine whether or not there is a significant relationship in terms of educational levels and instructional areas. The direction of these relationships will show the extent of teachers' conceptualization of special needs students and programs.

Variable 1 contained 7 sub-variables. The 7 sub-variables contained 11 of the 20 statements from the instrument used to gather data for this study. Variable 2 contained 5 sub-variables. The 5 sub-variables contained 9 of the 20 statements from the instrument used to gather data for this study. Sub-variable statements under both main variables were equal in weight in terms of positive and negative responses. Each positive and negative statement was assigned an equal weight value of 1 and was computed according to educational levels and instructional areas of the respondents.

Computations for sub-variables containing more than 1 statement from the research instrument were made by tabulating the positive and negative responses and dividing the total by the number of statements contained in the variable, thus a constant N value of 84.

| Vocational Teachers Favor Mainstreaming According to Educational Levels of Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Vocational Permit | Associate Degree | B.S. | M.A. | Ed.S. | Totals |
| Positive  | 22 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 56 |
| Negative  | 10 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 28 |
| Total     | 32 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 84 |
As the last column in Table 1 shows, the respondents were 66.7 percent in favor of mainstreaming. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 19.0, P < .001$). When the individual teacher groups were examined, only the difference in the case of the vocational permit teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) proved significant. While not statistically significant, the Bachelor degree teachers showed a definite trend in favor of mainstreaming.

### TABLE 2

**VOCATIONAL TEACHERS FAVOR MAINSTREAMING ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**

- BE—Business
- CD—Child Development
- CT—Construction/Technical
- FS—Food Services
- GA—Graphic Arts
- HEA—Health Occupations
- HE—Home Economics
- PS—Personal Services
- ST—Skill Trades

The last column in Table 2 shows that the respondents were 67.9 percent in favor of mainstreaming. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 10.7, P < .05$). When the individual teacher groups were examined, only the difference in the case of the skill trades teachers ($X^2 = 6.4, P < .05$) and the child development teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) proved significant.
TABLE 3

VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OPPOSE SPECIAL VOCATIONAL CLASSES FOR THE HANDICAPPED ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the last column in Table 3 shows, the respondents were 65.5 percent against special vocational classes for the handicapped. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level \( (X^2 = 8.0, \ P < .05) \). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Bachelor degree teachers \( (X^2 = 10.3, \ P < .05) \) and the Vocational permit teachers \( (X^2 = 4.5, \ P < .05) \) proved significant. While not sufficiently significant, the Associate degree teachers showed a definite trend against special vocational classes for the handicapped.

TABLE 4

VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OPPOSE SPECIAL VOCATIONAL CLASSES FOR THE HANDICAPPED ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
BE—Business
CD—Child Development
PS—Personal Services
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
HE—Home Economics
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
ST—Skill Trades
The last column in Table 4 shows that the respondents were 65.5 percent against special vocational classes for the handicapped. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 8.0, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Child Development teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) proved significant. Also, the difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) proved significant in favor of special vocational classes for the handicapped.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the last column in Table 5 shows, the respondents were 51.2 percent in favor of specially trained teachers for the handicapped. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = .05, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Vocational permit teachers ($X^2 = 21.1, P < .001$) proved significant. The difference in the case of the Associate degree teachers ($X^2 = 5.3, P < .05$) and the Education Specialist teachers ($X^2 = 8.3, P < .05$) proved significant against specially trained teachers for the handicapped.
TABLE 6
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS FAVOR SPECIALLY TRAINED TEACHERS FOR THE HANDICAPPED ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades

As the last column in Table 6 shows, the respondents were 51.2 percent in favor of specially trained teachers for handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = .05, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$), proved significant. While not sufficiently significant, the Construction/Technical and Skill Trades teachers showed a definite trend against specially trained teachers for handicapped students.

As the last column in Table 7, page 49, shows, the respondents were 73.8 percent in favor of the effects of HB-671 on teacher attitudes toward the handicapped. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 19.0, P < .001$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the vocational permit
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teachers ($X^2 = 15.1, P < .05$) proved significant. While not sufficiently significant, the Master of Arts teachers showed a definite trend in favor of the HB-671 class.

TABLE 7
EFFECTS OF HB-671 CLASS ON TEACHER ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
EFFECTS OF HB-671 CLASS ON TEACHER ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:

BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades
The last column in Table 8 shows that the respondents were 75.0 percent in favor of the HB-671 class. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 21.0, P < .001$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Child Development teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$), the Health Occupations teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) and Personal Services teachers ($X^2 = 4.6, P < .05$) proved significant.

### TABLE 9

**EFFECTS OF CURRICULUM DESIGN ON ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Associate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the last column in Table 9 shows, the respondents were 59.5 percent against their curriculums for handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 3.0, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Bachelor degree teachers ($X^2 = 4.6, P < .05$) proved significant.

As the last column in Table 10, page 51, shows, the respondents were 59.5 percent against their curriculums for handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05
level \( (X^2 = 3.0, \ p < .05) \). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Child Development teachers \( (X^2 = 7.4, \ p < .05) \), Construction/Technical teachers \( (X^2 = 4.3, \ p < .05) \), Personal Services teachers \( (X^2 = 4.6, \ p < .05) \) and Skill Trades teachers \( (X^2 = 6.4, \ p < .05) \) proved significant. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers \( (X^2 = 4.5, \ p < .05) \) and the Home Economics teachers \( (X^2 = 6.0, \ p < .05) \) proved significant in favor of their curriculums for handicapped students.

**TABLE 10**

EFFECTS OF CURRICULUM DESIGN ON ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:

- BE—Business
- CD—Child Development
- CT—Construction/Technical
- FS—Food Services
- GA—Graphic Arts
- HEA—Health Occupations
- HE—Home Economics
- PS—Personal Services
- ST—Skill Trades

As the last column in Table 11, page 52, shows, the respondents were 71.4 percent against the laws protecting the rights of handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level \( (X^2 = 3.0, \ p < .05) \). When we look at the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Master's degree
teachers ($X^2 = 10.3, p < .05$) and the Education Specialist teachers ($X^2 = 5.3, p < .05$) proved significant against the rights of handicapped students.

### TABLE 11

PL-94-142 AND SECTION 504 PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ONLY ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12

PL-94-142 AND SECTION 504 PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ONLY ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**
- BE—Business
- CD—Child Development
- CT—Construction/Technical
- FS—Food Services
- GA—Graphic Arts
- HEA—Health Occupations
- HE—Home Economics
- PS—Personal Services
- ST—Skill Trades
As the last column in Table 12 shows, the respondents were 73.8 percent against the laws protecting the rights of handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 19.0, P \leq .001$). When we examined the individual teacher groups, only the difference in the case of the Construction/Technical teachers ($X^2 = 11.8, P \leq .05$), the Personal Service teachers ($X^2 = 7.1, P \leq .05$), the Skill Trades teachers ($X^2 = 6.4, P \leq .05$) and the Child Development teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P \leq .05$) proved significant.

### TABLE 13

**VOCATIONAL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE HANDICAPPED HAVE NOT CHANGED IN THREE YEARS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the last column of Table 13, the respondents were 70.2 percent in favor of the handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 13.8, P \leq .001$). When we examined the individual teacher groups, we see that the difference in the case of the Master's degree teachers ($X^2 = 10.3, P \leq .001$) and the Education Specialist teachers ($X^2 = 12.0, P \leq .001$) proved significant. While not sufficiently significant, the Associate
degree teachers showed a definite trend against the handicapped students.

**TABLE 14**

**VOCATIONAL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE HANDICAPPED HAVE NOT CHANGED IN THREE YEARS ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**

BE—Business  
CD—Child Development  
CT—Construction/Technical  
FS—Food Services  
GA—Graphic Arts  
HEA—Health Occupations  
HE—Home Economics  
PS—Personal Services  
ST—Skill Trades

As the last column in Table 14 shows, the respondents were 70.2 percent in favor of handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level \( (X^2 = 13.8, P < .001) \). When we look at the individual teacher groups, we see that the difference in the case of the Child Development teachers \( (X^2 = 4.5, P < .05) \) and the Personal Service teachers \( (X^2 = 4.6, P < .05) \) proved significant, the Construction/Technical teachers showed a definite trend against changing attitudes toward the handicapped.

**Variable Two Analysis**

Variable Two: "Specific Attitudes of Vocational Teachers Toward Handicapped Students Participating in Vocational Programs." This variable
was classified into five sub-variables:

1. Effects of Handicapped Students on Progress of Regular Students
2. Responsibility for Job Placement
3. Handicapped Students Create a Hazard For All Students
4. Effects on Instruction
5. Effects on Teachers' Time

Once again each sub-variable was analyzed in terms of educational levels and instructional areas. The evaluation of these relationships or lack of relationships will give an in-depth analysis into teachers' conceptualization of handicapped students' participation in vocational programs.

### TABLE 15

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON PROGRESS OF REGULAR STUDENTS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the last column in Table 15, the respondents were 56.0 percent positive that handicapped students have no adverse effect on the progress of regular students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 1.2, P < .05$).
While not statistically significant, the Bachelor degree, Master's degree and Education Specialist teachers showed a definite trend in support of the position that handicapped students do not impede the progress of regular students.

### TABLE 16

**HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON PROGRESS OF REGULAR STUDENTS ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**

- BE—Business
- CD—Child Development
- CT—Construction/Technical
- FS—Food Services
- GA—Graphic Arts
- HE—Home Economics
- HEA—Health Occupations
- PS—Personal Services
- ST—Skill Trades

As the last column in Table 16 shows, the respondents were 56.0 percent positive that handicapped students do not impede the progress of regular students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 1.2$, $P < .05$). Although not sufficiently significant, Construction/Technical teachers showed a definite positive trend.

As the last column in Table 17, page 57, shows, the respondents were 78.6 percent against assuming responsibility for job placement for handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 27.4$, $P < .001$). When we look at the
individual teachers' group, only the difference in the case of the Vocational Permit teachers ($X^2 = 12.5, P \leq .001$), the Bachelor degree teachers ($X^2 = 7.1, P \leq .05$) and the Education Specialist teachers ($X^2 = 5.4, P \leq .05$) proved significant.

### TABLE 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Teachers are Against Responsibility for Job Placement, According to Educational Levels of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Teachers are Against Responsibility for Job Placement, According to Instructional Areas of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**
- BE—Business
- CD—Child Development
- CT—Construction/Technical
- FS—Food Services
- GA—Graphic Arts
- HEA—Health Occupations
- HE—Home Economics
- PS—Personal Services
- ST—Skill Trades
As can be seen in the last column in Table 18, the respondents were 78.6 percent against assuming responsibility for job placement for handicapped students. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 27.4, P < .001$). When we look at the individual teachers groups, only the difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers ($X^2 = 11.0, P < .001$), Personal Service teachers ($X^2 = 14.0, P < .001$) and Construction/Technical teachers ($X^2 = 6.4, P < .001$) proved significant. While not significant, the Skill Trades teachers showed a definite trend against assuming responsibility for job placement for handicapped students.

### TABLE 19

**HANDICAPPED STUDENTS CREATE A HAZARD FOR ALL, ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the last column in Table 19 shows, the respondents were 56.0 percent in agreement that handicapped students create a hazard for all students in vocational programs. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 1.2, P < .05$). While not significant, the Associate degree teachers showed a definite trend against the notion that handicapped students create a hazard for all students.
TABLE 20

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS CREATE A HAZARD FOR ALL, ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:

BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades

As can be seen in the last column in Table 20, the respondents were 56.0 percent in agreement that handicapped students create a hazard for all students in vocational programs. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 1.2, P \leq .05$). When we look at the individual teachers group, the difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers ($X^2 = 11.0, P \leq .001$), Business Education teachers ($X^2 = 8.0, P \leq .05$) and Construction/Technical teachers ($X^2 = 4.3, P \leq .05$) proved significant.

As the last column in Table 21, page 60, shows, the respondents were 52.4 percent against the statement that handicapped students have an adverse effect on instruction. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = .2, P \leq .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, the difference in the case of all 5 levels proved not significant.
TABLE 21

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON INSTRUCTION ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 22

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON INSTRUCTION ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:

BE—Business  
CD—Child Development  
CT—Construction/Technical  
FS—Food Services  
GA—Graphic Arts  
HEA—Health Occupations  
HE—Home Economics  
PS—Personal Services  
ST—Skill Trades

As can be seen in the last column in Table 22, the respondents were 52.4 percent opposed to the notion that handicapped students in regular classes have an adverse effect on instruction. A Chi-square analysis of test results was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = .2$, $P < .05$). There is no definite trend in either direction on the effects the handicapped have on instruction.
TABLE 23

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON TEACHERS' TIME
ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the last column in Table 23 shows, the respondents were 64.3 percent positive that the handicapped students have no adverse effect on the teacher's time. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 6.9, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, the difference in the case of the Education Specialist teachers ($X^2 = 5.4, P < .05$) proved significant. While not significant, all levels showed a positive trend.

As the last column in Table 24, page 62 shows, the respondents were 66.7 percent positive that the handicapped students have no adverse effect on the teacher's time. A Chi-square analysis of test results was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 9.2, P < .05$). When we look at the individual teacher groups, the difference in the case of the Home Economics teachers ($X^2 = 6.0, P < .05$) and the Business Education teachers ($X^2 = 4.5, P < .05$) proved significant. While not sufficiently significant, the Graphic Arts teachers showed a positive trend.
TABLE 24

HANDICAPPED STUDENTS HAVE NO NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON TEACHERS' TIME ACROSS INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades

Grid Analysis

The utilization of grid analysis gives a composite picture of data presentation. These grids were prepared in order to determine the extent of the positive (+), negative (−) and neutral (0) responses. The direction of these responses were based on the total N value. The basis for the assignment of positive, negative and neutral values are given below:

1. A positive response was equal to a Chi-square value of 3.84 or greater at the .05 level for positive attitude statements.

2. A negative response was equal to a Chi-square value of 3.84 or greater at the .05 level for negative attitude statements.

3. A neutral response occurred when a response was not significantly negative nor positive—was not equal to a Chi-square value of 3.84 or greater at the .05 level.
GRID A

GENERAL ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainstreaming</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special Vocational Classes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specially Trained Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effects of HB-671 Classes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curriculum Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rights of Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitudes Toward the Handicapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Grid-A, these teachers had an overall positive attitude toward mainstreaming. The Vocational Permit teachers had the most positive attitudes (+ = significant at the .05 level of Chi-square). The Associate degree, Bachelor degree and Master's degree teachers each had 1 positive response that was significant at the .05 level of Chi-square. The Education Specialist teachers had 2 positive responses that was also significant—thus a total of 7 positive responses. Four of the 5 levels had 1 negative response that was significant at the .05 level of Chi-square. Only the Associate Degree teachers had no negative response that was significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocational</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially Trained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of HB 671</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:**

BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades

As can be seen in Grid-B, the Business Education and Child Development teachers had the most positive attitudes toward mainstreaming. These two teacher groups each registered 2 significant positive responses. The Health Occupations, Home Economics, Personal Services and Skill Trades teachers each registered 1 positive attitude response that was significant—thus a total of 8 positive attitude responses. The Child Development, Construction/Technical, Health Occupations, Personal Services and Skill Trades teachers each registered 2 negative attitude responses that was significant—thus a total of 10 negative attitude responses.
GRID C

SPECIFIC ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>Vocational Permit</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Ed.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Progress of Regular Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Job Placement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard for All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Teacher Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Grid-C shows, the specific attitudes of these teachers toward handicapped students participating in vocational programs is negative. The difference in the case of the vocational permit, Bachelor of Science and Education Specialist teachers proved significant. Only the Education Specialist teachers registered a positive response that was significant.

As can be seen in Grid-D, the teachers had negative attitudes toward handicapped students participating in vocational programs. The difference in the case of the Construction/Technical, Health Occupations and Personal Service Teachers proved significant against assuming responsibility for job placement for handicapped students. The difference in the case of the Business Education and Home Economic teachers proved significant against the effects handicapped students have on the teacher's time.
GRID D

SPECIFIC ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Progress of Regular Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Job Placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard for All</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Teachers' Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
BE—Business
CD—Child Development
CT—Construction/Technical
FS—Food Services
GA—Graphic Arts
HEA—Health Occupations
HE—Home Economics
PS—Personal Services
ST—Skill Trades
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introductory Statement

This was a study of 84 vocational teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming handicapped students in vocational training programs. The purpose of the study was to examine the general and specific attitudes of 84 selected vocational teachers toward mainstreaming and toward handicapped students participating in regular vocational programs. The Vocational Teachers' Attitude Scale was utilized as the prime instrument of data collection and interpretation. Based on an analysis of the data, the following summary, findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations are considered pertinent to the study.

Summary

The writer initiated the study in January, 1978 with approval of the topic and the instrument by the thesis committee. The instrument was distributed to the 84 selected vocational teachers in February, 1978. The 84 respondents were all employed in the selected school. The respondents were selected because they had all completed a five quarter hour course in the identification, classification and teaching of handicapped students conducted by the writer in the spring of 1976.
The instrument used in the collection of the data was the Vocational Teachers' Attitude Scale. The instrument consisted of 20 statements which required a positive or negative response related to mainstreaming and handicapped students participating in vocational training programs. The statistical procedures and techniques of frequency distribution, percentiles, Chi-square and grid analysis were utilized for data interpretation and analysis.

Scoring Procedure

The 20 statements were assigned to two main variables—General Attitudes and Specific Attitudes. The two main variables were assigned sub-variables as follows:

1. Eleven statements made up the 7 sub-variables under general attitudes toward mainstreaming.

2. Nine statements made up the 5 sub-variables under specific attitudes toward handicapped students participating in vocational programs.

3. The sub-variable statements were computed as positive or negative responses according to the educational levels and instructional areas of the respondents. The scoring procedure utilized for computing the data were as follows:

a. Each positive and negative response was assigned an equal weight value of 1.

b. The positive and negative responses were tabulated for each of the 12 sub-variables according to the educational levels and instructional areas of the respondents.

c. Computations for sub-variables containing more than one statement were made by tabulating the negative and positive responses and dividing by the total number of statements contained in the variable, thus, a constant N value of 84.
d. The percentages were obtained by dividing the positive and negative responses by the constant N value of 84.

e. The Chi-square value of 3.84 at the .05 level was used to test for significant difference of positive and negative responses of respondents according to educational levels, instructional areas and as a total group.

**Findings**

An analysis of the data produced the following findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Attitudes:</th>
<th>Educational Levels</th>
<th>Instructional Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainstreaming</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special Vocational Classes for the Handicapped</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specially Trained Teachers for the Handicapped</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effects of HB-671</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curriculum Design</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rights of Students</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitudes Toward the Handicapped</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following is a general summary for each of the above sub-variables:

**Sub-Variable 1:** The educational levels positive response rate on mainstreaming was 66.7 percent (N=56) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 67.9 percent (N=57). The difference in the case of the Vocational permit teachers proved significant as did the difference in the case of Skill Trades and Child Development teachers. The overall response was also significant.

**Sub-Variable 2:** The educational levels and instructional areas
had the same positive response rate against special vocational classes for the handicapped, 65.5 percent (N=55). The difference in the case of the Bachelor degree and the Vocational Permit teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Child Development teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers proved significant in favor of special vocational classes for the handicapped. The overall response was also significant.

Sub-Variable 3: The educational levels positive response rate for specially trained teachers for the handicapped was 51.2 percent (N=43). The difference in the case of the Vocational Permit teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Associate degree and Educational Specialist teachers proved significant against specially trained teachers for the handicapped. The instructional areas response was 51.2 percent (N=43). The difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers was significant. The overall response was not significant.

Sub-Variable 4: The overall response in favor of HB-671 classes was significant for educational and instructional areas. The educational levels positive response rate was 73.8 percent (N=62) and the instructional areas response rate was 75.0 percent (N=63). The difference in the case of the individual teacher groups was not significant. The case of the instructional areas was significant for Child Development, Health Occupations and Personal Services teachers.

Sub-Variable 5: The overall response against their vocational curriculums for handicapped students was not significant for educational and instructional areas. The educational levels response rate was 59.5
percent (N=50) and the instructional areas response rate was 59.5 percent (N=50). The difference in the case of the Bachelor degree teachers was significant. The difference in the case of the Child Development, Construction/Technical, Personal Services and Skill Trades teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations and Home Economics teachers proved significant in favor of their curriculums for handicapped students.

Sub-Variable 6: The overall positive response against laws protecting the rights of handicapped students was not significant for educational levels but was significant for instructional areas. The educational levels positive response rate was 71.4 percent (N=60) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 73.8 percent (N=62). The difference in the case of the Master's degree and Education Specialist degree teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Construction/Technical, Personal Services, Skill Trades and Child Development teachers proved significant.

Sub-Variable 7: The overall positive response was significant in favor of changed attitudes toward the handicapped in the past 3 years. The educational levels positive response rate was 70.0 percent (N=59) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 70.2 percent (N=59). The difference in the case of the Master's degree and Education Specialist teachers was significant. The difference in the case of the Child Development and personal services teachers proved significant.
### Specific Attitudes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Variables</th>
<th>Educational Levels</th>
<th>Instructional Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effects on Progress of Regular Students</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Responsibility for Job Placement</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hazard for All</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effects on Instruction</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Effects on Teacher's Time</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following is a general summary of the above sub-variables:

Sub-Variable 1: The overall positive response was not significant. The educational levels positive response rate was 56.0 percent (N=47) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 56.0 percent (N=47). The difference in the case of all educational levels was not significant. The difference in the case of all instructional areas was also not significant.

Sub-Variable 2: The overall positive response against responsibility for Job Placement for the handicapped was significant. The educational levels positive response rate was 78.6 percent (N=66) and the instructional areas response was also 78.6 percent (N=66). The difference in the case of the Vocational permit, Bachelor degree and Education Specialist teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations, Personal Services and Construction/Technical teachers proved significant.

Sub-Variable 3: The overall positive response value was not
significant. The educational levels positive response rate was 56.0 percent (N=47) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 56.0 percent (N=47). The difference in the case of the educational levels was also not significant. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations, Business Education and Construction/Technical teachers proved significant.

Sub-Variable 4: The overall positive response was not significant. The educational levels positive response rate was 52.4 percent (N=44) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 52.4 percent (N=44). The difference in the case of the 5 educational levels proved not significant as was true for the 9 instructional areas.

Sub-Variable 5: The overall positive response value was significant. The educational levels positive response rate was 64.3 percent (N=54) and the instructional areas positive response rate was 66.7 percent (N=56). The difference in the case of the Education Specialist teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Home Economics and Business Education teachers proved significant.

Following is a general summary of findings of Educational Levels of the respondents:

1. Thirty-two or 38.09 percent of the respondents have Vocational Permits to teach.
2. Twelve or 14.28 percent of the respondents have the Associate Arts degree.
3. Fourteen or 16.67 percent of the respondents have the Bachelor of Science degree.
4. Fourteen or 16.67 percent of the respondents have the Master of Arts degree.

5. Twelve or 14.28 percent of the respondents have the Education Specialist degree.

Conclusions

Based upon an analysis and interpretation of the data, the following conclusions seem warranted:

General Attitudes

These vocational teachers had a positive general attitude toward mainstreaming:

1. These vocational teachers had an overall positive attitude toward mainstreaming handicapped students. There is a significant difference in the case of educational levels and instructional areas. The Vocational Permit teachers had the most positive attitudes according to educational levels and Child Development and Personal Service teachers have the most positive attitudes according to instructional areas.

2. These vocational teachers were opposed to special vocational classes for the handicapped. There is a significant difference in the case of educational levels and instructional areas. The Vocational Permit and the Bachelor degree teachers have the most positive attitudes. The Child Development teachers have the most positive attitudes. The Health Occupations teachers' difference is significant in favor of handicapped students attending special vocational classes.

3. These vocational teachers wanted handicapped students to be taught by specially trained teachers only. There is a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and attitudes and instructional areas. The difference in the case of the Vocational Permit teachers proved significant. Also, the difference in the case of the Health Occupations teachers was significant.
4. These vocational teachers had a positive attitude toward the special training they received in the HB-671 class. There is a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and between instructional areas. The difference in the case of the educational levels was not significant but the difference in the case of the Child Development, Health Occupations and Personal Services proved significant.

5. These vocational teachers had a negative attitude toward their curriculums being appropriate for handicapped students. The difference in the case of educational levels, Bachelor degree teachers proved significant as did Child Development, Construction/Technical, Personal Services and Skill Trades instructional areas. The difference in the case of the Health Occupations and Home Economics teachers proved significant in favor of their curriculums being appropriate for handicapped students.

6. These vocational teachers were against P.L. 94–142 and Section 504 because they believe that it discriminates against the regular students. There was a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and a difference between attitudes and instructional areas. The difference in the case of the Master's degree and Education Specialist teachers proved significant. The difference in the case of the Construction/Technical, Personal Services, Skill Trades and Child Development teachers proved significant.

7. These teachers showed neither a significantly positive or significantly negative attitude change toward the handicapped over the past three years. However, the difference in the case of the Master's degree and Education Specialist teachers was significant as was the difference in the case of the Child Development and Personal Services teachers.

There was a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and attitudes and instructional areas of these teachers.

1. The Vocational Permit teachers had the most positive general attitude toward mainstreaming. All other levels showed about the same degree of positiveness.
2. The Business Education and Child Development teachers had the most positive general attitude toward mainstreaming. All other areas registered about the same degree of positiveness.

3. The Health Occupations, Personal Services and Skill Trades teachers had the most negative general attitude toward mainstreaming. All other areas showed about the same degree of negativeness.

Specific Attitudes

These vocational teachers had a negative specific attitude toward handicapped students participating in vocational programs:

1. These vocational teachers did not believe that handicapped students impede the progress of regular students. There was not a significant difference in the case of the educational areas nor the instructional areas. While not significant, the Bachelor degree, Master's degree and Education Specialist teachers showed a definite trend in support of the position that handicapped students do not impede the progress of regular students. The Construction/Technical teachers also showed a definite positive trend.

2. These vocational teachers had negative attitudes toward responsibility for job placement for handicapped students. There was a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and between attitudes and instructional areas of teachers. There was a significant difference in the case of the Bachelor degree, Vocational Permit and Education Specialist teachers. These teachers had the most negative attitudes. There was also a significant difference in the case of the Construction/Technical, Health Occupations and Personal Services teachers. These teachers also had the most negative attitudes.

3. These vocational teachers felt that the handicapped students create a hazard for all students when working with tools, equipment and materials in labs and shops. There was no significant difference between attitudes and educational levels. However, Associate degree teachers showed a more positive attitude while all other levels showed about the same degree of negativeness. There was a significant difference between attitudes and instructional areas. Health Occupations, Business Education and Construction/Technical teachers proved significant.
4. These vocational teachers did not believe that the presence of handicapped students in regular classes had any negative effects on instruction. There was no significant difference between attitudes and educational levels nor between attitudes and instructional areas. The Bachelor degree and Education Specialist teachers showed the same degree of negativity and the same degree of positiveness. The 9 instructional areas showed about the same degree of negativity.

5. These vocational teachers did not believe that handicapped students had any negative effects on their time. There is a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and attitudes and instructional areas. The difference in the case of the Education Specialist, Home Economics and Business Education teachers proved significant.

There was a significant difference between attitudes and educational levels and between attitudes and instructional areas of these teachers.

1. The Education Specialist teachers had the most positive specific attitude. All other levels registered about the same degree of positiveness.

2. The Business Education, Construction/Technical and Health Occupations teachers had the most negative attitudes. All other levels registered about the same degree of positiveness.

3. These vocational teachers, while generally in favor of mainstreaming handicapped students, preferred that handicapped students be taught by specially trained teachers.

4. The attitudes expressed by these vocational teachers were reflective of their experiences in the HB–671 class.

5. These vocational teachers, while favoring mainstreaming did not want to assume the added responsibility for modifying and changing curriculums to meet the needs of the handicapped or for providing job placement assistance for them.
6. These vocational teachers' expressed belief that handicapped students create a hazard for all students were influenced by other variables.

7. These vocational teachers were aware of their expected responses and responded accordingly.

Implications

1. These vocational teachers need additional in-service in the identification, classification and training of handicapped students.

2. These vocational teachers did not fully understand Public Law 94-142 and Section 504 as they apply to providing appropriate education for the handicapped.

3. These vocational teachers need assistance in modifying and changing vocational curriculums to meet the special needs of handicapped students.

4. These vocational teachers need technical assistance in identifying single skill training areas within their training programs.

5. These vocational teachers need assistance in developing job placement resources for handicapped students.

6. These vocational teachers need assistance in designing lab and shop safety for handicapped students.

7. These vocational teachers need assistance in classroom management procedures that will facilitate appropriate instruction for all students in a mainstreaming environment.

Recommendations

The findings, conclusions and implications of this research warrant the following recommendations:

1. That HB-671 be amended to include the provision for the State Department of Education, Certification Division, to require 10 additional quarter hours of college credit or in-service for vocational teachers in the area of Special Education. The present Bill which requires 5 hours of college credit is indeed a step in the right direction. However, the Bill in its present form mainly addresses identification and classification of the handicapped. Attention must now be given
to methods and techniques of teaching the handicapped, curriculum development and modification and resources and materials.

2. That school systems provide release time for teachers so that at least one teacher in each core program can be trained in providing Special Education for the handicapped beyond what is presently required by HB-671. After completing the training, the trained teachers would provide in-service for their peers.

3. That vocational Curriculum and Staff Development personnel be trained in the identification of special education resources and materials in order that the curriculum staff can provide effective services for the vocational teachers.

4. That these vocational teachers be provided 10 additional quarter hours of training in special education for the handicapped. Special attention should be given to methods and techniques, curriculum development and revision and resources and materials.

5. That these vocational teachers be given assistance in using The Dictionary of Occupational Titles for identifying single skill occupations for handicapped students.

6. That provisions be made with a local university counseling department to provide training in Vocational Counseling and Job Placement for handicapped students.

7. That provisions be made with the Georgia Department of Human Resources to conduct lab and shop safety workshops for handicapped students. That these affected teachers be given 2 hours in-service credit for a minimum of 10 clock hours of training.

8. That these teachers be provided demonstration teaching activities in classroom management and procedures. These may be simulated situations.

9. That the administrators of the school where these respondents are employed be provided an oral report of the findings of this study.

10. That additional research be conducted with a random sample of equal respondents. It appears evident from the literature that only limited research has been conducted in the areas of vocational education and attitudes of vocational teachers.
This scale has been prepared so that you can indicate how you feel about handicapped students being mainstreamed in Vocational classes with "regular" students. Please respond to each item. In each case, draw a circle around the response which represents you and/or your own feelings. You will not have an opportunity to express a neutral feeling. You are being asked to express your feelings as follows:

SA.............if you strongly agree with the statement.
A.............if you agree but not strongly.
D.............if you disagree but not strongly so.
SD.............if you strongly disagree with the statement.

There is no correct answer. The only correct response is the one which represents how you feel.

1. Handicapped students should be mainstreamed in vocational training programs.................. SA A D SD
2. Handicapped students in vocational classes do not impede the progress of regular students ......... SA A D SD
3. Handicapped students should be taught by specially trained teachers only .................. SA A D SD
4. The special training vocational teachers received in the HB 671 class enables them to provide appropriate instruction for the handicapped students in their classes............................. SA A D SD
5. Special training beyond what is required by HB 671 is not necessary in order to provide special instruction for handicapped students .................. SA A D SD
6. Handicapped students do not want to be mainstreamed .................................. SA A D SD
7. Handicapped students take-up too much of the vocational teacher's time....................... SA A D SD
8. Handicapped students should not be required to attend special vocational classes for the handicapped .................................................. SA A D SD
9. Vocational teachers could provide more effective instruction if handicapped students were not in their classes .................................................. SA A D SD
10. It does not require any more time in preparation to teach the handicapped than to teach the regular students ........................................ SA A D SD

11. My attitude toward the handicapped is the same today as it was three years ago ....................... SA A D SD

12. Vocational teachers experience no serious difficulty in teaching the handicapped along with the regular students ................................. SA A D SD

13. Vocational classes are so highly individualized that handicapped students can be successful in a vocational training program .................... SA A D SD

14. Vocational classes are so large that the teachers are not able to give any special assistance to handicapped students .................................. SA A D SD

15. The only objection vocational teachers have to mainstreaming handicapped students is the added responsibility for their job placement ................. SA A D SD

16. Vocational Curriculums are not designed for handicapped students ........................................ SA A D SD

17. If vocational teachers had a choice, they would not accept handicapped students in vocational programs ......................................................... SA A D SD

18. Vocational teachers are constantly revising, modifying and changing their curriculums to meet the special needs of the handicapped students in the regular classes .............................. SA A D SD

19. Public Law 94-142, The Handicapped Act of 1975 and section 504 of the Rehabilitation act of 1977 protects the rights of the handicapped students by infringing upon the rights of the regular students .................................................... SA A D SD

20. Handicapped students create a hazard for themselves and others when working with vocational tools, equipment and materials required in training programs ................................. SA A D SD
IDENTIFICATION:

Draw a circle around the response in each column below which represents your educational level, teaching experience and the area in which you are now teaching.

**Education**
- Vocational Permit
- Associate Degree
- B.S./A.B. Degree
- M.Ed./MA/M.S. Degree
- Ed.S. Degree

**Instructional Area**
- Business
- Health
- Graphic Arts
- Personal Services
- Home Economics
- Child Development
- Food Service
- Skill Trades
- Construction/Technical
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