

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9307649

**Integrating special education students into the regular
classroom: An investigation and analysis of principal and
teacher attitudes**

Arrington, Linda Ruth, Ph.D.

The University of Arizona, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

INTEGRATING SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS INTO THE
REGULAR CLASSROOM: AN INVESTIGATION AND
ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER ATTITUDES

By

Linda Ruth Arrington

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND
HIGHER EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 9 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Linda Ruth Arrington entitled Integrating Special Education Students Into the Regular Classroom: An Investigation and Analysis of Principal and Teacher Attitudes.

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Paul E. Huber

8/20/92
Date

L. O. Nelson

8/20/92
Date

Sharon Conely

8/20/92
Date

Date

Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Paul E. Huber
Dissertation Director

11-23-92
Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Linda Ruth Arrington

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to express her sincere gratitude to her dissertation advisor, Dr. Paul Heckman, for his perceptive guidance and committee members, Dr. Mike Sacken, Dr. Robert Grant, Dr. Marcello Medina, Dr. Sharon Conley, Dr. Lawrence Nelson, and Dr. Arminda Fuentesvilla, for their assistance and collegial support.

A special note of appreciation is extended to Dr. Stephen Powers for creative insight and scholarly advice throughout the dissertation writing process. The writer would also like to thank Mr. Cephas Bowles and Mr. Rick Duran for their invaluable statistical advice and friendship. While the writer cannot mention the many friends who supported her efforts, she particularly wishes to recognize Dr. Glenn Smith, Dr. Bettye McCant, Dr. Anna Jolivet, Mrs. Amanda Phillips, and Dr. Clyde Phillips for years of mentorship and continual encouragement.

Finally, the writer bestows the highest acknowledgement to her family for their unique ability to support and nourish one another, and provide continual inspiration. Her parents, Mr. Lawrence Arrington, Mrs. Mamie Ruth Arrington; sisters, Lacrechia, Leisha, and Leslie; brothers, Larry, and Lonnie; and all the writer's nieces and nephews--their future is our hope.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	7
ABSTRACT.....	8
1. INTRODUCTION.....	10
Statement of the Problem.....	16
Purpose of This Study.....	16
Research Questions.....	17
Significance of the Study.....	17
Limitations.....	18
Assumptions.....	19
Definition of Terms.....	19
Organization of the Study.....	20
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	22
Historical Overview.....	22
The Least Restrictive Environment.....	27
The Regular Education Initiative.....	29
Integrated Programming.....	31
Educators as Change Agents.....	34
3. METHODOLOGY.....	40
Purpose of the Study.....	40
Instrument Development.....	41
Sampling Methodology.....	45
Data Analysis.....	47
4. RESULTS.....	49
Demographic Information.....	50
Number of Respondents.....	50
Age Range of Respondents.....	50
Occupation Based on Gender.....	50
Independent Samples of Gender.....	51
Ethnic Composition.....	52
Special Education Graduate Credit.....	55
Minority and Non-Minority Representation.....	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
4. <u>Continued</u>	
General Attitudes of Principals and Teachers.....	57
Student Success Concerning Integration.....	58
Student Success in Integrated, Non-Integrated Settings....	60
Attitude and Change Among Educators.....	62
Special Education Preparation....	64
Delivery of Special/Regular Programs.....	66
Summary of General Research Findings.....	69
Conclusion.....	70
5. PURPOSE.....	73
Design and Procedures.....	74
Summary of Results.....	74
Implications for Practitioners.....	78
Recommendations for Further Study.....	79
APPENDIX A: EXPLANATORY LETTER SURVEY EVALUATION FORM.....	81
APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL INTRODUCTION LETTER AND SURVEY TEACHER INTRODUCTION LETTER AND SURVEY.....	84
APPENDIX C: SURVEY FREQUENCY DATA.....	93
REFERENCES.....	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparison of Dual and Unified Systems.....	32
2	Occupation by Gender.....	51
3	Independent Samples of Gender.....	53
4	Occupation by Ethnicity.....	54
5	Special Education Graduate Credit Grouping.....	56
6	Minority and Non-Minority Representation....	57
7	Responses by principal and teacher groups...	59
8	Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups...	61
9	Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups...	63
10	Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups...	65
11	Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups...	67
12	Comparison of Principals and Teachers on each Item of the REI Survey Using T-Tests.....	68

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes among elementary principals and regular education teachers in Tucson, Arizona schools regarding perceptions of (1) what principals and teachers perceive as requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students; and (2) principals' and teachers' perception about the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classroom settings.

The study elicited responses from 117 principals and teachers during the 1992 school year. A survey instrument was used to obtain information from principals and teachers regarding their opinions on 18 items that have implications for integrating special education students into the regular classroom. Principals and teachers were also asked to indicate their level of support for integrating special education students into the regular classroom.

Statistical analysis revealed significant differences among principals and teachers regarding their support of integrating special education students into the regular classroom setting; integration would not be in the best interest of all students; integration requires a change in the attitudes of principals and regular education personnel; and that educational programs should be delivered to

handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classroom.

Most principals indicated that the majority of regular classroom teachers in their school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator. While principals and teachers support the inclusion of most students with handicapping conditions in general education classes, some respondents questioned the appropriateness of extending the regular class placement option to students with severe disabilities. Significant differences were found with regard to additional background and training associated with how principals and teachers view their success in educating special education students in the regular classroom.

Results of this study hold implications for policy makers, researchers, regular and special education teachers, and administrators.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today's schools face unprecedented demands for changes that will increasingly influence the role of school personnel as they educate all students in our nation's public schools. Some reasons for change include: An increase in the number of poor students who are of color and whose primary language is other than standard English; an increased emphasis on the integration of all students, including special education students into the regular classroom setting; and increased emphasis on the school educator's role and her/his responsibility to provide quality education for all students.

In recent years, policy makers have become increasingly concerned about the high percentage of students who are placed in special education programs (Will, 1984, 1986). When Public Law 94-142 Education Handicapped Act of 1974 was passed, Congress assigned high priority to identifying and educating school-age handicapped children, and meeting the needs of the severely handicapped. As this law was implemented in the public schools, many children who were not handicapped ended up in special education classes (Willig, 1985, Ortiz, 1984).

Sometimes inadequate regular education options designed to meet the needs of children with different learning styles resulted in a misplacement of students. For example, students have been referred to special education on the basis of behaviors which did not fit with the expectations of educators, not because they required special education services. School personnel inaccurately interpreted linguistic, cultural, economic, or other background characteristics as deviant (Willig, Greenburg, 1986). As this concern became more apparent, educators, parents, other interested community members, and researchers questioned the need for segregated groupings of special education students in the school setting (Lilly, 1986; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Will, 1984, 1986).

Public dissatisfaction with American schools and student achievement was also increasing. As the public demanded that schools improve curricula and student test scores, pressures were placed on principals to bring about changes in the way all children are educated in our public school system (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Lincoln & Higgins, 1991). Pressures include improving the basic academic skills such as reading, writing, and math, and managing the general classroom behavior of heterogenous groups of students. This pressure has also affected the teachers and other educators who work with children and brought into question their

educational preparation, primarily in the area of special education coursework (Walker, 1987).

Demographic projections indicate that by the year 2000, America will have approximately 256 million people. One of every three will be African American, Hispanic, or Asian American (O'Hare, et.al., 1991). By the year 2000, the proportion of children of color under eighteen will be at least 38 percent. Many of these children will be students in our public school system. These statistics imply that significant changes are occurring presently in the ethnic composition of America's public school children.

It has been estimated that between 25 and 38 percent of school age children will be culturally and linguistically diverse by the 21st century (Chinn & Hughes, 1987). Many students enter school speaking a language other than English or a non-standard dialect of American English (Garcia, 1987).

To be defined as linguistically different involves more than speaking a foreign language or a different English dialect. Speaking a certain language or dialect ties one to particular ethnic and cultural groups that hold values and attitudes that may conflict with the teachers' values and attitudes (p. 249).

These children have expectations that are different from Anglo American middle-class values and attitudes which predominate in public schools. The effects of poverty and economic deprivation on American school age-children will

increasingly affect their ability to learn in the traditional classroom setting.

The economic circumstances of children have deteriorated significantly over the past decade (Bianchi, 1990). Approximately one in five American children live in a poor family. As a group, children are now the poorest segment of our nation's population, and children of color are more likely to be poor, (Population Bulletin, 1991). Approximately 43 percent of African American and 40 percent of Hispanic children live in poverty (Committee for Economic Development, CED, 1987). Also, poverty during childhood affects how well children do in school, and their chances for success as adults (Duncan and Rogers, 1988; Hill and Duncan, 1987; Lincoln and Higgins, 1991). However, some children who live in poverty have family support that includes role models and mentors who help them to succeed in school and later in life (CED, 1987; Population Bulletin, 1991).

The desirability of schools working cooperatively with families is positively associated with student learning (Odom, and McEvoy, 1990). Nevertheless, the emerging student population of public schools is such that children are more likely to live in a single parent home with a female head of household (Hodgkinson, 1988), making school connections to families less likely. The diversity of

cultures, languages, and attitudes also challenges our schools.

Within the next eight years, educators must meet the responsibility to educate future students who, more likely than students today, will be members of racial or ethnic groups, less financially secure, and speak a language other than English. The increasing number of students of color placed in special education has raised a question: Is special education a part of a larger tracking system or "sorting machine?" (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Yates, 1988). For example, once students are placed in pullout special education programs that have been designed to physically remove students from the regular classroom, the students rarely move out of special education programs and classrooms (Singer & Butler, 1987). One investigation of special education services in three urban schools found that only four percent of students who were placed in special education programs went back to a regular education program exit in a given school year (Reynolds et.,al. 1987).

In addition, in many schools, a third grader, who is reading two years below grade level with an IQ of 98, would be eligible for special education. However, a student reading at the same level, but with an IQ of 82, would not qualify for special education because the student fails to

show a significant discrepancy between IQ and achievement. Many educators and researchers are urging public schools to experiment with more flexible models for meeting the needs of students with learning problems (Will, 1984, 1986; Stainback & Stainback, 1984, 1985, 1987; Lieberman, 1985; Lilly, 1986).

The Office of Education has recommended a change in the manner in which students with handicaps and non-handicapped students more adequately deal with pressures in the public school system (Will, 1986a). Regular education and special education are to be combined into one unified program. The local school principal is empowered to make decisions for ensuring appropriate education for all students.

This proposal is known as the Regular Education Initiative (REI). The REI also provides instruction in the least restrictive environment and decreases "pull out" programs that have failed "to meet the educational needs of these students, and have created barriers to their successful education" (Will, 1986). The REI calls for a major reformation of instructional program options for low-achieving students, both handicapped and non-handicapped (Lieberman, 1985; Mesinger, 1985; Stainback & Stainback, 1984, 1985, 1987).

The REI will presumably discourage the identification and placement of language minority, learning disabled children

of color in special education programs as underachieving students who are not classified as handicapped (Gartner, 1986; Stainback & Stainback, 1984, Ortiz, 1988; Will, 1986a, 1986b). Some believe that regular education personnel still are not ready in either attitude or instructional capabilities to adequately meet the needs of students with special requirements within the regular classroom (Davis, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

The Regular Education Initiative promotes alternative ways to identify and educate students who have, and do not have handicaps, and are low achieving in the public schools (Will, 1986a). However, there is little agreement about what school personnel perceive about the REI. More information is needed regarding the perceptions of student success potential, and what principals and teachers perceive as requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students. Principal and teacher perceptions about the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classrooms is important as it relates to the restructuring of our public education school system.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes among elementary principals and regular education teachers

in Tucson, Arizona schools regarding perceptions of (1) What principals and teachers perceive as requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students; and (2) Principals' and teachers' perception about the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classroom settings.

Research Questions

The research questions that will guide this study are:

1. Do significant differences exist between elementary principals and regular education teachers concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings?
2. Is there a significant difference in attitudes between gender?
3. Do the attitudes of elementary principals and regular education teachers depend on their level of academic preparation in special education?
4. Is there a significant difference in attitude between minority and non-minority elementary principals and regular education teachers?

Significance of the Study

There is little research reflecting attitudes and perceptions of regular classroom teachers and elementary principals toward proposed changes in the structure of general and special education (Robinson, 1981; Kauffman,

Gerber, Semmel, 1988). A concentration of the continuing unmet needs of students who are of color, and whose primary language is other than standard English has lead to a proposal for integrating regular and special education programs to benefit the needs of all students.

Criticisms of the identification, classification and educational placement of students with handicapping conditions has also lead to the REI proposal. Reformists have assumed that support for integrating regular and special education students does, or should exist among those educators who would be the primary change agents in effecting it. At present, very little information is available on current local attitudes and perceptions of elementary school principals and regular education teachers towards changes in regular and special education.

The results of this study will provide useful information about attitudes of elementary principals and regular education teachers regarding various aspects of regular and special education that are likely to be implemented by school personnel in support of integrating special and regular education initiatives in our public education system.

Limitations

1. This study was limited to a consensus of elementary principals, and a sample of certified regular

education teachers employed in one urban school district.

2. Classified and special education teachers were not included in this study.
3. Only public elementary schools were included in this study.
4. Misinterpretation of survey items could affect the conclusions of this study.
5. Data collected in Tucson, Arizona schools may not reflect conditions in schools outside this area.

Assumptions

1. Respondents selected for this study have the ability to report their attitudes accurately.
2. Survey and interview respondents answered questions with complete candor.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, several terms used require definition.

Children of Color. Any child who has been identified, or labeled as African American, Asian American, Hispanic, Mexican American, or Native American, represents this category.

Handicapped. To have special learning needs due to mental, physical, sensory, language, and emotional disabilities. Included in this group of individuals are

students with learning disabilities, mental retardation, behavior disorders, speech and language disorders, vision and hearing disabilities, and physical and health handicaps.

Integration. A process by which groups of students with, and without disabilities have been "mixed" (Odom and McEvoy, 1990; Taylor et al. 1987). The mixing can occur in two ways: Students with disabilities can be served all or part of the day in classrooms or programs designed for normally developing children; or students without handicaps can be incorporated into classrooms or programs designed primarily for children with disabilities.

Special Education. Adaptations of typical teaching approaches made to accommodate the student who does not adapt to the regular classroom setting.

The Regular Education Initiative (REI). An ideology supported by a number of proposals that collectively call for the restructuring of regular and special education.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 has presented the background of the problem to be studied, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and research questions. The possible significance of the study, limitations, assumptions, and definitions of pertinent terms were also included in Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 contains the review of the literature. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the study.

It contains the instrument development, a description of the procedures, sampling methodology, and data analysis.

Chapter 4 provides the results and discussion of the data obtained in the study.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study followed by conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

For the purpose of this study, the literature review addresses the following topics: (1) A historical overview, (2) the least restrictive environment, (3) the regular education initiative, (4) integrated programming, and (5) educators as change agents.

Historical Overview

In 1975, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) was enacted by Congress. This legislation guaranteed provision of educational services for a number of handicapped children who had been excluded from public education. In addition to establishing the right to a free and appropriate public education for handicapped children, P.L. 94-142 also stipulated the manner in which the "appropriateness" of this education would be decided, where it would be delivered, how eligibility would be decided, and the safeguards for children and their parents.

In the decade following implementation of P.L. 94-142, an increase occurred in the number of students who have been referred and placed in special education despite the decline in overall school enrollments. The Commission on Excellence in Education published a report entitled, *A Nation At Risk*, in 1983. It documented the inferiority of our educational

system. Although some educators interpreted this report as a call for the improvement of educational practices for all students, others expressed concern for the report's explicit exclusion of any reference to handicapped students. These students have been the subject of a separate debate as to the future of what is called, "special education".

Throughout the history of public school education, there has been tension between inclusion and exclusion of students. There has also been a progressive inclusion of an even broader range of students, children of color, children of non-citizens, and most recently, children who are labeled handicapped. Since the beginning of the 20th century, exclusion has been limited by the compulsory attendance laws, *Brown vs. the Board of Education*, and subsequent school desegregation decisions, *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act* in 1975, and the *Lau vs. Nichols* decision of 1975 concerning the limited English proficient.

Our public schools have begun to see a large population of students who have failed or are excluded from the educational system. When included, they are separated or segregated; and even when successful enough to graduate, they are often not prepared as future learners, workers, or citizens. In urban districts, this may include as many as two-thirds or more of the students (Wilson, 1987).

Throughout the decade of the 1960's and 1970's, public schools excluded children who experienced learning problems. When included, these children found limited services, segregated, and less than appropriate educational settings, fees charged for what was provided free to other students, and discriminatory treatment of racial minorities, and those whose native language was not the standard English language (Garcia, 1987). Since the 1970's, claims of inappropriate access to equal education for all children in our public schools have taken on increasing importance in our society. Public law 94-142 has been interpreted as the equivalent equal education for all.

In 1975, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act was initiated by Congress. It established the right of handicapped children to a free and appropriate public school education using the most appropriate means necessary. It insured provision of educational services for handicapped children who previously were excluded from public education. Part of this enactment was the integration mandate clarified in P.L. 94-142. Section 1412 (5) (B) requires that all states must establish procedures to ensure:

That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including those children in public, or private institutions, or other care facilities, are educated with children who are handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature of severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes

with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

The legislative history of the integration merger mandate mentions several Congressional decisions:

1. If children with handicaps are to live a decent independent life in an ordinary community, handicapped and non-handicapped children must learn together in the schools.

2. Learning by all children, including the severely disabled, happens when they are provided the opportunity to observe and model from each other in the regular classroom setting.

3. Noting the frequent assignment of schooling for children with handicaps to inappropriate learning conditions such as basement classrooms (closets, hallways etc.) and unequal distribution of school resources, Congress concluded that if children with handicaps were educated with non-handicapped children, they would be protected by the joint influence of their parents and the school community.

In the decade following the implementation of P.L. 94-142, an increase occurred in the number of students who were referred and placed in special education despite the decline in overall school enrollments (U.S. Department of Education, 1985). It was found that no area in special education had created more concern than the procedures for the referral and assessment of students. Together, they raised issues about the professional judgement used in identifying

students labeled as Learning Disabled, and discrimination, as seen in the differential treatment of children of color, and those with limited proficiency in standard English:

Referral is more likely to occur in cases where the student is a member of a minority group or from a family whose socio-economic status varies from the district's norm. Further, decisions about special education classification are not only functions of child characteristics but there involve powerful organizational influences. The number of programs availabilities of space, incentives for identification, range and kind of competing programs and services, number of professional, and federal, state, and community pressure all affect classification decisions (Keogh, 1988, p. 235).

While the total special education student population grew 20 percent between 1976-77 and 1986-87, those labeled as Learning Disabled increased 142 percent. They comprise 44 percent of all special education students (Tenth Annual Report, 1988, Table 1, Figure 4). As the number of students labeled as Learning Disabled increased, there has been a simultaneous decline (by some 300,000 between 1976-77 and 1986-87) in those labeled as retarded. The Department of Education explained the reduction in the number of students labeled as retarded:

These decreases in the number of children classified as mentally retarded are the result of an increasing sensitivity to the negative features of the label itself and to the reaction of local school systems to allegations of racial and ethnic bias as a result of the use of discriminatory and culturally biased testing procedures (Seventh Annual Report, 1985, p. 4).

While there may be "increasing sensitivity," the over-representation of students of color continues. During the 1986-87 school year, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, reported minority students comprised 30 percent of all public school students. These students accounted for 42 percent of all students classified as educable mentally retarded (EMR), 40 percent of those classified as trainable mentally retarded (TMR), and 35 percent of those classified as seriously emotionally disturbed (SED). The disproportion was greatest among African American students, with particular emphasis on the male population.

Research indicates that there is a relationship between poverty and impairment. However, given the correlation in the U.S. between race and poverty, and between race and impairments, this explanation of the over-representation fails, given the absence of such disproportion among students labeled as physically handicapped (Gartner, Kerzner, 1989).

The Least Restrictive Environment

While referral and assessment procedures vary widely, P.L. 94-142 is clear concerning Least Restrictive Environment criteria. "Removal from the regular education environment" is to occur, "only when the nature and severity of the handicap are such that education in regular classes

with the use of supplementary aids cannot be achieved satisfactorily," (Section 612 (5) (B)).

The mainstreaming of handicapped students into regular classrooms, under the least restrictive environment provision of P.L. 94-142 while special education maintains a separate service delivery system, has caused concern and difficulty for students and teachers. The basic premise of special education is that its students will benefit from a unique body of knowledge and smaller classes staffed by specially trained teachers using special or modified materials. However, there exists no significant evidence that segregated special education programs offers benefits for students (Ysseldyke, 1987).

A recent study rejects the prevalent "pull-out" strategy as ineffective and concludes:

This split-scheduling approach...is neither administratively nor instructionally supportable when measured against legal requirements, effective schools research or fiscal considerations (Hagerty & Abramson, 1987).

A review of the literature on effective schools as it relates to instruction suggests that the general practice of special education is in conflict with the basic effectiveness principles in teaching behaviors, organizing instruction and instructional support (Bickel & Bickel, 1986).

Another study related to this issue states:

There appear to be at least three discrepancies between the suggestions for best practice and the observation of actual teaching practice for mildly handicapped students: (a) there is almost no instruction presented to these students that might be classified as involving high level cognitive skills, (b) there is a small amount of time spent in activities that could be considered direct instruction with active learner response and teacher feedback, and (c) students receive a low frequency of contingent teacher attention (Morsink, et al., 1986).

The Regular Education Initiative

Several unique challenges that reflect various trends in the overall education of students with special learning needs are evident when specifically addressing the education of culturally and linguistically different learners.

Educators and researchers have expressed their concern for students who experience problems in learning but, because they lack a classification as handicapped, are not entitled to receive the only special help that the public school offered, namely, special education services (Gartner, 1986, Wang & Reynolds, 1986; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1987; Will, 1986a).

The Assistant Secretary of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Madeline Will, wrote an article entitled, "A Shared Responsibility" in 1986. She identified a number of questionable practices occurring in our local schools: dual systems, stigmatization of students and disagreements between parent and school personnel about

placement decisions. The article requested ideas and creative responses for improving the education of students with learning problems in the regular education setting. This request became known as, The Regular Education Initiative. The article responded to four main concerns with the current system of special education:

1. special education and regular education operate as a dual system that diminishes the role of the regular classroom teacher by placing students with learning problems in special programs;

2. distinct categorical programs result in fragmented services to children;

3. students in special programs who are segregated from their non-handicapped peers are stigmatized and suffer from poor self-esteem and negative attitudes toward school and learning; and

4. eligibility requirements of special programs turn a "potential partnership" between parents and schools into an adversarial attitude over the placement of children (p. 7).

A recommended solution for solving these problems is for general educators to take more responsibility for students who have learning problems. An additional solution is to provide instructional, organizational, and administrative support to regular classroom teachers, increasing instructional time, returning administrative control to

school principals for managing and coordinating categorical services, and employing new educational approaches, such as cooperative learning, curriculum-based assessment and individualized curricula.

Integrated Programming

A common feature of integrated programs is that they do not ignore the individual needs of all students. An integrated program makes use of teacher aides and support staff in the classroom; cooperative teaming between general and special education teachers; consultation and technical assistance to teachers; adaptation of curricula; the use of specific learning strategies such as cooperative learning designs and peer instruction, and out-come based approaches. By providing for the students' individual needs, a unified educational system does not become a "dumping ground," it becomes reformed educational system that provides for all students. Summarizing the look of an educational system that educates all students, Stainback, Stainback and Forrest (1989) compares dual with unified system in Table 1. Drawing upon an extensive study of factors affecting student achievement, Brophy (1986) states: "Research has turned up very little evidence suggesting the need for qualitatively different forms of instruction for students who differ in aptitude, achievement level, socio-economic status or learning style.

Table 1

Comparison of Dual and Unified Systems

CONCERN	DUAL SYSTEM	UNIFIED
Student characteristics	Dichotomizes student into special/regular	Recognizes continuum among all students of intellectual, physical, and psychological characteristics
Individualization	Stresses individualization for students labeled as special	Emphasizes dualization for all students
Instructional strategies	Seeks to use special strategies for special students	Selects from range of available strategies according to each students' learning needs
Type of educational services	Eligibility generally based on category affiliation	Eligibility based on each student's individual learning needs
Diagnostics	Large expenditures on identification of categorical affiliation	Emphasis on identifying the specific instructional program
Professional relationships	Establishes artificial barriers among educators that promote competition and alienation	Promotes cooperation through sharing resources, expertise, and advocacy, responsibility

TABLE 1 (Continued)

CONCERN	DUAL SYSTEM	UNIFIED
Curriculum	Options available to each student are limited by categorical affiliation	All options available to every student as needed
Focus	Student must fit regular education program or be referred to special education	program is adjusted to meet all students' needs
The "real" world	Some students educated in artificial special world	All students educated in mainstream of regular education
Attitude	Some students given an education as a special and charity-like favor	All students given an education as a regular and normal practice

Educators As Change Agents

One critical factor to be considered regarding the achievability of the REI are the attitudes of the people who work inside the school system. Regular elementary teachers, and elementary principals are the individuals who would be primarily responsible for carrying out the changes required to affect the REI or integration of regular and special education. The positions and attitudes of building school educators toward the implementation of the REI or a merger have not been studied at the local level. However, the discussion and debate surrounding this issue have been generated by special education personnel at university and federal agency levels (Davis, 1989).

The rationale for a merger of special and regular education has been based on referring too many students, and inappropriate placement of language minority and children of color. It was also prompted by the lack of regular education alternatives to meet the needs of non-handicapped, low-achieving students, the ineffectiveness of current educational practices in special education, and the fundamental belief that students are more alike than different.

Keogh (1988), in her analysis of a merger, questioned its two underlying assumptions: (1) that there are few truly handicapped students, and (2) the regular education system

is capable of effectively serving all students. To achieve successful implementation of the REI, or a merger of regular and special education, it would appear to require changes requested above. They did not, however, address current attitudes toward the integration of mainstreaming, or acknowledge fundamental organizational (school) changes that might be needed to effect the REI or a merger.

Bonds and Lindsey (1982), in an examination of attitudes of elementary school teachers concluded that teachers see the principal as able to make very specific and worthwhile contributions to special and regular education programs. In a number of areas relating to special education and the special needs student, urban and suburban principals were found in agreement with one another, according to a study conducted by Payne and Murray (1974). Agreement was found regarding those teacher competencies needed for the successful integration of handicapped students into regular classroom settings. In spite of this area of agreement, urban principals were found significantly more reluctant than suburban counterparts to integrate handicapped students.

"Attitudes of Principals and Teachers Toward Mainstreaming Handicapped Children" (Smith, 1979), focused on the categories of exceptional children which principals and teachers thought should be mainstreamed. The study

found that most educators were in agreement on the categories of exceptionally to mainstream, including the educable mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed or behavioral disordered, and the learning disabled. At least 50% of the responding principals and regular classroom teachers favored mainstreaming in general. While less than half the classroom teachers favored mainstreaming the educable retarded, almost three-fourths of the principals were in favor.

In 1973, McGuire found a significant correlation existed between the building principals' attitudes toward handicapped students and quality of educational programs received by these students. While not necessarily surprising, this finding does underscore the importance of the educators' attitudes.

Jorden (1981), sought to evaluate certain variables related to the training and experience of school principals to determine whether these factors effect the principals' attitudes toward integrating the handicapped into the general education program of the school. No significant difference in attitude toward integrating handicapped students was found between male and female principals' of varying levels of experience with the handicapped school experience other than teaching or administration, age as a school principal, type of school administered, and

relationship to handicapping conditions. A significant difference as found in attitudes toward integration of handicapped students between principals of varying levels of training. Only those principals with extensive training in special education (seven or more classes) held significantly more positive attitudes toward the integration of the handicapped into the regular education program of the school.

In "A Study of the Attitudes of Regular Teachers and Administrators Toward Mainstreaming," 1990, the attitude of elementary school principals and regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming was investigated.

The major findings suggested that there were no significant differences between the principals' and teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming handicapped students. However, a significant difference was found with respect to credit hours taken in special education. Two groups of educators (elementary principals, regular education teachers) were the focus of this research. They assumed different roles within a school organization, each holding a unique position as change agents and in the education of all students.

Concerns regarding the role of regular teachers in the mainstreaming process and their training for involvement with handicapped students was expressed when P.L. 94-142 first became law (Swartz, 1978) and continues in current

research (Stone, Brown, 1986-87,). Providing special education services within the regular education class has been proposed as an alternative to the current practice of providing services for special needs students. Teaching skills inherent in the concept of quality education are ones which are required by both general and special education teachers (Lipsky & Gartner, 1987). Other researchers believe that a dual system of educators to teach handicapped or non-handicapped students is not necessary, and only contributes to the separation and fragmentation that serves no useful purpose in any school system (Stainback, Stainback, 1984-87).

In conclusion, the REI has three basic premises:

(1) Many children with learning problems are not eligible for special education, (2) students who are diagnosed as handicapped are stigmatized by their placement in segregated programs designed to isolate them from the rest of the school population, and (3) special education does not include prevention as a major emphasis. Suggested remedies include a delivery model based in the regular classroom, early identification and intervention, curriculum-based assessment, and the inclusion of all students with learning problems, regardless of their eligibility for special education. The REI returns to classroom teachers responsibility for educating students with problems.

The concern of general education's difficulty in meeting the needs of students with learning problems diminishes when compared to the magnitude of the failure that is likely to come. The problem facing our public education system is much greater than deciding whom is to be responsible for handicapped students and their failure in school. A larger issue is how best to educate students who are likely to fail in school.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will present the design and a description of the survey methodology used in this study. The composition of the examination includes four phases: (1) Purpose of the Study (2) Instrument Development (3) Sampling Methodology and (4) Data Analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The objectives of this study are (1) to determine what principals and teachers perceive as requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students; (2) to ascertain principals' and teachers' perceptions about the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classroom settings. The research questions sought to explore the beliefs of elementary principals and regular education teachers about integrating special education students, their educational needs, and requirements for program delivery in the regular classroom setting.

The research questions which guided this study are:

1. Do significant differences exist between elementary principals and regular education teachers regarding their attitudes concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings?

2. Is there a significant difference in attitudes between gender?
3. Do the attitudes of elementary principals and regular education teachers depend on their level of academic preparation in special education?
4. Is there a significant difference in attitudes between minority and non-minority elementary principals and regular education teachers?

Instrument Development

Owing to the interest in answering the above questions, the investigator examined the literature about attitudes and perceptions elementary principals and regular education teachers have regarding the Regular Education Initiative. The investigator could not locate an instrument to answer the research questions outlined above. Accordingly, two focus groups consisting of 12 elementary school principals and 12 regular education teachers met and discussed their attitudes related to integrating regular and special education students into a unified classroom setting. This discussion led to the development of a pilot survey. The pilot survey was given to 12 principals and 12 teachers not associated with the focus group.

They were asked to complete the survey, review and recommend changes on an evaluation form (see Appendix A) which might improve the applicability of the questions. The

respondents were asked to mail the survey and evaluation forms back to the evaluator. There were 10 principal respondents, and 9 teacher respondents. Suggested alterations were incorporated into the surveys. A more comprehensive pilot study was then conducted to determine content validity and evaluate the survey for clarity, bias, and ease of response using 10 experts in special education and elementary education. Ten individuals knowledgeable about educational research and central office administration were also included. Each subject received a survey, explanatory letter, and evaluation form. Assimilating respondent recommendations, the instrument was revised accordingly.

A research proposal was presented to the District in an effort to seek approval to complete the survey portion of the study. Approval was granted in April 1992. A panel of three experts consisting of a special education director, an educational researcher, and a special educator reviewed each item and determined what construct the item appeared to measure.

As a result of this process, the panel came to a consensus on what the survey was supposed to measure, and decided final items for inclusion. The panel recommended that two survey instruments, one for principals, and one for teachers be designed using the same question format. This

was done to create an easier method of distributing and separating the surveys, once completed by the respondents as well as to word surveys appropriately for principals and teachers.

The issues surrounding the research questions were divided into two groups, student success and attitude or perception among elementary principals and regular education teachers concerning integrating special education students into regular classrooms. This was done as a result of focus group discussions and research documentation. The survey items were associated with student success or attitude, and in some instances both in the following manner:

Student Success

Item	Background
1	All students in same class.
2	Integration would not be for all.
3	Current system unable to meet needs of all.
4	Integration would require special education for some students.
5	Students should be educated only in full-time regular class.
6	Handicapped students should be educated in regular half day and special half day.
7	Handicapped students should be in full-time special class.
8	Handicapped students should be in special school.

Attitude

Item(s)	Background
9	Integration would require preparation to ensure all students are educated in unified manner.
10, 11	Integration requires change in attitude.
12	Integration leads to greater cooperation.
13	Integration requires teacher aides in class (Student Success).
14, 15	Integration requires educators to develop expertise in special education.
16	Handicapped students should be taught by special educators working outside the regular class (Student Success).
17	Handicapped students should be taught by special educators working within the regular class (Student Success).
18	Teachers are able to educate all students without assistance from special educator (Student Success).

The outcomes of this phase of the instrument development were named the Regular Education Initiative (REI) Survey for Principals and the Regular Education Initiative Survey for Regular Teachers. The surveys consisted of four point Likert-type items measured on a scale varying from 1 to 4. (Strongly Agree), (Agree), (Disagree), (Strongly Disagree). In addition, demographic items request information about

age, gender, ethnicity, and educational background (see Appendix B).

Since all of the survey questions were closed, i.e., respondents chose from several options, the frame of reference would be more likely to be consistent across respondents (Schuman & Presser, 1981).

Sampling Methodology

A large urban school district located in the south central portion of Arizona, was selected for this study. Within this school district are three elementary school zones: 1, 2, 3. Each zone contains approximately the same number of elementary schools. The characteristics of the zones are homogeneous. Zone 1 and 2 have approximately 8,000 students, zone 3 has approximately 12,000 students.

SAMPLING PLAN

ZONE 1

S1	S2	S3	S4
T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅

ZONE 2

S1	S2	S3	S4
T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅

ZONE 3

S1	S2	S3	S4
T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅	T ₁ T ₂ T ₃ T ₄ T ₅

S = SCHOOL T = TEACHER

Because it was possible to obtain responses from nearly all elementary principals, the survey was administered in May, 1992, at the monthly principals' meeting for each zone. A total of 62 of 67 principals (93%) completed the survey instrument. The remainder were absent from the meetings and had no opportunity to respond to the survey.

Because there were many more teachers than principals, it was decided to randomly sample clusters of teachers within a subset of elementary schools within each zone. By stratifying the sample along geographic zones, it was possible to insure that differences among zones in terms of relevant variables which might influence survey outcomes would be adequately covered. For example, if the Socio-Economic Status (SES) varied across the geographic zones, sampling equal numbers of schools across the three zones would insure that zone to zone differences should be included in the sample, insuring a representative sampling of characteristics across the zones. Four schools were randomly selected within each of the three geographic zones, and five teachers were randomly selected from the pool of regular education teachers within each school. This yielded a potential sample of $4 \times 5 \times 3 = 60$ regular education teachers; of these teachers, 54 (90%) responded to the survey which was mailed during April and May, 1992.

Data Analysis

Initially, frequency distributions were calculated for each survey item, separating for principals and teachers. Frequency distributions were also obtained for number of females, males, ethnicity, educational background, and age. Cross tabulations were computed according to occupation based on gender and ethnicity. For each survey item, independent sample t-tests were made between principals and teachers. The pooled variance estimate was used to calculate the t statistic in this study. Also, an independent sample t-test was performed to determine the difference between attitudes of minority and non-minority educators as well as the differences in attitude between gender.

A three group classification was used for level of education depending on number of graduate level credits taken in special education. A series of variances (ANOVA) was run to determine whether any significant difference occurred among the three levels, 0-10 credits; 11-20 credits; over 21 credits. The .05 alpha level was used as the criterion for statistical significance. For two independent groups, this study tested the null hypothesis that the means of the two groups are equal against a two-sided alternative that the means of the two groups are different. For Analysis of Variance (ANOVA's), we tested

the null hypothesis that the means of all the groups are equal against the alternative that at least one mean is different. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the attitudes of elementary principals and regular education teachers in Tucson, Arizona schools were different regarding the general support of integrating regular and special education students into the public school system. The data collection instrument was a survey designed for elementary principals and regular education teachers. This chapter reports the results of the study.

The survey consisted of two discrete parts. The demographic characteristics yielded information about age, occupation, gender, ethnic composition, and special education graduate credit grouping of respondents. The second part included items that sought information from respondents about their attitudes toward integrating regular and special education students into the public schools.

Attitudes about integration are presented in cross tabulation tables (one through six), frequency tables (7 through 11), and a t-test table (12). Statistically significant differences between principals and teachers are highlighted within tables using t-tests. Results are discussed and conclusions are drawn.

Demographic Information

What follows is a discussion of demographic information contained in the REI Survey. T-test Tables will be displayed to show categorical information.

Number of Respondents

One hundred-and-twenty-seven surveys were sent, or given to 67 principals and 60 teachers in Tucson, Arizona schools. A total of 118 surveys were returned for a 92.9 percent return rate. By groups, response rates were: principals $n = 63$, and teachers $n = 55$. The response returns were better than expected because the investigator was able to administer the surveys personally during district principals' meetings. The teacher's surveys were hand delivered to each school building participating in the survey. Respondent totals differ for several survey items due to failure of some principals and teachers to answer every item. Therefore, response totals are presented for each item in the data summary tables.

Age Range of Respondents

The age range for respondents varied from 26 to 68 years. In the principal group, the age ranged from 38-68. The teacher group was slightly younger, ranging from 26-63.

Occupation Based on Gender

A total of 84 females and 32 males participated in the study. Of the 84 females, approximately 54 percent were

teachers. Of the 32 males, approximately 72 percent were principals. Table 2 displays occupation by gender.

Table 2

Occupation by Gender

	Female	Male	Row Total
Principal	39	23	62 53.4
Teacher	45	9	54 46.6
Total (percent)	84 72.4	32 27.6	116 100.0

Independent Samples of Gender

A t-test for two independent samples was employed in the statistical analysis regarding gender. This type of analysis was performed because it clearly displays two sets of information. In Table 2, a comparison of gender groupings indicates that there is a difference in attitude between females and males about integrating special education students into the regular classroom. The female and male principals and teachers were combined into one category labeled, "Group A". Similarly, the same format was

used for the male principals and teachers which resulted in a category labeled, "Group B".

While the males tend to agree more than the females that current education systems would be unable to provide opportunities for all students to be educated in the same classroom (item 1), females tend to agree more than males that handicapped students should be educated in a full-time special school for the handicapped (item 8). The females were more favorable toward the opinion that integration requires a change in attitudes of principals and regular education personnel toward students with handicaps (item 10). Table 3 displays the most statistically significant independent samples of gender.

Ethnic Composition

The ethnic composition of respondents consisted of 10 African Americans, 35 Hispanics, 1 Native American, and 70 Anglo-Americans. There was no representation in the Asian American group (see Table 4). This sample appears to be similar to the overall population of principals and teachers employed in the school system under study with the exception of the Asian American group. Their representation is equivalent to approximately one percent of the overall population of the district.

Table 3

Independent Samples of Gender

Group A (Female)				Group B (Male)					
Item value	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	p-	
3(no inter-gration)	81	1.86	.862	31	2.22	.717	-2.07	.040	
8(spec. ed school)	81	3.54	.775	31	3.16	.688	2.40	.018	
10(change in attitude)	82	3.31	.718	32	2.96	.897	2.17	.033	

n=number, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, t= t-tests
p-value=probability

Table 4

Occupation by Ethnicity

	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Anglo	Total
Principal	7	21		33	61 52.6
Teacher	3	14	1	37	55 47.4
Total (percent)	10 8.6	35 30.2	1 .9	70 60.3	116 100.0

Special Education Graduate Credit

Educators were grouped according to the number of credit hours they accumulated in graduate level special education classes (see Table 5). The first group consisted of educators who had between zero and ten credit hours of graduate level special education classes, while the second group consisted of educators with eleven to twenty credit hours. The third group consisted of those with 21 or more credit hours. A comparison was made on each item of the REI Survey using One-way ANOVA's.

With regard to graduate credit, there was a significant difference in level of agreement in the belief that integration requires a change in the attitudes of elementary principals, and regular education teachers toward students with handicaps (items 10, 11). This response supports the belief that our current education system is unable to meet the educational need of all students. Group 2 (0-10 credits) appeared to believe more strongly that a change in the attitude of educators is needed to bring about successful integration of special education students. Group 1 (0-10 credits), and Group 3 (20+ credits) affirm that integration requires elementary principals and regular education teachers to develop expertise in special education. These responses indicate that additional coursework credits in the area of special education may be

Table 5

Special Education Graduate Credit Grouping

Item value	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	F-value	p-
10(change attitude)	49 M 3.2245	15 3.6667	10 2.7000	5.5847	.0056
11(change in attitude)	47 M 3.1702	15 3.7333	10 3.0000	4.2815	.0177
14(expertise in special ed.)	49 M 3.0408	16 3.4375	10 3.6000	4.1787	.0192
15(expertise in special ed.)	49 M 1.9388	16 1.3750	10 1.3000	5.5866	.0056

n=number, M=Mean, F-value=frequency, p-value=probability

important to the success of integrating special education students into the regular classroom.

Minority and Non-Minority Representation

In an attempt to compare the attitudes of minorities and non-minorities, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans were combined into a category labeled, minority group. Anyone identified, or labeled as an Anglo, or Caucasian, was placed in the non-minority group (see Table 6).

Survey responses of the two groups were compared on each question of the survey. Only items two (no integration) and

Table 6

Minority and Non-Minority Representation

Item value	Minority			Non-Minority			t	p-
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD		
2(no inter- gration)	45	2.93	1.00	69	2.50	.98	2.24	.027
5(full-time reg. class)	46	1.80	.500	67	1.56	.633	2.13	.036

n=number, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, t=t-tests, p-value=probability

five (full-time regular classroom) were found to be statistically significant. The minority group was consistently more favorable in its attitudes about (1) what is in the best interest of students, and (2) that students, regardless of their handicapping condition, should be educated only in full-time regular classrooms. This suggests that members of minority groups may differ in their attitudes about special education, suggesting greater complexity in determining the best ways to educate minority special education students.

General Attitudes of Principals and Teachers

What follows is a discussion of the frequency data presented in Tables 7 through 11. The results are also displayed in t-tests on Table 12 which displays the responses for each attitude item on the survey. The t-test

responses by principals and teachers. An examination of two sets of results will be discussed: (1) the perceptions and attitudes among elementary principals and regular education teachers regarding how they perceive requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students; (2) and the perceptions of principals and teachers toward the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classroom settings. Items one through eighteen examine the level of agreement between each item.

The statistical method employed was the t-test for independent samples. The pooled variance was used to calculate the t statistic for survey items. The chosen significance level was .05. At this level, statistical analysis revealed that principals' attitudes were different from teachers' attitudes.

Student Success Concerning Integration

Table 7 shows frequency distributions of principals and teachers on items one through four of the REI Survey. These tables also display significant differences between principals and teachers concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings. It appears that principals and teachers differ strongly in

Table 7

Responses by principal and teacher groups

Survey Item	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Teacher</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
(1)						
One program						
Strongly Agree	50	(30)	24	(13)	37	(43)
Agree	43	(26)	45	(25)	44	(51)
Disagree	6	(4)	25	(14)	16	(18)
Strongly Disagree	1	(1)	6	(3)	3	(4)
Total	100	(61)	100	(55)	100	(116)
(2)						
No integration						
Strongly Agree	13	(8)	11	(6)	12	(14)
Agree	20	(12)	51	(28)	34	(40)
Disagree	34	(21)	18	(10)	27	(31)
Strongly Disagree	33	(20)	20	(11)	27	(31)
Total	100	(61)	100	(55)	100	(116)
(3)						
Unable to meet needs						
Strongly Agree	32	(19)	31	(17)	32	(36)
Agree	42	(25)	45	(25)	44	(50)
Disagree	19	(11)	20	(11)	19	(22)
Strongly Disagree	7	(4)	4	(2)	5	(6)
Total	100	(59)	100	(55)	100	(114)
(4)						
Special education for some						
Strongly Agree	46	(28)	42	(23)	44	(51)
Agree	48	(29)	56	(31)	52	(60)
Disagree	3	(2)	2	(1)	2	(3)
Strongly Agree	3	(2)	0	(0)	2	(2)
Total	100	(61)	100	(55)	100	(116)

their attitudes towards special education students' integration in the regular classroom.

On item one, 31 percent of the teachers disagreed that integrating special education students into the regular classroom would be successful for all students compared to five percent of the principals. On item two, there was also an apparent difference between principals' and teachers' attitude concerning the best interest of all students. Thirty-four percent of principals disagree that integrating special education students would not be in the best interest of all students, while 51 percent of the teachers believe that integration would be in the best interest of students. Items three and four appeared to show that principals and teachers have similar perceptions regarding the educational needs of students, and student success in special education class for some students (see Table 7).

Student Success in Integrated, Non-integrated Settings

Table 8 shows responses by principals and teachers on item five through eight of the REI Survey. On item five, there appears to be similar disagreement between principals and teachers concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings. Approximately 95 percent of the principals, and 94 percent of the teachers disagree that students, regardless of their handicapping condition, should be educated in full-time regular classrooms.

Table 8

Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups

Survey Item	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Teacher</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
(5) Full-time regular class -----						
Strongly Agree	2	(1)	0	(0)	0	(1)
Agree	3	(2)	6	(3)	4	(5)
Disagree	65	(40)	46	(25)	57	(65)
Strongly Disagree	30	(18)	48	(26)	39	(44)
Total	100	(61)	100	(54)	100	(115)
(6) 1/2 Special education 1/2 Regular education -----						
Strongly Agree	28	(17)	37	(20)	32	(37)
Agree	54	(33)	54	(29)	54	(62)
Disagree	18	(11)	9	(5)	14	(16)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Total	100	(61)	100	(54)	100	(115)
(7) Full-time special education -----						
Strongly Agree	3	(2)	9	(5)	6	(7)
Agree	5	(3)	11	(6)	8	(9)
Disagree	52	(32)	47	(26)	50	(58)
Strongly Disagree	40	(24)	33	(18)	36	(42)
Total	100	(61)	100	(55)	100	(116)
(8) Special school -----						
Strongly Agree	2	(1)	7	(4)	4	(5)
Agree	2	(1)	6	(3)	4	(4)
Disagree	38	(23)	36	(19)	37	(42)
Strongly Disagree	58	(35)	51	(28)	55	(63)
Total	100	(60)	100	(54)	100	(114)

Fifty-four percent of the principals and teachers believed that handicapped students should be educated in a combination class half the school day, and the remainder in a special education classroom (item 6).

On the t-test (Table 12), item 7 was statistically significant. Principals and teachers were asked to what extent they agree with the idea, or premise of placing special education students (item 7) in full-time special education classrooms. The frequency distributions showed that 52 percent of principals did not believe that full-time placement would be the best option for students compared to approximately 20 percent of the teachers who agree that this would be the best option (see Table 8).

Attitude and Change Among Educators

Table 9 presents frequency data concerning principal and teacher opinions regarding the attitude and educational preparation among respondents as it relates to the successful integration of special education students into the regular classroom. A statistically significant difference was supported by responses to principal and teachers on items 11 (change in attitude) on t-test Table 11. Certain responses reflecting strong principal and teacher opinions are discussed below.

Table 9 indicates that 44 percent of principals and 39 percent of teachers agreed that integration requires a

Table 9

Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups

Survey Item	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Teacher</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
(9)						
Equality for all -----						
Strongly Agree	58	(36)	46	(25)	53	(61)
Agree	35	(22)	45	(24)	40	(46)
Disagree	7	(4)	9	(5)	7	(9)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Total	100	(62)	100	(54)	100	(116)
(10)						
Change in attitude -----						
Strongly Agree	44	(27)	39	(21)	41	(48)
Agree	42	(26)	43	(23)	42	(49)
Disagree	11	(7)	16	(9)	14	(16)
Strongly Disagree	3	(2)	2	(1)	3	(3)
Total	100	(62)	100	(54)	100	(116)
(11)						
Change in attitude -----						
Strongly Agree	54	(33)	34	(18)	45	(51)
Agree	39	(24)	36	(19)	38	(43)
Disagree	7	(4)	28	(15)	17	(19)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	2	(1)	0	(1)
Total	100	(61)	100	(53)	100	(114)
(12)						
Greater cooperation -----						
Strongly Agree	49	(31)	42	(23)	46	(54)
Agree	49	(31)	51	(28)	50	(59)
Disagree	2	(1)	7	(4)	4	(5)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Total	100	(63)	100	(55)	100	(118)

change in attitudes towards students with handicaps (item 10). Item 11 asks the same question as item 10. However, 54 percent of the principals agree, compared to only 34 teachers who are in favor. In item 12, there was similar agreement with principals and teachers that greater cooperation is needed between regular and special educators (see Table 9).

Special Education Preparation

Table 10 shows responses by principals and teachers on items 13 through 16. Principals and teachers strongly agree that integration requires teacher aides to be placed in all regular classes where students with handicaps are enrolled.

Sixty percent of both groups strongly agree that expertise in the area of special education is needed to successfully integrate special education students into the regular classroom (items 14 and 15). A statistically significant difference was found in item 16 (refer to t-test Table 12). The frequency information located in Table 9 indicates that 89 percent of principals disagree that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classrooms, compared to 73 percent of the teachers. (see Table 10).

Table 10

Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups

Survey Item	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Teacher</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
(13)						
Teacher aides						

Strongly Agree	42	(26)	65	(35)	53	(61)
Agree	40	(25)	24	(13)	33	(38)
Disagree	15	(9)	7	(4)	11	(13)
Strongly Disagree	3	(2)	4	(2)	3	(4)
Total	100	(62)	100	(54)	100	(116)
(14)						
Expertise in special education						

Strongly Agree	40	(25)	31	(17)	36	(42)
Agree	49	(31)	53	(29)	51	(60)
Disagree	11	(7)	16	(9)	13	(16)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Total	100	(63)	100	(55)	100	(118)
(15)						
Expertise in special education						

Strongly Agree	43	(27)	42	(23)	42	(50)
Agree	44	(28)	42	(23)	43	(51)
Disagree	13	(8)	11	(6)	12	(14)
Strongly Disagree	0	(0)	5	(3)	3	(3)
Total	100	(63)	100	(55)	100	(118)
(16)						
Taught by special educator in special class						

Strongly Agree	3	(2)	19	(10)	10	(12)
Agree	8	(5)	26	(14)	17	(19)
Disagree	48	(29)	42	(22)	45	(51)
Strongly Disagree	41	(25)	13	(7)	28	(32)
Total	100	(61)	100	(53)	100	(114)

Delivery of Special/Regular Programs

Table 11 shows frequency of responses by principals and teachers on items 17 and 18 of the REI Survey. The strongest level of agreement by principals and teachers (73 percent) was indicated on item 17 (taught by special educator in regular classroom). Both groups strongly agreed that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students by special educators working within the regular classroom.

Finally, 55 percent of principals and teachers believe that the majority of regular classroom teachers in their school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator (see Table 11).

Table 11

Responses by Principal and Teacher Groups

Survey Items	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Teacher</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
(17)						
Taught by special educator in regular class -----						
Strongly Agree	15	(9)	20	(11)	18	(20)
Agree	70	(43)	57	(30)	64	(73)
Disagree	12	(7)	17	(9)	14	(16)
Strongly Disagree	3	(2)	6	(3)	4	(5)
Total	100	(61)	100	(53)	100	(114)
(18)						
Taught by regular education teacher only -----						
Strongly Agree	6	(4)	7	(4)	6	(8)
Agree	30	(18)	15	(8)	23	(26)
Disagree	49	(30)	46	(25)	48	(55)
Strongly Disagree	15	(9)	32	(17)	23	(26)
Total	100	(61)	100	(54)	100	(115)

Table 12

Comparison of Principals and Teachers on each Item of the REI Survey Using T-Tests

Item	PRINCIPALS			TEACHERS			t	p
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD		
*1 One program	61	3.39	.69	55	2.89	.84	3.66	.00
*2 No interaction	61	2.87	1.02	55	2.47	.94	2.16	.033
3 Unable to meet need	59	1.98	.86	55	1.96	.82	.12	.902
4 Spec. ed. for some	61	1.63	.708	55	1.60	.531	.34	.738
5 Full-time reg. class	61	1.77	.589	54	1.57	.602	1.77	.080
6 Half reg. Half spec. ed.	61	3.11	.661	54	3.25	.678	-1.16	.250
*7 Full time spec. ed.	61	3.36	.578	55	3.03	.902	2.33	.022
8 Spec. ed. school	60	3.53	.623	54	3.31	.886	1.53	.128
9 Equity for all	62	3.51	.620	54	3.38	.627	1.10	.275
10 Change in attitude	62	3.25	.788	54	3.18	.779	.50	.618
*11 Change in attitude	61	3.47	.622	53	3.01	.843	3.32	.001
12 Greater cooperation	63	3.47	.535	55	3.34	.615	1.24	.219
13 Teacher-aides	62	1.79	.813	54	1.55	.861	1.51	.134
14 Expertise in special education	63	3.28	.658	55	3.14	.678	1.14	.257
15 Expertise in special education	63	1.69	.687	55	1.78	.809	-.61	.546
*16 Taught by spec. ed.	61	3.22	.761	53	2.49	.953	4.60	.000
17 Taught by spec. ed. in regular class	61	2.96	.632	53	2.94	.745	.18	.854
18 Taught by regular teacher only	61	2.27	.799	54	1.98	.879	1.90	0.60

n=number, M=mean, SD=Standard Deviation, t=t-test, p=probability, *=Statistically Significant

Summary of General Research Findings

The general findings and trends regarding characteristics, attitudes and perceptions of the respondents are as follows:

1. Of the 127 surveys mailed or given to principals and teachers, 92.9 percent were returned with usable data.

2. Principals and teachers were similar in age. Approximately 54 percent of the female respondents were teachers, and approximately 72 percent of the male respondents were principals.

3. Significant gender differences with regard to educating special education students in the regular classroom do exist between principals and teachers.

4. Significant differences were found with regard to educational background and training being associated with how principals and teachers view their success in educating special education students in the regular classroom.

5. Significant differences in attitude among minority and non-minority as it relates to the adequacy of our current educational system to educate all students exists.

6. The principals were more supportive than teachers of providing an opportunity for all students to be educated in the same classroom setting.

7. The Teachers were less supportive than principals of providing an opportunity for all students to be educated in the same classroom setting.

8. While principals and teachers support the inclusion of most students with handicapping conditions in general education classes, some respondents questioned the appropriateness of extending the regular class placement option to students with severe disabilities.

Conclusion

There are two possible explanations that may account for the reported information. Previous educational background and training is associated with how principals and teachers responded to demographic information of special education graduate level coursework. It also suggests that previous training is associated with how principals and teachers rate their competence in using their educational background to promote the success of special education students in regular classrooms. This conclusion is supported by the finding that principals and teachers holding master's degrees reported stronger feelings about increasing their special education background as did teachers with bachelor's degrees (Bonds, 1982). The principals were stronger in their opinion about educating special education students in the regular classroom than teachers. The changing demography of America's school population, coupled with increasing demands for better education, have made it necessary for school personnel to bring about an educational system that is equipped to meet the diverse needs of our student

population. Instead of seeing the public school system as a place where individual student differences are homogenous, recognition must be made to view the ability of each student to bring unique qualities to the classroom in a heterogenous fashion.

The public expects the educational mission in the public schools to educate all children through grade twelve. However, the changing nature of society such as more students from single parent families, larger proportions of students of color enrolling in the public schools, and an increase in the number of children considered to be at-risk are becoming more evident in the school system. According to Hodgkinson (1988), "It is clear that what is coming toward the educational system is a group of children who will be poorer, more ethnically and linguistically diverse, and who will have more handicaps that will affect their learning." These children require different approaches to instruction in the school setting, and the challenge for school educators will be to become more involved in the search for the solution to this dilemma.

Some literature has shown that the provision of special education services within the regular classroom is being promoted as an alternative to resource rooms, or self-contained programs for students with learning problems (Will, 1986). The lack of educational preparation in the

area of special education could possibly be a reason for this agreement. This would need to include the basic component of the school working collectively to insure that classroom placements are age-and grade appropriate, with no self-contained special education classes operating at a school site.

CHAPTER 5

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes between elementary principals and regular education teachers in Tucson, Arizona schools regarding perceptions of (1) what principals and teachers perceive as requirements for successful classroom integration of special education students; and (2) principals' and teachers' perception about the potential for student success in integrated, partially integrated, and non-integrated classroom settings.

The research questions that guided this study are:

1. Do significant differences exist between elementary principals and regular education teachers concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings?
2. Is there a significant difference in attitudes between gender?
3. Do the attitudes of elementary principals and regular education teachers depend on their level of academic preparation in special education?
4. Is there a significant difference in attitude between minority and non-minority elementary principals and regular education teachers?

Design and Procedures

The study was a descriptive survey. Ninety-three percent of principals and 90 percent of teachers responded to the survey. A large urban school district located in the south central portion of Arizona, was selected for this study. Each member of the sample was sent or given a three-page questionnaire that consisted of (1) eighteen questions, each derived from perception among elementary principals and regular education teachers concerning integrating special education students into regular classrooms, and (2) a section on principal and teacher demographics.

Summary of Results

The first research question addressed the question: (1) Do significant differences exist between principals and teachers concerning student success in integrated and non-integrated classroom settings? Significant differences occurred between the attitudes of principals and teachers in the manner in which students are to be educated, to what degree their education will be implemented, and the need for change in the attitudes of educators in relation to special education. Principals and teachers generally agreed that handicapped students should be educated in a combination class half the school day and the remainder in a special education classroom. Both groups of respondents did not believe that handicapped students should be educated in a

full-time special self contained classroom. The depth of feeling expressed regarding the need for smaller class size and additional funding to accommodate the needs of all students was prevalent throughout the survey. Several respondents referred to this issue.

There was some resentment among the regular education teachers about having to accommodate all special needs students in their classrooms. The principals in the sample were generally positive, and accommodating to the view of including special needs students in their schools. A conflict ensues around issues of student referral, how and when students with special needs should be served, and the organization of services that should take place in the school or classroom setting. The regular education teachers must daily cope with the tasks of teaching groups of students with an assortment of needs, and abilities. They are also charged with the responsibility of maintaining discipline, and of meeting school, district, and state curriculum and achievement standards. Sometimes, teachers feel that all students whose exceptional need impede or prevent the accomplishment of these responsibilities should receive assistance outside of the regular classroom from resource specialists in the school.

Research question 2 was concerned with differences in attitudes between gender. Male principals and teachers tend

to agree more than female principals and teachers that the current education system would be unable to provide opportunities for all students to be educated in the same classroom. Female principals and teachers tend to agree more than males that handicapped students should be educated in full-time special schools for the handicapped. They were also more favorable toward the opinion that integration requires a change in attitudes of principals and regular education personnel toward students with handicaps.

Because female principals have more contact with students as teachers, they may express positive attitudes about integrating special education students into the regular class room. Possessing the knowledge about the problems and issues surrounding special education in general, specific handicapped and at-risk for failure groups, and dealing with all the associated problems could lead under some circumstances to a more positive attitude. Research question 3 explored the relationship between levels of academic preparation in special education and attitudes about principal and teacher educational preparation. Years of teaching resulted in no significant difference in knowledge about integrating special education students into the regular classroom. The years of experience as principal, or teacher did not suggest significant

differences in attitude or knowledge about educating all students.

This finding was perplexing. One would think that principals and teachers with more experience, who have of exposure to, and work with regular and special education students, teachers, and programs would show benefits from that experience. However, earned graduate credit hours in special education courses showed a significant relationship on the attitudes and knowledge of principals and teachers. There was agreement between principals and teachers who possessed 11 or more graduate credit hours in special education that integration requires a change in the attitudes of principals and teachers toward students with handicaps. There was also a significant difference in the belief that integration requires principals and teachers to develop expertise in special education.

Research question 4 focused on attitudes of minority and non-minority principals and teachers. The minority group members appeared to be more favorable in their attitudes about (1) what is in the best interests of the students, and (2) that students, regardless of their handicapping condition, should be educated only in full-time regular classrooms. These particular findings raised complex issues that can not be addressed in this survey such as: What factors or underlying conditions constitute a student of

color to be placed in a special education program? How equitable should our public school systems be when it comes to providing the least restrictive environment for students who speak a language other than standard English, and can not be accommodated in the regular classroom setting?

Implications for Practitioners

1. Principals and teachers must become partners in the fundamental change process of how teachers and learning occur in our public schools for all students. Creating these partnerships will not be easy, but they are necessary.

2. Provisions must be made for teachers and principals to not only participate together in the implementation process of integrating special education students into the regular classroom, but also to share leadership in thinking about and implementing change. This is not to imply that principals should relinquish leadership. Instead, principals should assist in empowering teachers to participate in, and contribute to a school culture of commitment, flexibility and support for all students in the school setting.

3. Principals and teachers need to create networks and partnerships that extend beyond their school environment. By conversing with educators from other educational settings like university faculty, business community people, and others, principals and teachers will become more aware of

alternative ideas, and resources that can enrich and provide additional learning opportunities for all students.

4. Principals and teachers should move from dialogue, reflection, and observation toward action of integrating students.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was designed to examine the attitudes among elementary principals and regular education teachers regarding their perceptions and attitudes of integrating special education students into the regular classroom setting. The small size of the sample and the restriction to a district operating under the laws of one state, does not provide a sufficient foundation to generalize these findings. With a larger sample, the question of ethnicity might be examined more thoroughly as a variable that could explain attitude differences. It might also be beneficial to investigate a broader number of schools throughout a state or across a number of states.

To clarify and expand findings of this study, additional research should be conducted using a broader sample to determine the current status of regular and special education classroom teachers' and principals' attitudes and competencies regarding the integration of special education students into the regular classroom. Evaluation studies are needed with regard to the effectiveness of alternative

systems of providing resource services in the elementary school setting (team teaching models, cooperative learning techniques, consultive team building approaches such as site-based management).

These suggestions are meant to serve as a starting point for dialogue and a prelude to collaborative action for elementary principals and regular education classroom teachers. They are not intended as the only manner in which to bring about successful implementation of integrating special education students into the regular classroom. It is through a process such as this that change becomes productive in schools, thus, providing success in learning for all students.

APPENDIX A

EXPLANATORY LETTER

SURVEY EVALUATION FORM

EXPLANATORY LETTER

February 16, 1992

Dear Colleague:

I am in the process of finalizing the data collection instrument for a study to be conducted in April 1992. The purpose of this study is to identify the attitudes and perceptions of elementary principals and regular education teachers regarding integrating regular and special education students.

I am requesting that you assist me in the refinement and piloting of a survey. Enclosed is a copy of the survey along with a brief rating sheet. I would appreciate your comments regarding the clarity, completeness, and ease of response of the survey.

PLEASE FOLLOW THESE DIRECTIONS:

1. Answer each survey item.
2. Answer the summary evaluation items on the rating sheet provided

Your support and cooperation in replying will assist me in completing this project. I plan to complete this final pilot phase by March 20, 1992.

Please return your completed survey and rating sheet in the pre-addressed return envelope.

Thank you!

Linda Arrington

enclosures

SURVEY EVALUATION FORM

1. LIST BY QUESTION NUMBER ANY SURVEY ITEM(S) THAT ARE:
UNCLEAR
BIASED
2. ARE THERE ANY ITEMS THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD BE DELETED?
(INDICATE BY ITEM NUMBER)
3. ARE THERE ANY ITEMS THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD BE INCLUDED?
(PLEASE BE SPECIFIC)
4. ARE THERE ANY AREAS OF CONCERN THAT WERE NOT ADDRESSED WITHIN
THE SURVEY? (PLEASE EXPLAIN)
5. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS...

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL INTRODUCTION LETTER AND SURVEY

TEACHER INTRODUCTION LETTER AND SURVEY

PRINCIPAL INTRODUCTION LETTER

April 29, 1992

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a survey as part of a research project through the University of Arizona. I would like to learn your views about the integration of regular and special education students occurring in your school.

As an expert in the field of educational reform, you can provide critical information about the interpretation of these changes as they relate to STUDENTS and PRINCIPALS.

I would greatly appreciate if you would fill out the survey. Your responses will be kept confidential, and the results of the survey will be used only for the research project.

I thank you for your time and voluntary effort in completing this survey!

Sincerely,

Linda Arrington

cc: Attachment

PRINCIPAL CONSIDERATIONS		LEVEL OF AGREEMENT			
		SA	A	D	SD
9.	I believe that integration would require elementary principals to be prepared to ensure that all students be educated in a unified system.				
10.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of elementary principals toward students with handicaps.				
11.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of regular education teachers toward students with handicaps.				
12.	I believe that integration leads to greater cooperation between regular and special educators.				
13.	I believe that integration requires teacher aides to be placed in all regular classes where students with handicaps are enrolled.				
14.	I believe that integration requires elementary principals to develop expertise in special education.				
15.	I believe that integration requires regular education teachers to develop expertise in special education.				
16.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classroom.				
17.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students by special educators working within the regular classroom.				
18.	I believe that the majority of regular classroom teachers in my school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator.				

Principal Survey

The following information is requested for classification purposes only. It will be kept confidential. Please check the line that applies to you.

19. Age: _____
20. Gender: _____Female _____Male
21. Ethnicity: _____African American _____Native-American
 _____Asian/Pacific _____White
 _____Hispanic _____Other (Specify)_____
22. How many years have you taught in this district?_____
23. How many years did you teach in elementary education?_____
24. How many years did you teach in Special elementary education?_____
25. What is the highest degree you received?
 _____Bachelors _____Education Specialist
 _____Masters _____Doctorate
 _____Other (Specify)_____
26. If you are not certified in Special education, how many earned credit hours of special education graduate level classes do you have?_____
27. Please list your certification areas_____
-

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

YOUR INPUT IS APPRECIATED

TEACHER INTRODUCTION LETTER

April 29, 1992

Dear Teachers:

I am a graduate student at the University of Arizona and would like to learn your views about integrating special education students into classrooms with regular education students.

As an expert in the field of teaching, you can provide invaluable information about the interpretation of these changes.

Please fill out the survey, place it in the attached envelope, seal it and return to your principal.

Your responses will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your time and voluntary effort in completing this survey!

cc: Attachment

TEACHER CONSIDERATIONS		LEVEL OF AGREEMENT			
		SA	A	D	SD
9.	I believe that integration would require regular classroom teachers to be prepared to ensure that all students be educated in a unified system.				
10.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of regular education personnel toward students with handicaps.				
11.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of elementary principals toward students with handicaps.				
12.	I believe that integration leads to greater cooperation between regular and special educators.				
13.	I believe that integration requires teacher aides to be placed in all regular classes where students with handicaps are enrolled.				
14.	I believe that integration requires elementary principals to develop expertise in special education.				
15.	I believe that integration requires regular education teachers to develop expertise in special education.				
16.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classroom.				
17.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students by special educators working within the regular classroom.				
18.	I believe that the majority of regular classroom teachers in my school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator.				

Teacher's Survey

The following information is requested for classification purposes only. It will be kept confidential. Please check the line that applies to you.

19. Age: _____
20. Gender: _____Female _____Male
21. Ethnicity: _____African American _____Native-American
 _____Asian/Pacific _____White
 _____Hispanic _____Other (Specify)_____
22. How many years have you taught in this district?_____
23. How many years did you teach in elementary education?_____
24. How many years did you teach in Special elementary education?_____
25. What is the highest degree you received?
 _____Bachelors _____Education Specialist
 _____Masters _____Doctorate
 _____Other (Specify)_____
26. If you are not certified in Special education, how many earned credit hours of special education graduate level classes do you have?_____
27. Please list your certification areas_____
- _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!
 YOUR INPUT IS APPRECIATED

APPENDIX C

SURVEY FREQUENCY DATA

PRINCIPAL CONSIDERATIONS					TOTAL
LEVEL OF AGREEMENT					
	SA	A	D	SD	
9. I believe that integration would require elementary principals to be prepared to ensure that all students be educated in a unified system.	36	22	4	0	62
10. I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of elementary principals toward students with handicaps.	27	26	7	2	62
11. I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of regular education teachers toward students with handicaps.	33	24	4	0	61
12. I believe that integration leads to greater cooperation between regular and special educators.	31	31	1	0	63
13. I believe that integration requires teacher aides to be placed in all regular classes where students with handicaps are enrolled.	26	25	9	2	62
14. I believe that integration requires elementary principals to develop expertise in special education.	25	31	7	0	63
15. I believe that integration requires regular education teachers to develop expertise in special education.	27	28	8	0	63
16. I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classroom.	2	5	29	25	61
17. I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students by special educators working within the regular classroom.	9	43	7	2	61
18. I believe that the majority of regular classroom teachers in my school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator.	4	18	30	9	61

Principal Survey

The following information is requested for classification purposes only. It will be kept confidential. Please check the line that applies to you.

19. Age: 38-68
20. Gender: 39 Female 23 Male
21. Ethnicity: 7 African American 0 Native-American
0 Asian/Pacific 33 White
21 Hispanic 0 Other (Specify) _____
22. How many years have you taught in this district? 0-31
23. How many years did you teach in elementary education? 0-31
24. How many years did you teach in Special elementary education? 0-21
25. What is the highest degree you received?
0 Bachelors 4 Education Specialist
45 Masters 13 Doctorate
0 Other (Specify) _____
26. If you are not certified in Special education, how many earned credit hours of special education graduate level classes do you have? 0-30
27. Please list your certification areas _____
-

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

YOUR INPUT IS APPRECIATED

THE REGULAR EDUCATION INITIATIVE SURVEY FOR REGULAR TEACHERS

This is a survey of attitudes about educating special education students with regular education students.

The word **INTEGRATION** means to merge regular and special education students into one unified program.

DIRECTIONS: You are asked to **CHECK** your level of agreement with each statement from **STRONGLY AGREE** to **STRONGLY DISAGREE**. Please answer all items.

Please use the following scale: **SA = STRONGLY AGREE**
 A = AGREE
 D = DISAGREE
 SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

STUDENT CONSIDERATIONS		LEVEL OF AGREEMENT				TOTAL
		SA	A	D	SD	
1.	I believe that integrating special education students would provide an opportunity for all students to be educated in the same classroom setting.	13	25	14	3	55
2.	I believe that integrating special education students would not be in the best interest of all students.	6	28	10	11	55
3.	I believe that the current education system would be unable to meet needs of all students.	17	25	11	2	55
4.	I believe that integrating special education students with regular education students would require special education classes for some students with handicaps.	23	31	1	0	55
5.	I believe that students regardless of their handicapping condition should be educated only in full-time regular classrooms.	0	3	25	26	54
6.	I believe that handicapped students should be educated in a combination of regular class part of the day and special classroom part of the day.	20	29	5	0	54
7.	I believe that handicapped students should be educated in a full-time special self-contained classroom.	5	6	26	18	55
8.	I believe that handicapped students should be educated in a full-time special school for the handicapped.	4	3	19	28	54

TEACHER CONSIDERATIONS		LEVEL OF AGREEMENT				TOTAL
		SA	A	D	SD	
9.	I believe that integration would require regular classroom teachers to be prepared to ensure that all students be educated in a unified system.	25	24	5	0	54
10.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of regular education personnel toward students with handicaps.	21	23	9	1	54
11.	I believe that integration requires a change in the attitudes of elementary principals toward students with handicaps.	18	19	15	1	53
12.	I believe that integration leads to greater cooperation between regular and special educators.	23	28	4	0	55
13.	I believe that integration requires teacher aides to be placed in all regular classes where students with handicaps are enrolled.	35	13	4	2	54
14.	I believe that integration requires elementary principals to develop expertise in special education.	17	29	9	0	55
15.	I believe that integration requires regular education teachers to develop expertise in special education.	23	23	6	3	55
16.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students primarily by special educators outside the regular classroom.	10	14	22	7	53
17.	I believe that educational programs should be delivered to handicapped students by special educators working within the regular classroom.	11	30	9	3	53
18.	I believe that the majority of regular classroom teachers in my school are able to provide an appropriate education for any student without the assistance of a special educator.	4	8	25	17	54

Teacher's Survey

The following information is requested for classification purposes only. It will be kept confidential. Please check the line that applies to you.

19. Age: 26-63
20. Gender: 45 Female 9 Male
21. Ethnicity: 3 African American 1 Native-American
0 Asian/Pacific 37 White
14 Hispanic 0 Other (Specify) _____
22. How many years have you taught in this district? 1-25
23. How many years did you teach in elementary education? 0-25
24. How many years did you teach in Special elementary education? 0-23
25. What is the highest degree you received?
22 Bachelors 3 Education Specialist
27 Masters 2 Doctorate
0 Other (Specify) _____
26. If you are not certified in Special education, how many earned credit hours of special education graduate level classes do you have? 0-12
27. Please list your certification areas _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!
 YOUR INPUT IS APPRECIATED

REFERENCES

- Bianchi, Suzanne M. (1990). "America's children: Mixed prospects." Population Bulletin, 45: 1-43.
- Bickel, W.E., & Bickel, D.D. (1986). Effective schools, classrooms, and instruction: Implications for special education. Exceptional Children, 52 (6), 489-500.
- Bonds, C.W., Lindsey, J. (1982). The principal in special education: The teachers' perspective. Education, 102 (4), 407-410.
- Brophy, J.B. (1983). Research in the self-fulfilling prophesy and teacher expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75 (5), 631-661.
- Brophy, J.B. (1986). Research linking teacher behavior to student achievement. In B.I. Williams, P. A. Richmond, & B. J. Mason (Eds). Designs for Compensatory Education (121-179). Washington, DC: Research and Evaluation Associates.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954). 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L.Ed. 873 (Case No. 85).
- Chinn, P.C., & Hughes, S. (1987). Representation of minority students in special education classes. Remedial and Special Education, 8 (4), 41-46.
- Committee for Economic Development. Research and Policy Committee, (1987). Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged. Committee for Economic Development.
- Davis, J.L., & Greene, D. (1983). Organizational barriers to full implementation of P.L. 94-142. In J.G. Chambers & W. Hartman (Eds.), Special education policies: Their history, implementation and finance. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Davis, W.E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55 (5), 440-446.

- Deal, T.E., Meyer, J.W. & Scott, W.R. (1975). Organization influences on educational innovation. In J.V. Baldrige & T.E. Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Duncun, Greg J. & Willard L. Rodgers. (1988). "Longitudinal aspects of childhood poverty." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50: 1007-10021.
- Garcia, S. B., & Ortiz, A. A. (1988). Preventing inappropriate referrals of language minority students to special education. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. New Focus, 5, 1-12.
- Garcia, R. (1987). Language, ethnicity, and education. Chapter 14 in, James Banks, Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 249-270.
- Garrison, G. W., (1990) Special education practitioners' responses to the three underlying assumptions of the regular education initiative. Doctoral Dissertation, Georgia State University.
- Gartner, A., Kerzner D. (1989). The yoke of special education: How to break it. (Working Paper) National Center on Education and the Economy, Rochester, N.Y.
- Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1989). New conceptualizations for special education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 4 (1), 16-22.
- Gartner, A. (1986). Disabling help: Special education at the crossroads. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 72-79
- Hagerty, G.J., & Abramson, M. (1987). Impediments to implementing national policy change for mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 53 (4), 315-324.
- Hill, Martha S. & Greg J. Duncan, (1987). "Parental family income and the socioeconomic attainment of children." Social Science Research, 16: 39-73.
- Hodgkinson, H. (1988). The right schools for the right kids. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 10-14.

- Idiong, I. J. (1982). The perceptions of elementary principals and special education administrators toward their expected and actual role responsibilities in implementing specific provisions of Public Law 94-142. Doctoral Dissertation, North Texas State University.
- Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Jewell, M. (1990). Special education and the regular education initiative: Basic assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56, 479-491.
- Jorden, R.E. (1981). Variables related to principal's attitude toward the integration of handicapped children into the general education program. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.
- Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable Assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 6-11.
- Keogh, B.K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 19-22.
- Lau vs. Nichols (1974). 414 U.S. 563, 39 L. Ed 2nd, 94 S. Ct 786.
- Lieberman, L.M. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? Exceptional Children. 51, 513-516.
- Lipsky, D.K., Gartner, A. (1989). Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Lewis, R.B., & Doorlag, D.H. (1987). Teaching special students in the mainstream. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Lilly, M. S. (1988). The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23, 253-260.
- Lilly, M. S. (1986, March). The relationship between general and special education: A new face on an old issue. Counterpoint, p. 10.
- Lincoln, C.A., & Higgins, N.M. (1991). Making schools work for all children. Principal, Vol. 70, No. 3 6-10.

- Mann, P.H. (Ed.). (1976). Training administrators for shared responsibility roles. In P. H. Mann (Ed.) Shared responsibility for handicapped students. Miami, FL: Banyon Books.
- Mayer, C.L. (1982). Educational administration and special education: A handbook for school administrators. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mesinger, J.F. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education" or is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion? Exceptional Children, 51, 510-512.
- McGuire, D.J. (1973). An analytical survey of the attitudes of school administrators and teachers of educable mentally retarded children and the quality of educational programs provided for educable mentally retarded children within selected school districts in New York State. Dissertation Abstracts.
- McPherson, R.B., Crowson, R.L., & Pitner, N.J. (1986). Managing uncertainty. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Morsink, C.V., Soar, R.M., Thomas, R. (1986). Research on teaching: Opening the door to special education classrooms. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 32-40.
- Murphy, J., Hallinger, P. (1987). "New Directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for Improvement." In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany: SUNY Press.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Odom, S.L., McEvoy, M.A. (1990). "Mainstreaming at the Preschool Level: Potential Barriers and Tasks for the Field." Journal of Early Intervention, 10, 48-61.
- O'Hare, W.,P., Pollard, K.M., et. al., (1991). African Americans in the 1990's. Population Bulletin. Vol. 46, No. 1. 2-40.
- Ortiz, A.A. (1988). Evaluating educational contexts in which language minority students are served. Bilingual Special Education Newsletter. 7, 1, 3-4.

- Ortiz, A.A. (1984). Language and curriculum development for exceptional bilingual children. In P. C. Chinn (Ed.), Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Ortiz, A.A. (1984). Choosing the language of instruction for exceptional bilingual children. Teaching Exceptional Children. 16, 208-212.
- Payne, R., Murray, C. (1974). Principals' attitudes toward integration of the handicapped. Exceptional Children, 41, (2), 123-125.
- Public Law 94-142. Education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Ninety-fourth Congress, S. B. 6, November 29, 1975.
- Robson, D.L. (1981). Administering educational services for the handicapped: Role expectations and perceptions. Planning and Changing, 11, 203-213.
- Reynolds, M.C., Wang, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.
- Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sarason, S., & Doris, J. (1978). Mainstreaming: Dilemmas, opposition, opportunities. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), Futures of education for exceptional students: Emerging structures. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Shuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981). Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments on question form, wording, and context. New York: Academic Press.
- Singer, J.D., & Butler, J.A. (1987). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act: Schools as agents of social reform. Harvard Educational Review. 57 (2), 125-152.
- Smith, T.E.C. (1979). Attitudes of principals and teachers toward mainstreaming handicapped children. Journal for Special Educators. 16, 89-95.

- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1987). Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on "Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility." Exceptional Children, 66-68.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1985). The merger of special and regular education: Can it be done? A response to Lukerman and Mesinger. Exceptional Children, 51, 517-521.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.
- Stone, B., & Brown, R. (1986-87). Preparing teachers for mainstreaming: Some critical variables for effective preservice programs. Educational Research Quarterly, 11, 7-10.
- Swartz, S. (1978). The case against mainstreaming. Principal, 9, 6-10.
- Taylor, S.; Biklen, D.; Lehr, S.; and Searle, S. (1987). Purposeful Integration...Inherently Equal. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Center on Human Policy.
- Walker, B.M., The relationship between teacher attitude and perceived principal attitude toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students. Boston College
- Wang, Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H. (1986). Rethinking special education. Educational Leadership, 44, (1), 26-31.
- Will, M.C. (1986a). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-416.
- Will, M.C. (1986b, November). Educating students with learning problems: A shared responsibility. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Washington, D.C.
- Will, M. (1984). OSERS programming for the transition of youth with disabilities: Bridges from school to working life. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

- Willig, A.C., & Greenburg, H.F. (Eds.). (1986). Bilingualism and learning disabilities: Policy and practice for teachers and administrators. New York: American Library Publishing.
- Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research. 55, 269-318.
- Wilson, W. (1987). The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1988). Tenth annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1985). Seventh annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, DC: Author.
- Yates, J.R. (1988). Demography as it affects special education. In A. A. Ortiz & B. A. Ramirez (Eds.), Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Ysseldyke, J.E., Thurlow, M.L., Christenson, S.L., & Weiss, J. (1987). Time allocated to instruction of mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and non-handicapped elementary students. The Journal of Special Education. 21 (3), 49-55.