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Chapter 1

Introduction

Traditionally, handicapped students have been educated in segregated classrooms or institutional settings. Since the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142, an expression of the principles set forth in this federal legislation have resulted in increased levels of integration of handicapped students into regular classrooms (USDOE, 1990). However, the goal of least restrictive placements has not been achieved in certain instances. This process requires more than the physical presence of handicapped students in least restrictive placements; these students are expected to be integrated educationally and socially to the maximum extent appropriate with their nonhandicapped peers.

Particularly affected by least restrictive placements are regular classroom teachers, special education teachers, and school principals. These individuals, must assume the primary responsibilities for integrating the special needs student and the manner in which they respond is crucial. In view of new instructional and management challenges, the development of new roles and competencies is required of educators in the special education process. Specifically, they must develop
familiarity with instructional strategies, curricular models, management techniques, and evaluation of students and programming. To be positive influences on the effectiveness of mainstreaming programs, educators are expected to be cooperative, collaborative, and have positive attitudes toward exceptional students, special education, and the notion of mainstreaming. It follows then that the perceptions individuals hold of their students, colleagues, and the system in which they operate will ultimately benefit or hinder the delivery of quality education to exceptional students.

The research literature has specifically addressed the attitudes of educators toward mainstreaming and suggests that educator attitudes are crucial, changeable, multifaceted, and built upon a matrix of factors which mold the perceptions of professionals, and may ultimately determine their responses (Fishbein and Alzen, 1975; Knight, 1986; Knoff, 1985; Pedhazur, 1981; Prus, 1989; Williams and Algozzine, 1979; Winzer and Rose, 1986). In view of this evidence, it may be concluded that educators' attitudes ultimately determine the extent to which handicapped students are not only physically integrated but become integral class members, benefiting academically, socially, and emotionally from the mainstreamed experience (Horne, 1985; Larrivee, 1982). The formulation and maintenance of educators' attitudes is contingent upon their experience, knowledge, skill, and support that is afforded to them in fulfilling their responsibilities as teacher or
Need for the Present Study

Public Law 94-142 specifies that recipients of federal funds for the education of the handicapped may exclude no handicapped child from receiving an appropriate education in the least restrictive environment, and that all such agencies follow a policy of zero reject. In other words, the law designates that all educationally handicapped children, regardless of the degrees of their disability, are entitled to a free appropriate public education including any special education and related services necessary to meet their unique educational needs.

The extent to which this mandate is being met is documented in part in the Annual Reports to Congress on the Implementation of Public Law 94-142, prepared by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (1990). Specifically, mildly handicapped students currently comprise the largest and most increased percentage of students identified as educationally handicapped and provided special education throughout our nation's public schools.

As a result, a major difficulty for school systems appears to be their ability to devise and implement programming that will concurrently meet federally and state imposed regulations while providing effective and supportive services within school environments. Although the majority of
mildly handicapped students are receiving special education services predominantly in the regular classroom setting, less attention has been given to the increasing numbers of students who are referred and placed in the special education pipeline (Korinek and Algozzine, 1985). Most importantly, the perceived capabilities of educators within the school environment who are charged with the responsibility to educate these students have not been adequately addressed in a systematic manner. One study (Prus, 1989) examined district level practices and procedures related to mainstreaming effectiveness, revealed by the perceptions of various educator groups (K-12). No studies have investigated the perceptions educators in Virginia public schools have of the process of integrating mildly handicapped students into regular classes in grades 5-9. Studies have not addressed the possible differences or disparity in the availability of services/resources in Virginia public urban and rural school divisions for comparison with educator perceptions of the mainstreaming process within their localities. Further, no studies have addressed the issues, concerns, and recommendations of educators in Virginia regarding the topic of mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9. Thus, the need for the present study is demonstrated.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions that school principals, directors of special
education, regular educators, and special educators in Virginia public schools have of the process of integrating educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled students into regular classes in grades 5-9. Research questions were stated as opposed to null hypotheses, due to the descriptive nature of this study. Specifically, the purpose of this investigation was to reveal the mainstreaming perceptions of educators, factors that underlie educator perceptions, and individual qualitative accounts of educator perspectives regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school divisions.

In an attempt to investigate the issues, concerns, and recommendations of educators to reveal empirical evidence and derive implications for administrative support, staff development, and systematic mainstreaming, the following questions were addressed in this study:

1. What does each professional group perceive to be the most facilitating and the most inhibiting factors related to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9 in Virginia public schools?

2. Do differences and similarities exist in perceptions among each professional group across school divisions throughout Virginia?

3. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group exist through
analysis of responses according to the personal demographics of respondents (sex, race, years experience in education, educational level, current position, and coursework in special education) and their responses?

4. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group can be determined through analysis of responses according to the demographic characteristics of each selected school division (student enrollment and classification of the community) and the responses of educators employed within each division?

5. What differences or similarities exist in the availability of instructional resources, as perceived by educators employed in selected urban and rural school divisions? Will a qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources in selected school divisions correspond with the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents within each of these divisions?

Information concerning the perceptions of teachers and administrators has important implication for planning systematic mainstreaming programs to promote the delivery of
quality education to handicapped students.

The perceptions of educators were investigated to determine the issues specifically addressing the education of handicapped students in regular classes as perceived by these professionals throughout these levels of schooling. Additionally, the relationship between educator and school division demographic variables and survey responses were investigated to determine similarities and differences among the perceptions of educators from various geographic locations. To support the validity of survey data, individual qualitative accounts of regular educator perspectives regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school divisions were performed through on-site structured interview sessions. These data, in comparison with the survey responses, provide greater insight into the issues specifically addressing the education of handicapped students in regular classes as perceived by each educator group.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for purposes of this study:

Mainstreaming: Mainstreaming is defined as the practice of educating handicapped and nonhandicapped students in regular education settings; generally practiced with mildly/moderately handicapped students.

Integration: Integration is defined as another term for mainstreaming.
IEP: The IEP is the Individualized Education Program or Plan of instruction/services for a handicapped student.

Perception: Perception is defined as an understanding, interpretation, or view; perception is a predisposed influence upon response.

Mildly Handicapped Students: Mildly handicapped students are those who have been judged eligible for services under the provisions of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Act, and the Virginia Regulations; specifically including three categories of exceptional students: the educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled.

Special Educators: Special educators are those who teach mildly handicapped students at grades 5-9 in resource or self-contained class settings in the public schools.

Regular Educators: Regular educators are those teachers who teach nonhandicapped and mainstreamed handicapped students in regular class settings in Virginia public schools at grades 5-9.

Principals: Principals are those who administer the school programming in grades 5-9 of the regular and special educator respondents, and mildly handicapped students. Assistant principals are included.

Directors of Special Education/Directors of Pupil Personnel/Psychologists: These individuals include each of the specified district level personnel employed by each
Virginia school division to provide leadership and management of the special education programs within their school system.

Instructional Resources: Instructional resources are those resources within a school or school system that may be available to assist teachers in the instructional process; these resources may include: instructional materials, facilities, teacher teams, support services, staff development and administrative arrangements.

Small Urban School Division: Small urban school divisions are those within Virginia that meet the following statistical demographic characteristics: land area 2-17 square miles, population density per square mile 641-7,193, population estimate 6,400-107,900, 1989-1990 student population 471-14,290, and 1-4 middle/intermediate/junior high schools within each division.

Large Urban School Division: Large urban school divisions are those within Virginia that meet the following statistical demographic characteristics: land area 49-434 square miles, population density per square mile 431-5,298, population estimate 66,700-739,300, 1989-1990 student population 9,320-126,790, and 3-20 middle/intermediate/junior high schools within each division.

Small Rural School Division: Small rural school divisions are those within Virginia that meet the following statistical demographic characteristics: land area 134-404 square miles, population density per square mile 36-170, population estimate
Large Rural School Division: Large rural school divisions are those within Virginia that meet the following statistical demographic characteristics: land area 504-995 square miles, population density per square mile 30-93, population estimate 1,800-65,100, 1989-1990 student population 2,458-9,756, and 1-5 middle/intermediate/junior high schools within each division.

Limitations of the Study

The present investigation and analysis was limited to the collection and analysis of data related to the specific research questions addressed.

Conclusions are limited to the three categories of exceptionality studied, and the four educator groups employed by Virginia public school divisions to work with students of these categories.

Generalizations of conclusions to educators not employed in public school divisions that are within the designated parameters which define the four major division types of this study, will not be included. Further, generalizations of conclusions to educators employed in other states will not be included.
Chapter 2
A Review of the Literature

Introduction

In this chapter, the literature was examined to reveal what research has to say about the historical development of the mainstreaming concept, teacher and administrator attitudes toward mainstreaming handicapped students of all exceptionalities as defined by Public Law 94-142, the effect of staff development on educator attitudes and the effect of direct classroom intervention on student achievement. The attitudes of special and regular teachers and school principals in elementary, middle, and secondary schools are examined from a review of sources identified by ERIC database, Exceptional Child Educational Resources, and Dissertation Abstracts International. Sixty studies and articles were analyzed for inclusion. Except for five, all studies were implemented and documented in the literature since the passage of Public Law 94-142.

Of particular importance are the issues specifically addressing the education of handicapped students in the mainstream as perceived by teachers and administrators. These are examined to reveal factors that underlie the reported
attitudes of professionals and provide direction for current educational practices that are implemented to better facilitate successful integration of students, as well as, direct future educational research.

Historical Perspective

The Education for all Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142, has required the establishment of procedures which will assure, to the maximum extent appropriate, that handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped. Specifically, the statute states:

"to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, (should be) educated with children who are not handicapped, and that separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment (should) occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily" (20 U.S.C.1412(5)(B); 34 C.F.R. 300.551, 1975).

Regulations accompanying this law have specified that the placement of handicapped children should entail the least restrictive environment with respect not only to academic services, but nonacademic related or support services. Each student's individualized education program is the vehicle by which placement decisions are made operational by educators and parents. The extent to which a handicapped student's needs are to be met in the regular educational program is indicated in the I.E.P. and is determined not only by the
special needs of the student, but by the perceptions, attitudes, and opinions educators hold toward education for the handicapped in public schools.

While the major thrust for mainstreaming has emerged during the past century, the concept is not a new one. A brief historical overview of this concept by Horne (1985) reveals that prior to the 1800's, handicapped individuals were either excluded from educational or training programs or educated largely in segregated institutional or classroom settings. The 1800's through the 1940's were more optimistic, and the potential for social and educational integration of handicapped students was addressed by researchers and legislators. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established by Congress within the Office of Education in the 1960's, and during this decade public school programs for various exceptionalities were made available. Legal decisions guaranteed the provision for the mentally retarded to a right to a public school education, addressed assessment procedures for placement of handicapped students in special classes, and ruled that discrimination against handicapped individuals was prohibited.

In 1975, Public Law 94-142 was enacted for the purpose of insuring that handicapped individuals, ages three through twenty-one, regardless of the nature or degree of their handicap, would have access to free and appropriate public school education. Four major provisions of this legislation
were stipulated. The least restrictive environment provision has had the greatest impact on public school education because of its focus upon the integration of handicapped students into the regular school environment (Biklin, 1985). This concept, summarized by Biklin (1985) requires the integration of disabled and nondisabled students whenever possible: to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children...are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling or other removal should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (U.S.C., 1975). Even though Public Law 94-142 does not include the term "mainstreaming", many individuals refer to it as the mainstreaming law; this term emerged among professionals as a way of operationalizing this concept through the implementation of accompanying regulations. As a result, the process of integrating handicapped and special educational programming into public schools has proven extremely controversial; it not only has required public schools to add special education but has also required that drastic changes within the public sector occur (Biklin, 1985). The perceptions and attitudes that have developed as a result of the insistence upon educational change continue to affect the daily educational programming of handicapped students.
Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

One of the reasons for mainstreaming handicapped students into regular classes is to facilitate positive interactions among nonhandicapped and handicapped students. The intellectual, social, and emotional adjustment of the child is dependent upon the understandings, or perceptions and attitudes of teachers and students toward handicapped students (Haring, 1957; Kingsley, 1967; Horne, 1985). The significance of the effects of regular teachers' attitudes on mainstreaming handicapped students has led researchers to examine the attitudes and perceptions of these professionals. The attitudes and perceptions of special educators and school principals have also been examined for comparison. The identification of variables that are associated with the attitudes of these professionals toward mainstreaming has been the subject of recent research efforts. Investigators have carefully probed the variables associated with acceptance or rejection of specific groups of exceptional students, the impact of teacher related characteristics; the effects of contact with or exposure to exceptional students, and the impact of information about exceptional students and special education upon subsequent attitude modification. Additionally, researchers have investigated the factors that underlie the attitudes of educators toward mainstreaming in an attempt to provide a conceptual framework for these dimensions.
The first section of this review is devoted to several empirical studies that focus upon the attitudes held by regular educators, special educators, and school principals toward mainstreaming. These studies address the opinions, understandings, and underlying factors associated with teacher and administrator attitude formation.

**Teacher Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming**

The variables associated with acceptance or rejection of specific groups of handicapped students have been investigated and the literature is replete with empirical evidence that suggests the importance of the role of the regular classroom teacher in successful educational programming of such students in regular classes (Lapp, 1957; Geurin, 1979; Hirshonin and Burton, 1979; Moore and Fine, 1978; Vandiver and Vandiver, 1981; Charles and Malian, 1980; Williams and Algozzine, 1979; Knoff, 1985). Specifically, the attitudes teachers hold toward the handicapped and the manner in which they choose to respond to the needs of exceptional students is an extremely potent variable in determining the success of mainstreaming these students (Larrivee, 1982).

Charles and Malian (1980) found that regular classroom teachers are not overwhelmingly supportive of the integration of exceptional children into their classes. If unusual accommodations, individualized instruction, special teaching strategies or curricular adaptations not provided for nonhandicapped students were required, they were unwilling to
accept exceptional students. Teachers may feel that the placement of exceptional students in their classrooms will require lower standards or dilute their programs (Hudson, Graham and Warner, 1979).

While regular teachers have reported a generally pessimistic view toward mainstreaming, there is evidence that they are more willing to accept some handicapped students than others. One study (Warger and Trippe, 1982) surveyed the opinions of undergraduates who had completed student teaching in an elementary or secondary setting about their beliefs toward mainstreaming emotionally disturbed students. The respondents were generally positive, although they expressed concerns about the management of behaviors typical of an emotionally disturbed student. Studies (Hudson, Graham, and Warner, 1979; Brulle et al., 1983) indicate that exceptional students are viewed as potential creators of classroom disturbance and demand a disproportionate amount of the regular teacher's attention. For these reasons teachers are generally most supportive toward the integration of learning disabled students and less willing to accept mentally retarded students (Hirshonin and Burton, 1979; Moore and Fine, 1978; Williams and Algozzine, 1979).

The empirical literature addressing the effects of diagnostic labels remains unclear (i.e. whether or not they cause negative attitudes and lower expectations) yet, the potential negative effects have been documented in two
laboratory studies. Foster et al., (1976) report regular and special educators expressed negative expectations for students with a label (mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled, respectively), even when presented with videotapes of an age-appropriate, "typically behaving" student. In a second study, Gillung and Rucker (1977) also ascertained that regular and special educators had lower expectations for labeled students than for students with identical behaviors who remain unlabeled.

When Gickling and Theobald (1975) in a statewide investigation questioned whether or not teacher attitudes may be most influenced by their attributions to classification labels based upon individual knowledge and experiences, they found the 85% of the regular educators felt unprepared to provide appropriate intervention for special needs students. An update and expansion of the previous study (Gickling and Theobald, 1975) included random sampling of two states: Massachusetts, which noncategorically identifies handicapped students, and New York, which categorically labels its special needs students for educational services (Knoff, 1985). The researcher hypothesized that the attributions to classification labels by teachers are significantly influenced by the descriptions of exceptional students in the state laws and regulations. An analysis of the differences in mainstreaming attitudes across these states and among professional groups revealed significant attitude
discrepancies between respondents from categorical (New York) versus noncategorical (Massachusetts) states and between the two professional groups (regular and special teachers). The results indicated that some of these differences could be due to the categorical/noncategorical identification processes.

More recently, Roberts (1989) examined the attitudes toward mainstreaming of 139 elementary teachers from several districts in southwest Ohio. Several factors were hypothesized as effecting the attitudes of teachers: handicapping condition, impact of mainstreaming on pedagogy, teacher affect toward mainstreaming, and administrative support for mainstreaming. The results indicated administrative support, teacher attitude toward handicapping condition, and impact on pedagogy were factors that provided significant statistical differences among teachers with positive orientation toward mainstreaming from teachers with negative orientations. Overall, it may be concluded teacher attitude is affected by these factors.

Teacher-related Variables

A second body of research has been concerned with identifying variables affecting teacher attitudes. These variables include age, sex, educational role, teaching experience, and level of education of the teacher. Findings in regard to these static variables are inconclusive and often contradictory. Females have been found to be more supportive
of handicapped students and the idea of mainstreaming (Higgs, 1975; Winzer and Rose, 1986) whereas other researchers report no significant relationship between attitudinal differences and gender (Berryman and Berryman, 1981; Foley, 1978; Hughes, 1978; Donaldson and Martinson, 1977; Harasymiw and Horne, 1976). Foley (1978) and Hughes (1978) reported that the age of a teacher does not significantly correlate with mainstreaming attitudes; however, younger teachers were found to hold more positive views than their older colleagues in a study implemented by Berryman and Berryman (1981). In 1984, Harvey and Green reported that older educators felt better prepared to instruct the handicapped and were more strongly of the opinion that teacher attitudes and low pupil-teacher ratio were critical determinants of effective mainstreaming. Years of teaching experience as a variable potentially defining attitudes toward mainstreaming indicate contradictory findings. A negative correlation between teaching experience and positive attitude is indicated in some studies (Mandell and Strain, 1978; Harasymiw and Horne, 1976) while others found the two variables to be partially confounded making it impossible to determine which variable was most important (Harvey and Green, 1984).

A clearer pattern in the research is a correlation between the grade level taught and a positive attitude toward the integration of the handicapped. Generally, attitudes become less positive as grade level ascends (Larrivee and
Contact and Exposure

The positive effects of contact with and exposure to exceptional students upon the attitudes of teachers are documented (Hoover and Cessna, 1984; Marston and Leslie, 1983; Larrivee, 1982). Harvey and Green (1984) found that teachers who had more experience with handicapped students were more supportive of mainstreaming than their colleagues without such experience. Previously, Frith and Edwards (1981) reported that experience with handicapped students generates more knowledgeable comments about the integration of such children into regular classes; teachers who had taught the handicapped were concerned with curriculum and instruction whereas others without this experience identified coping with the basic self-help and hygiene needs of students as their major concern. Likewise, Schultz (1982) reported that planning for individual differences was the major concern of the researcher's sample of 300 teachers with mainstreaming experience.

Davis-Clerk (1990) investigated the relationships between teacher opinions toward mainstreaming emotionally handicapped students and several teacher demographic variables. A sample of 210 regular elementary classroom teachers in a New York City school district were surveyed on a self-constructed questionnaire. Among the results, the following are highlighted: A) experienced teachers who were knowledgeable about instruction of handicapped students indicated more
positive opinions about the mainstreaming process, and B) respondents rated topics for inservice education, as most important to include instruction on the characteristics and learning needs of emotionally handicapped students, classroom management, and instructional techniques.

Similarly, the relationship between the development of a favorable attitude toward handicapped learners in regular classes and the taking of special education coursework is confirmed (Harvey and Green, 1984; Winzer, 1984b; Farrell, 1985; Leyser and Abrams, 1983; Cortright, 1980). Leyser and Abrams (1983) investigated the attitude change in 19 regular educators following introductory special education coursework and practicum; the results indicated a significantly positive change. Secondly, utilizing a descriptive questionnaire, Cortright (1980) surveyed 1,777 public school teachers and emphasized the importance of special training and reduction in class size for successful mainstreaming practices.

**Underlying Factors**

While the static variables associated with teacher acceptance-rejection issues, teacher-related characteristics, and exposure to special education coursework or students have been considered, less effort has been directed to uncover the factors that may underlie attitudes. It is evident that teacher attitudes are influenced by many factors, although the degree of influence of each on attitude formation is unclear. Three exceptions are studies by Larrivee and Cook (1978),
Pedhazur (1981), and Winzer (1984a) that assessed the underlying dimensions of attitudes toward mainstreaming and suggest that attitudes are complex, multifaceted and not a unitary dimension. Larrivee and Cook (1978) uncovered five dimensions underlying the acceptance of mainstreaming handicapped students: general philosophy of mainstreaming, classroom behavior of handicapped students, perceived competency to teach handicapped students, discipline and classroom management concerns, and the academic development of the handicapped student. In a second study, the researchers surveyed the attitudes of 941 teachers in six New England states. The data indicated that teacher perception of degree of success in teaching handicapped students was the most important variable in determining positive attitudes (Larrivee and Cook, 1979). Also in this study a strong relationship was found between teachers' attitudes and the level of administrative support and availability of support services.

Similarly, Pedhazur (1981) explored the critical dimensions that underlie teacher attitude by employing a mainstreaming opinionnaire consisting of two sub-scales - academic costs of mainstreaming and socio-emotional cost of segregation. The attitudes of special educators, regular educators, and non-educators were assessed. Even though the regular and non-educators did not think that mainstreaming would have negative effects, in terms of academic costs, they did not indicate attitudes as positive as did the special
educators. On the dimension of socio-emotional costs of segregation no significant difference was found between the subsamples.

Addressing the concerns similar to researchers previously mentioned, Winzer (1984) investigated the attitudes of educators and non-educators toward mainstreaming employing a three dimensional attitude survey. All groups showed positive attitudes on the dimensions assessing the effects of mainstreaming among the regular educator, Winzer found that teachers, although indicating a positive attitude, were significantly less oriented toward mainstreaming than their special education colleagues.

Knight (1986) investigated the attitudes of Louisiana public school educators at the elementary school level, toward the practice of mainstreaming mildly handicapped students. The Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale, developed by Larrivee (1978) was administered to 228 subjects from 100 randomly selected schools. All groups differed in their attitudes toward mainstreaming when overall attitude, years of professional experience, general philosophy, and classroom behavior were considered. However, when personal variables such as age, race, course preparation, ability to teach, classroom management, and social and academic growth of students were considered, a homogeneity in attitudes was indicated. Knight concluded special educators reflect a more positive attitude toward mainstreaming, particularly when the
variables classroom behavior and general philosophy are considered. However, regular educators' attitudes were generally less positive, while special educators and school administrators who had additional professional experience indicated more positive attitudes.

Factors which influence the implementation of the least restrictive environment provision in Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children's Act were studied through qualitative research methodology (Settner-Eaton, 1989). The sample consisted of 23 school district representatives in Maryland. The results provide an understanding of factors which influence the capacity of school districts in one state to provide educational opportunities for students with moderate and severe handicaps. Attitudes of individuals within a district, district size, and student performance of previously integrated students were most frequently mentioned factors perceived to facilitate integration. Factors perceived to impede integration were associated with state or local control and include: policy, leadership, funding, and employee attitudes. Depending upon the subject, one factor, attitudes, appeared to influence either positively or negatively the individual's philosophy toward the implementation of the least restrictive provision. In general, Stettner-Eaton concluded the participants of this study reflected a lack of understanding of the philosophical underpinnings for the least restrictive environment provision.
Prus (1989) developed and validated a 60-item survey instrument for the purposes of determining educator perceptions of the enhancing and restraining practices which either facilitate or delimit successful mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students in seven school districts that comprise the Olde English Consortium in South Carolina. Four categories of professional groups formulated the 582 randomly selected sample population; these included: regular educators, special educators, special services/support staff; and school administrators from suburban, urban, and rural districts with student populations ranging from 3,050 to 12,600 students.

The existence of five scales to measure factors that underlie educator perceptions of mainstreaming were confirmed through factor analysis. Instructional Planning/Training; Expectations/Climate; Personal Attitudes toward Mainstreaming; Support Services/Resources; and Administrative Support were the included scales. A qualitative measure requesting that respondents indicate the five most important things that can be done to improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming in their district revealed information to support the validity of the five scale instrument (Prus, 1989).

Consistent significant differences among professional groups on the survey scales were determined. Several personal demographic variables, including educational level, years teaching experience, number of handicapped children
counseled/taught/evaluated indicated significant influence on the perceptions of educator groups. Administrators tended to reveal the most positive ratings. Support Services/Resources and Instructional Planning/Training had the lowest ratings of the five survey scales. These findings support previous studies (Larrivee, 1981; Leyser & Abrams, 1984; Gans, 1987) that strongly suggested that when educators are continually provided appropriate training, the result is a positive effect upon their attitudes toward mainstreaming. Likewise, studies (Center & Ward, 1987; Larrivee & Cook, 1979) indicate the attitudes of educators toward mainstreaming are positively influenced by the availability of adequate support services and resources to facilitate the instructional process for mildly handicapped students in mainstream classes.

Overall, the underlying dimensions assessed in the literature are suggestive and not exhaustive. Even though the significance of each variable on the development and maintenance of positive attitudes toward mainstreaming is imprecise, the interdependence and complexity of these variables is documented. Among the factors examined in the literature the most critical ones affecting teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming are: educational philosophy, student behavior, perceived teacher competency, classroom management, academic development, administrative support, and availability of resources to classroom teachers.
Administrator Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

Several studies appearing in the literature regarding teachers' attitudes and attitude formation suggest a relationship between teachers' attitudes and their perceptions of administrative support. However, only a small number of studies have investigated the perceptions and attitudes of school principals for comparison with their colleagues' perceptions. Studies have queried principals about which handicapped students they think can be mainstreamed and have addressed the relationship between the number of years serving as a principal with positive attitudes toward mainstreaming; while others have investigated principals' perceptions of appropriate resource needs in their schools (i.e. personnel services, curricular modification (Center et al., 1985; Payne and Murray, 1974; Smith, Flexer, and Sigelman, 1980; Guerin and Szatlocky, 1974). The findings of these studies have shown that principals share many of the same reservations and concerns teachers indicate about mainstreaming practices. Payne and Murray (1974) surveyed 35 school principals about the integration of mildly handicapped students into regular classrooms. The researchers reported 59% of the principals from suburban settings were more accepting of integration, whereas 46% of the principals from suburban settings were more accepting of integration, and 46% of the principals from urban settings were likely to accept mainstreaming programs. Both groups indicated similar responses for handicapped groups they
felt could be more easily mainstreamed; these groups (from most to least mainstreamable) were: visually impaired, deaf, physically handicapped, educable mentally retarded, and trainable mentally retarded. Additionally, Smith Flexer, and Sigelman (1980) reported that principals rated the learning disabled student significantly less positively than the "normal student", but learning disabled students were perceived more favorably than mentally retarded students. In another study (Davis, 1980) school principals were questioned how successful they perceived mainstreaming would be for mildly handicapped groups of students. The results indicated 89.6% of the principals thought students with learning disabilities could be successfully mainstreamed when adequate support and resources were available; the figure for mild emotional disturbance was 50.1% and even less for mild mental retardation (46.4 percent). Similarly, previous research findings are replicated (Center, Ward, Parmenter, and Nash, 1985; Junkala and Mooney, 1986; Friedman, 1985) to suggest that the availability and deployment of resources necessary for students perceived by teachers and principals as difficult to teach are major factors that determine educators' attitudes toward mainstreaming the mildly handicapped student into regular classes.

The relationship between teacher attitude and perceived principal attitude toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students was investigated by Walker (1987) through descriptive
survey techniques involving approximately 200 teachers from 15 schools in Berkshire County, Massachusetts. The results of this study confirm the hypothesis that teachers' perceptions of their principals' attitudes toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students is a significant variable in predicting teacher attitudes. Additionally, the number of course credits earned in special education and class size were significant variables related to teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.

**Modifying Attitudes**

Since the education of handicapped students is not exclusively the responsibility of special education professionals, regular classroom teachers and administrators are expected to understand and accept their roles as implementors of the mainstreaming process. Their role perceptions of responsibilities, competencies to work with the handicapped, and administrative support or services necessary to meet the needs of handicapped students in regular classes are critical determinants of their attitudes toward the integration process. Consequently, these attitudes become crucial factors in the successful integration of handicapped students into the regular mainstream.

Hence positive attitudinal formation and maintenance is vital. There is evidence to suggest that educators are more supportive of mainstreaming programs for handicapped students when they have had training and preparation and are provided adequate support services. Problem-solving orientations to
modify attitudes and facilitate successful integration of handicapped students into the regular mainstream reveal two distinct current practices: educator training for mainstreaming implementation, teacher consultation and support services.

**Staff Development**

Assuming that attitudes can be modified by altering perceptions, and these changes are a result of new environmental experiences, attempts have been made to enhance the teacher's information level, specific skill acquisition, and experience with the handicapped. These variables have been investigated alone or in combination. However, few empirical studies are available to assess the long-term effect that increased knowledge has on the development of attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Researchers (Brooks and Brandsford, 1971; Cooper, 1989; Harasymiw and Horne, 1976; Inserni, 1987; Johnson, 1980; Knight, 1986; Larrivee, 1981; Rodriguez, 1985; Winzer, 1984b) have advocated modifying attitudes through retraining programs, inservice experience, and workshop approaches. The results of studies are contradictory. Harasymiw and Horne (1976) found that after an in-service training program teachers were more liberal in their opinions regarding the manageableability of handicapped students in the classroom, yet no meaningful improvement in attitudes toward mainstreaming ensued. On the other hand, efforts to acquaint regular
classroom teachers with attitudes and behavioral aspects of handicapped students were beneficial and led to increased competency in their ability to teach mildly handicapped student in the regular classroom (Brooks and Bransford, 1971; Larrivee, 1981; Winzer, 1984b).

Cooper (1989) investigated the differential effect of three inservice training experiences on teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming and knowledge of appropriate placement. A sample of 51 teachers from 3 suburban school districts represented pre-kindergarten through high school grade levels. Teachers were randomly assigned to participate in three experimental groups. Pre and Post measures to assess attitudes regarding the administrative and educational aspects of mainstreaming, and a measure of knowledge of appropriate placements were obtained. The results indicated no significant differences among the three groups on posttreatment or knowledge measures. It was concluded interventions to alter teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and develop the knowledge base of teachers to better equip them to provide instruction in their classrooms be sustained for more extensive periods of time.

Few studies have addressed the long-term effects of a professional development training program on teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students (Rodriguez, 1985; Insenri, 1987). Results revealed that post treatment measures from standardized instrumentation showed a
significant positive shift of teachers' attitudes toward mainstreamed students. Most importantly, in the follow-up measures six months after the inservice training, the teachers maintained their positive attitudes.

**Classroom Intervention**

In addition to in-service programs, classroom intervention programs for teachers that provide direct assistance and support to educators in the integration of handicapped students into their classes have yielded strategies that exemplify excellence in mainstreaming. Four studies focused directly on the effects of modifying regular classroom instruction on the achievement of mainstreamed mildly handicapped students (DeLoach, 1989; Meckler and Vogler, 1984; Spruill, 1987; Wang et al., 1984). First, Meckler and Vogler (1984) hypothesized that if teachers received instruction about classroom practices, instructional modifications, and curricular adaptations to modify their practices to accommodate mildly handicapped students, and if they received on-going support in implementing the modifications, then the reading and mathematics achievement scores of handicapped students would exceed the achievement of handicapped students whose teachers did not receive the same training. The result indicated that teachers in the experimental group, who had received training and support, were more effective; the achievement scores for their handicapped student were significantly higher. The study also
demonstrated that specific modification and support strategies can be learned and implemented by regular and special teachers when they work collaboratively.

Spruill (1987) conducted an in-depth, qualitative investigation of the mainstreaming experiences of 550 mildly handicapped students in mainstream classes and resource settings in a suburban high school located nearby Boston, Massachusetts. Recorded interviews with teachers and students, classroom observations and audiotaped verbal interactions formulated the basis of data collection procedures. Distinctive among the findings include the following: (a) Even though each student presented an individual learning profile, mildly handicapped students shared learning behaviors with non-handicapped peers, (b) handicapped students developed strategies to receive assignments that would reduce their risk of failure, provide opportunities for socialization, and successfully achieve academically, (c) teachers developed teaching strategies to decrease the role of stigma; specifically, tasks were broken into smaller units and the learning behaviors of students became the focus of the teaching process, and (d) the social nature of students was not sufficiently incorporated into the teachers' perceptions of the teaching-learning process.

Spruill (1987) concluded the present organization and teaching methods failed to provide sufficient support for student learning. "Instructional strategies need to promote
interactive, group activities since learning in cooperation with non-handicapped students can be an advantage for the mildly handicapped."

The last studies for review also indicated the effects of modifying regular classroom instruction to accommodate the learning needs of handicapped students.

Wang et al., (1984) investigated the efficacy of a comprehensive basic skills training program that was implemented in regular grades 1 to 3. The Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM) was developed at the University of Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center and evaluated over a one-year period in five schools in three large urban districts. The purpose of the program was to meet the learning needs of both regular and special students in regular classrooms. Instruction was individualized, focused on basic skills mastery, and was designed to inculcate processes of inquiry, independence, and cooperative learning. In this investigation, the researchers measured the degree of program implementation, student academic and attitude outcomes, and parent and teacher attitudes toward the program when implemented by 26 teachers who each served a mean of five handicapped students per class. The results indicated that the implementation of this program did lead to predicted classroom processes: regular and mainstreamed students showed greater-than-expected achievement in reading and mathematics, and mainstreamed students' achievement gains were
significantly higher than the gains of students with similar learning needs in self-contained classrooms. Also, the attitudes of parents and teachers were positive.

DeLoach (1989) evaluated the impact of Project T.E.A.M.S.: Teaching Educators Alternatives for Mainstream Students, an regular classroom integration model for high school students with learning disabilities. Distinctive among the findings include the following: a) Each of the two courses were more effectively taught during and one semester after the implementation of the TEAMS model; b) students with learning disabilities performed successfully in TEAMS classes without modified performance objectives, c) students with learning disabilities perceived their TEAMS classes favorably impacted their academic achievement and behavior; and d) TEAMS teachers perceived TEAMS classes to be more effectively taught. Specifically, student involvement, order/organization, and teacher management were positively enhanced. Teachers perceived the instructional model in combination with a trained teacher assistant were the crucial factors in the success of this project. These findings support the conclusion Project TEAMS provides an effective and viable regular classroom integration model for learning disabled adolescents.

This research, in concert with previous studies demonstrates the positive effects of implementing a program for modifying regular classroom instruction to accommodate
handicapped learners. The effectiveness of training and supporting practicing teachers, the feasibility of implementing a comprehensive programs for mainstreaming handicapped students, and the tremendous amount of knowledge, skill, collaboration, and coordination that is required to modify regular classroom instruction has been researched and supported. The problem-solving orientations to modify attitudes and facilitate successful integration of handicapped students into regular classes that have been in the research literature clearly demonstrate the positive effects of these interventions upon teacher attitude and mainstreaming effectiveness. However, a limited number of studies have examined the complexity of factors that may underlie the attitudes of educators; this demonstrates the need for further research.

Summary

Review and analysis of the presented research reveal several major concerns for professional practice and further educational research to facilitate successful mainstreaming programs for mildly handicapped students.

First, Kunzweiler (1982) has adamantly stated that if mainstreaming is to succeed, then two frontiers must be confronted: educator attitude and educator training. Each of these areas have been investigated in the literature and suggest that educator attitudes are crucial, changeable, multifaceted, and built upon a matrix of factors which mold
the perceptions of individuals (Williams and Algozzine, 1979; Knoff, 1985; Winzer and Rose, 1986; Larrivee and Cook, 1979; Winzer, 1984; Pedhazur, 1981; Knight, 1986; Prus, 1989; Stettner-Eaton, 1989). Educators' perceptions and attitudes ultimately determine the extent to which the learning needs of handicapped students are met in regular classes. Specifically, educators' attitudes directly influence the extent to which handicapped students are not only physically integrated but become integral class members, benefiting academically and socially from the mainstreamed experience (Horne, 1985; Larrivee, 1982).

The research literature strongly indicates that increased knowledge, experience, and exposure to handicapped students are important factors to consider for positive attitude formation and the development of mainstreaming programs (Cooper, 1989; Farrell, 1985; Harvey and Green, 1984; Winzer, 1984b; Rodriguez, 1985; Inserni, 1987). Classroom teachers' concerns for direct teaching assistance at all levels of schooling, and the availability and deployment of resources to teachers are critical determinants of positive attitudes and successful programs.

Lastly, administrative support and professional assistance to teachers are highlighted as important considerations (Davis-Clerk, 1990; DeLoach, 1989; Knight, 1986; Larrivee and Cook, 1979; Meckler and Vogler, 1984; Prus, 1989; Wang et al., 1984).
Chapter 3
Methodology

Population and Sample Selection

The population of subjects for this study included four categories of educators: 1) school principals; 2) regular classroom teachers; 3) special education teachers; and, 4) special education administrators/directors of pupil personnel/school psychologists employed by Virginia public school divisions to work with special education students in grades 5-9.

The special educators were those who taught resource and/or self-contained classes for (a) the Educable Mentally Retarded, (b) the Severely Emotionally Disturbed, and (c) the Learning Disabled during the 1990-91 school year in grades 5-9 in the Virginia public schools. The regular educators were those who taught regular classes and mainstreamed handicapped students in the same schools as the special educators. The school principals were those who administered the school programs of the regular and special teacher respondents. Administrators of special education and directors of pupil personnel services, who were designated as district level directors or supervisors, included all from each selected Virginia school division. The final category
included school psychologists, who were those who provided testing and psychological services in Virginia public school divisions.

A sample of Virginia public school divisions was selected to represent the following classifications, based upon land area, population density, total population, student population, and number of middle/intermediate/junior high schools within each (Virginia Department of Education, 1989, 1990; Center for Public Service, 1989). A listing of school division types and defining characteristics is provided in Appendix A. Table 1 designates the number of school divisions characterized by size and rural or urban demographics.

Table 1
Number of School Divisions by Size and Division Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Urban Divisions</th>
<th>Large Rural Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban Divisions</td>
<td>Small Rural Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School superintendents in each selected system were contacted by letter, to solicit the participation of educators in their system. A copy of the letter sent to each school superintendent is provided in Appendix B. After willingness to participate in the study was indicated on a stamped-addressed card and returned to the researcher, listings of
randomly selected personnel from each professional group were generated after personnel directories were obtained from the participating school divisions. Follow-up letters were mailed to school division representatives requesting personnel listings.

Personnel directories of each school division were used to generate listings for each of the divisions of all special educators, regular educators, school principals, and directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/school psychologists. Utilizing a table of random numbers, random selection of personnel was generated. Subjects from rural and urban divisions that were characterized as small or large numbered no less than twenty per group or 80 subjects in each educator group. Six hundred and forty educators were selected as the sample to receive a questionnaire. Three hundred thirty-three educators (333) returned completed questionnaires, indicating a limited, 52% return rate.

One hundred twenty-eight regular educators were randomly selected to participate in individual interviews with the researcher. Personnel directories of each selected division were used to generate listings of classroom teachers of grades 5-9 for interview purposes. Utilizing a table of random numbers, random selection of teachers was obtained. Participants from 16 randomly selected divisions (small and large, urban and rural) numbered no less than four teachers per division type. A random selection of 128 individuals
were contacted by letter to request their participation in individual interviews with the researcher regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school. A copy of the letter mailed to teachers to request their participation in the interview process is provided in Appendix C. Subjects were requested to indicate their willingness to participate in an informal interview by telephoning the researcher via collect calls. A limited number (24) teachers responded; the first 16 teachers comprising a proportionate sample of 4 per division type were selected to participate. The selected sample included four regular education teachers from small urban, large urban, small rural, and large rural divisions respectively.

**Instrumentation**

The *Survey of Educator Perceptions of Enhancing and Restraining Forces Related to the Integration of Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Educational Setting*, (Prus, 1989) designed to ascertain individual and collective educator perceptions was the survey instrument selected for use in this study. Appendix D contains a copy of the survey instrument. Appendix E contains a copy of the permission statement authorizing the use of the survey in this study.

This survey is a 60-item Likert scale designed to assess perceptions related to the following specific categories: 1) General Attitudes/Information; 2) Special Services/Support Services; 3) Instruction/Training; 4) Placement/Least
Restrictive Environment; 5) Administration; and, 6) School Climate.

The construction of the original 5-point scale consisted of 105 items that were arranged into a questionnaire with four sections. Section A was designed to elicit demographic data on respondents. In Section B, response choices ranged from Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD) for each item. Section C consisted of 2 general questions and the last section (D) was an open-ended question.

Through field testing the potential 105 items, expert agreement served as the first criterion to support the content validity of the instrument. Through item analysis and content validation, the original questionnaire was revised to a 60-item survey.

Pilot testing continued over a three-week period and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .91 was obtained. Every item was found to be significantly correlated with the total survey measure to suggest internal consistency for the instrument. An alpha coefficient of .92 further suggest the internal reliability of the survey.

Factor analyses revealed the existence of five scales that were consistent with the original design of the instrument. Specifically, the five primary factors measured by the following scales were: instructional planning/training, expectations/climate, support services/resources, personal attitudes toward mainstreaming,
and administrative support. Pearson Product-Moment correlations demonstrated the validity of survey data for each questionnaire item, the five survey scales, and the total survey score.

A structured interview questionnaire was utilized as a guide for data collection during individually scheduled teacher interviews. The questionnaire was based upon a review of literature regarding the characteristics of effective mainstreaming practices, the researcher's professional experience in the field, expert review, and a pilot study that was implemented during the Spring 1990. A copy of the interview questionnaire is provided in Appendix F. The pilot study involved use of the instrument in a qualitative research study investigating the availability of instructional resources in selected Virginia public schools as perceived by selected teachers and administrators. The instrument consisted of ten open-ended questions that typically required a minimum of forty-five minutes per interview to administer.

**Research Questions**

In an attempt to investigate the issues, concerns, and recommendations of educators to reveal empirical evidence and derive implications for administrative support, staff development, and systematic mainstreaming, the following questions were addressed in this study:

1. What does each professional group perceive to be the most facilitating and the most
inhibiting factors related to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9 in Virginia public schools?

2. Do differences and similarities exist in perceptions among each professional group across school divisions throughout Virginia?

3. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group can be determined through analysis of responses according to the personal demographics of respondents (sex, race, years experience in education, educational level, current position, coursework in special education) and their responses?

4. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group can be determined through analysis of responses according to the demographic characteristics of each selected school division (student enrollment and classification of the community) and the responses of educators employed within each division?

5. What differences or similarities exist in the availability of instructional resources, as perceived by educators employed in selected urban and rural school divisions? Will a
qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources in selected school divisions correspond with the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents employed within each of these divisions?

Research Design

The method of research utilized in this study is a descriptive research design that involved the implementation of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures.

Research questions were stated as opposed to null hypotheses since the purpose of this investigation was to reveal the mainstreaming perceptions of educators, the factors that underlie educator perceptions, and individual qualitative accounts of educator perspectives regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school divisions.

This study was a replication and an extension of the research completed by Prus (1989). Prus (1989) surveyed 4 relevant educator groups that were representative of grades K-12, from seven school districts comprising the Olde English Consortium in South Carolina. The present study extended previous research by incorporating the following procedures: 1) a sample of study implemented on a statewide basis; 2) random selection of school divisions; 3) a combination of descriptive survey and structured interview methodology; and, 4) a comparison and contrast of the demographic
characteristics of rural and urban school divisions with
survey data and individual interview data.

Subjects receiving questionnaires included 640 randomly
selected educators from 31 selected school divisions that
comprise the following educator groups: (a) regular educators,
(b) special educators of the mildly handicapped, (c) school
principals, and (d) directors of special education/directors
of pupil personnel/school psychologists who are employed to
work grade levels 5-9 of each division.

A 2 X 2 X 4 research design (division size X division
type X educator group) consisted of sixteen cells in which
the following number of subjects responded. Table 2 indicates
the number of subjects per group.

Table 2
Number of Subjects Per Cell Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large Divisions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects of this study received a questionnaire packet
that included: a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, directions for completing the questionnaire, assurance of anonymity, and a stamped addressed return envelope. Research packets were mailed to each subject selected for participation. Subjects were asked to return their completed questionnaire by mail to the researcher. A copy of the cover letter to educators is provided in Appendix G.

Regular education teachers receiving a letter to request their participation in an informal interview numbered 128. The first 16 teachers who indicated their willingness to participate, and comprising a proportionate sample of four teachers per division type were selected. Individual interviews were scheduled with teachers and directions to each school site were obtained via telephone calls. Interviews were conducted at each school site individually with each participant. Data were collected during each interview by tape recorder and note taking.

Analysis

Analysis of Personal Demographics. The percentage of respondents by educator group, sex, race, educational level, number of years in present position, current work setting, community setting, student enrollment, number of special education courses completed, number of handicapped students respondents had direct contact with during the prior 12 months, and the type of training received on the mainstreaming of handicapped students were calculated to provide descriptive
data of the sample population.

Relationships between personal demographic variables that were expressed as continuous variables and the total survey score, were studied through correlational procedures.

First, Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were computed between each personal demographic variable and the total survey measure.

Second, Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were computed between each personal demographic variable and the total survey score for each professional group to determine the possible influence between demographics and total survey measure on the major independent variable (group).

Third, to investigate the possible relationship between personal demographic variables expressed as categorical variables, and the total survey score, stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed. An alpha level of .01 was used for all analyses to provide a more conservative analysis to protect against the possibility of a type 1 error.

Analyses of Scores on Each Survey Scale. To determine what each professional group perceives to be the most facilitating and the most inhibiting factors related to mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9, and to determine if differences exist among the perceptions of each professional group, the following procedures were applied:

The mean rating for each of the five scales that were previously determined through factor analysis (Prus, 1989)
were determined for each educator group. Mean scores for each educator group on each of the 5 survey scales were computed for comparison.

To determine the significance of group differences between educator groups on each of the five scales, multivariate analysis of variance was calculated. The dependent measure included the scores on each of the five survey scales. The independent variable was the category of educator or professional group, and included four levels.

Significance of the differences between educator groups on each of the five survey scales were further analyzed through on-way analysis of variance for each of the 5 dependent measures (survey scales). Post Hoc analysis (p< .01) were applied to each analysis that yielded significant effects.

Analysis of Respondent Recommendations. Section D of the survey instrument requested each respondent to list the 5 most important things that could be done to improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their school division.

Content analysis of qualitative data provided by respondents to Section D of the survey instrument were synthesized into 20 categories with corresponding numbers of the tabulated responses for each. A compilation of the comments according to category is provided (Appendix H).

Data obtained through Section D were reported to note content and frequency within each category for each educator
group by division type to support the validity of the rating scale and suggest implications for district programming throughout the Commonwealth.

Analysis of Interview Data. Interview data obtained through individual interviews with randomly selected classroom teachers from selected urban and rural divisions were analyzed by visual inspection. Each interview was tape recorded, summarized and transcribed. This information is contained in Appendix I. A synthesis and categorization of the comments generated through structured interview procedures was completed to support the validity of the survey instrument, the survey data, and suggest implications for district planning for effective mainstreaming programs throughout Virginia's urban and rural divisions.
Chapter 4

Analysis of the Results

The results of this study are presented in Chapter 4. The first section is devoted to a presentation of descriptive data on the sample. The following sections address each research question, the statistical procedures applied and the results obtained. An alpha level of .01 was used for all analyses to provide a more conservative analysis to protect against the possibility of a type 1 error.

Descriptive Data

The subjects for this study included 333 public school educators, who collectively, work with all subjects and grades 5-9, and comprise the following educator groups: 1) regular education teachers (24.3%), 2) special education teachers (24.6%), 3) school principals (24.3%), and 4) directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel services/school psychologists (26.8%).

Subjects reported a variety of division types and student enrollments ranging from below 1,000 to 20,000 or more students for their division. Approximately equivalent representation from each educator group and division type were
reported by respondents. Table 3 provides a description of the percentage of respondents by educator group, division type, and student enrollment.

Table 3
Percentage of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator Group</th>
<th>School Division Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Teacher</td>
<td>Small Rural</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Teacher</td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Large Rural</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir./Psychologist</td>
<td>Large Urban</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or more</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=333
Table 4 presents the percentages of respondents by sex, race and educational level.

Table 4

Percentages of Respondents by Race, Sex and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White 85%</td>
<td>Male 29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black 14.1%</td>
<td>Female 70.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Level

- Bachelor's Degree plus 18 Credit Hours 16.8%
- Master's Degree 31.8%
- Master's Degree plus 30 Credit Hours 27.9%
- Education Specialist 6.3%
- Doctorate 5.4%

The sample consisted of 70.6% females and 29.4% males. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the respondents were white and 14.1% were black.

The majority of respondents (31.8%) held master's degrees. Twenty-seven percent (27.9%) reported having a master's degree plus 30 credit hours; 6.3% having an education specialist degree, and 5.4% having a doctorate.

Table 5 presents the percentages of respondents by years experience in education, years experience in present position and educational settings.
Table 5

Percentages of Respondents by Years Experience in Education, Years Experience in Present Position and Educational Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience in Education</th>
<th>Years Experience in Present Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>0-4 years 46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>5-9 years 24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>10-14 years 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>15-19 years 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>20 or more 5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Settings

- Elementary 29.4%
- Middle 25.2%
- Junior High 9.2%
- High School 12.3%
- District Office 12.6%
- Multiple Settings 11.4%

The majority of respondents (46.2%) reported having 0-4 years experience in their present position.

The subjects of this study represented a full range of educational settings that include grades 5-9.

The distribution of the sample reflecting the number of
courses completed in special education reveals the majority of respondents (46.8%) have taken four or more courses in special education. Twenty-five percent (25.5%) reported having no special education coursework. Table 6 presents the percentages of respondents by coursework in special education and educational experiences related to mainstreaming.

Table 6
Percentages of Respondents by Coursework in Special Education
and Educational Experiences Related to Mainstreaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework in Special Education</th>
<th>Educational Experiences Related to Mainstreaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Course 9.3%</td>
<td>Seminars 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Courses 12%</td>
<td>Inservices 54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Courses 6%</td>
<td>Portions/Modules of Coursework 35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more 46.8%</td>
<td>One or more Courses Related to Mainstreaming 35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Courses 25.5%</td>
<td>No Training 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presents the mean and range of respondents for the number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months and the number of direct contacts with handicapped students during the prior 12 months.
Table 7

Mean and Range Number of Handicapped Students Taught/Counseled/Evaluated During the Prior 12 Months and Number of Direct Contacts With Handicapped Students During the Prior 12 Months

| Number of Handicapped Students Taught/Counseled/Evaluated During the Prior 12 Months | Mean = 47.9 students | Range = 1-400 students |
| Number of Direct Contacts With Handicapped Students During the Prior 12 Months | Mean = 47.9 students | Range = 1-387 students |

Analysis of Scores on Each Survey Scale

To determine what each professional group perceives to be the most facilitating and the most inhibiting factors related to mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9, and to determine if differences exist among the perceptions of each professional group, the following procedures were applied with subsequent results.

Mean ratings for each of the five survey scales that were previously determined through factor analysis (Prus, 1989) were determined for each educator group. The results appear
Table 8
Mean Ratings for Educator Groups on Survey Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad. Support</th>
<th>Support Services</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Instruc. Plan</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Educator</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Educator</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir./Psychologist</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison and contrast of mean ratings suggested the need for more systematic determination of differences between educator groups on each of the survey scales. To examine for significant group differences between educator groups on each of the 5 scales, multivariate analysis of variance was calculated first.

The dependent measures included the scores on each of the 5 survey scales. The independent variable was educator group. Results of the multivariate analysis of variance are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9
Multivariate Analysis of Variance with Educator Grouping as the Independent Variable and Scale Scores as Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Probability &gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>15,809</td>
<td>16.057</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai Trace</td>
<td>15,885</td>
<td>14.771</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley Trace</td>
<td>15,875</td>
<td>17.029</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the multivariate analysis of variance are consistent in suggesting a significant overall effect (p<.001) for the independent variable (educator group). Significance on each of the five survey scales were further analyzed through one-way analysis of variance for each of the 5 dependent measures (survey scales).

Significant differences (p<.01) between educator groups in the mean ratings on each of the five survey scales were found.

The results of the analysis of variance between each educator group and their scores on each of the survey scales are presented in Tables 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Table 10
Analysis of Variance for the Dependent Measure Score on the Administrative Support Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2005.753</td>
<td>14.201</td>
<td>47.080</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4217.735</td>
<td>668.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Analysis of Variance for the Dependent Measure Score on the Support Services/Resources Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1608.926</td>
<td>536.309</td>
<td>12.705</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>12,536.861</td>
<td>42.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Analysis of Variance for the Dependent Measure Score on the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2005.753</td>
<td>668.584</td>
<td>47.080</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4217.735</td>
<td>14.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Analysis of Variance for the Dependent Measure
Score on the Instructional Planning/Training Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Probability &gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2757.789</td>
<td>919.263</td>
<td>24.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>11180.012</td>
<td>37.643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Analysis of Variance for the Dependent Measure
Score on the Expectations/Climate Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Probability &gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>911.519</td>
<td>303.840</td>
<td>13.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6832.282</td>
<td>23.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences between educator groups were further analyzed through the use of post-hoc analysis. The Tukey HSD test for multiple comparisons indicated principals provided significantly higher ratings (p<.01) than the other
educator groups on each of the following scales: Administrative Support; Support Services/Resources; Instructional Planning/Training; and Expectations/Climate. The differences between the mean ratings of regular education teachers, special education teachers, and directors of special education/psychologists/directors of pupil personnel were insignificant (p<.01), and lower than principal ratings.

Regular education teachers' ratings were found to be significantly lower than the ratings of other educator groups on the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale. Special education teachers, principals, and directors of special education/psychologists/directors of pupil personnel reported higher ratings to the items on the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale, than regular education teachers, but were equivalent to each other. The higher ratings are more indicative of positive attitudes regarding the benefits of mainstreaming handicapped students.

Analysis of Personal Demographics

To examine the relationships between personal demographic variables expressed as continuous variables and the total scale score, correlational procedures were performed. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations with the total survey score were computed for each of the following variables: 1) number of contacts with handicapped students in the prior 12 months; 2) number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months; and 3) types of training
experiences related to mainstreaming that subjects had received. All correlations yielded insignificant results (p > .01).

In order to determine the possible influence of the major independent variable (educator group) of the present study, additional correlational analyses were conducted. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were computed between each of the following variables and the total survey score for each educator group: 1) number of contacts with handicapped students in the prior 12 months; 2) number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months; and 3) types of training experiences related to mainstreaming that subjects had received. Two significant correlations were found for the regular education teacher group. A small, but significant negative correlation (r = -.301; p < .008) was found between number of direct contacts with handicapped students during the prior 12 months and the total survey score. A second (small) negative correlation (r = -.342; p < .002) was found between the number of students having taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months and the total survey score for the regular educator group. These results suggest regular education teachers with more direct contact with handicapped students provided less positive ratings for the factors that support their total survey scores.

Insignificant correlations (p > .01) were indicated for the
special education teacher and principal groups.  

A smaller, but significant inverse relationship

\( r = -0.289; p < 0.009 \) was found between the directors of special
education/pupil personnel/psychologists who participated in
coursework on mainstreaming (1 or more courses) and their
total scale scores. Specifically, this group tended to
provide lower, less positive ratings for their total scale
score.

To investigate the possible relationship between personal
demographic variable expressed as categorical variables, and
the total survey score, stepwise multiple regression analysis
was conducted. The following categorical variables were
entered into the regression equation: 1) sex; 2) years
experience; 3) student enrollment; 4) number of courses
completed in Special Education (0–4 or more courses);
5) classification of the community (small or large, urban or
rural); and 6) educator group.

The results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis
are summarized in Table 15 and provide estimates of the
magnitude and significance of relationships between the
categorical variables and the total survey score.
Table 15

Multiple Regression Analysis Between the Categorical Variables and the Total Survey Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Multiple R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted Squared</th>
<th>Standard Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>18.974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stepwise Predictors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>RSQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YE = Years Experience  
E = Student Enrollment  
CC = Classification of Community  
JC = Job Category or Educator Group  
SC = Special Education Coursework

All variables, except the variable, sex, were found to be significant predictors of the dependent measure, total survey score. The best predictor variable was years experience. This variable yielded a multiple correlation coefficient of .296. The total amount of explained variance in the criterion variable (total survey score) was .137. These results represent small, but significant estimates of the criterion variable.
Analysis of Respondent Recommendations

Section D of the survey instrument requested each respondent to list the 5 most important things that could be done to improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their school or school division. A total of 931 comments were written by respondents to this open-ended section to provide perceived suggestions for ways to improve mainstreaming effectiveness. Content analysis of qualitative data provided by respondents were synthesized into 20 categories with frequencies of tabulated responses for each. Data are reported in Table 16 to note content and frequency within each category for each educator group by division type. In order of cumulative frequency, staff development, communication/collaboration/teamwork, support services/personnel, and mainstreaming considerations were the categories that accounted for 47% of the total number of responses to Section D. The identified needs for improvement were similar to the survey results of this study. A listing of all comments reported by respondents is provided by category and educator group, in Appendix H.
## Table 16
Tabulation of Section D Comments
According to Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Small Urban</th>
<th>Large Urban</th>
<th>Small Rural</th>
<th>Large Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHED CT P D</td>
<td>SHED CT P D</td>
<td>SHED CT P D</td>
<td>SHED CT P D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>13 10 17 18</td>
<td>11 5 16 20</td>
<td>10 10 13 12</td>
<td>12 8 8 9</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/</td>
<td>5 12 3 5</td>
<td>10 4 5 7</td>
<td>6 11 1 5</td>
<td>7 5 7 6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services/</td>
<td>6 8 9 4</td>
<td>6 3 5 6</td>
<td>5 6 3 8</td>
<td>2 8 1 7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td>8 3 2 2</td>
<td>3 1 8 4</td>
<td>6 5 0 7</td>
<td>4 3 1 7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>4 4 0 3</td>
<td>3 3 5 13</td>
<td>3 8 2 0</td>
<td>2 3 5 4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4 3 3 2</td>
<td>6 1 3 6</td>
<td>7 5 1 4</td>
<td>5 6 3 3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations/Attitude/</td>
<td>5 4 3 9</td>
<td>1 2 2 3</td>
<td>6 3 2 8</td>
<td>5 1 4 3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>3 1 1 6</td>
<td>4 2 2 7</td>
<td>3 3 1 3</td>
<td>3 1 1 1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>3 6 1 2</td>
<td>1 1 0 4</td>
<td>1 3 4 2</td>
<td>1 0 2 6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2 0 1 4</td>
<td>3 2 0 2</td>
<td>6 1 1 0</td>
<td>4 2 1 5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP's/Paperwork</td>
<td>2 3 3 2</td>
<td>2 1 0 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 1</td>
<td>4 1 3 2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community</td>
<td>0 1 1 2</td>
<td>4 0 4 2</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3 1 2 0</td>
<td>0 1 3 2</td>
<td>2 1 2 3</td>
<td>1 0 3 1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/Equipment</td>
<td>1 3 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 1 0</td>
<td>1 3 3 0</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular/Alternative Programs</td>
<td>4 4 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0</td>
<td>1 0 2 0</td>
<td>3 0 1 2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Policy/Criteria</td>
<td>2 0 1 2</td>
<td>2 0 1 4</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>0 2 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Incentives</td>
<td>0 0 1 2</td>
<td>4 0 2 0</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 2 0 2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 2 0</td>
<td>5 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 3 2 0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Centered Education</td>
<td>0 1 0 2</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 3 1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHED = Special Educator  
CT = Classroom Teacher  
P = Principal  
D = Directors of Special Education/Psychologists/Directors of Rupil Personnel
The four predominantly mentioned categories of recommendations for the improvement of mainstreaming efforts for each educator group by division type. Table 17 provides a tabulation of these comments to reveal the four most frequently noted categories by each educator group in each division type.
Table 17
Tabulation of Section D Comments
Most Frequently Rated Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Small Urban</th>
<th>Large Urban</th>
<th>Small Rural</th>
<th>Large Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED CT P D</td>
<td>SPED CT P D</td>
<td>SPED CT P D</td>
<td>SPED CT P D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>13 10 17 18</td>
<td>11 5 16 20</td>
<td>10 10 13 12</td>
<td>12 8 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Collaboration Teamwork</td>
<td>5 12 3 5</td>
<td>10 4 5 7</td>
<td>6 11 0 0</td>
<td>7 5 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services/Personnel</td>
<td>6 8 9 0</td>
<td>6 3 5 0</td>
<td>0 6 3 8</td>
<td>0 8 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming Considerations</td>
<td>8 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 8 0</td>
<td>6 0 0 7</td>
<td>0 0 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 3 5 13</td>
<td>0 8 0 0</td>
<td>0 5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0 0 3 0</td>
<td>6 0 0 0</td>
<td>7 0 0 0</td>
<td>5 6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations/Attitude/Role</td>
<td>0 0 3 9</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>6 0 0 8</td>
<td>5 0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td>0 0 0 7</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0 6 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/Equipment</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 3 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Special Educator
B = Regular Educator
C = Principal
D = Director of Special Education/Principals/Director of Pupil Personnel
Collectively, all educator groups from each division type indicated the need for improvement in three predominant areas: 1) staff development; 2) communication/collaboration/teamwork; and 3) support services/personnel.

The need for staff development was the most frequently cited perceived need of respondents to Section D of the survey. In comparison with previous analyses in the present study, this perceived area of need is consistent with the lower ratings on the Instructional Planning/Training scale. Illustrative comments were selected and follow:

"Teachers need to be effectively trained to teach the handicapped"

"Educate all staff members"

"Enthusiastic - motivating inservices"

"Principals and department heads must receive coursework in mainstreaming"

"Staff development involving all in collaboration"

"Provide opportunities for teachers/principals to observe where mainstreaming is an integral part of the regular education program"

"More practical professional development opportunities for teachers".

In comparison with the extant literature reviewed, the perceived importance of staff development, the relationship of educator perceptions of competency for teaching handicapped
students to attitudes toward mainstreaming is consistently documented (Brooks & Bransford, 1971; Cooper, 1989; Cortwright, 1980; Davis-Clerk, 1990; Farrell, 1985; Gans, 1987; Harasymiw & Horne, 1976; Harvey & Green, 1984; Hudson, Graham & Warner, 1979; Inserni, 1987; Larrivee, 1981; Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Leyser & Abrams, 1983; Prus, 1989; Winzer, 1984b). It appears staff development is a major consideration to be pursued within Virginia public school divisions in order to facilitate more effective mainstreaming practices.

"Communication/Collaboration/Teamwork" was the second most frequently cited category for improvement among all respondents regarding the mainstreaming of handicapped students within their school divisions. Collectively, teachers more frequently than principals or directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists provided recommendations for this area. This need is also consistent with the lower ratings by subjects on the Instructional Planning/Training scale and the Administrative Support scale. Respondents' comments indicate the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their school division could be improved if the processes of communication, collaboration, and teamwork were facilitated. Specific comments for illustration include:

"Special education teacher collaboration in content classes for strategy support"

"Develop a teacher assistance team. This would be a group that works well with our at-risk and special education
students. If a teacher is having difficulty with a particular student or teaching a particular concept, then he/she could ask this group for advice" 

"Organize regular education and special education teachers into cooperative teams" 

"Build collegial working relationships between regular and special education". 

Appendix H contains specific comments regarding this area for improvement, recommendations for consideration, and activities that could be coordinated within schools. 

"Support Services/Personnel" was the third most frequently cited category by respondents. Based upon the comments provided, collectively, educators perceive a need to provide an increased level of support staff to facilitate mainstreaming efforts within their division, and an expanded variety of support services to include direct teacher assistance and consultation. Sample comments reported by educators are illustrative. 

"Support staff to consult with regular teachers to facilitate mainstreaming" 

"Add more resource teachers to each building so they can team more with specific grade levels" 

"More resources for school and classroom teacher in order to properly mainstream" 

"Instructional aides" 

"Make sure your support staff is supportive"
"Less time spent by support services in evaluation and more time spent in direct assistance to teachers and parents"

"More support personnel for the schools".

These recommendations are consistent with the lower mean scale ratings of educators on the Support Services/Resources scale in previous analyses of this study. Further, they are consistent with the extant literature addressing the relationship between the availability of support personnel and services with educator attitudes toward mainstreaming (Center & Ward, 1987; Center, Ward, Parmenter, & Nash, 1985; Gans, 1987; Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Leyser & Abrams, 1984; Prus, 1989).

"Mainstreaming Considerations" is a category of recommendations by respondents that is based upon their perspectives of effective mainstreaming practices, administration, and service delivery. This category of recommendations comprised the fourth most frequently mentioned area by educators. Groups who cited recommendations for mainstreaming considerations most frequently include: 1) special education teachers of small urban and rural divisions; 2) principals of large urban divisions; and 3) directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists of rural divisions. Illustrative comments provided by respondents include:

"Get the special education teacher into the regular classroom"
"Use only teachers that are willing to work with handicapped students for the regular class instruction"
"Integration of the student in complete school program"
"Place handicapped pupils in all schools"
"Effective mainstreaming models and /or programs for study by division"
"Abolish pull-out programs"
"Elimination of separate special and regular education administration systems".

Several categories in addition to staff development, communication/collaboration/teamwork, support services/personnel, and mainstreaming considerations were identified by respondents to reveal their perspectives about areas for improvement in the mainstreaming effectiveness of their respective divisions. Class size, time, expectations/attitudes/role, administrative support, evaluation, and materials/equipment were highlighted areas. Each of these areas are addressed in items that supported the mean scale ratings and total survey scores of respondents.

Class size was frequently cited by respondents as an area for improvement. One small urban special educator recommended, "Limit the classroom enrollment in special needs are mainstreamed into a particular class." Similarly, a principal from a large urban division commented, "Keep class size at a level which allows for more time for each student."

"Time" was a frequently mentioned category of
recommendations provided by teachers. Comments in this category were reflective of teacher perceived need for time to plan, consult, and coordinate within a flexible daily schedule.

"Expectations/Attitudes/Role" was a category that included frequently mentioned comments provided by directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists of small urban divisions. Comments focused upon teacher and administrator roles in the education of handicapped students, teacher/administrator attitudes toward mainstreaming, and expectations for student achievement.

"Administrative support", "evaluation", and "materials/equipment" were areas for consideration frequently cited by directors, principals, and teachers. Comments in these areas were reported in regard to their perceived needs for adequate materials and resources for curricula; formative and summative evaluation of individual student mainstreaming, and division/school mainstreaming programs; and principal support for mainstreaming efforts within their school or division.

Recommendations in several additional categories were identified by the respondents to reveal their thoughts about areas for improvement regarding the mainstreaming of students in their schools. These categories, created from a compilation of comments include the following: instruction,
IEP'S/paperwork, parent/community involvement, funding, materials/equipment, curricular/alternative programs, district policy/criteria, facilities, teacher incentives, student involvement, and child-centered education. Appendix H contains a listing of comments provided by respondents to support these categories for improvement.

Analysis of Interview Data

To determine if differences or similarities exist in the availability of instructional resources, as perceived by educators employed in selected urban and rural school divisions individual interviews with randomly selected regular education teachers were conducted at each educator's school site. This qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources in selected school divisions, perceived by regular education teachers further determined the validity of the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents employed within each school division indicated by the survey analyses.

Each interview was categorized by division type (small or large, urban or rural) and a summary is provided of the responses reported by each participant to each of the 10 questions that comprise the Informal Interview Questionnaire. Appendix I contains a summary of the data collected during each interview with regular education teachers. A copy of the Interview Questionnaire is located in Appendix F.

The following section presents each interview question
followed by a brief summary of the data collected during interviews for each question.

**Question 1**

Please describe your present position and the various types of responsibilities that you hold.

Four (4) regular education teachers from small urban, large urban, small rural, and large rural school divisions comprised the interview participants of this study. All participants were female and they represented a range of grade levels and school settings; thus, their roles and role perceptions differed. Table 18 depicts the grade level taught, division type, and grade level organization for each participant.
Table 18
Participants by Grade, Division Type, and Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division and Organization</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants (10) taught grade 5 or 6;
teaming or self-contained classes were the major types of grade level organization of descriptive their teaching positions.

Teachers of grades 7 and 8 numbered six. One small urban teacher taught grades 7 and 8. The majority of these participants characterized their grade level organization as departmentalized. One teacher, grade 7, representing a large rural division, indicated team teaching best characterized the grade level organization of her present teaching position.

The participants represented a range of educational settings including elementary (6), middle or junior high (10 teachers).

In addition to teaching, participants assumed several roles to fulfill their perceived responsibilities for the educational programming of their students. These responsibilities involved membership in school or district level planning committees; coordinating student organizations and clubs; grade level or departmental team leadership; consultation team coordination; coordination of student extracurricular activities; and participation in after-school programs.

Question 2

Tell me about the different kinds of instructional materials that are utilized in your classes, or your school. Comment freely on the availability of these.

A wide variety of basic instructional materials were
described by participants. All teachers reported the availability of state-adopted textbooks, supplementary materials, classroom computers and/or computer labs, teacher-made materials, audio-visual equipment, and library resources. The availability of a division-wide teacher resource center was reported by 3 participants. Generally, participants indicated a basic satisfaction with the availability of instructional materials and equipment. Specific needs for additional materials were indicated and include: science textbooks for primary level students (small rural), upper level reading materials for the school media center (large rural), classroom computer software for science instruction (small urban), supplementary curricula for special needs students (small rural), and a centralized teacher resource center (large urban, small rural, and large rural).

Question 3

Describe your view of the availability of support services (counselors, social workers, and psychologists) in your school.

Are teachers aware of how to access these services?

For what purposes are these services needed?

Are adequate facilities provided for support staff to work with students?

The process for securing support services was viewed as being understood by teachers. All participants indicated teachers are aware how to access the services of support
personnel. One participant (large urban) reported student knowledge of the services available and how to obtain support services is lacking.

The services of school psychologists, guidance counselors, social workers and the number of personnel/time available to provide support services to teachers and students varied. The majority of participants reported the services of psychologists are least accessible and teacher contact with psychologists is described as minimal. All teachers reported the availability of full-time guidance counselors, except one teacher (small rural) indicated the availability of a part-time guidance counselor. One teacher (large rural) described support personnel as integral team members who were highly regarded; while the majority of participants (large rural, large urban, small urban, and small rural) reported infrequent contact with support personnel, and stated the need for an increased level of support services and staff.

Inadequate facilities for support staff to work with students, staff, and families were reported by teachers (large urban, large rural, small urban and small rural).

Question 4

What type of support personnel are available in the classroom to assist teachers in the instructional process?

a) How often are they available?

b) Please describe the kinds of services they provide.

One participant (large rural) indicated floating aides
are available to provide assistance, but often they are utilized as substitute teachers. Another participant (large rural) described the availability of a special education teacher as minimal. Generally, special education teachers of self-contained classes, kindergarten teachers, and Chapter 1 Math and Reading teachers were described as having instructional assistance by teacher aides. Parent volunteers and student tutors were mentioned by teachers representing small rural and small urban divisions. Participants (large urban) reported teacher aides are employed to assist Basic English and Math teachers. Collectively, few support personnel were reported to assist regular education teachers in the instructional process.

Question 5

In special education the decision making process that facilitates student identification and placement is dependent upon multidisciplinary teamwork. In addition to this team, do other kinds of teams exist in your school that may assist teachers?

Participants reported the existence of grade level and department level teaming in most schools represented. One teacher (large rural) reported her school is based on teaming. "We function as a mini-support group for the teacher and the student. The team owns the responsibility for educating their students." A few teachers reported the existence of Child Study committees, and committees to address the needs of
students at-risk for academic failure. In most instances, teachers reported there were no additional teams for teacher intervention or assistance.

**Question 6**

Do you think the school day is structured to provide adequate time for teachers who are willing to collaborate for instruction?

Seventy-five (75%) of the participants from large urban and large rural divisions indicated their school days are not structured to provide adequate time for teachers who are willing to collaborate for instruction. Two teachers (small rural) indicated the availability of personal planning and team planning periods. Similar responses were reported by participants who represented small urban divisions.

**Question 7**

Are teacher assistance teams formally organized to respond to the professional needs of teachers?

a) Are any arrangements made to support teachers in meeting instructional/management concerns? If so, please describe.

The majority of participants stated no teacher assistance teams are formally organized to respond to the professional needs of teachers. Teacher assistance teams were available to teachers in 25% of the schools representing each division type.

In the absence of teacher assistance teaming,
arrangements to support teachers in meeting instructional management concerns were described as informal meetings among teachers of a specific grade level, or department.

**Question 8**

How would you feel if administrative arrangements were made to formulate a team of teachers from different program areas and/or grade levels whereby cases involving children with learning problems could be brought before this committee for teacher assistance?

a) What is your reaction to the implementation of this kind of teacher assistance team in your school?

A variety of candid responses were obtained from the participants regarding their feelings and reactions toward the implementation of teacher assistance teams. The following comments are illustrative:

"Actually it might be a good idea depending on the membership. Teacher preparation of the average junior high school teacher does not include specialized training to prepare us to work with students who have learning problems." (Large Urban)

"If teachers could volunteer to serve with individuals of their choice, and if the team could function as a team, then it might be a good and productive idea." (Large Urban)

"I think teachers would rather have input from their peers than from an administrator who has been removed from the classroom a number of years." (Large Urban)
"I favor the idea. We need to implement new ideas that will help children. I think educators need to try anything we feel might possibly enable our students to become educated." (Small Urban)

"I would think of it as one more meeting from my planning time or additional time after school. I would not want an administrator to be present. I would feel microscopic in that situation. I don't know if would want a special education teacher to participate either. I would want to hand select the people for my team and I would have to respect their ideas." (Large Rural)

"I can see the advantage, but the principal may not want another team to oversee." (Large Rural)

"The only negative reaction we experience is the feeling of being overwhelmed. Thus far, I think the results of the small workgroups are positive and I believe more teachers will volunteer to serve." (Small Rural)

"I think the teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors provide the support system for special concerns. I have not felt the need for a team because I have always had the support of personnel to provide assistance for me." (Small Rural)

"I think this kind of teaming would be helpful. Different scheduling would enable us to implement this intervention." (Small Rural)

"I think it would be great if we could schedule it."
At the moment I wonder how this would affect my time with my children. If the time were taken from my students, then I would not favor the idea of teaming." (Small Urban)

"The teacher teams that exist in my school are very beneficial. We give and receive help for instruction and school planning." (Small Urban)

**Question 9**

Do you think there are sufficient opportunities for students to be socially integrated in your school?

a) Do teachers plan activities or is this an administrative function?

b) Does the facility lend itself toward social integration of the student body? Would you make changes?

c) Does the facility provide access for all students to any program that is provided?

Teachers reported socialization opportunities are planned by teachers and administrators. Interestingly, 75% of participants from small rural and small urban divisions reported social integration of students is weak in their schools. Opportunities for socialization were reported for students within their individual classes, but few opportunities were available school-wide. Most teachers who represented these divisions targeted the need for clubs, sports activities, and time for student recess and free play.

Conversely, most teachers who represented large urban and
large rural school divisions indicated a sufficient level of opportunity for student socialization, the desire for more extended situations for students and transportation for students.

The majority of teachers indicated their schools are not fully accessible to handicapped students and made recommendations for modification. Seven teachers reported their school building as either fully accessible or programming would be made accessible in the event a student needed to be accommodated to receive services or participate in a selected program.

**Question 10**

In closing, please describe 2 or more of the most important areas that should be focused upon to improve the effectiveness of your school's instructional program for all students.

When asked to describe 2 or more areas for improvement in instructional effectiveness of their school, participants reported the following areas for improvement:

a) academic instruction of basic subjects,

b) alternative educational programs and resources for at-risk students,

c) staff development,

d) increased teacher interaction and collaboration,

e) more accommodating facilities,

f) support personnel, and
g) attention to the specific learning needs and differences among their student population.

The following comments highlight individual teacher perspectives of the areas for improvement of their school's instructional program:

"Reading instruction needs greater focus." (Small Rural)

"I think we should focus more on science and math instruction." (Small Rural)

"We should offer more hands-on vocational classes. There are few alternatives for students who have repeated 2-3 grades. Our system has good resources for special education; we need resources for other student populations at-risk for academic failure." (Small Rural)

"Instructional grade-level aides would be the greatest asset." (Small Rural)

"We need teacher inservice and staff development to address the issues associated with educating the handicapped. Secondly, parent involvement and participation in inservice programs to educate them of their child's needs and the services available is needed." (Large Urban)

"We want an advise and advisor program for students to enhance their self-confidence and self-esteem." (Large Rural)

"Teachers need encouragement to utilize creative strategies and the collegial interaction of teachers needs to be fostered." (Large Urban)

"Smaller class size would allow teachers to provide more
attention to students with special learning problems. We also need more educational alternatives for students who seem unmotivated to get an education and are repeat offenders of school conduct rules." (Large Urban)

"We need appropriate training of paraprofessionals. Teachers need to have greater opportunity to collaborate during the school day." (Large Urban)

"Modifications in our school building would allow more functional spaces and larger rooms." (Large Rural)

"We need a new middle school with adequate space and personnel." (Small Urban)

"I would like more planning time for myself and my grade-level peers. We need more structured times for teacher interaction and collaboration." (Large Rural)

Summary

The results of the study were presented in this chapter. The first section presented a overview of descriptive data on the sample. The following sections addressed the analysis completed for each research question, the statistical procedures applied and the results obtained. Conclusively, it was determined:

1. Differences among the survey scale scores are attributed to the independent variable, educator group; significant differences exist among the mean ratings reported by educator groups on each of the five survey measures.

2. Principals consistently provided significantly higher
ratings, than other educator groups on each survey scale, except the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale. On this scale regular education teachers provided significantly lower ratings.

3. Correlations between predictor variables expressed as continuous variables, were not found to be significant predictors of the total survey score. Correlations between these variables with the total survey score for each educator group were not indicative of strong relationships.

4. Correlations between predictor variables expressed as categorical variables, were found to be small, but significant estimates of the criterion variable, total survey score. The variable, sex, did not enter the regression equation. Years experience in education was the best predictor.

5. A large quantity (931) recommendations were reported by survey respondents to Section D of the survey instrument. The need for improvement in instructional planning/training, administrative support, support services/resources, and expectations/climate is supported by content analysis of the qualitative data. Thus, the frequency of comments within categories supports the validity of the survey scale results.

6. Further support of the major themes revealed by survey respondents was indicated in the content analysis of data collected during informal interviews with a smaller sample of regular education teachers in randomly selected urban and rural divisions.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions that school principals, directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/school psychologists, regular education teachers and special education teachers in Virginia public schools have of the process of integrating educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled students into regular classes in grades 5-9. The questions to be answered in the study were:

1. What does each professional group perceive to be the most facilitating and the most inhibiting factors related to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9 in Virginia public schools?
2. Do differences and similarities exist in perceptions among each professional group across school divisions throughout Virginia?
3. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group exist through analysis of responses according to the personal demographics of respondents (sex, race, years experience in education, educational level,
current position, and coursework in special education) and their responses?

4. What differences among the perceptions of each professional group can be determined through analysis of responses according to the demographic characteristics of each selected school division (student enrollment and classification of the community) and the responses of educators employed within each division?

5. What differences or similarities exist in the availability of instructional resources, as perceived by educators employed in selected urban and rural school divisions? Will a qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources in selected school divisions correspond with the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents within each of these divisions?

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions that regular education teachers, special education teachers, principals and directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists in Virginia public schools have of the process of integrating mildly handicapped students into regular classes in grades 5-9. Given the limited return rate
of survey respondents (52%), the results led to the following conclusions for the research questions:

**Research Questions 1 and 2**

A. There is a significant overall effect (p<.001) for the independent variable, educator group on the dependent measures (five survey scales). This suggests differences among scale scores are attributed to the independent variable, educator group.

B. Significant differences exist among the mean ratings reported by educator groups on each of the five survey scales.

C. Significantly higher ratings were provided by principals, than other groups on each of the following survey scales: 1) Administrative Support, 2) Support Services/Resources, 3) Instructional Planning/Training, and Expectations/Climate. The results suggest principals displayed more positive ratings, than other educator groups regarding district practices and procedures related to the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their divisions. Therefore, principals perceive these factors as more facilitating when compared with the perceptions of other educator groups.

Conversely, special education teachers, regular education teachers, and directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists reported significantly lower ratings that did not differ significantly. These results suggest these groups displayed less positive ratings of division practices and procedures related to the effectiveness of
mainstreaming than principals. Therefore, special educators, regular educators and directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists perceive these scale factors to be less facilitating factors related to mainstreaming effectiveness within their divisions.

D. Regular education teachers provided significantly lower ratings on the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale than other educator groups. This suggest regular educators display less positive attitudes toward mainstreaming handicapped students than the other educator groups. Thus, Attitudes may be considered to be a less facilitating factor related to mainstreaming for the regular education group.

E. The findings of this study support the extant research literature. Specifically, educator attitudes are crucial, changeable, multifaceted and built upon a matrix of factors which mold the perceptions of educators, and may ultimately determine their responses to the needs of students.

Research Questions 3 and 4

A. Predictor variables, expressed as continuous variables, were not found to be significant predictors of the total survey score.

B. The predictor variables, number of direct contacts with handicapped students during the prior 12 months, and number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months were found to be significantly, negatively correlated with the total survey score for the regular
education teacher group. These correlations were not indicative of strong relationships. Thus, these predictors did not account for much variance in the dependent measure.

C. The predictor variable, participation in coursework on mainstreaming (1 or more courses), was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with the total survey score for directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists, but were not strongly correlated. Thus, this predictor did not account for much variance in the dependent measure.

D. The predictors, expressed as categorical variables: years experience, number of courses in special education (0 - 4 or more courses), student enrollment, classification of the community (large or small, urban or rural), and educator group were found to be small, but significant estimates of the criterion variable, total survey score. Thus, these predictors did not account for much variance in the dependent measure.

Research Question 5

A. The quantity of responses to Section D of the survey instrument indicates the willingness of respondents to make recommendations for improvement in the effectiveness of mainstreaming practices in their local school or division. The frequency of comments within categories supports the validity of survey scale results. Thus, Instructional Planning/Training, Support Services/Resources and
Administrative Support are perceived areas of weakness, or inhibiting factors, relating to the mainstreaming effectiveness of Virginia public school divisions.

B. Differences and similarities exist in the availability of instructional resources in Virginia public schools, as perceived by regular education teachers in selected urban and rural divisions. These results are based upon content analysis of data collected through individual interviews with teachers in Virginia. This qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources, further determined the validity of the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents employed within each school division, indicated by the survey results.

Discussion

This investigation was designed to examine the perceptions of those professionals who have the primary responsibility for the education of mildly handicapped students. Specifically, the factors they perceive to be the most facilitating and the most inhibiting factors related to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9 in Virginia public schools were investigated. Of particular importance were the issues specifically addressing the education of mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9 in Virginia public schools as perceived by special education teachers, regular education teachers, school principals, and directors of special education/directors of pupil
personnel/school psychologists.

A significant overall effect was determined for the independent variable, educator group, on the dependent measures (survey scales). This indicates strong evidence to support the conclusion, differences among scale scores are attributed to the independent variable, educator group.

The predictor variables, expressed as continuous variables, were not found to be significant predictors of the total survey score.

The predictor variables, number of direct contacts with handicapped students during the past 12 months, and number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months were found to be significantly, negatively correlated with the total survey score for the regular education teacher group. These correlations were not indicative of strong relationships. Thus these predictors did not account for much variance in the dependent measure, total survey score.

The predictor variable, participation in coursework on mainstreaming, was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with the total survey score for directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists, but were not strongly correlated. Thus, this predictor did not account for much variance in the dependent measure.

The predictors, expressed as categorical variables: years experience, number of courses in special education (0 -
100

4 or more courses), student enrollment, classification of the community (large or small, urban or rural), and educator group were found to be small, but significant estimates of the criterion variable, total survey score. Thus, these predictors did not account for much variance in the dependent measure; however, potentially these variables may influence educator perceptions of division mainstreaming practices and procedures.

These findings are consistent with previous research. Findings in regard to these static variables are inconclusive and often contradictory (Berryman & Berryman, 1981; Harasymiw & Horne, 1976; Harvey & Green, 1984; Hughes, 1978; Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Mandell & Strain, 1978; Prus, 1989; Winzer & Rose; 1976). Previously, the positive effects of contact and exposure to exceptional students upon the attitudes of teachers has been documented (Davis-Clerk, 1990; Frith & Edwards, 1981; Harvey & Green, 1984; Hoover & Cessna, 1984; Larrivee, 1982; Marston & Leslie, 1983). Findings of this study revealed, potentially, the greater the number of contacts educators had within the prior 12 months, the lower or less positive were their survey scores. It is possible that previous studies focused more upon the relationship between these predictors and teacher attitudes toward the handicapped, instead of educators' perceptions of division practices and procedures related to mainstreaming handicapped students.
The relationship between the development of a favorable attitude toward handicapped learners in regular education classes and the taking of special education coursework has also been confirmed (Cortwright, 1980; Farrell, 1985; Harvey & Green, 1984; Leyser & Abrams, 1983; Walker, 1987; Winzer, 1984b). For purposes of this study, these results were not supported. The amount of coursework in special education (0 - 4 or more courses) was not related to educators' perceptions measured by the survey instrument.

The results of this study revealed stronger evidence to indicate that significant differences exist between the mean ratings reported by educator groups on each of the five survey scales. Significantly higher ratings were provided by principals, than other educator groups on each of the following survey scales: 1) Administrative Support; 2) Support Services/Resources; 3) Instructional Planning/Training; and Expectations/Climate. These results suggest principals displayed more positive ratings, than other educator groups regarding district practices and procedures related to the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their divisions. Therefore, principals perceive these factors as more facilitating when compared with the perceptions of other educator groups.

Conversely, special education teachers, regular education teachers, and directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/psychologists reported significantly lower
ratings that did not differ significantly from each other. These results suggest these groups displayed less positive ratings of division practices and procedures related to the effectiveness of mainstreaming than principals. Therefore, special education teachers, regular education teachers, and directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists perceive these scale factors to be more inhibiting factors related to mainstreaming effectiveness within their divisions.

Prus (1989) identified similar results and suggested that the Administrative Support scale constituted a type of "self-evaluation" by principals; perhaps response bias may have been the reason for significant differences between principals' ratings of the Administrative Support scale and the ratings of other educator groups.

Prus (1989) noted the mean ratings of principals on the Support Services/Resources scale were significantly different and higher than other educator groups. These results suggest the existence of differing perceptions of the quality and quantity of support services available to assist mainstreaming efforts in Virginia public schools as more facilitating and less inhibiting than regular educators, special educators, or directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists.

Consistent with the pattern of differences noted previously, differences on the Instructional Planning/Training scale and the Expectations/Climate scale were similar. Regular education teachers and special education teachers
reported the lowest mean ratings regarding the instructional planning and training efforts within their divisions. The mean ratings reported by directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists were also lower than principals' ratings on this scale. These findings replicate similar results noted in previous research (Prus, 1989). These results suggest educators more directly involved with the education of handicapped students rate classroom and school expectations less positively than principals, and indicate less positive views regarding their need for instructional planning and training.

Regular education teachers provided significantly lower ratings on the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale than other educator groups. This finding suggests regular education teachers in Virginia public schools hold less positive attitudes toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9, than any other educator group. Thus, Attitudes may be considered to be a less facilitating factor related to the benefits of mainstreaming for regular education teachers.

The need for improvement in instructional planning/training, administrative support, support services/resources, and expectations/climate is supported by content analysis of the qualitative data provided by respondents to Section D of the survey instrument. The quantity of responses indicates the willingness of respondents
to make recommendations for improvement in the effectiveness of mainstreaming practices in their local school or division. The frequency of comments within categories supports the validity of the survey scale results. Thus, Instructional Planning/Training, Support Services/Resources, Administrative Support, and Expectations/Climate are perceived areas of weakness, or inhibiting factors relating to the mainstreaming effectiveness of Virginia public schools. In order of cumulative frequency, staff development, communication/collaboration/teamwork, support services/personnel, and mainstreaming considerations for effective practice, administration, and service delivery were the categories that accounted for approximately one-half of the total 931 responses that were reported. Further, the four predominantly mentioned categories of recommendations for the improvement of mainstreaming efforts within their school/division for each educator group by division type, yielded greater similarity than difference. Collectively, all groups from each division type reported the need for improvement in the following areas: 1) staff development; 2) communication/collaboration/teamwork; and support services/personnel.

The need for staff development was the most frequently cited perceived need of respondents to Section D of the survey. This perceived area of need is consistent with the lower ratings on the Instructional Planning/Training scale.
In comparison with the extant literature reviewed, the relationship of educator perceptions of competency for teaching handicapped students to attitudes toward mainstreaming is consistently documented (Brooks & Bransford, 1971; Cooper, 1989; Davis-Clerk, 1990; Farrell, 1985; Harasymiw & Horne, 1976; Harvey and Green, 1984; Hudson, Graham & Warner, 1979; Inserni, 1987, Larrivee, 1981, Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Leyser & Abrams, 1983; Prus, 1989; Rodriguez, 1985; Winzer, 1984b). Staff development is a major consideration to be pursued within Virginia public school divisions in order to facilitate more effective mainstreaming practices for mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9.

Communication/Collaboration/Teamwork was the second most frequently cited category for improvement among all respondents regarding the mainstreaming of handicapped students within their school divisions. Collectively, teachers more frequently than principals or directors of special education/pupil personnel/psychologists provided recommendations for this area. This need is consistent with the lower ratings by subjects on the Instructional Planning/Training scale and the Administrative Support scale. Respondents' comments indicate the effectiveness of mainstreaming within their school division could be improved if the processes of communication, collaboration, and teamwork were facilitated.

Support Services/Personnel and Mainstreaming
Considerations for effective practice, administration, and service delivery were the next most frequently cited categories by respondents. Based upon the comments provided, collectively, educators perceive a need to provide an increased level of support staff to facilitate mainstreaming efforts within their division, and an expanded variety of support services to include direct teacher assistance and consultation. Educators' comments reflected the need for different models of service delivery that are provide more integration of handicapped students within the school mainstream, as opposed to the traditional pull-out programs. These findings are consistent with the lower mean scale ratings of educators on the Support Services/Resources scale, the Administrative Support scale and the Expectations/Climate scale in previous analyses of this study. Further, they are consistent with the extant literature addressing the relationship between the availability of support personnel and services with educator attitudes toward mainstreaming (Center & Ward, 1987; Center, Ward, Parmenter & Nash, 1985; Gans, 1987; Larrivee & Cook; 1979; Leyser & Abrams, 1984; Prus, 1989); these findings are also consistent with the literature addressing the positive effects of modifying regular classroom instruction on the achievement of mainstreamed mildly handicapped students (DeLoach, 1989; Meckler & Vogler, 1984; Spruill, 1987; Wang et al., 1984).

In an attempt to triangulate the collection of data,
informal interviews were conducted and data collected were analyzed in concert with the results of the survey data collected from the survey instrument. The breadth and depth of educator perceptions is further revealed by content analysis of data collected during interviews with regular education teachers in randomly selected urban and rural school divisions throughout Virginia. Conclusively, this qualitative assessment of the availability of instructional resources, as perceived by regular classroom teachers, further determined the validity of the mainstreaming perceptions of educator respondents within each school division, indicated by the survey scale scores, and the comments reported in Section D of the survey instrument. Specifically, regular classroom teachers indicated the following areas of perceived need:

1) the availability of basic instructional materials, the need for additional curricula materials, and centralized teacher resource centers within their division;
2) the need for support services, support personnel, and facilities to accommodate personnel;
3) the need for direct teacher assistance to assist in the instructional process within the classroom, and teacher intervention teaming;
4) the need for adequate time for planning and collaboration among educators to be scheduled within their school day;
5) the concern for collegial, professional relationships and voluntary participation in teacher intervention teams;
6) the need for opportunities for student socialization outside the classroom parameters that would facilitate school-wide integration of the student body;
7) the need for facility modifications to make their school fully accessible to the handicapped, more accommodating and a more motivating environment for all students; and
8) the need for improvement in the instructional effectiveness of their school. Participants reported the following areas for improvement:
   a) academic instruction of basic subjects,
   b) alternative educational programs and resources for at-risk students,
   c) staff development,
   d) increased teacher interaction and collaboration,
   e) more accommodating facilities,
   f) support personnel, and
   g) attention to the specific learning needs and differences among their student population.

Recommendations for Future Research and Practice

Based upon the results and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for future research and practice are provided:

1. The research methodology of future studies should include quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures, as an attempt to triangulate research data, to reveal more holistic perspectives of mainstreaming processes.
2. The relationship between the predictor variables, years experience, student enrollment, number of contacts during the past 12 months with handicapped students, and the number of handicapped students taught/counseled/evaluated during the prior 12 months, and the perceptions educators have of the procedures and practices within their school/division should be further investigated.

3. Future studies need to focus on the differences between the perceptions school principals have of mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in Virginia public schools, and the perceptions other relevant educator groups have of this process.

4. Additional research to replicate the findings of this study within additional geographic regions needs to be conducted to further demonstrate the validity and factor structure of the survey instrument, and the validity of the interview questionnaire. Of primary importance, additional research to determine the issues specifically related to the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students as perceived by relevant educator groups should be conducted.

5. Virginia school division administrators need to conduct evaluation research studies within individual localities to specifically determine the needs of educators regarding the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students. Specific areas of investigation should focus upon staff development, support services and support personnel, models of
service delivery, teaming, availability of materials/equipment/resources, facilities, and structure of the school day.

6. Given the limitations and generalizability of the results of the present investigation and analysis, the perceived needs of educators for instructional resources to facilitate the mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students, should be addressed and supported by the state and local educational agencies of Virginia public schools. Specifically, the State Department of Education should investigate and recommend the implementation of comprehensive, statewide staff development and inservice training for all educators on effective mainstreaming practices. Secondly, the quantity and quality of support services, support personnel, facilities, and instructional resources necessary to provide appropriate educational programming, should be considered and made available to meet the perceived needs of educators. Of particular importance are the perceived needs for improvement in the processes of communication, collaboration, and teamwork to facilitate the instructional process of all students. Mainstreaming considerations for alternative service delivery models, administration of special and regular education, and effective practice should be investigated, implemented and endorsed by the Virginia Department of Education and the local school divisions. Lastly, the funding sources necessary to
provide training, personnel, and the necessary resources for instruction should be made available to each locality.
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School Division Types and Defining Characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>9,756</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50,400</td>
<td>9,657</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55,100</td>
<td>9,096</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>9,129</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>8,046</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35,400</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>4,724</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>8,057</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>9,665</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>4,109</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td>11,994</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>66,200</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>57,900</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>11,527</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Large Urban Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>20,788</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>66,700</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>280,800</td>
<td>36,428</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>100,100</td>
<td>12,880</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>18,523</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>216,600</td>
<td>26,885</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>162,800</td>
<td>28,313</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>350,100</td>
<td>40,654</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>739,300</td>
<td>126,790</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>179,100</td>
<td>42,864</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>184,700</td>
<td>40,991</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>141,500</td>
<td>28,324</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>8,348</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>107,900</td>
<td>9,269</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter to School Superintendents
Dear :

Your school division has been selected as part of the random sample of rural and urban public school divisions in Virginia that comprises the sample population to be investigated for my doctoral dissertation. I am requesting your cooperation in conducting this research study. It is the culminating experience required for completion of the doctoral program in Educational Administration with an Emphasis in Special Education at the College of William and Mary.

As a doctoral candidate, I am investigating educator perceptions of the process of integrating mildly handicapped students into regular classes in grades 5-9. Specifically, I am seeking to determine the issues addressing the education of mildly handicapped students in regular classes as perceived by principals, special educators, classroom teachers, and directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/school psychologists in urban and rural divisions throughout Virginia at these grade levels.

I would like to mail a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a stamped-addressed envelope to randomly selected personnel from each educator group in your division. Additionally, I would like to randomly select and interview a sample of ten classroom teachers of grades 5-9. Teachers will be contacted by letter and/or phone to request their participation; individual interviews will be scheduled with teachers and conducted at each school site.

The questionnaire is self-explanatory, will take each educator approximately twenty minutes to complete, and will be returned directly to me. A copy of the structured interview is included. Each interview will require approximately 45 minutes to conduct. Confidentiality and anonymity of school divisions, schools, and individuals will be protected; all results will be reported in group terms.

Please indicate your willingness to participate in this research project on the stamp-addressed card and mail this to me.

I would appreciate it if you will return your card by , 1990.

I will be pleased to provide you with a summary of the
results when the dissertation is completed.

Thank you very much for your interest and input.

Sincerely,

Pamela Buckner Riedel, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education
Appendix C

Letter to Teachers Requesting Participation
Dear Educator:

You have been randomly selected as part of a sample of educators of rural and urban public school divisions in Virginia to participate in the research project that I am conducting for my doctoral dissertation. This research is the culminating experience required for completion of the doctoral program in Educational Administration with an Emphasis in Special Education at the College of William and Mary.

I am investigating educator perceptions of the process of integrating mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9. More specifically, I am seeking to determine the issues addressing the education of mildly handicapped students in regular classes as perceived by principals, special educators, classroom teachers, and directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/school psychologists throughout urban and rural school divisions in Virginia.

I hope that you will be able to give about twenty minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Confidentiality and anonymity of school divisions, schools, and participants will be protected; all results will be reported in group terms.

I have included a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience and I would appreciate it if you will return the completed questionnaire by

If you are interested in the results of my study, I will be sending a summary of the results to your school division upon completion of the research project.

Thank you very much for your interest and input.

Sincerely,

Pamela Buckner Riedel, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education
Appendix D

Survey of Educator Perceptions of Enhancing and Restraining Forces Related to the Integration of Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Educational Setting
Survey of Educator Perceptions of Enhancing and Restraining Forces Related to the Integration of Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Educational Setting

SECTION A: Please check the response for each item which most closely reflects your experience and position.

1. Sex:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female

2. Race: (predominant)
   ____ Black
   ____ White
   ____ Hispanic
   ____ Oriental
   ____ Other (specify)

3. Years Experience in Education
   ____ 0-4 years
   ____ 5-9 years
   ____ 10-14 years
   ____ 15-19 years
   ____ 20 or more years

4. Educational Level:
   ____ Bachelors Degree
   ____ Bachelors + 18 hrs.
   ____ Masters Degree
   ____ Masters + 30 hrs. or Educational Spec Degree
   ____ Doctorate

5. Current Position
   ____ Regular Educ Teacher
   ____ Special Educ Teacher
   ____ Principal
   ____ District Administrator (Non-Special Education)
   ____ Special Educ Admin
   ____ Special Services Staff
   ____ Other (specify:________)

6. If currently a teacher, what grade(s) and/or subject(s) do you teach?
   ____ Not Applicable

   Grades:
   a) ____
   b) ____
   c) ____

   Subjects
   a) ____
   b) ____
   c) ____
7. **Number of years in present position:**
   - ___ 0-4 years
   - ___ 5-9 years
   - ___ 10-14 years
   - ___ 15-19 years
   - ___ 20 or more years

9. **Student enrollment of your school district:**
   - ___ under 1,000
   - ___ 1,000 - 4,999
   - ___ 5,000 - 9,999
   - ___ 10,000 - 19,999
   - ___ 20,000 or more

11. **Number of courses completed in Spec Educ:**
    - ___ 0
    - ___ 1
    - ___ 2
    - ___ 3
    - ___ 4 or more

13. **Number of handicapped students you have taught, counseled, or evaluated during the past 12 months:**
    - ___

8. **Current Work Setting(s):** (Check all that may apply)
   - ___ Elementary
   - ___ Middle School
   - ___ Junior High
   - ___ High School
   - ___ District Office

10. **Classification of the community in which you work:**
    - ___ Urban
    - ___ Rural
    - ___ Mixed
    - ___ Other (specify: ____________)

12. **Number of handicapped you have had direct contact with during the past 12 months:**
    - ___

14. **Type of training rec'd on the mainstreaming of handicapped students:**
    - ___ 1 or more college courses devoted to mainstreaming
    - ___ Portions, modules, or college courses
    - ___ Professional seminars
    - ___ District in-services
    - ___ Other (specify: ____________)
    - ___ None
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS:

- MAINSTREAMING - The practice of educating handicapped and non-handicapped students in regular education settings; generally practiced with mildly-moderately handicapped students.

- INTEGRATION - Another term for mainstreaming.

- IEP - Individualized Education Program or plan of instruction/services for a handicapped student.

- HANDICAPPED - For purposes of this study, the term pertains to any student identified as having mild-moderate degree(s) of cognitive, physical, or emotional impairment which warrants special service provision.

SECTION B: Please circle the response that best describes your perceptions or beliefs on each of the following items. If you work in multiple schools, you may elect to respond just on the basis of one of the schools only. If you are a building administrator, respond to questions as they pertain to your school. If you are a district administrator, respond to items as they may pertain globally to all of the schools in your district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Given appropriate materials and support, most teachers will actively work with all handicapped students in their classes.  
   - SA  A  U  D  SD

2. In my district, there tends to be an inadequate array of special services or therapies available to
3. In my school(s) teachers establish realistic academic criteria and behavioral expectations for handicapped students.

4. In my school(s) the objective of handicapped students' IEPs generally aren't communicated to reg class teachers.

5. My district administrators are visibly supportive of mainstreaming handicapped students.

6. In my school(s) reg educators, spec educators, and support staff do not devote adequate time to jointly met together to play instruction and provide ongoing monitoring for the mainstreamed students.

7. In my role as an educator, I feel that I have little control as to whether others make "scapegoats" out of the handicapped students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE(SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. In my school(s) adequate support services (e.g., counseling, school psychology, social work, etc.) are available for students and staff.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Only those people trained in Special Education can effectively teach the handicapped.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In my school(s) most teachers carefully monitor the IEPs and the quality of education the handicapped students receive.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In my district there are inadequate funds, materials, or resources needed by staff to work with handicapped students.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The social climate in my school(s) is such that the handicapped students feel included and supported by staff and other pupils.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Generally, non-handicapped students develop skills, attitudes, and values that are more constructive and tolerant through on-going interaction with the handicapped.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Special Services staff tend to be so busy evaluating students for placement that they are not regularly available for consultation and technical assistance for the teachers.

15. In my school(s) most teachers do vary task presentation and adapt instructional materials to accommodate mainstreamed students.

16. In my school(s) the handicapped are not provided opportunities to participate in the athletic and intramural sports programs.

17. In my school(s) the principal observes the integrated programs to determine if and when modifications of overall programs goals are needed.

18. In my school(s) there is resistance to working with handicapped students in regular education classes.
19. I believe that the integration of handicapped students into the reg class detracts from the educational achievement of the other students.  

20. In my school(s) teachers are aware of how to access the support services (e.g. counseling, school psychology, social work, etc.) available to them.  

21. Individualized educational activities are generally not provided for handicapped students in regular education classes.  

22. To the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children should be educ with nonhandicapped children.  

23. In my district principals and administrators tend to be too busy with other priorities to be concerned with making integration of handicapped students within reg classes work as effectively as possible.
24. In my school(s) teachers create an accepting, helpful social climate and openly encourage students to expect and value individual differences.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I generally look forward to the challenge of working with handicapped students.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In my school(s) the allocated time for the provision of special services (e.g. speech, counseling, physical therapy, etc.) interfaces with the handicapped students' participation in the regular class schedule.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. In my school(s) teachers devote adequate time to prepare and adapt instruction for all of the students in the class.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. In my school(s) the handicapped have limited, at best, opportunities to participate in or be chosen for academic rewards/incentive programs, school clubs, social clubs, or other extracurricular activities.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. My principal(s) openly encourages the staff to work effectively with handicapped students in reg classes.  

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
   SA   A   U   D   SD  

30. The social climate in my school(s) is such that many of the handicapped students may tend to feel excluded or unsupported.  

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
   SA   A   U   D   SD  

31. Mainstreaming efforts increase the workload for teachers.  

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
   SA   A   U   D   SD  

32. In my district special education staff provide training in supplemental and instructional methods regarding the handicapped so as to support the regular classroom teacher.  

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
   SA   A   U   D   SD  

33. The size of most classes today interferes with the opportunity to effectively mainstream handicapped students.  

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)  
   SA   A   U   D   SD  

34. I regularly participate in any regular/special education meetings/planning sessions conducted regarding handicapped students.
35. Self-study efforts to identify ways to overcome barriers to effective mainstreaming are lacking in my school(s).

36. In my school(s) staff members are generally positive in their attitudes toward working with handicapped students in their classes in the class.

37. I feel confident that I am able to make handicapped students feel valued in an educational setting.

38. The amount of time available for student counseling/consultation by the school psychologists and guidance counselors tends to be inadequate.

39. In my school(s) most classroom teachers closely adhere to the IEP for any handicapped student assigned to them and incorporate the related IEP objectives into daily instruction within their classes.
40. In my school(s) regular education and special educ tend to be viewed as separate instructional programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. In my district administrators and principals actively work toward ensuring that the total instructional program, room accommodations and school equipment are adequate to accommodate the various educational needs of handicapped pupils.

42. In my school(s) mainstreaming activities are not perceived as a "team effort" among administrators, staff, and students.

43. Mainstreaming serves little purpose or benefit for anyone involved.

44. In my school(s) an adequate number of support personnel (e.g. guidance counselors, school psychologists, social workers, etc.) are available to help implement an effective mainstreaming program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (SA)</th>
<th>AGREE (A)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (U)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (D)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. The paperwork and accountability related to mainstreaming practices detracts from teaching and consulting tasks.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. In my school(s) appropriate personnel have an opportunity to be involved in the decision making and programming process for placement of students in special education programs.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. In my school(s) the principal seldom, if ever, holds meetings with staff to determine the school's needs and resources specifically related to mainstreaming.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. In my school(s) there is open communication between regular and special educational personnel in order to resolve any problems or issues related to their function, roles and responsibilities regarding mainstreaming.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I believe that I am prepared to effectively serve the needs to mainstream handicapped students.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. With support, if needed, regular classroom teachers can effectively teach mildly or moderately handicapped students.

52. An IEP is often viewed by staff as an administrative formality and does not seem that critical to instruction.

53. My principal(s) is visibly supportive of mainstreaming.

54. Integration of handicapped students within regular classrooms can diminish the image of the school.

55. The presence of handicapped students in regular classrooms is a cause for concern expressed by parents of the other pupils.

56. In my district adequate facilities are provided for support staff (e.g. speech therapists, psychologists, counselors, etc.) to work with students.
57. Mainstreaming within my district typically involves schedule disruptions due to removing handicapped pupils from class several times a day/week in order to receive specialized services.

58. In my school(s) there is an ongoing program of staff development/in-service regarding mainstreaming which is provided for all the staff.

59. My principal(s) rarely attends staffings for students being considered for placement in spec educ programs or services.

60. In my school(s) joint reg and spec educ staff/meetings/planning sessions are frequently conducted to determine strengths and weaknesses of the programs, class standards, necessary adaptations, on-going monitoring, testing and grading of mainstreaming students.
SECTION C: Please circle the response that best describes your perceptions or beliefs on each of the following items.

1. Mainstreaming is an important goal for most handicapped students.

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
   SA       A       U       D       SD

2. In general mainstreaming is working well in my district.

   STRONGLY AGREE (SA)   AGREE (A)   UNDECIDED (U)   DISAGREE (D)   STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
   SA       A       U       D       SD

SECTION D: Please list the five most important things that can be done to improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming in your district.

1. ______________________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________________________

4. ______________________________________________________________

5. ______________________________________________________________

Thank you for your assistance. Please put the Questionnaire in the attached addressed, stamped envelope and mail immediately.
Appendix E

Permission to Use the Survey
Pamela K. Buckner, doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary, has my permission to use my *Survey of Educator Perceptions of Enhancing and Restraining Forces Related to the Integration of Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Educational Setting* as a data gathering instrument in her doctoral dissertation.

\[\text{Dr. Audrey S. Prus} \]

\[\text{March 16, 1990} \]

Date
Appendix F

Interview Questionnaire
Informal Interview Questionnaire

Position:
Grade Level:
Date:

As you may recall from our telephone conversation, the purpose of this interview is to explore the resources within your school or school system that may be available to assist teachers in the instructional process. We will focus upon several major areas; these include support services, teacher teams, instructional materials, facilities, and administrative arrangements.

1. To begin, please describe your present position and the various types of responsibilities that you hold.

2. Please tell me about the different kinds of instructional materials that are utilized in your classes, or your school. Comment freely on the availability of these.

3. Please describe your view of the availability of support services (counselors, social workers, and psychologists) in your school.
   a) Are teachers aware of how to access these services?
   b) For what purposes are these services needed?
   c) Are adequate facilities provided for support staff to work with students?

4. What type of support personnel are available in the classroom to assist teachers in the instructional process?
   a) How often are they available?
b) Please describe the kinds of services they provide.

5. In special education the decision making process that facilitates student identification and placement is dependent upon multidisciplinary teamwork. In addition to this team, do other kinds of teams exist in your school that may assist teachers?

6. Do you think the school day is structured to provide adequate time for teachers who are willing to collaborate for instruction?

7. Are teacher assistance teams formally organized to respond to the professional needs of teachers?
   a) Are any arrangements made to support teachers in meeting instructional/management concerns? If so, please describe.

8. How would you feel if administrative arrangements were made to formulate a team of teachers from different program areas and/or grade levels whereby cases involving children with learning problems could be brought before this committee for teacher assistance, brainstorming, etc.? a) What is your reaction to the implementation of this kind of teacher assistance team in your school?

9. Do you think there are sufficient opportunities for students to be socially integrated in your school?
   a) Do teachers plan activities or is this an administrative function?
   b) Does the facility lend itself toward social
integration of the student body? Would you make changes in
the physical plant or should it remain the same?

c) Does the facility provide access for all students to
any program that is provided? Please explain.

10. In closing, please briefly describe 2 or more of the most
important areas that should be focused upon to improve the
effectiveness of your school's instructional program for all
students.
Thank you very much for your input!
Appendix G

Letter to Educators Requesting an Interview
Dear Colleague:

You have been randomly selected as a part of a sample of educators of rural and urban public school divisions in Virginia to participate in the research project that I am conducting for my doctoral dissertation. This research is the culminating experience required for completion of the doctoral program in Educational Administration with an Emphasis in Special Education at the College of William and Mary.

I am investigating educator perceptions of the process of integrating mildly handicapped students in grades 5-9. Specifically, I am seeking to determine the issues addressing the education of mildly handicapped students in regular classes in urban and rural divisions throughout Virginia. Your input is needed.

I would like to schedule an appointment, visit you at your school site and conduct an informal interview. The purpose of the interview is to explore the resources within your school or school system that may be available to assist teachers in the instructional process.

I hope that you will be able to give about forty-five minutes of your time to complete the interview. Confidentiality and anonymity of school divisions, schools, and participants will be protected; all results will be reported in group terms.

Please indicate your willingness to participate in this research project by calling my home collect (804-480-0388) during the evening between 7:30 and 9:00 p.m. to answer any questions you may have and schedule our appointment. I would appreciate it if you will contact me by , 1991.

Thank you very much for your interest and input.

Sincerely,

Pamela Buckner Riedel, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education
Appendix H

Comments of Survey Respondents to Section D
Staff Development

Small Urban Special Educator
"Compulsory inservice/staff development"
"Educate regular education teachers"
"Training of regular education teachers needs to include more special education courses"
"Information/suggestions--inservices"
"Inservices and joint sessions on mainstreaming"
"On-going inservices on how to adapt grade level materials to meet special needs"
"Layman workshops on each exceptionality"
"Courses in behavior management techniques"
"More inservice for regular education teachers"
"Regular and special education inservice"
"More in-school inservice training in mainstreaming"
"Regular class teachers should be required to take special education classes for recertification (at least one)"
"More training for classroom teachers"
"More inservice programs involving regular and special teachers"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Provide more inservices for regular teachers"
"Provide more inservices for administrators and principals"
"An expanded staff development program to help regular teachers deal effectively with handicapped students"
"Educate regular and special education teachers in the nuts
and bolts of mainstreaming...how to get started and maintain an effective program"
"Provide more inservice for regular educators"
"Inservice regular education teachers on mainstreaming so they take more ownership of special education kids"
"Provide workshops for regular education teachers in identifying learning styles of students"
"Educating regular classroom teachers in meeting/incorporating techniques in regular classroom program"
"Enthusiastic-motivating inservices"
"Inservice for regular teachers on mainstreaming"
"Inservice training for regular education teachers"
"Principals and department heads must receive coursework in mainstreaming"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Teach regular classroom teachers how to modify and adapt materials"
"Inservice education for all teachers regarding the development of appropriate lesson plans. We still level classes. The majority of regular education teachers teach all of their classes in the same way. If they would make some accommodations, our special education kids could make it"
"Inservice on cooperative teaching should be given prior to implementing a program"
"Educate all staff members"
"Newsletters for teachers and parents on mainstreaming"
"Workshops...teachers"
"Inservices on how to provide success for these kids...let's build self-esteem not destroy it!"
"Inservice of regular education teachers on differentiation of instruction"
"Staff education--regular teachers seem very uninformed as to their responsibilities and/or the integration process"
"Improve teacher flexibility"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Offer professional seminars which prepare teachers for mainstreaming"
"Have inservices concerning mainstreaming and what is involved"
"Require regular educators and support staff to take one or more courses in special education"
"More education for the professionals"
"More information on adapting tests and curriculum for special education students"
"Inservice administrators, regular educators on the various handicapping conditions"
"Inservice education for regular classroom teachers"
"Inservice or formal education for administrators"
"Regular classroom teacher education on modifying"
"A better understanding of the problems facing moderately and mildly handicapped students"
"Education of regular educators about mainstreaming should be
implemented"
"Inservice on behavior management in the regular classroom"

**Small Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Workshops for all teachers"
"Some staff development regarding mainstreaming"
"Educate those teachers who will received the mainstreamed child"
"Inservice on mainstreaming tips and techniques from successful programs"
"More inservice training on mainstreaming"
"Staff development for teachers (regular classroom)"
"Training for classroom teacher"
"Teachers need to be effectively trained to teach the handicapped"
"Requirement of courses for classroom teacher which are devoted mainstreaming"
"More inservice on specific ways to handle behavior (special education)"
"Inservice on specific teaching methods (special education/LD)"

**Large Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Conduct inservice programs that would help prepare regular classroom teachers for the integration of handicapped students"
"Education/inservice training for teachers"
"Inservices and training"
"Good training sessions"
"Provide further education for regular teachers regarding the handicapped"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**

"More training for regular classroom teachers"
"More training in how to meet the needs of this type of student"
"Improve the number of inservices on effectively teaching mainstreamed students"
"Have inservice workshops for regular teachers and special education teachers together"
"Inservice to make staff aware of what mainstreaming is"
"Workshops on 'special' children"

**Staff training**

"More teacher awareness of the help that is available for the mainstreamed pupil"
"Train the classroom teacher"
"To educate the regular classroom teacher"

**Large Rural Classroom Teacher**

"Teacher's to receive inservice training for dealing with handicapped students"
"Teacher education"

"Education of classroom teachers in regard to expectations and available personnel and materials to permit a confident approach to the handicapped student"
"Limited technical knowledge regarding special education
exists among teachers--major inservice development should occur"
"Inservice instruction"
"Mandatory inservices with help on how to meet individual
needs in a regular classroom"
"Inservice"
"Offer inservice days for regular teachers to prepare
appropriate materials"

Small Urban Principal
"The regular classroom teachers need a better understanding
of what to do with special education students with the
students misbehavior in the class. Quite often they send
them back to the special education teacher to deal with the
problem"
"More on-going training for all teachers"
"More on-going training for administrators on legalities of
special education"
"Inservice to educate all teachers about mainstreaming"
"Inservice regular education teachers on mainstreaming and
adaptations"
"Teacher inservice meetings on current special education
laws and effective mainstreaming"
"More inservice on mainstreaming"
"Understanding that regular and special education should be
integrated, collaborative programs"
"Inservice program for teachers"
"More training for classroom teachers"
"Inservice for administrators"
"Additional inservices for all personnel"
"Continued inservice"
"Teacher staff development"
"Inservice regular educators more"
"Staff development"
"Training"

Large Urban Principal
"Training for staff in working with mainstreamed students"
"Training for regular education teachers"
"Help for regular education teachers in understanding IEP's"
"More training for regular education teachers on how to work with special education students"
"Provide inservices on collaboration"
"Inservice for all teachers on mainstreaming"
"Adequately train classroom teachers of mainstreamed handicapped students"
"Teacher awareness of mainstreamed students"
"More practical professional development opportunities for teachers"
"Inservice teachers on materials and procedures"
"On-going inservice activities"
"Provide inservice for administrators and teachers"
"More staff development"
"More training for special education teachers on how to work
with special education teachers"
"Teacher training"
"Tips for assisting special students"

Small Rural Principal

"Staff development"

"Inservice all teachers on techniques to teach students"
"Continued regular inservice"
"More inservice with the regular classroom teacher in order to meet the needs of the mainstreamed students"
"Require courses for teachers in various handicapping conditions"
"Train administrators to understand mainstreaming"
"Train regular education teachers to effectively deal with individual needs"
"Inservices which deal with specific handicaps and specific ways the regular classroom teacher can help service the child"
"Better understanding of handicapping conditions by regular classroom teachers"
"Provide district-wide seminars for all regular/special education teachers on mainstreaming"
"Teacher inservice...regular and special educators"
"Teacher training"
"Better understanding of special education by classroom teachers"
Large Rural Principal
"More county-wide inservice for teachers"
"More teacher inservice"
"Continued professional development"
"The district should schedule more workshops and inservice programs to improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming"
"Continued inservicing"
"Provide adequate training for regular classroom teachers"
"Workshops to help regular education teachers deal with special needs"
"Inservices to deal with mainstreaming"

Small Urban Director
"Reeducating regular education teachers regarding special education practices/possibilities"
"On-going inservices re: relevant topics of special education and curriculum/instruction"
"Sensitivity training for staff"
"More disability awareness activities are needed in all schools"
"Educate personnel and students that handicapped classes are an integral part of the school"
"Inservice regular educators on merits of mainstreaming"
"Provide staff development and staff support to make mainstreaming an integral part of education!"
"Provide regular education teachers with on-going assistance and inservice about mainstreaming"
"Educate principals and other administrators about the goals of mainstreaming (teachers, also!)

"Educate teachers about characteristics, learning styles, etc., of handicapped students"

"Provide inservice training on a regular basis"

"Provide opportunities for teachers/principals to observe districts where mainstreaming is an integral part of the regular education program"

"Provide workshops on adaptation and content, curriculum, textbook, and strategies on mainstreaming"

"Educate teachers about learning theory"

"Education of regular classroom teachers"

"More staff development and inservice"

"Staff development"

Large Urban Director

"Provide more inservice training for regular education teachers to assist them with mainstreaming"

"Inservicing special education teachers on how to accommodate regular education teachers"

"Staff development for administrators and regular education teachers in mainstreaming"

"Staff development for special education teachers in the process of mainstreaming"

"Staff development involving all in collaboration"

"Train regular education teachers to work with handicapped students"
"Monitory teacher training and administrator training in special education and mainstreaming"
"Inservice for regular education: comprehensive and ongoing"
"Skills training for special education teachers on consulting with other professionals"
"Continued training and support for regular education teachers"
"Train principals on techniques of mainstreaming and awareness of ways to accomplish it"
"Train regular teachers on techniques of mainstreaming and characteristics of special education students"
"Inservice regular teachers...alternative strategies"
"Awareness: Some principals and teachers have the misconception that mainstreaming means all classes, all the time"
"Education of staff"
"Train regular education staff"
"Staff development for regular education teachers"
"Inservice school administration"
"Inservice for regular educators"
"More inservice on mainstreaming"
Small Rural Director
"Training to special educators in how to consult and collaborate"
"Inservice training for regular education in how to teach
the typical child
"Inservice on mainstreaming techniques"
"Provide on-going inservice to regular and special educators regarding mainstreaming"
"Inservicing of parents on learning differences of handicapped versus non-handicapped children"
"Inservice education regarding mainstreaming"
"Provide additional staff development activities"
"More training for regular educators on mainstreaming"
"More training of special educators on consultation"
"Continued staff development"
"More teacher inservice"
"Educate all staff members"

Large Rural Director

"More training for regular education teachers in techniques, styles", methods to help special education children"
"Teacher training (regular education) to alert and reinforce the need to mainstream an accommodate"
"Preparation of regular education teachers in how to adapt to a handicapped student"
"Compulsory attendance at inservices regarding effective mainstreaming for all new teachers"
"More opportunity for regular education inservice"
"Principal education and involvement"
"Educate regular classroom teachers"
"In-depth training and resources"
"Teacher education"
Communication/Collaboration/Teamwork

Small Urban Special Educator
"Regular and special staff members communication"
"More communication"
"Communication"
"Communicate!"
"More communication to determine effectiveness of special education classes and students"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Working more closely with regular teachers"
"Frequent communication"
"Maintain regular contact with regular educators and special education"
"Special education teacher collaboration in content classes for strategy support"
"Hold general meetings between regular education teachers and special educators to discuss IEP objectives, strategies, and student progress"
"Special education supervisors could consult with principals in order to set expectations"
"Consultation and collaboration between special and regular educators"
"Problem solving among special education professionals"
"Teachers should be encouraged to observe mainstreamed classes and make recommendations openly"
"More teamwork!"
Small Rural Special Educator

"Special education and regular education teachers need to communicate on a regular basis"

"Making special educators part of the educational team in order to improve planning, evaluation, modification, support, comprehension of program, etc...for all special needs students on every team"

"Teachers sharing effective lessons"

"Develop a teacher assistance team. This would be a group that work well with our at risk and special education students. If a teacher is having difficulty with a particular student or teaching a particular concept, then he/she could ask this group for advice, suggestions, etc."

"Team teaching...team a regular teacher with a special teacher"

"More teacher input and empowerment in identification and mainstreaming"

Large Rural Special Educator

"All teachers involved with the special education student should talk to the special education teacher before class starts about that child/student"

"The special educator should talk to the regular classroom teachers once a week about the student mainstreamed into their classes"

"More and better communication between regular and special educators"
"Improve lines of communication between the special education department/individual schools"

"Strive towards a more unified effort (principals, regular education, special education, and guidance counselors"

"Input from everyone concerned (teachers, parents, students, principals"

"Improve communications with all personnel"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher

"Increase communication among administrators and faculty team effort"

"More communication between staff in developing IEP's"

"Meeting with regular teachers at beginning of the year in regard to special education students' abilities"

"Regular special education staff prior to mainstreaming so that transition is smooth"

"Have specific suggestions for helping the regular classroom teacher"

"Have frequent communication between regular and special education teachers"

"If the mainstreaming situation is not working for the child, it should be addressed and solved"

"Communicating and working together (parents, teachers, administration, and the student)"

"Better communication between special and regular educators"

"Increase communication between special education and regular education"
"Better communication with former teachers when IEP's are being discussed"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher

"Special educators need to work with teachers to provide ideas for mainstreaming"

"Elective teachers should be part or at least made aware of IEP's on handicapped students"

"Increase the communication between regular and special educators"

"Have a staffing with all teachers involved and see the IEP"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher

"Inform the teacher thoroughly of student's problems and ways to help him/her (suggestions)"

"Let the teacher know more about the handicapped students"

"Improved communication between handicapped teacher and mainstreamed teacher"

"Mainstreaming needs to be seen as a team effort"

"More coordination between all groups who are working with this student"

"Coordinate at the beginning of school with regular classroom teachers to give background of child's handicap"

"More planning with special educators"

"More school interaction dealing with special children"

"More input from their 'special' teacher"

"Teacher input with special education teachers, administrators"
Small Rural Classroom Teacher

"When a handicapped student is mainstreamed, the special education teacher should discuss specific techniques and strategies to be used with this child. Also expectations should be made clear (i.e., will they be taking the Literacy Passport, will they be able to use a multiplication table, etc.)"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher

"More interaction between regular and special educators...experienced team leaders meet once a week with one or more special education teachers"

"More open communication in general between special and regular"

"Increase communication between trained special educators, parents, and regular teachers"

"Schedule regular meetings throughout year between regular and special educators with parents"

"Team planning"

Small Urban Principal

"Counseling meetings with teachers before handicapped students are placed in their class"

"Better communication for general education"

"Keep lines of communication open"

Large Urban Principal

"Actively participate in planning for handicapped students"

"Improved articulation between the junior high and high
school"
"Joint planning of regular teacher and special teacher"
"Regular meetings between special education teachers and core staff"
"Organize regular education and special education teachers into cooperative teams"

Small Rural Principal
"Sharing of the IEP's with classroom teachers"

Large Rural Principal
"Special education teachers and regular education getting together on topics of mainstreaming"
"Open line of communication between central office staff and special education teachers"
"Administrators working more closely with special educators to facilitate scheduling"
"Greater cooperation between regular education and special education personnel"
"To improve communication between special and regular educators"
"To further impress upon the special education department, principal and staff that mainstreaming is a team effort"
"More joint regular and special education staff meetings to coordinate mainstreaming"

Small Urban Director
"Increase communication between regular and special education"
"More team building exercises between regular and special education"  
"Build collegial working relationships between regular and special education"  
"Communications between regular education and special educators"  
"Demand active cooperation and participation between special education and regular education teachers particularly during IEP development"  
"Regularly scheduled meetings between all teachers of a special education student in order to review the plan and child's progress"  

Large Urban Director  
"Communication among special and regular education teachers"  
"Have planning meetings between regular and special education to plan how mainstreaming can best be accomplished"  
"Closer articulation with IEP development and implementation"  
"Open communication between all departments whose main goals are serving children"  
"Joined efforts to bring regular education and special education together as one program"  
"More coordination between departments of special education and special services"  
"More regular/special teacher teaming"
Small Rural Director
"Arrange joint planning 'program' sessions between regular and special educators"
"Communication to regular and special education teachers regarding identification of handicapped students and required services"
"Establish a communication link between regular and special educators to minimize paperwork and maximize instruction"
"Better communication between regular and special education"
"Adequate planning"

Large Rural Director
"More effective teacher assistance teams district-wide"
"Communication between regular and special education teachers and principals"
"Promote the consultation model of providing specialized services per IEP development"
"Regular team meetings"
"Regular coordination between special and regular education teachers"
"Consultation between regular teachers and special education teachers and school psychologists need to be available"
Support Services/Personnel

Small Urban Special Educator

"Diagnosticians to do evaluations rather than the special education teachers"

"Added resource positions for special education--at present teachers work with resource and self-contained"

"Increased time support personnel available"

"Support staff to consult with regular teachers to facilitate mainstreaming"

"Teacher assistance in modifying materials/curriculum (and willingness to do so)"

"Assistance from special services"

Large Urban Special Educator

"More support services for special education students"

"Provide support for those children who are mainstreamed"

"Add more resource teachers to each building so they can team more with specific grade levels"

"Provide more Chapter 1 type assistance for children who don't qualify for special education so teachers don't feel overburdened"

"Special educators in every school rather than running from one to another"

"Services to regular staff to modify classwork to accommodate needs of special students"

Small Rural Special Educator

"I believe our administration is supportive of more
mainstreaming. Now, if we can convince the teachers"
"Arrange related services so as not to interfere so heavily in mainstreaming. This calls attention to the problem"
"Additional personnel to release special education and regular education teachers so they have time to communicate and effectively monitor progress"
"There should be a special education teacher in each department to consult and assist with teaching"
"Make sure your support staff is supportive"

**Large Rural Special Educator**

"Availability of school psychologist for counseling on regular on-going basis"
"Improvement of guidance services and stop placing LD kids into the lowest grouping"

**Small Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Support staff to help the classroom teacher"
"Provide an aide for the classroom teacher"
"A resource teacher for special education children. At present, we share with another school system, forcing children to leave"
"Having to share resource people with other schools often we get them for only half a day once a week"
"Have an special education teacher at my school"
"More input from psychologists/counselors on special students"
"Another counselor"
"Increased help from special education teachers"
"Less crowding in special education services. More services need to be provided"

**Large Urban Classroom Teacher**
"Expand support staff roles"
"Have available help when needed"
"Readily available trained personnel in school to help train and assist with counseling"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**
"Allow for aides to accompany students with certain special needs"
"More opportunities for children to get special services"
"More special educators in the classroom"
"Enough support personnel"
"Adequate number of support personnel"
"More resources for school and classroom teacher in order to properly mainstream"

**Large Rural Classroom Teacher**
"School psychologists available for testing--don't have to wait 5 months! More follow-up"
"Support services"
"Psychologists being available daily"
"Support people keeping set schedules and having substitutes"
"More support staff"
"Teacher support"
"More help from the classroom teacher (an aide)"
"Have a good teacher aide that teaches students to accept everyone and their differences"
"Provide needs for students regardless of staffing problems (i.e., we don't have a hearing impaired teacher so we can't label a child hearing impaired)"

Small Urban Principal

"More access to psychologist or others to give services to students who need more than the school program as available"
"Support for the mainstream teacher"
"Provide any necessary support services to regular education teachers"
"More personnel to bring down ratio...teacher assistants with special education inservice is needed"
"Additional psychological counseling services"
"Faster turnaround time on testing referrals for services"
"An aide to support mainstreamed students as needed"
"We have so few special services. I do not feel I can answer this question...(speech only)"
"Adequate support personnel"

Large Urban Principal

"Increase training assistance for regular teachers in instructing handicapped"
"Additional paraprofessionals"
"Increase the number of support personnel available to help implement an effective mainstreaming program"
"More support personnel for the schools"
"Consultants in specific handicapping conditions available as resource teachers"

Small Rural Principal
"Instructional aides"
"Availability of aides"
"Central office support staff needs to be more readily available for the regular staff"

Large Rural Principal
"Provide adequate support services for regular classroom teachers"

Small Urban Director
"Provide more aides to special education to assist with transition from special education to regular education class locations"
"Provide more support staff to assist in counseling and other support services"
"Greater support systems for teachers and parents"
"Assist teachers in working effectively with mainstreamed students"

Large Urban Director
"More support personnel especially school psychologists and social workers"
"Support from support services (i.e., speech, psychologists, counselors)"
"Adequate personnel to assist in implementing an effective
program"
"Adequate staff to teach effectively the handicapped"
"Provide support staff in mainstreamed schools"
"Appropriate support personnel"

Small Rural Director

"Increase amount of support services available"
"The addition of support services and programs to the child who has difficulty but who is not handicapped. (Decrease the range between regular and special education)"
"Instructional support for regular teachers"
"Make sure your support staff is supportive"
"Increase number of support personnel"
"Provide on-going support to regular teachers who work with handicapped"
"Better trained special education teachers in consultation skills"
"Better trained regular education teachers on instructional groups...how and when to use them"

Large Rural Director

"Use of support personnel more in a consultative capacity rather than on a pull out basis"
"Double (at least) the number of school psychologists"
"Better support for slow students to prevent handicapped placement"
"Less time spent by support services in evaluation and more time spent in direct assistance to teachers and parents"
"Increased support staff and school psychologists, social workers, etc."

"Adequate personnel"

"Adequate support staff"

**Small Urban Special Educator**

"I would like to complete this section for your study but I will not be able to because I am not a strong advocate of mainstreaming and find it the wrong avenue for the handicapped. The effectiveness of teaching handicapped students needs to progress forward—not regress. We are not meeting their needs in small groups. How can we think they could be met in the regular classroom? We need to improve our small groups so that their (the handicapped students) needs will be addressed. At this point in my thinking, mainstreaming is an avenue of confusion and oversimplification of our students' needs. We need to face realism!"

"We have a wonderful working mainstream situation in my elementary school. This is one of the strengths of my program, and I am lucky to have a supportive, loving staff that readily accepts special learners!"

"To go from a special educational setting to a special materials classes (small number) then if and when they can meet the S.O.L.s of the regular classes, they will be placed."

"Send a list of students--their disability--learning style--
medication—sent to the mainstream teacher plus hints on how to teach these students should also be sent yearly"

"Accept differences in other people"

"Retirement of some teachers"

"Observe and trade off classes between regular education and special education teachers"

"Don't consolidate special education classes basically all in 1 school"

Large Urban Special Educator

"Special education supervisors could design a mainstreaming program for our school system"

"Eliminate self-contained classes for LD students or at least alter their format so that children have regular education, homeroom, etc."

"Get the special education teacher into the regular classroom"

Small Rural Special Educator

"We have too many students in special education classes. We need to have more in regular education"

"Make sure the experience is rewarding to everyone"

"Self-contained, one teacher teaching all subjects should be done away with"

"Regular teachers should be volunteers, not required"

"More flexibility within regular classroom"

"Mainstreaming needs to be considered for some students as a time for social adjustment, not merely academics"
Large Rural Special Educator
"Streamline the special education department. There are too many administrators. Spend the savings on additional teachers and classroom materials"
"Discontinue cross-category placements"
"Use only teachers that are willing to work with handicapped students for the regular classroom instruction"
"Mainstream in appropriate regular education classes...do not put in failure situations"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"The needs of regular students should be considered before mainstreaming some special students"
"Accountability of classroom teacher regarding mainstreaming"
"Plan mainstreaming one subject at a time"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Choosing only certain teachers at each level to train who are receptive and feel comfortable doing this (and of course give them the smaller class loads)"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"Some of your questions were hard to answer because of my lack of knowledge and involvement with speech therapists, psychologists, and school board advisors. I am usually not included with the decision-making process of special education"
"Treat discipline of handicapped same as average student"
"Minimize disruptions in the classroom"
"Reduce 'pull-outs' for speech, adaptive physical education, physical therapy, etc., of those mainstreamed"
"Put the students in classrooms where the teachers want them (hand pick teachers for mainstreaming)"

**Large Rural Classroom Teacher**

"Place children for mainstreaming in teacher's room that won't resent the child or extra work"
"Integration of student in complete school program"
"True mainstreaming...not mainstreaming just for looks"

**Small Urban Principal**

"Schools should have more say in how much special education they can handle! (Self-contained classes) There is not enough K-1 classes to mainstream all the young special education students. Regular education teachers have 24 to 26 students with 2 EMR mainstreamed and no aide! There are too many special education self-contained classes at 1 school!"

"Help regular education teachers to understand goal of mainstreaming"

**Large Urban Principal**

"Place handicapped pupils in all schools"
"Dissolve self-contained classes except for severe and profound retardation, physical disabilities or severe emotional problems"

"Require it from the central office"
"Sell it to principals and provide enough staff support to make it work"
"More evenly distributed IMR classes to other schools; we shouldn't have them all in one school"
"Move toward ungraded classroom organization"
"Smaller resource class sizes to enable special education teachers to meet with regular education teachers frequently"
"Opportunities for administrators to discuss ways of handling mainstreaming effectively"

Large Rural Principal

"Have students to study with regular teachers"

Small Urban Director

"A gap that tends to exist in the transition of handicapped individuals into the workplace"
"There's always room for improvement!"

Large Urban Director

"Change structure of resource model so that resource teacher is resource to regular educator. For example, she may go to the regular education classroom instead of students coming to her class. This will require an increase in the number of staff"
"Develop resource room concept with special educators to assist and demonstrate for regular teachers"
"Begin mainstreaming activities at lunch and other activities so regular teachers get to know students..especially to moderately handicapped"
"Flexible models of special education programming"

Small Rural Director

"Move toward school-based management"

"Establish an exchange program whereby special and regular educators can exchange classes periodically to resolve fears of mainstreaming"

"Make sure the experience is rewarding to everyone"

"Encouragement from State leadership to 'regular education'. (All the support comes from special education who some think must be somebody else's job)"

"Effective mainstreaming models and/or programs for study by district"

"Implement cooperative teaching mode"

"Better selection of mainstream settings and teachers (some settings/teachers do not match up well)"

Large Rural Director

"Publicize successful mainstreaming"

"Elimination of separate special and regular education administration systems"

"Relocation of special education classes within school plan. More integration with normals!"

"Move greater focus upon prevention/early intervention which may naturally facilitate greater mainstreaming"

"Serve EMR students at home school on a resource/regular classroom basis prior to self-contained placement"

"Make the process gradual"
"Abolish pull-out programs"
Class Size

Small Urban Special Educator
"Realistic teacher-pupil ratios for mainstreamed classes"
"Lower class size (weighted numbers for handicapped students)"
"Limit the classroom enrollment if special needs are mainstreamed into a particular class"
"Fewer students in regular education classroom"

Larger Urban Special Educator
"Reduce class size and use special educators within the regular classrooms as consultants and 'hands-on' support for regular teachers"
"Small class loads for regular teachers"
"Small class loads for special teachers"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Reduce regular education class size when special education students are mainstreamed into classes"
"Class size could be reduced from 30 to 20. We have 30 students, 8 are LD"
"Smaller classes"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Reduce caseload (LDSC and LSR)"
"Lower student-teacher ratio in regular classes"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"Class size...no one teacher should be expected to teach 30 students with 7 handicapped students included. Smaller
class size"
"Small class size"
"Don't place them in overcrowded regular classes"
"Smaller size classes"

**Large Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Reduce class size for regular teachers who work with handicapped students"
"Cut class loads for more individualization and aides"
"Smaller class load"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**

"When a special educator with 8 students and an aide mainstream one of those students into a class of 25 with no aide, they should be required to share the aide or they should visit the classroom"

"Smaller classes with 'special' children in them"
"Smaller class size"

"Allow for smaller class sizes when mainstreamed students are included"

"Maintain reduced class sizes so handicapped students can be served/taught more effectively"

"Limit the number of students mainstreamed into any one classroom situation"

"Count handicapped twice when figuring teacher-pupil ratio"
"Smaller class sizes"
Larger Rural Classroom Teacher
"Reduce class size in cases where LD, ED, and EMH students are placed"
"Lower student/teacher ratio"
"Smaller classes for mainstreamed classes"
Large Urban Principal
"Keep class size at a level which allows for more time for each student"
"Lower class size of rooms with mainstreamed handicapped students"
"Lower pupil teacher ratio in regular education classes"
"Lower teacher-pupil ratio"
"Reduce class size or develop a plan to give extra weighting to students with IEP's"
Small Rural Principal
"Provide smaller class sizes to accommodate mainstreaming"
"Reduce teacher-pupil ratio in regular classrooms"
Large Rural Principal
"Smaller classes overall to ensure that special education students still obtain some individual attention"
"Lower class sizes to assist teachers with mainstreaming"
"Lower student teacher ratio in classes where students are"
"Lower teacher/pupil ratio in regular classes"
"Reduce overall class size"
Small Urban Director
"Lower class size of classes when many mainstreamed students
are placed in a class"
"Small class sizes for teachers who have mainstreamed students"
"Lower pupil/teacher ratio in order to allow time for all students"

Large Urban Director
"Smaller class sizes for regular classroom teachers"
"Reduction of regular class sizes"
"Lowering class size in regular education"
"Reduced class size"
"Small classroom size and/or child/teacher ratio"
"Smaller class sizes"
"Reduce class size"
"Improve psychologist:student ratio"
"Reduce size of regular education classes"
"Improve counselor:student ratio"
"Improve social worker:student ratio"
"Decrease regular class size (average pupil teacher ratio now is 27-28 students per teacher)"
"Decrease student-psychologist ratio. The ratio now is one psychologist per 4,000 students"

Small Rural Director
"Lower student-teacher ratio"
"Reduce class size"

Large Rural Director
"Weighting of special education students"
"Smaller teacher-pupil ratio"
"Lower pupil-teacher ratios"
"Decreased class size"
Time

Small Urban Special Educator
"Time for regular classroom monitoring by special education teacher"
"More time to work with teachers of regular education--observation and consultation"
"Allotment of time for teachers to meet within school day"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Provide time for planning and communication"
"Planning time for preparation of lessons and materials"
"Schedule an enrichment period for all students. During this time, any child with special needs can receive assistance, whether the child is identified special education or not. This way the child does not miss academic instruction in order to receive special services because other children are working on special activities at this time as well!"
"Rearrange special education teachers' schedules to free them for consultation with regular education teachers"
"Provide special educators more time to provide consultation"
"Relief time for brainstorming"

Small Rural Special Educator
"More time for communication between regular teachers and special education teachers"
"There needs to be time daily for students to be counseled"
on their behaviors"

"Provide consultation time for resource students...the resource student would spend time with special education teacher getting extra help with organization and tests, etc."

"Provide preparation time for special education teachers...this time they would spend developing materials and aids for special education students in regular classes"

"Scheduled teacher consultations during school day"

"Allow consultation time for special education teachers"

"Cooperative teachers could be given the same planning period"

**Large Rural Special Educator**

"Provide time to coordinate team teaching and counseling between special education and general education teachers"

"Improvement of scheduling problems"

"An existing schedule that benefits everyone"

"Flexibility in scheduling of regular and special education classes"

"Allow for meeting times to coordinate efforts (administrators, teachers)"

**Small Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Limit the time if the classroom teacher finds it unmanageable"

"Adding more mainstreaming time as student becomes ready"

"Flexible scheduling"
Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Time is what teachers need to take IEP's seriously and handle individual student problems more effectively"
"More planning time"
"More planning and/or IEP evaluation, team planning time that would not replace regular planning time"
"More time for communicating during the work day"
"Provide regular teachers with time and materials to effectively plan and implement appropriate instruction to handicapped students"
"With this arrangement of time, meetings such as curriculum and mainstreaming coordination occur regularly...during the school day and not after school when teachers are tired"

Small Urban Principal
"Planning time for regular and special educators"
"More common planning time for regular/special teachers"
"Find time for regular teachers to attend IEP meetings"

Large Urban Principal
"Provide time for planning"
"Provide time for teachers to plan together"
"Provide adequate time for regular classroom and special educators to conference"

Small Rural Principal
"Provide more time for planning sessions to fully evaluate the mainstreaming program for each handicapped student"
Large Rural Principal
"Planning time"
"Separate elementary and sec. bus systems to shorten instructional day to create more consultation time (presently 156 buses)"
"More planning time between special education and classroom teachers"

Small Urban Director
"Scheduled time for consultation between regular and special education"
"Provide ample time for educators to plan mainstreaming opportunities and discuss goals for students"

Large Urban Director
"Provide more time for planning/conferencing between regular education and special education"
"Additional time allotted to schools for support services (i.e., psychologists, social workers)"
"Provide adequate time for collaboration and planning between regular and special education teachers"
"More teacher planning time for regular education teachers"
"Time provided for regular staffings"
"Mutual planning time"

Small Rural Director
"More planning time"
"More time for joint special/regular education meetings to jointly plan and monitor progress"
"Eliminate, if possible, scheduling problems"

"Provide joint planning time/consultation for regular education and special education teachers"

Large Rural Director

"Give teachers more teacher time...fewer duties outside of the classroom"

"More time for team planning within a school"

"Release time for paperwork"
Expectations/Attitude/Role

Small Urban Special Educator

"Modify expectations"

"Many regular educators tend to resent having to teach handicapped students. In my school, I can tell before I mainstream a child whether or not he/she will be successful with certain teachers. Therefore, I hesitate to mainstream with those teacher"

"Change attitudes of regular education teachers"

"Attitude!"

"Ease tension between regular and special education teachers"

Large Urban Special Educator

"A positive attitude by teachers, principals, and non-handicapped"

Small Rural Special Educator

"All students should be in the mainstream--receive help if they need it--not in special education and 'go out' if they can handle it"

"Better acceptance by the regular classroom teacher"

"All teachers believing mainstreaming is an important part of educating handicapped and non-handicapped students"

"The burden of mainstreaming needs to be shared equally"

"Often the special education teacher is burdened with all the work"

"Strong commitment by special educators to
assist/educate/encourage regular teachers"

Large Rural Special Educator
"True willingness by regular teacher to make adequate adjustments/modifications as needed by special education student... many regular education teachers don't or won't take the time to do this"
"Acceptance of special education teachers in regular classrooms by regular teachers if they have been directed to go into those rooms"
"Improved expectations for the handicapped student. Use of alternative ways of teaching"
"Regular class teachers are sometimes resentful because they feel they cannot fail special education students"
"Classroom teacher should lower the expectations for special education students"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"An in-depth understanding of the important contribution of handicapped students"
"Better attitude of teacher toward handicap pupils"
"More cooperation of the special education staff with regular staff"
"Actively involve classroom teacher in planning mainstreaming"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Special education students take too much time away from regular education students by creating disturbances"
"Be able to return the child if he/she doesn't hold their own"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher

"Continue to push for mainstreaming of handicapped students...but make certain the facility, administration, teachers, have the necessary instruments to educate the mildly handicapped child"

"Mainstream the students only into the subject areas in which they can be successful"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher

"Rearrange teacher roles and percent of time in large group classes so that professional teachers may spend more time with student consultation"

Small Urban Principal

"Teachers read more carefully the educational psychological and other information on handicapped students"

"Regular teachers should follow IEP modifications"

"Regular teachers should make necessary adaptations"

Large Urban Principal

"Have regular education teachers attend IEP conferences"

"Reduce overall teacher load to better accommodate the mainstreamed student"

Small Rural Principal

"The principal needs to provide more inservice for the regular staff"

"We are in our first year of total, 100% integration. As a
staff and community, we feel as though we should have been doing this for years!"

Large Rural Principal

"Regular educators should fully understand their responsibilities when a student is mainstreamed with accommodations"

"Regular education teacher acceptance and removal of fears of teaching special education students"

"Teachers accepting mainstreaming of special education students into regular classes"

"More effort by all regular education personnel to understand the problems of the special education students"

Small Urban Director

"Acceptance by regular education faculty of special education students"

"Special education teachers encouraging regular education teachers that they are capable of adapting for special education students"

"School administrators must understand the importance of integration and collaborative teaching"

"Encourage principals to take an active role in mainstreaming"

"Regular classroom teachers becoming more accountable for special students"

"Regular classroom teachers being held accountable for the IEP and aiding in its writing"
"Not expecting the same amount of work as from regular classes would help"
"Teacher need to be more flexible and lower expectations in order for it to work"
"Although inservices would help unless principals clearly expect mainstreaming, they would not help"

Large Urban Director

"Have special education staff in central office take more active role in facilitating mainstreaming"
"Require regular teachers to read the child's confidential record"

"Note: You have a very interesting topic. I hope to be able to see your results some day"

Small Rural Director

"Myth that handicapped students cannot learn must be dispelled"
"Administrators must play a more active role in education of special students"
"Prejudice must play less of a role in mainstreaming decisions"
"Teacher awareness of needs of handicapped students must be increased"
"Principals becoming more involved in monitoring what actually goes on"
"More participants from general education in developing mainstream procedures"
"Utilization of special education staff to inservice regular educators on assessment tips, interpretation of data, and application to classroom use"

"The removal of child study teams from special education administration to regular education administration. (People then might understand that it is not a 'specialization' to help a child who is in trouble"

**Large Rural Director**

"Include classroom teachers in the identification process...not done here!"

"Include classroom teachers in the IEP process!"

"Change of attitudes toward special education, mainstreaming"
Administrative Support

Small Urban Special Educator
"More support from administration and principal (visible and verbal support)"
"Support of special education administrator (more available on a day-to-day basis)"
"Administrators need to take a more active and visible role in the special education process"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Special education supervisors could define the role of special education teachers in the regular classroom"
"Supportive administration"
"Adequate support of special teachers"
"Make administrators follow the laws come to IEP meetings and stop sabotaging teacher efforts to mainstream"

Small Rural Special Educator
"More obvious support by head principal"
"Administrative support"
"Consistency"
"Structure"
"Unity of faculty as to procedures"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Inservice for regular teachers by administrative staff in special education"
"Principal attendance of placement meetings (eligibility meetings) for special services"
"Principal becoming more involved with the mainstreaming effort"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher

"More involvement of the principal in determining needs"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher

"Increase the principal's role by educating that person about special education"

"Increase the support for the special education teachers from the special education department"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher

"Set goals to bring regular and special education teachers together"

"Administrative support of special education"

"Have a way to overrule a parent when a parent is not qualified to make a decision about his/her child's services (do what's best for the child not the parent)"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher

"Principal need to demonstrate an open attitude to students and teachers of the handicapped"

Small Urban Principal

"Define clearly areas of responsibility of both the special education teacher and the regular education teachers"

Large Urban Principal

"Principal support for mainstreaming"

"Central administration's commitment to mainstreaming"
Small Rural Principal
"Stronger leadership from our pupil personnel services department"

Large Rural Principal
"Improve coordination of central office and local school"

Small Urban Director
"For the principals in all schools to not only support but expect mainstreaming"
"Demands/directives for mainstreaming must come from the top followed by appropriate surveys of teachers' needs for inservice"
"Support from central office personnel on merits of mainstreaming"
"Administrative support teachers"
"Building administrator support"

Large Urban Directors
"Encouragement by administrators for greater attempts at mainstreaming"
"Empowerment: Principals need to feel part of the decision process. They must also feel in control to creatively solve problems"
"Support by administrators for more flexibility in curriculum of regular classes would help provide for reasonable expectations"
"The conveyance by administrators to mainstreamed teachers that successful mainstreaming is a regular classroom teacher
priority has not been accomplished"
"Visible commitment from central office administrative team"
"Principal support of mainstreaming"
"Support from principals"

Small Rural Director
"More principal support for mainstreaming"
"Enlist the support of building principals in the mainstreaming effort"
"Adequate administrative support"

Large Rural Director
"Flexible, progressive leadership"
Evaluation

Small Urban Special Educator

"Three week reports from mainstream teachers to special education teacher who in-turn compile this info on one sheet and sent this to the student's parent"

"A grading system that regular teachers can use for mainstreamed students"

"A grading system that allows different standards for different individuals"

Large Urban Special Educator

"Monitor more closely those children who are mainstreamed"

Small Rural Special Educator

"Follow-up, monitoring, assistance--all take time"

Large Rural Special Educator

"Monitoring by special education administration and principal in regular classes with mainstreamed students"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher

"A better method of evaluating students coming into the program"

"Mainstreaming should be reevaluated often and put into more restrictive environments when they are not progressing in other classes"

"Joint meetings to provide on-going monitoring for mainstreamed students"

"Grades are difficult to determine"

"More info on ways to grade special education and LD"
students"
"Routine follow-up by support personnel"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"There is little follow-up by special education teachers to reinforce work in regular education classes"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"More checks to make sure the special education teacher is effectively communicating with mainstream teachers"
"Monitor students every week"
"Faster, more efficient screening procedures"
"Early identification of students with special needs"

Small Urban Principal
"Hold more meetings to determine school needs and resources pertaining to mainstreaming"

Small Rural Principal
"More assessment of the effectiveness of the current program"
"Need regular, special education, and central office staff to meet more frequently to discuss and evaluate mainstreaming"
"Provide an approach for reviewing student placements to see they are effective"
"Regularly scheduled meetings to evaluate the program"

Large Rural Principal
"Self-study of special education program"
"On-going meetings to determine what is needed specifically
in relationship to mainstreaming"

Small Urban Director

"Teachers could realize that mainstreamed students are not graded as regular"

"Replace certain 'burned out' special education and regular education teachers...include in evaluation process their skills in addressing needs of handicapped"

Large Urban Director

"Hold building administrators accountable for implementation and include outcomes in their annual evaluations"

"Frequent review of IEP goals and joint meetings between special educators and regular educators"

"Have a mechanism for Eligibility Committee to either be part of the IEP Committee, or to provide recommendations"

"Have very careful consideration of placement of students in regular education. No matter how hard we try, there are a very few teachers who should not have special education students in their class"

Small Rural Director

"Improve effectiveness of child study committees"

"Give teachers more decision-making power"

Large Rural Director

"Potential effectiveness of the WANG model Study for large school system"

"Careful evaluation of candidates prior to mainstreaming"

"Regular assessment by staff of special education progress"
"Evaluate student progress at regular intervals"

"Elimination of all labels...just identify students with academic or behavior needs"

"Adequate supervision/monitoring"
**Instruction**

*Small Urban Special Educator*

"Less emphasis on 'age-appropriate placement'"

"Multi-text approach rather than single textbooks"

*Large Urban Special Educator*

"Put special education teachers in regular classes with special students so they can experience what the child experiences and assist him more effectively"

"Provide classes which are grouped accordingly to ability levels (i.e., reading/math)"

"Provide support to regular education teachers for modifications/strategies in instruction"

*Small Rural Special Educator*

"Provide regular educators with information for test making, organization, and assistance"

"Eliminate leveling"

"Cooperative teaching"

"Peer tutoring programs, pairing a special education student with a regular education student could be useful"

"Attitude kids should not be in a low average classes"

"Cooperative teaching is needed between special and regular education teachers"

*Large Rural Special Educator*

"Regular educators should vary task presentation and adapt materials to accommodate special education students"

"Provide individualized educational activities for
handicapped students in regular education classes"
"Give more individual attention"
"Present more hands on tasks"

**Large Urban Classroom Teacher**

"Teachers should be required to take handicaps into consideration when making assignments"
"Many times students are not able to do the work--i.e., reading below grade level and are placed due to age and not ability"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**

"Guide teachers in ways they can help the children while not taking away from non-handicapped"

**Large Rural Classroom Teacher**

"Mix all students according to their levels of learning. Specifically mix handicapped students in this manner"
"Involve 1 on 1 peer tutors between regular students and handicapped students. Assign student volunteers to same mainstreamed classes with handicapped students. Assign a study time for the two to meet for going over class and home assignments"

**Small Urban Principal**

"Specific inservice on instructional techniques classroom teachers can implement for mainstreamed students"

**Small Rural Principal**

"Diminish homogeneous grouping"
Large Rural Principal
"Teach students on their level"

Small Urban Director
"Use favorable peer grouping"
"Use cooperative learning"
"Provide opportunities for success! Often we set students up for failure"
"Lower incidence of 'at risk' students in classes with mainstreamed handicapped"

Large Urban Director
"Make teachers less tied to the necessity of the basic text. More in class delivery of special and support services"

Large Rural Director
"Less emphasis on academic objectives and more on meeting perceptual/affective needs first"
"Provision of special education and related services in the regular class setting whenever possible"
"Place candidates in small classes for more individualized instruction"
"Instructional strategies need to be communicated with the staff"
"Regular teacher and special education teacher integration of techniques in IEP's"
IEP/Paperwork

Small Urban Special Educator
"Really involve regular teachers in IEPs"
"Cut-down on paper workload"

Large Urban Special Educator
"IEP goals to be shared with regular educators"
"Include all persons in IEP development, especially regular educators"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Explain that IEPs are law...this is what it says; therefore, this is what we do!"
"Decrease paperwork requirements"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Required attendance of regular teacher involved in projected mainstreaming to attend IEP meetings"
"Make sure teachers in regular classroom read IEP before working with students"
"Cut down on the workload"
"Reduce paper work"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"IEP needs to be given to the regular classroom teacher also"
"Have all teachers involved in forming the IEP"
"IEPs need to address on a regular basis not once and never looked at again"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Reduce the paperwork related to mainstreaming"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher

"IEPs communicated to classroom teacher"

"Cut the paperwork/complexity of referring students for services"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher

"Communicate goals of IEPs and methods to obtain"

Small Urban Principal

"Cut down special education paperwork. It prohibits common sense changes"

"IEP modifications are cumbersome"

"Reduce paperwork involved in mainstreaming"

"Develop IEP in Fall rather than the Spring to include current teachers"

"Small Rural Principal"

"Incorporate in greater detail in IEP"

"Less or better defined paperwork"

Large Rural Principal

"Get the state to deregulate some of the massive paperwork needed and other regulations"

"Minimize paperwork"

"Less paperwork"

Small Urban Director

"All personnel closely follow IEP...not to be considered more paperwork"

"Realizing that the IEP is not a formality, but a working
document"

Large Urban Director
"Regular education goals and objectives included on IEP's with involvement of regular education teachers"

Small Rural Director
"Development and use of monitor/mainstream IEP's on a temporary basis to see if it is practical and effective with ultimate goal of exit in some cases"

Large Rural Director
"Involvement of regular education teachers in the IEP"
"Clear objectives available in copy to all the team"
Parent/Community Involvement

Large Urban Special Educator
"Support for parents (of handicapped and non-handicapped)"
"An increase of parent participation in classrooms, homework assignments must be developed. Parent coaching during school hours"
"Parent training"
"Communicate objectives of mainstreaming to educators and the community"

Large Rural Special Educator
"More parental involvement in mainstreaming decisions"
"In all school districts, the media should report on the effectiveness and benefits of mainstreaming handicapped with non-handicapped peers in an effort to inform 'Joe Public' that education is working to successfully educate all children in academic and social areas"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"Positive parent involvement— not 'it's the law and you are us' attitudes!"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"Involve parents more in the actual learning process"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher
"More parental support (consistent outside of school help with homework)"
"Parental support and follow through"
Small Urban Principal
"Parental support"

Large Urban Principal
"Counsel parents on the realistic expectations for their children"
"More parent involvement"
"Involve parents in the school program of their handicapped students"
"Provide community awareness of the scope and actions of the handicapped student"

Small Rural Principal
"More workshops for parents and teachers on mainstreaming"

Large Rural Principal
"Educate the parents of non-handicapped students on the benefits of mainstreaming"
"More county-wide inservice for parents"

Small Urban Director
"All parent meetings, workshops (regular/special education) on mainstreaming"
"Develop an understanding among community and teachers as to the real definition of mainstreaming"

Large Urban Director
"Get non-handicapped public to be more comfortable with handicapped individuals"
"Inservice for parents"
Large Rural Director

"Parent awareness/workshops as to concept of mainstreaming"

"Parental/community involvement"

"Involve parents in the process"

"Change public perceptions of handicapped students"

"Provide parents with additional information"
Funding

Small Urban Special Educator
"Money!"
"Additional monies for additional supplies/materials manipulatives, etc."
"Money for appropriate workshops/classes/conferences"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Funds"
"Funding"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Funding for teaching materials and supplies"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"Increase funding for special services"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"More attention and money should be placed on the education of slightly/moderately handicapped and less on profoundly handicapped"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"Allow money for instructional materials that does not come from the small subject area budget"

Small Urban Principal
"Funding and its support are always a concern for smaller districts"
"Changes in state funding that allow for even more support"

Large Urban Principal
"For the state to make more money available for staffing and
services and smaller classes in order to meet the needs of these students"
"Improved monitoring of student progress and schedules"
"Increase budget for special needs"

Small Rural Principal
"More financial assistance should be provided for special education staff to obtain educational supplies"
"More available funding"

Large Rural Principal
"Money to lower student/teacher ratio in certain grades to increase teacher time with each kid"
"Money earmarked for mainstreaming"
"Adequate financial resources"

Large Urban Director
"Allocate funds beyond categorically reimbursed classifications to support mainstreaming process"
"Funding/Program Standards: more money or relaxed standards for the use of paraprofessionals"

Small Rural Director
"More money for supplementary materials for mainstreaming"
"Funds"
"Adequate funding"

Large Rural Director
"Adequate funding for support personnel to counsel, test, etc."
Materials/Equipment

Small Urban Special Educator
"Adequate resources for adapting curriculum"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Adequate resources and materials"
"Materials adequate and similar to mainstream"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Provide modified tests, tests, notes, etc., for regular educators"

Large Rural Special Educator
"Equipment such as computers and tape recorders in all classrooms"
"Adequate availability of materials for both regular and special educators"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"Offer the classroom teacher workbooks, etc., for mainstreamed students"
"Use of more multi-level materials"
"Materials.....equipment"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Have essential materials to teach the child"
"Sufficient supplies"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"Make needed extra materials available with flexible budget limits"
"Adequate materials for physical education department to
improve handicapped performance"

"More equipment for these 'special' students"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher

"More material to use that is on the student's level of ability"

"Adequate 'up-to-date' equipment for each child"

Small Urban Principal

"Computerize bank of intervention/modifications, strategies and related materials"

Large Urban Principal

"Adequate materials"

Small Rural Principal

"Provide easy access to varied instructional materials"

"More adaptive equipment"

"Supplies"

Large Rural Principal

"Provide adequate materials for special education and regular teachers"

Large Rural Director

"Match instructional materials for regular and special education for individual students"

"Resources (materials, ideas) for regular teachers to use with handicapped students"
Curricular/Alternative Programs

Small Urban Special Educator

"Alternative life-skill or pre-vocational class offerings"

"Behavior management programs that are effective (time-out is always effective and sometimes that is the only option for disruptive behavior)"

"A supervised time-out area available whenever necessary"

"Alternative but parallel materials (talking books, filmstrips)"

Large Urban Special Educator

"Curriculum continuity"

Large Rural Special Educator

"Provide social skills training of handicapped students before integration"

"Make sure all extracurricular activities includes all students"

"Improvement in vocational education...it is too limited at the middle school"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher

"A need for occupational programs for handicapped individuals"

"Including handicapped students in the non-academic activities of the regular classes"

"Greater number of extracurricular activities for handicapped students"

"Regular classroom teachers need to do units on handicapped
awareness"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**

"Provide alternatives where necessary"

**Large Urban Principal**

"Appropriate electives"

"Spend more time in career planning for handicapped students, beginning at a much earlier age"

**Large Rural Principal**

"Give students experiences away from school"

**Small Urban Director**

"Develop user friendly curriculum (child-centered content)"

**Small Rural Director**

"Better reciprocity between special education and general education curriculum (example: S.O.L.'s and IEP objective match better)"

"Volunteer programs within the schools, between regular and special education teachers"

**Large Rural Director**

"Increase in instructional alternatives to college-geared curriculum"

"Establish teaching units on relationship...getting along with other people, acceptable"
District Policy/Criteria

Small Urban Principal
"District goals"

Large Urban Principal
"Clarify criteria for when mainstreaming is appropriate"

Small Rural Principal
"Develop a district-wide plan for all schools to provide for appropriate mainstreaming"

Small Urban Director
"District goals and priorities set and implemented about mainstreaming"
"Definitions of mainstreaming and components presented to school board"

Large Urban Director
"Develop a strong policy guidelines"
"A more formalized procedure to follow when mainstreaming is appropriate"
"Defining acceptable standards of mainstreaming"
"Develop a policy manual for mainstreaming"

Large Rural Director
"Specific exit criteria for special education"
Facilities

Large Urban Special Educator
"A resource room that stores materials for special students must be maintained for all teachers"
"Better facilities for handicapped students"

Small Rural Special Educator
"More barriers need to be removed"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"More space (we are crowded)"
"Barrier-free facilities (i.e., no steps)"

Large Urban Classroom Teacher
"Provide adequate work space for support staff"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher
"Appropriate space, equipment, and time for handicapped students"

Small Urban Principal
"Provision of physical facilities that increase flexibility for mainstreaming"

Large Urban Principal
"Provide facilities with more classroom space for students"

Small Rural Principal
"Better facilities"

Large Rural Principal
"Adequate room size"

Small Urban Director
"Improve facilities to adequately handle and accommodate the
handicapped"

**Large Urban Director**

"Provide additional space for support personnel"

**Small Rural Director**

"Equip the building to accommodate the handicapped"
Teacher Incentives

Large Urban Special Educator
"Provide credit classes for regular education teachers to understand special education students"
"Teachers should be encouraged to give inservices for points or credits. Collaboration is needed: sharing ideas"
"Recognition to teachers who work well with special students...teacher recognition and team recognition"
"Encourage regular education teachers to use modifications for all students in their classes"

Small Rural Special Educator
"Set up some type of incentives to encourage regular classroom teachers to modify"

Large Rural Classroom Teacher
"Paid classes for teachers of mainstreamed students"
"Get all teachers to feel/see the benefits for the children involved"

Small Urban Principal
"Tuition reimbursement for special education classes taken by regular education teachers"

Large Urban Principal
"Professional activities"
"Give incentives to teachers willing to participate"

Small Urban Director
"Have direct consequences for teachers unwilling to modify
"instruction to accept special education students"

"Have benefits of indirect rewards to those teachers successfully mainstreaming special education students"

Small Rural Director

"Pay educators the salaries they deserve for the importance of their work"

Large Rural Director

"Establish incentives and expectations that students with special needs be taught in regular class settings"

"Reward classroom teachers for success in mainstreaming"
Student Involvement

**Small Urban Special Educator**
"Regular students are uncomfortable with some special students. They need more contact"

**Large Urban Special Educator**
"Adequate effort on the part of the mainstreamed student"

**Small Rural Special Educator**
"Lessons on handicapping conditions should be taught to all regular education students prior to special education student mainstreaming"
"A structured, well thought-out course in interpersonal relations needs to be developed and used for all students--even mainstreamed students sometimes lack interpersonal skills"
"Workshops for students to reveal what they can do"
"Workshops for the handicapped to reveal what to expect in the classroom and how to achieve"
"Regular psychological and social skills counseling for mainstreamed students"

**Small Rural Classroom Teacher**
"Get both types of students involved so as to build good self-concepts in both"

**Large Rural Classroom Teacher**
"Student education"
"Student empathy"
"Support of peers"
Large Urban Principal

"Work on attitudes of students toward the handicapped"

"Inservice students (through the guidance department) about accepting handicapped students"

Large Rural Principal

"Student awareness sessions"

"Allow students' input"
Child-Centered Education

Large Urban Special Educator
"Recognize that students have problems. Teach and schedule accordingly"

Large Rural Special Educator
"For all staff to teach and react to the students' strengths not their weaknesses"

Small Urban Classroom Teacher
"Make the handicapped feel at home in the regular classroom"

Small Rural Classroom Teacher
"Have a comfortable environment for all students"
"Make sure the program is safe for student participation physically and psychologically"

District Policy/Criteria

Small Urban Special Educator
"District-wide policy on mainstreaming so it is consistent and none can refuse"
"Develop district-wide procedures"

Large Urban Special Educator
"Consistent procedures for mainstreaming"
"A simple guide explaining benefits of mainstreaming for guidance counselors and teachers"

Small Rural Special Educator
"A strong commitment by district and school administrators to integrate. (Agree to an implementation plan and follow through)"
Large Rural Special Educator
"Country-wide policies concerning mainstreaming"

Small Rural Principal
"Emphasis on child-centered education"

Large Rural Principal
"Let's return to being concerned about the child rather than compliance issues. Th tail wags the dog"
"Little or big, praise students"
"Throw away their textbooks and treat each child as a special child catering to his/her developmental needs"

Small Urban Director
"Determination of the value of mainstreaming with its impact on the child kept in mind"
"Handicapped students must feel included and more a part of school"

Large Rural Director
"Common sense approach to mainstreaming. Handicapped are children too!"
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Interview 1
Small Rural Division

Questions

1. I am a seventh grade math teacher. I serve as the math curriculum leader of my school. In this capacity, I issue textbooks, make orders for math materials, provide liaison between the math teachers of our school and the office, conduct workshops, and assist teachers. I serve as a team member with 5 members. The team members share responsibilities. Each semester we rotate our responsibilities; this semester I am the office liaison.

2. I have access to the traditional classroom materials. We have textbooks, teacher editions, a classroom computer and software, an overhead projector, VCR, and television. I have adequate instructional materials and supplies. Each team is allotted $800.00 for the purchase of additional items. I have good success securing funds for the materials that are needed.

3. At the beginning of each new school year, the procedures for accessing the services of support personnel are reviewed during staff meetings. We have a school-based counselor. Teachers are aware of how to access these services.

4. I don't have anyone to help with my clerical work. Tutors are available to provide direct student instruction
in small groups or with individual students.

5. We have a grade level team that consist of five teachers. We have a Child Study Team that allows us to assess student's learning needs and devise appropriate intervention. The guidance counselor often meets with the two teams to collaborate for student intervention. Sometimes the purpose of the meetings are not to discuss a specific student; we have collaborated to design programming for many students.

6. Yes, there is time for collaboration and planning. There are seven periods each day. I teach five classes. I have a team planning period and a personal planning period.

7. There are advisory committees within our school composed of representatives from each department team. I don't participate so I can't specifically describe them. We are new to this and in the early stages of development.

8. I would like to see our child study process revamped. It has not been an effective tool. As teachers we often feel very limited by the resources available. We need more alternatives before we reach the point of referral.

The only negative reaction we experience is the feeling of being overwhelmed. Thus far I think the results of the small work groups are positive and I believe more teachers will volunteer to serve.

9. During the course of our schoolday, we have no time
between classes and there are no bells. I support this, because I don't think this is the time for students to socialize; it disrupts the instructional time.

I would like to see at the middle school, more clubs and activities for student participation. We offer pep rallies, student recognition days, and special events in the cafeteria and auditorium. These events are planned by teachers and administrators. Teachers are paid for their work with some of the clubs and activities.

The auditorium and cafeteria are the only large spaces available. The facility is accessible for handicapped students. Eventually we will have an elevator installed.

Physically disabled students are accommodated by providing their academic programs on the lower levels of our facility.

10. We should offer more hands-on vocational classes. There are few alternatives for students who have repeated 2-3 grades. Our system has good resources for special education. We need resources for other student populations at-risk for academic failure.

Instructional, grade-level aides would be the biggest asset. We also need more innovative ideas for curriculum design. Identifying student needs is not the issue, providing effective services for at-risk populations needs improvement.
Interview 2
Small Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade teacher. I am a self-contained classroom teacher of twenty-one students. I don't hold any additional team responsibilities within my school. We are grouped for math this year; I teach all of the children with IEP's for gifted education.

2. I think we have an adequate amount of instructional materials. I have a classroom computer, television, VCR, and newly acquired maps and globes for my classroom. There is a computer lab for student instruction. We have many math materials and manipulatives for instruction.

Some of our teachers have attended math training sessions this past year in Kansas.

The implementation of a new math curriculum and textbook has been challenging for teachers and students, and an area of improvement.

3. Teachers are aware. Our system is small and we have a small family of educators. We are well-informed of the services and the procedures. Our major complaint is the lack of time for support personnel to provide services. The psychologist and social worker are responsible for providing services for all of our schools. We have a school-based guidance counselor.

Our guidance counselor has an office. Other support
personnel must find a location for individual student assessment or team meetings.

4. A local university provides teacher assistance. Daily a student reports to me from 8:30 to 11:30. Students have the opportunity to teach an entire class, small groups, and individual students. This system is implemented throughout our school division. Often we have more student aidses than we can accommodate.

Parent volunteers sometimes provide clerical assistance, but we have not had their assistance this year.

5. No other teams exist. I think the new teacher certification process may lead to this kind of teaming, because the opportunities for peer observation are included. I would be hesitant to make any recommendations to a teacher about her student, until I had the opportunity to observe the student. Prior to this time, the opportunities for peer consultation have been limited. The new recertification process does not yet exist, but will provide an opportunity for teacher consultation.

6. There is not enough time. Our meetings are held after school when we can coordinate schedules. No teacher has mutual planning with another. Some days I may have 30 minutes for planning and other days I don't have any planning time.

7. Teacher assistance teams are not organized. I know of what you are speaking. We must go through the child
referral process. There is nothing before we get to the point of referral.

8. At the moment I wonder how this would affect my time with my children. If the time would be taken from my students, then I would not be in favor of this kind of teaming. Teachers who are experiencing difficulties managing student behavior or designing instruction would talk informally with their grade level teachers. We would have some teachers who would vehemently oppose additional committee responsibilities that require time after school.

9. I think our building provides accessibility. We have one level. I question whether the bathroom doorways will provide access for a wheelchair. I think the building is about 14 years old.

Recreational activities and sports are a big part of the community. Our local university provides a tremendous variety of activities for youngsters and young adults from all socioeconomic levels.

Teachers and parents organize a "Just Say No" program for grade five. A policeman teaches a drug program in grade 6. Our guidance counselor conducts small-group sessions with students.

I would modify the school building. We need a room for band and student activities. Our activity room was divided to accommodate gifted education, band, music, art, and speech. Now we don't have a large space for student
activities.

10. We had an exceptional curriculum supervisor who was not selected for an assistant superintendent's position in our division. She left the school division and became employed by the State Department of Education. We are functioning without the assistance of a supervisor of curriculum. She kept us appraised of new ideas, made classroom visits, and met with grade level teams. She secured grant monies and materials for programs. She was a tremendous asset. I feel that I've lost my leadership, there is no one to bring us together. We have lost our cohesiveness. I would try to replace this person with another supervisor.

Finances are the other concern. We are suffering budget cuts that don't allow us to provide the services and programs that we would like to provide.

Interview 3
Large Urban School Division
Questions

1. I am a seventh grade teacher in a school of 780 students. I am responsible for teaching three core blocks of language arts. I am chairperson of the language arts department and a member of the academic honors committee.

2. There is strong coordination between special and regular classroom teachers when students are mainstreamed for instruction. Basic education teachers are provided
teacher assistants. Teacher assistants provide instruction and coordination between the special education teacher and the basic education teacher.

We also have a day treatment program for seriously emotionally disturbed students. There are 2 therapists who work with classroom teachers and assistants to issue medication, participate in staffings, and provide family counseling. We have 10 children in this program.

The guidance department provides resources for teachers who have students with special learning needs or problems. There are many booklets and materials that provide information about handicapping conditions and appropriate intervention techniques.

3. Our accessibility is very good. Teachers are informed of procedures and services each year during in-service programs conducted by our guidance personnel.

Each support person is assigned a day each week. They are often available to provide assistance when needed and arrange their schedules to accommodate us when we have eligibility meetings. They work their schedule to meet the needs of the parents and the child.

We also have an educational diagnostician that provides academic assessments when a student is experiencing difficulties. This person also meets with parents to discuss results and formulate an action plan. The physical facilities are also very accommodating.
4. We have four teacher assistants in the special education department. In the day treatment program we have an assistant that works with the teacher. In classes where special education students are mainstreamed, we have two teacher assistants who work in the English and Mathematics.

We utilize the services of community volunteers throughout our school.

5. Yes. There is a teacher who provides in-school coordination for testing and diagnostic services. She has a strong background in learning disabilities. She provides diagnostic services and communicates the results/strategies to parents and teachers. This resource provides an avenue for addressing student needs without the requirement of a comprehensive assessment.

There are no teams composed of general and special educators. We rely on the special education teachers, counselors, and administrators to assist us with special education concerns.

Team planning occurs on each level and there is one person designated at the chairperson who is responsible for coordinating the services of their department.

6. I think so. We have unencumbered planning time and time before school to collaborate.

7. These teams unfold as the need arises. For example, we have organized a support team of teachers, counselors, and administrators to address the impact of
Operation Desert Storm on our students. We are remiss otherwise if we don't take a proactive stance. We must be keen to the needs of our students.

We don't have any formally organized teacher assistance teams that are additional to child study.

8. Yes, social interaction is what middle school is about!
Our curriculum addresses social skill development and interaction.
Activities are mainly teacher planned, we write the curricula.

9. The facility lends itself toward social integration.
The facility is not fully accessible to physically handicapped students. We have two levels. Usually these students will attend another school.

10. We need teacher in-service and professional development to address the issues associated with educating the handicapped. I feel the more educated teachers are about handicapped, the more receptive teachers become. I think teachers really want to know. Every year we need to be informed and updated. I think this should be on-going.

Secondly, parental involvement and participation in in-service programs to educate them of their child's needs and the services available. Sometimes they do not follow through with their parental responsibilities. I see this as
negligence and rather lax in their response to their child's needs. Parents need to be involved and responsible.

Interview 4

Large Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a self-contained classroom teacher for grade 5. My responsibilities are varied. My major responsibilities are for the academic instruction of my students.

2. I have the typical classroom materials, textbooks, and equipment. We have a computer and software is plentiful. Our school also has a computer lab for large group or small group instruction. I feel comfortable with the availability of instructional materials and equipment at my school.

3. Teachers are very knowledgeable, but students often do not know how to secure the services of our guidance department. I don't feel there is a problem with the availability of support services. I think some of our handicapped students may have more difficulty than the regular education students. For example, we have a class of deaf students and I don't think our counselors and psychologists are prepared to work with these students.

   Yes, there are adequate facilities.

4. There are communication skills teachers that work with at-risk general education students in the regular
classroom. These teachers have classroom aides. No other classroom assistance exist. I have heard some regular educators are not receptive of the idea; they feel there are too many people in their classroom. Sometimes the aide may not be well-trained. This creates additional stress for the teacher. Paraprofessional need to be trained. With proper education and training their assistance would be better appreciated.

5. We have a teacher assistance team composed of teachers from all departments. If I have a student who is experiencing difficulties, then I complete a referral form to this committee and designate the different strategies I have tried to help my student. This is a pre-referral committee and it is a new idea for our school this year. The purpose is to cut down on the number of referrals for special education services.

6. No! We need additional time to plan and to speak with our peers.

7. Our teacher assistance team is composed of volunteer teachers. We have 15 people from each discipline and an administrator that serve. We meet about every two weeks.

8. I think teachers would rather have input from their peers than from an administrator who has been removed from the classroom a number of years. I think people who have utilized us eventually refer their students.
9. We offer extended situations for handicapped and non-handicapped students after school in other locations. Transportation is vital. Some of our children live 30 miles away. If the activity bus services are cut, then they won't be able to participate.

I would integrate the special education classes into the regular mainstream. We are segregated in this section of the school. Regular education students do not know that we are here.

Accessibility is good; however, if a deaf student were in the bathroom when a fire alarm sounds, this student will be endangered. It has been brought to the attention of the administration.

10. We need appropriate training of paraprofessionals on the essential skills for classroom instruction.

Teachers need to have greater opportunity to collaborate during the school day for instruction.

The implementation of new curricula needs to stem from us. All teachers need to be involved in this process.

Interview 5
Small Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade teacher. I teach math, health, science and social studies. I have two classes of students and I am paired with a teacher who teaches the language arts to the same students.
I am part of a Science Club committee that meets weekly with students.

I am part of a division-wide instruction committee that meets each month.

I am also part of the Academic Talented Math Curriculum Committee. We have meetings each month.

I don't have bus or lunch duty.

2. Hands-on manipulatives, transparencies, and the traditional instructional materials are plentiful. We form cooperative learning groups; I think this is an additional strategy that is very resourceful for the teaching of math and science. We have a library and computer lab. My students attend the lab once each month. Individual students may be referred at any time. We don't have a classroom computer.

3. Teachers are knowledgeable of how to access these services. We have a full-time guidance counselor that is available whenever we need her help. She provides counseling to build self-esteem and confidence. She has provided workshops for single-parent children, and study skills sessions for all students.

I have encountered no problems with completing referrals for special education within the timelines; our psychologist has been available for testing and observation of students.

We have a multi-purpose room that is frequently used.
The guidance counselor has an office.

4. We have a volunteer program that is in full force. We have the assistance of a teacher aide once each week. The parents work with students and do clerical work in the office. The community people serve as resources to students for the completion of special projects.

5. There are 7 fifth grade teachers in our department and one special educator. We are paired for instruction and have total group meetings several times each month.

6. Yes, I think so. I have a 55 minute planning time. My partner has planning at this time too, so we can plan together if necessary. We have some time after school too.

7. There are no teams for this purpose. Special and general educators work closely on an informal basis to monitor student progress and coordinate instruction.

8. I think teachers, guidance counselors, and administrators provide the support system for special concerns. I have not felt the need for a team, because I have always had the support personnel to provide assistance to me. On the other hand, I think the implementation of a teacher assistance team would be great.

9. I think there are ample opportunities for social integration. We offer after school activities, clubs, and dances for our students.

Teachers and administrators plan activities. Teachers often volunteer to direct a club as a result of their
personal preference and perceived student interest or need. There is some administrative assignment.

I don't think the building is an inhibiting factor, but some people might. We are separated into 3 separate buildings. Each building houses a different grade level. Students have opportunities to circulate for different activities and classes.

We don't have a physically handicapped child and provisions would have to be made if we did. It is feasible for these students to attend another middle school that would not present accessibility problems.

10. I think we should focus more on science and math instruction. Children need more exposure. I think these are areas where we fail the needs of our society.

Interview 6
Large Rural School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade teacher of 23 students. I teach all the basic academic subjects. My students are heterogeneously grouped.

I have bus duty each day.

I am serving on 3 committees: drug/alcohol prevention, textbook adoption, and the calendar committee for our division.

I am also providing homebound assistance to one student.
I participate in an after school program for 25 at-risk students. We meet for an hour each Wednesday afternoon. We have one teacher for each grade level to provide reinforcement activities. For example, we have paired reading activities, drama, visits to the public library, and computer activities. A teacher of the learning disabled works with us too. She tutors individual students. A business sponsor donated funds to support the purchase of books for this program.

2. I think we are blessed with the availability of materials. My principal will secure whatever items we suggest; she is very willing to purchase materials for us. We have lots of books, remedial materials, Chapter I Reading and Math, audio-visuals, classroom computers and software. One of our business sponsors purchased books for the students Christmas.

3. I think teachers are aware. We have 2 psychologists in the division. They probably would be least accessible. They primarily provide testing and assessment services. I have never encountered a problem; some teachers have complained about testing taking longer than the timelines allow. Some student test records have been lost. This has created difficulties for parents, teachers, and the student involved.

We have a full-time guidance counselor. She feels a great sense of commitment to our children and their needs.
We have children from back in the mountains and they are poor.

We have a staffed social services department. They always respond, but I am not certain there is much they can do about student needs. Poverty, alcohol abuse, sexual abuse, and child neglect are prevalent concerns. There have been court cases; the dysfunctioning has to reach a terrible point before the child is removed from the home.

Space is a precious commodity at our school. We are hoping for a new addition. We have one room used by the speech teacher and LD teachers. We have to find space for testing.

4. We have two kindergarten aides and they provide assistance when necessary to other grade levels. Our parent volunteer program is effective. Parents read to children, work with individual and small groups, provide clerical assistance, and read tests to the LD students. We have very good parental support in our volunteer program.

5. The child study team in the only one. The classroom teacher identifies the student with special learning difficulties. A referral form is completed by the teacher. The committee members meet and discuss the referral. If they decide the student needs further testing, the psychologist goes into the home to complete the home study and completes the assessment process, and the child's physical is completed. Findings are reported to the
committee and the child's parents.

Planning times are individual. We have no mutual planning.

6. Some teachers are happy and some are not with their schedule. Each Monday and Wednesday I have no breaks. Thursdays I have three class period breaks, because of the itinerant teachers.

Scheduling is a big agenda for our administration.

We try to be flexible.

7. There are no teacher assistance teams formally or informally organized in our school.

If I have a student performing below grade level, teachers are very cooperative about giving materials.

We have a peer tutoring program. The fifth graders meet with a kindergarten class each week for one period to read to them, participate in art activities, and learn the responsibility of taking care of little children. I think we have a beginning, but we don't have a team like the one you describe.

8. I favor the idea. We need to implement new ideas that will help children. I think educators need to try anything we feel might possibly enable our students to become educated.

9. There are opportunities, but not as many as I would like to see. I feel social interaction is most important for our fifth graders. We don't have any activities in
addition to the basic academic program. The only interaction activity our fifth graders have during their fifth year is the end of the year school picnic. Our school day is so tight there is no time for student interaction.

We have a gym. Usually students have physical education with their group. Sometimes two groups may participate in outdoor games. The fifth grade chorus perform together, but practice separately.

I think we need recess times for students to engage in free play and conversation.

The building is not completely accessible to physically disabled students.

10. Modifications of our school building to allow more functional spaces and larger rooms. We are scheduled to have a new library, cafeteria, more classroom and storage space.

The second area for improvement is better scheduling.

Interview 7
Large Rural School Division
Questions

1. I am a self-contained classroom teacher for the sixth grade. I have 22 students. One student has learning disabilities and five students are receive services for gifted education. I teach all the basic subjects.

I am chairman of the Biannual School Plan committee and I am a representative for the division's teacher education
association. I will participate in textbook adoption this year. I have bus duty.

2. We have a library with reference materials. Encyclopedias are in classrooms. We use them frequently even though they are old. I have a mini library of paperback books in my room. We don't have many additional materials.

I have access to any equipment that I may need. I have a classroom computer and software is available from the library.

Basically I am satisfied with the availability of materials. My principal is supportive of our requests. We are working toward the purchase of new encyclopedias for our classrooms.

We have a materials center in our division that we can order audiovisuals. It is well-stocked.

3. We have a guidance counselor. I have not had the need to use her services in my room often. She is a big help to many teachers. She provides assistance to teachers in the special education process.

I have not had good experiences with our school psychologist. I don't agree with his findings. It is difficult to get him here. It has been sometime since I have referred a student. I think our new principal is supportive of teachers when they refer students.

The county social services department is supportive.
Probation officers are also become involved with school truancy.

4. We have a part-time LD teacher. She works with classroom teachers when students are mainstreamed. She has a large number of students. Her schedule has been reorganized to better accommodate her student load. She does not have an aide.

5. There are no additional teams or personnel to assist us. The school psychologist takes over after the child study committee recommends testing. He completes the home visit and psychoeducational assessment of the student; then the findings are reported to the eligibility committee and the child is placed.

6. Each of the sixth grade teachers have separate planning times. We are beginning to organize a grade level team and conduct meetings. I think this will help and provide communication to our principal. These meetings are after school.

Two days a week I have no planning period. It is very hard at times.

7. Teacher assistance teams are not organized to assist us. I think if we had a problem, we would schedule a meeting.

8. I think this kind of teaming would be helpful. It would have to be after school. Different scheduling would enable us to implement this intervention. Our principal is
new and she is here for the students. I think scheduling has been a big inhibiting factor.

9. There is not ample opportunity; we are too structured. Our students need more time for a recess, free play and conversation. It is only at the middle school that the opportunities are available.

Our building is 55 years old. After remodeling, the facility would be more accessible for social activity.

My principal has offered movies at the end of the six week marking period to reward student achievement.

We celebrate birthdays daily. The last day in each month is designated for birthday cake during the lunch hour for all students. This special for our students.

In the event a child has a broken leg, the student has been carried or assisted by other students and the custodian up and down the stairs. We have let them leave school early. We have not had a child in a wheelchair.

There is another school that is one level and could accommodate programming.

10. Reading instruction needs greater focus. Most of my children are on grade level, but I still have a large number of students going to Chapter reading. Something is wrong and I'm not sure why we have so many at-risk students. Our students don't master skills at the early stages. I present the material and for some reason we have students who just are not developing academically.
test scores are low in science. We don't have any textbooks for primary grades in this subject. There is no money to purchase the texts for students.

Interview 8
Small Rural School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade classroom teacher and I teach all the academic subjects.
   I was co-chairman of the School Self-Study committee.
   I serve on the Advisory committee.
   All our meetings are held after school hours.
   Staff development meetings are held after school. Each teacher receives twenty-four hours of in-service each year.
   I have bus duty.

2. I have all the basic instructional materials. I can order materials. We have a centralized teacher resource center. Material orders must be place in advance to assure an order can be promptly filled. Our school has a library, reference materials, books, equipment, and computer software. I have a classroom computer. My classroom has a library of paperback books, a set of antiquated encyclopedias, and dictionaries for student use.

3. I think we support each other well. We have difficulty securing the services of the psychologist.
   Our counselor provides individual and large group counseling. Teachers request her assistance.
Social services are provided through the county department. The court system has been helpful and supportive.

I don't think adequate space is provided. All spaces are utilized.

4. We have parent volunteers. A parent reports to me once each week. She does clerical work, crafts with students and provides assistance in the classroom. If a parent has a specialty, they are invited as guest speakers.

Chapter I reading and math programs have aides. These aides are used to in classes when a teacher is absent.

5. There are no additional teams.

6. There is not enough time for planning and collaboration. The school scheduling is going to be modified next year. Presently, we don't have any time during the school day that is shared planning. We don't even share lunch periods.

7. Teacher intervention teams are not available. No arrangements are made outside the child study process to assist us.

8. I think it would be great, if we could schedule it. I am here for the betterment of our children's education and I am most willing to participate.

I think it is always good to share experiences and strategies for teaching to assist each other.

9. I think there are opportunities within each
classroom, but not outside the classroom. Sometimes the activities are teacher planned. We participate in skits, roleplays, etc. Sometimes the ideas are from Weekly Reader.

Primary is on the lower level, kindergarten is outside in mobile units, and the upper grades are on the second level. They are grouped with their age-level peers.

The school is not accessible to students with physical disabilities.

10. I would have less disruption of class periods to facilitate instruction. We are often interrupted with intercom announcements, notes, and information to read or respond per office requests. These disruptions are distracting to students. I don't have time to read or respond to these requests during the day.

Our students need to learn to accept greater responsibility for their academic work, develop greater self-confidence, and respect for self and others.

Interview 9
Small Rural School Division

Questions

1. I am a seventh grade teach in a middle school. My class periods are forty-five minutes. I teach four classes of English, one class of reading, and one exploratory class daily. I have a forty-five minute team planning period. During this time our team of four teachers meet to discuss curriculum, discuss student performance, plan instruction,
and conduct parent conferences. I am the team leader.

This is the second year our school has existed. It has been challenging because we are all greenhorns, but it has been fun and we are making improvement.

I am the School Consultation Team Coordinator. This team is composed of a cross-section of teachers from each grade level and subject area. A special educator is on the team too. It is a modified child study team. I have many responsibilities and I am given extra pay. I coordinate all student reevaluations for special education, monitor the completion of eligibility components, eligibility scheduling and notification to all parties, and filing. I average 14 reevaluations yearly.

As a team we are a prescription team to assist teachers. We offer 12-24 strategies for the teacher to implement over a 4-6 week period. We spend more time helping teachers with children who will never see a special education program.

The psychologist may also observe the student.

The teacher is provided videotapes, computer programs, teacher resources and ideas.

There is a lot of paperwork to document our intervention. We follow-up to assure the child's performance has improved. We do mostly this kind of work. This takes time so it is critical that we have our planning periods. We conduct our SCT meetings after school from 3:30
to 4:00 each Monday.

2. The basic textbooks, personal teacher-owned materials, and supplementary materials are available.

Teamwork and cooperative learning strategies are very effective at the middle school level.

The library offers resources and teachers pool resources to accommodate student needs at different grade levels and functioning levels.

We have a large video library. My curriculum supervisor is always helpful and resourceful.

We have a computer lab. My classroom doesn't have a computer. I want one for my students to do their creative writing. Under the circumstances, I don't think the budget will allow the purchase of classroom computers.

3. These people are very highly regarded. They have never refused to assist us when asked. The school psychologist, guidance counselor, and the grade level team often work together to problem solve. We work as a prescription team when mainstreaming students into the school program. Community Mental Health representatives, school social workers, school nurses, and visiting teachers are available and supportive too.

4. We have floating aides, but they are often pulled to substitute for teachers. We are in a critical bind because of the money situation. I can request the assistance of an aide if needed. They will work with
individual students for instruction purposes or paperwork.

Parent volunteers are not as plentiful as needed. These people participate in special projects. They may participate in fund-raising, volunteer to be a buddy for a student, or listen to students read. I don't have parent volunteer; in fact, my entire team doesn't. We need their assistance and involvement.

Community speakers participate in our school program when we have special curricula activities that require the involvement of professional from various public services.

The community is very supportive.

5. Our school is based on teaming. We have 3 seventh grade teams and 3 eighth grade teams. We function as a mini-support group for the teacher and the student. The team owns the responsibility of educating their students. Team leaders also meet to discuss individual grade level team functioning.

6. Yes.

7. Yes.

8. I like this idea very much. I became involved with the concepts from a course I took at a nearby university. I learned so much from this experience and wanted to put these ideas into practice. I believe teaming is a wonderful strategy for coordinating and communicating.

9. Within my classroom there is because I do cooperative learning activities. You are doomed if you
don't. A teacher would concentrate solely on discipline if she didn't institute opportunities for socialization.

The students participate in exploratory classes and offer opportunities.

Sports, clubs, and cheerleading are offered.

Many students live a distance from the school and have difficulty finding transportation home when they elect to participate in after school activities. We don't have an activity bus.

A new facility would be wonderful but we won't get one. It originally was a high school for this county. Last year we bused children to a vocational school for physical education. This year we have made modifications and we have a gymnasium. Our cafeteria and gym are not connected to this building. Children must go outside to enter these areas.

Our building is not fully accessible to physically handicapped students. Students in wheelchairs can not go upstairs. Their team makes their program available on the first floor. Other areas are accessible. We plan to install an elevator. Exploratory classes are limited to these students because of the steps. To compensate, and if they really want to take a course they can't travel to, we will switch classrooms to make the program available.

10. There is always room for improvement no matter where you are I think.
We want to have an advise and advisor program. We plan to implement this next year. Children will be paired with an adult in small-group settings for personal interaction and interest. All school employees will be involved and each person will have about 12 students to follow through the year. We want to enhance our students' self-confidence and self-esteem.

Another area for instructional improvement and extension of our instructional program is the coordination of interdisciplinary units within teams or grade levels. This would offer more student opportunity and choice in their education.

Interview 10
Small Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade classroom teacher of twenty-five students. We are on a parallel schedule. I teach reading, math, creative writing, language, and spelling.

I have duty three weeks each month to provide supervision of students when they arrive and depart from school. We don't have a bus system and our children either walk to school or their parents drive them here.

I have recess duty every third week. All students have a twenty minute recess after lunch and teachers provide supervision during this time.

All duties require minimal time and are what we would
expect.

I serve on a curriculum committee for the guidance curriculum and I serve on the superintendent's advisory committee.

We engage in several staff development activities. We are all teaching the whole language approach. I am participating in an on-going workshop on individual instruction for the gifted child. We have many staff development opportunities for us to choose.

2. We have basal readers, but we don't use them. We use tradebooks. We have an abundance of material. There isn't anything I want that I don't have or can't obtain. I share a computer with another fifth grade teacher. We have an in-school video system for recording student skits and commercials. I have a VCR and television. All art supplies and paper materials are available. We are free to be creative with our teaching.

Our school has a media center and professional library. There is a variety of equipment. We have a computer lab for instruction in our skills room. Everyone attends the skills lab.

3. Our support people are very much apart of our faculty. Communication occurs daily between support personnel and the faculty. The LD teacher and myself work closely.

The guidance counselor is implementing a program for
students with faculty assistance. This is called Project Pride and all grade levels are involved. We work on listening skills, reinforcement of student self-confidence and self-esteem.

Our guidance counselor works with parents and interacts with community agencies. Students go to her for individual counseling. She is also involved with curriculum writing with teachers.

I have not met our psychologist. I am a new teacher in this system. We have community counselors to work with students since we are a small system. Clinical people meet with students who have problems on a weekly basis.

I have had no contact with the social workers.

There is ample space and facilities for support personnel.

4. There are aides to assist special education teachers and Chapter 1 teachers.

We have parent volunteers. I don't have one now. The skills teacher has a parent volunteer. Others provide clerical services and direct assistance in the classroom.

5. We have a child study team to study a child that may need a referral for special education. There is also an at-risk committee for teacher assistance.

6. Teachers are grouped for collaboration. My planning time is a 30 minute block each morning. I have two larger planning periods two days a week when my students
have music and art. I don't have mutual planning with the other fifth grade teacher. We have lunch together and can talk then.

Twice each month our school has a one o'clock closing and we have time for staff development and planning.

7. The at-risk committee is a teacher intervention team that meets at least once each month. The principal, counselor, classroom teachers, and LD specialist serve on this team.

8. The teacher teams that exist at our school are very beneficial. We give and receive help for instruction and school planning. I think our teams are a critical component of our school program.

9. Yes, there are many opportunities for socialization. There recess time is good for them and gives them a time to choose friends. The general philosophy of this school is to give students a choice and I think we do.

The building is accessible. We have a ramp and an elevator.

10. I like parallel scheduling and it would be nice to have a larger block of instructional time each day instead of just a few times each week.

Interview 11
Small Urban School Division
Questions
1. I am a language arts teacher of grades seven and eight.
I teach all the seventh and eighth grade students, because we are a very small school. I teach three classes of seventh and three classes of eighth grade. I teach three days of writing and reading workshop each week. I am a Student Cooperative Association Sponsor; I serve on the planning committee for the new high school; and I am the teacher representative for the school restructuring committee.

2. The availability of instructional materials is good. I don't have difficulty securing materials. I have a classroom computer and accessibility to any kind of equipment that I need.

We have a fully stocked media center.

3. Our school has a full-time guidance counselor and a gifted coordinator. We have a special education resource teacher, special education coordinator and psychologist that serve our school.

The guidance counselor provides group and individual counseling to students as needed; she instituted our teacher advisory group; and she conducts in-services. Our psychologist provides testing services for special education referrals.

We see the part-time people very little.

Contact with social workers is usually handled through the administration and the guidance department.

There are separate rooms for these people to work with
students.

4. There are no classroom aides. We have parent volunteers when the schedules can accommodate. These people help in the library, with the drama club, presentations, and guest lectures. Our best substitute teachers are parents. Many volunteer to help with the band.

5. There are no additional teams.

6. I teach 50 minute periods of six classes daily. I have one planning period and a 25 minute lunch period. There is mutual planning with two teachers. We have team planning one period each week.

We can always can use more time. It has been suggested for our restructuring that we have a team planning time and an individual planning time daily. Budget cuts have prohibited the hiring of additional personnel to make this operational.

7. There are no teacher assistance teams in our school. Informally we meet to discuss students when we feel a need. The principal and guidance counselor have been to the inservices and workshops on programming for at-risk students and know more about this than we.

8. We have Project YES (Youth Experiencing Success) at our school for repeaters. They meet a half day for core curriculum and they work in the community the remainder of the day. The goal of the program is to transition these
students to the high school. One teacher and an aide are employed to provide instructional services and coordination with the community agencies.

An adolescent day treatment program is available. Group counseling and functional living curriculum are provided for emotionally disturbed students in this program. These students are mainstreamed into our regular school program for english, history and math instruction.

Since we are small, we can talk informally. I don't see the need to have a set committee for teacher assistance.

9. Yes, there are ample opportunities. We have dances and these are planned by the SCA.

The building is accessible for physically handicapped students.

I would modify the building by placing a connecting doorway between my room and the neighboring classroom. I would place the computer lab in this area between the two classrooms.

10. The instructional effectiveness of our school can be improved by having a program that would get those students who are out of control, under control. There is a discipline policy; we need to be more consistent throughout the classrooms. Our consistency would bring about more instructional effectiveness.

Our faculty is good and we have adequate facilities. I can't think of anything else.
Interview 12
Small Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a sixth grade science teacher. I teach four science and health classes, and a reading class each day. I am also responsible for teaching the family life curriculum. I serve as the sixth grade team leader of four teachers. We meet daily to discuss students, conduct parent conferences, and collaborate for instruction.

2. We have a budget of $1300. for grades six through eight and this provides an allotment of about $300. for each teacher to purchase materials.

We share equipment and our library provides audio-visuals for instruction.

We have 9 computers used for sixth grade remediation in the language arts and math skills. Software is available for these purposes. Student access is limited from my perspective.

I have many manipulatives for science instruction and charts in my classroom. I am satisfied with the availability of materials. Our superintendent is very supportive and usually makes the funding available for the purchase of teacher requested materials.

3. Our psychologist is also the supervisor of special education. This person provides the diagnostic testing of students referred for special services. I have very little
contact with this person.

Our school guidance counselor is a very busy person. She communicates with parents, counsels students individually, and coordinates several programs. She coordinates the Adopt-a-Student program for advising students. She works with the Adolescent Day Care Program and the Vocational program at the high school.

There is not ample space. Every available space is used. Our school system has planned to build a middle school, but the lack of funding has impeded our progress.

4. We do not have any assistance in our classrooms for instructional or clerical purposes.

5. We have a child study team for special education referrals. No additional teacher assistance teams exist. We have made lists of students at-risk for failure because of truant behavior. Parents and students have been notified of additional after school programs for students to make up their lost instructional time.

We have grade level meetings and we work very closely. Communication among our grade level teachers is informal and on-going.

6. The school day is structured for collaborative teaming for our level, but not for grade 7 and 8. They do not have mutual planning periods. Our students go to the high school for band, industrial arts, and art. This complicates and limits our ability to schedule for ideal
planning time for teachers.

7. No teacher assistance teams are organized. Teachers meet informally. No other arrangements are made by the administration.

8. We are a very small faculty and school; I don't think the teacher assistance teams are necessary.

9. We once had a club day for students. Community volunteers were asked to participate, but our plans failed. The community did not provide support and our program never was successful. I believe the faculty will have to be responsible for clubs and activities, because our community does not offer the school resources for special programs. We offer dances and intramural sports.

Our students have a 15 minute break in the morning with their classmates. Students like to talk, play cards, and share snacks from their homes.

Our school building is not fully accessible to physically handicapped students. We have 2 levels and this restricts student accessibility to exploratory classes.

10. We need a new middle school with adequate space and personnel.

Interview 13
Large Rural School Division
Questions

1. I teach a sixth grade self-contained class of 20 students. I am responsible for the academic instruction of
these children in all basic subjects; art, music, and physical education are taught by other teachers.

I am responsible for the coordination of science equipment for grades 3-6. I serve on the discipline committee. This committee is newly formed and has teacher representatives from all grade levels. It is an open committee for teachers to speak or listen.

I have bus duty and bulletin board responsibilities.

I serve on a county-wide committee for middle school education.

2. I have the standard basal texts for instruction of all subjects. We have resource kits to accompany the basal series. We have a teacher resource center that houses audio-visuals for our use. We don't have good upper grade resources in our library. We have computers in our classrooms and I share a printer. I have a good supply of manipulatives for math. I am lacking science material previously available to me at another school.

Specialized materials for deaf or blind students are provided with much more ease than a few years ago.

3. These personnel are very supportive. The addition of guidance personnel at the elementary level last year has been a big help. She visits our classroom and conducts activities with my students on goal-setting and building self-esteem. She provides individual counseling. She has trained peer mediators. She has instituted a peer tutoring
program and offers special group sessions for children who have experienced divorce or are from single parent families. She is responsible for the standardized testing program.

Psychologists are not available unless you make a referral for special education. They provide the testing services necessary for eligibility.

I have not had contact with our school social work department. The communication with our local health department and social services department is not very open. There seems to be a barrier.

Adequate space is provided.

4. The kindergarten teachers have aides. The LD teacher has an aide. We recently obtained a federal grant that allows us to remediate the reading and math skills of students in the first quarter of standardized test results. Our reading and math labs have aides and these people are used as resources.

We don't have many parent volunteers. Most are working parents or they are single.

We don't have community volunteers; we have expressed the need for adults to work with some of our black male students.

5. I think problems with students that may be related to a special education situation, would involve teacher contact with the guidance counselor and special education teacher.
The child study team is prescriptive through the testing process. Most recently I was able to participate in the complete process and last week participated in my first IEP meeting. In previous years I was invited into the eligibility meeting and then dismissed for deliberations. The present changes are much better because I feel my input is valued.

6. We need more time for planning and teaming.

7. To my knowledge we do not have any additional teacher intervention teams. We have partners at grade levels.

8. I can see the advantage, but the principal may not want another team to oversee. I think if the need were here, then the committee would evolve.

It has been much more positive for me to participate in the child study and referral process. It is a very open one here and I think as ideal as possible.

9. Yes, I do. Our sixth graders work with lower grade level students and I receive good feedback from students about the tutoring program.

We offer a drama club and a school newspaper. There are no sports. Most students play league sports.

Activities are planned by both teachers and administrators. Teachers often sponsor special pet programs. I don't think the facility lends itself toward social integration. We have three separate buildings
and there is a security risk for the younger students. They must travel with a buddy.

The facility is very accessible. Until this year most special education was housed here. The new configuration allows for mainstreaming of our special populations throughout the locality.

10. Elementary science needs greater concentration. The focus is mainly upon the language arts and math. Greater preparation for instruction of science with hands-on learning activities is needed.

Reading instruction does not seem to effectively address the learning problems of our students. Additional resources are needed to accommodate the remedial and corrective instructional needs of our students.

Interview 14
Large Rural School Division

Questions

1. I am a fifth grade classroom teacher of twenty-three students. I teach all the basic academic subjects and my students receive music, art, and physical education instruction from other teachers. I teach three groups of fifth graders daily; my homeroom class is ability grouped for reading and mathematics.

I serve on the Child Study Committee. I am Coordinator of the School Spelling Bee and I serve on the Gifted Education Committee.
I have lunch duty 2 days each week.

2. I have a classroom computer and some software. We are setting up our computer lab for the school.

I have a new reading program that is multi-medial and targeted for the instruction of students at varying functioning levels.

We have media center in our school, but resources are limited. A county-wide resource center offers professional materials, videos, audio-visuals, and any type of equipment I could want.

3. Support services seem to be understaffed. I don't believe we can provide a satisfactory level of services to our students, because the manpower is not available.

There is a school guidance counselor. At the fifth grade level, she provides small group counseling, individual counseling, and services to teachers.

I have never met the psychologist. This person visits our school for half day each week. I presume he would oversee the guidance services and testing programs. He would be responsible for all testing for special education referrals and eligibilities.

I have not had any contact with the school social worker.

There is adequate space for everyone. We have a new school.
4. The special education teacher will make herself available to one of her students during the time the student is receiving instruction in my classroom. She will enter the classroom on an unscheduled basis and remain for a few minutes to touch base with the student and offer encouragement and prompts. I suppose she might remain for a longer period if I requested. No one else comes into my classroom.

At the primary level I think aides are available to assist teachers in some of the classes.

5. There are 3 fifth grade teachers at our level. We plan together on a weekly basis. We often meet before school hours.

6. I have mutual planning times with my fellow grade-level teachers. My planning period is forty minutes each day. I don't have a planning period on friday. We definitely do not have enough time. I don't think this is necessarily the school administrator's fault; I believe it is a county wide programmatic problem. This policy needs attention.

7. I believe this is occurring in the Child Study meetings. We are able to have our frustrations addressed during a non-threatening peer meeting and brainstorm ideas for intervention.

8. I would think of it as one more meeting from my planning time or additional time after school. I would not
want an administrator to be present. I would feel microscopic in that kind of situation. I don't know if I would want a special education teacher to participate either. I would want to hand select the people for my team and I would have to respect their ideas. If we could meet informally to seek new ideas, then it might be helpful.

9. I think there are sufficient opportunities for student socialization. Our students have a lunch period and recess afterward. They also have 30 minutes of free play each day. We have holiday parties and movies on special occasions.

I think the building offers many large spaces and areas for small-group conversation or play.

Our building is fully accessible to the physically handicapped; other school facilities throughout our county are not accessible.

10. I would like more planning time for myself and my grade-level peers. Before I came to this county two years ago, I had a personal planning and a group planning period each day. We need this time.

We also need more structured times for teacher interaction and collaboration about students. It is very difficult to get together with our special education teachers.

Interview 15
Large Urban School Division
Questions

1. I am an eighth grade teacher of physical science and I teach four classes of 29-30 students each day. My students are heterogeneously grouped for instruction.

I serve as a cheerleading advisor. I am the chairperson of the Staff Welfare Committee; I serve on the committee for academic awards provided to outstanding students each year; and, I am the co-chair of the committee for developing criteria for academic awards.

2. I think we have more than adequate supplies and instructional materials. I have the school adopted science textbooks and supplementary texts. We have many lab resources. I frequently use transparencies and these are plentiful. If there is anything I desire, I can usually get it. We have two computer labs and software is available, but limited in science. There are computers in the library for student use too. We have a television and public broadcasting offers excellent programming for physical science instruction. Videos and special video programs are available at our school too.

3. I believe teachers are aware, know the individual to ask for help, and usually find answers to their questions most readily. Our school has 5 guidance counselors. A psychologist is assigned to our school and visits regularly. I don't have regular contact with the psychologist, and only when I participate in the eligibility process. He is
available if I need his help. I am not aware of a school social worker, but there is a full-time school nurse.

The guidance counselors provide individual and group counseling services to students. They are responsible for the testing programs, career education, and parent conferencing. They also conduct orientation programs for new students.

4. The LD self-contained teacher has an aide. There is an aide for the Basic English Teacher. This is a government funded position for the remediation of language and reading skills.

There are two teacher assistants who provide clerical assistance, take messages to teachers and supervise during lunch periods.

Our PTO is outstanding. The parent volunteer group is good. One individual is a nurse and is most helpful with some of our CP students.

Parent volunteers usually work in the library, clinic, or duplicating room.

Community volunteers present class discussions sometime.

5. We are departmentalized. There are 13 teachers who have departmental meetings and function as a team. We primarily interact on an informal basis whenever possible.

There are no additional teams for teacher intervention or assistance.
6. I think the answer will always be negative. I have a 50 minute planning time. I have mutual planning time with some of my peers, but the majority of us don't share planning. I also have a 20 minute duty in the office each day. We have some time for planning before the students arrive.

7. There is a school at-risk committee for grades 7-9. I participated as a member last year and found it to be ineffective. I didn't choose to participate this year. I felt I lacked the knowledge to be of help and very few strategies were ever suggested or implemented. I felt my expertise would be more helpful elsewhere. It really was a frustrating experience; I think the team was basically dysfunctional.

We offer a Peer Counseling program for our students. There is a teacher big buddy for each student and this also includes parental involvement.

8. If teachers could volunteer to serve with individuals of their choice, and if the team could function as a team, then it might be a good and productive idea.

9. The social integration of our students could be better. We have a commons area in our school for student interaction. Our students have a fifty-minute lunch period. This gives them time to interact with their friends. Our school offers mini-courses, clubs, and after school activities.
The building is fully accessible to physically handicapped students.

10. I don't know that I would target anything for improvement! There does not appear to be a strong weakness. We have an effective administration and helpful support services.

Smaller class size would allow teachers to provide more attention to students with special learning problems. We also need more educational alternatives for students who seem unmotivated to get an education and are repeat offenders or violators of school conduct rules.

I think all students should be required to pass science to be promoted to the next grade. Many lack the motivation to do well in this subject, because they are not required to pass the class to be promoted. It should be a requirement for promotion.

Interview 16
Large Urban School Division

Questions

1. I am a seventh grade English teacher. I teach seventh grade Honors English and Basic English.

I coach the Forensics team; I served on the Instructional Strategies Committee until recent budget cuts deleted this responsibility, and I serve on the English Curriculum committee.

2. All the classroom equipment I need, transparencies,
paper materials and textbooks are available to me. We are told our paper supply is limited, but we don't know how limited! I always have paper for students.

The cassette players and video recorders provide creative alternatives for students to listen and view themselves performing. They like these opportunities and find the instruction enjoyable.

We have two computer labs and each teacher has a Macintosh computer. My basic classes have more access to the computer instruction and software is plentiful.

I incorporate many personally made materials to make my classed enjoyable to students. We have games for reinforcement and many creative writing projects with story starters on cassette tape. I like to be creative and I think my students find it appealing.

3. Support personnel seem to be available. I think teachers are aware of how to access these services, but I don't think many students utilize these services. Our guidance counselors have worked more closely with students of parents involved in Operation Desert Storm. These people are very supportive. They provide group counseling and individual counseling.

Guidance counselors are actively involved in the career counseling of students.

They also serve as mediators when parent conferences are held to discuss a student's school problems.
I have seen the psychologist and social worker, but I haven't had any direct contact with them.

We have ample space. This is a relatively new school; our student population is growing beyond 1300 students.

4. Yes, we have additional people to assist us. Instructional Specialists have been available; however, budget cuts have forced some of these people to return to classroom teaching.

There are teacher aides to assist the Basic English and Basic Math teachers.

Special education personnel provide no services in the general education classrooms. All special education services are provided on a pull-out basis.

We have community volunteers working in the library, at book sales, and are active in our Parent Teacher Association.

5. There is no additional teaming. We are given direction from the special education teachers.

We have an Adopt-a-Student Committee for students at-risk.

A Crisis Intervention Team is organized for student intervention in response to Operation Desert Storm. Faculty are paired with students to provide individual counseling if the need exists.

6. We don't have enough time for planning and consultation. We see our department peers in the morning
before school hours; we rarely discuss teaching strategies, curriculum, or student intervention. Each of the 18 teachers in my department are rarely together during the day. Each of us travels to different classrooms.

7. Please refer to number 5.

8. Actually it might be a good idea depending on the membership. The teacher preparation of the average junior high school teacher does not include specialized training to prepare us to work with students who have learning problems or present classroom management problems. It is important to have a good sounding board that is collegial and voluntary.

9. I think there are sufficient opportunities for student socialization. Students have a fifty minute period for lunch and they are free to go into the library or the foyer to meet their friends or study. We offer sports, clubs and after-school activities.

   Our school building is very nice and accessible for physically disabled students. It provides opportunity for student socialization. I wouldn't make changes.

10. There are two specific areas: teachers need encouragement to utilize creative strategies and the collegial interaction of teachers needs to be fostered. We are function too independently and we need to be more collaborative.
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Abstract

AN INVESTIGATION AND ANALYSIS OF EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS OF MAINSTREAMING MILDLY HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN GRADES 5-9 IN RANDOMLY SELECTED URBAN AND RURAL SCHOOL DIVISIONS IN VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Chair: Professor F. Douglas Prillaman

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions that school principals, directors of special education/directors of pupil personnel/psychologists, regular educators, and special educators in Virginia public schools have of the process of integrating educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed students into regular classes in grades 5-9. The study sought to examine mainstreaming perceptions of educators, factors that underlie educator perceptions, and obtain individual qualitative accounts of educator perspectives regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school divisions.

The Survey of Educator Perceptions of Enhancing and Restraining Forces Related to the Integration of Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Educational Setting, was the survey instrument used in this study (Prus, 1989). Six hundred and forty educators were randomly selected from school divisions characterized by size and rural and urban demographics and mailed a survey. Three hundred thirty-three (333) educators returned completed surveys.

One hundred twenty-eight (128) regular educators were randomly selected to participate in individual interviews with the research regarding the availability of instructional resources within their school. The selected sample included four teachers from each of the division types; a total of 16 participants comprised the sample. Interviews were conducted at the school site of each participant. A structured, interview questionnaire, developed and field tested by the researcher, was used as a guide for data collection.

The results of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Analyses of Variance, and post-hoc analyses indicated the existence of significant differences between educator groups on the survey scales. Except for the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming scale, principals provided the most positive ratings on each scale. Regular educators provided significantly lower ratings on this scale.

Pearson Product-Moment correlations indicated several demographic variables were found to be small, but significant predictors of the total survey score.

The validity of the survey results was supported by content analysis of respondent recommendations for the
improvement of mainstreaming effectiveness within their school divisions, and the analysis of interview data.

It was concluded principals perceive the level of administrative support, support services/resources, expectations/climate, and instructional training/planning as more facilitating than inhibiting factors related to the mainstreaming process in their school divisions. The significantly lower ratings revealed by other educator groups suggest these groups perceive these factors to be more inhibiting factors related to mainstreaming effectiveness within their divisions. Consistent with the pattern of differences noted on the survey analysis, survey respondents and interview participants indicated areas of need for improvement in division mainstreaming efforts. Specific recommendations for further research and practice are included.