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ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF CLASSROOM TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINSTREAMING

by

Phyllis R. Tallent

The problem of this study was to determine if a difference existed between selected classroom teachers’ attitudes toward mainstreaming.

The Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale (ATMS) was the instrument selected as appropriate for the study. Permission was obtained from Joan Berryman at the University of Georgia, Athens, to reproduce and administer the ATMS. A stratified random sample was conducted as representative of the total population of classroom teachers in North Carolina. A demographic data sheet and the ATMS were mailed to 280 classroom teachers. A 75% return was obtained. The data sheet asked for the sex, present level of teaching position, area of assignment, level of formal preparation, years experience, hours taken in special education, and whether or not the teacher served mainstreamed students.

Nine null hypotheses were formulated to be tested at the .05 level of significance. The t-test was used to test for significant differences for hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9. The analysis of variance was used for hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 to determine if differences existed between attitudes and years of teaching experience. If a significant difference was revealed, the Newman-Keuls procedure was used to determine where specific differences lay.

Three null hypotheses were rejected. Major findings revealed that female teachers had more positive attitudes than did male teachers. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had more positive attitudes than did teachers with more than 10 years experience, and non-content area teachers had more positive attitudes than did content area teachers.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Education for handicapped and nonhandicapped children was drastically changed when President Gerald R. Ford signed the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) on November of 1975. This act contained several stipulations that would eventually lead to better educational services for handicapped children. One of these stipulations mandated that handicapped children be educated in the "least restrictive environment." (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 71). This has since become known as mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming was hailed as a solution to the traditionally segregated classes for handicapped individuals. Much research has been devoted to the benefits of educating handicapped students with their nonhandicapped peers. However, little attention has been directed toward classroom teachers, and what they might do to provide appropriate instruction for the handicapped students, while at the same time maintaining their usual teaching responsibilities (Reynolds, Martin-Reynolds, & Mark, 1982).

When the law became a reality in October 1977, classroom teachers were suddenly faced with teaching students for whom they had little or no training. As exceptional children have been integrated more and more into the regular classrooms, teachers have had to modify and adjust their instructional programs and procedures. Since much of the success
of mainstreaming depends on the attitudes of teachers involved, it has become crucial that school administrators, supervisors, curriculum planners, and persons involved in teacher preparation programs look more closely at teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming. Administrative modifications could perhaps bring about more positive attitudes and more successful education for handicapped students (Berryman, Neal & Robinson, 1980).

This study will attempt to measure the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming and look at characteristics of teachers who possess positive and negative attitudes toward mainstreamed students.

The Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if a difference existed between selected classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming.

The following sub-problems were developed for this study:

1. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and sex of the teacher,

2. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and age of the teacher,

3. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and years of teaching experience,

4. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and the subject the teacher taught.
5. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and whether the teacher had mainstreamed students in his/her classroom, and

6. Determine if a significant difference existed between teacher attitude toward mainstreaming and the number of course hours taken in special education.

**Significance of the Study**

Without drastic modifications special education programs cannot continue to serve greater numbers of students each year. Due to current funding constraints, school districts are faced with trying to serve more special education students, while resource allocations are being cut more and more each school year. The field of special education must try to meet the new demands and challenges by moving in new directions. Students are guaranteed by law a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. Many local educational units are attempting to meet this requirement with indirect service from resource teachers. Therefore, it has become more crucial that every regular classroom teacher serve special education students, to the greatest extent possible, in their regular classroom (Graden, Casey, & Christenson, 1985).

Many classroom teachers have been assigned the responsibility for instruction of mainstreamed students of all types and levels of severity. Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, & Moultrie (1979) determined that teachers selected five major problem areas associated with mainstreaming children in regular classes. These included concerns with
individualization, high cost of support personnel, lack of immediate assistance, pressure from added responsibility, and the high percentage of new students identified daily.

Much research has been conducted dealing with the attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming certain types and categories of exceptional children (Vandiver & Vandiver, 1982; Williams & Algozzine, 1979). Williams & Algozzine (1979) stated that "the effectiveness of mainstreaming may be related to the attitudes of the receiving teachers" (p. 63). In light of this finding, school administrators and programs of higher education should look more closely at why certain teachers have more accepting feelings toward handicapped students and determine what makes certain teachers have more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Limitations

The following limitations were imposed on the study:

1. The review of the literature was limited to materials available at Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University; Carol Grotnes Belk Library at Appalachian State University; ERIC search; and the Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Virginia.

2. The study was limited to randomly selected classroom teachers in North Carolina.

3. The data were collected during the fall of 1985.

4. The random selection was based on information obtained from the North Carolina Education Directory 1985-86 and personnel directories from each participating unit.
Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered relevant to the study:

1. Findings from the study could be utilized to improve teacher preparation programs and to assist curriculum planners and school administrators.

2. The participants would respond honestly and seriously to the questionnaire.

3. The sampling procedures were adequate for population representation.

4. The questionnaire was appropriate for the purpose of the study.

Definitions of Terms

Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale (ATMS)

The ATMS is an eighteen-statement Likert-type scale that was developed to measure attitudes toward mainstreaming that met the criteria of brevity, usefulness with persons other than special educators, ease of administration, and satisfactory validity and reliability (Berryman, Neal & Robinson, 1980).

Consultation

"Consultation is provided the regular classroom teacher by a special education consultant. Although special materials may be
furnished, the child spends the entire day in the regular classroom (Vandiver & Vandifer, 1981, p. 385).

**Content Area Teacher**

For the purpose of this study a content area teacher was one whose primary teaching assignment was either English, Math, Science or Social Studies which are courses required for graduation.

**Education for all Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142)**

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act is federal legislation that mandated that certain stipulations for special education programs be met by state and local educational agencies in order that they receive federal educational monies. Stipulations related to the education of handicapped children include:

1. The provision of free, appropriate education for all handicapped children
2. Procedures for testing and evaluation of children that are nondiscriminatory in terms of race and culture
3. The development of individualized educational programs (IEPs) for each handicapped child
4. Education in the least restrictive environment
5. The assurance of due process procedures for the child and her or her parent or guardian (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 71).

**Elementary Teacher**

For the purpose of this study an elementary teacher was one who taught in grades K-6.
Elementary School

For the purpose of this study, an elementary school was one containing grades K-6.

Handicapped Children

Handicapped children were defined as children with special needs which includes, without limitation,

All children who because of permanent or temporary mental, physical or emotional handicaps need special education, are unable to have all their educational needs met in a regular class without special education or related services, or are unable to be adequately educated in the public school.

(Rules Governing Programs and Services for Children with Special Needs, 1985, p. 1)

Least Restrictive Environment

Least restrictive environment was defined as "the education of handicapped children with nonhandicapped children to greatest extent possible" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 61).

Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming referred to the "educational arrangement of placing handicapped students in regular classes with their nonhandicapped peers to the maximum extent appropriate" (Turnbull & Schultz, 1979, p. 52).
Non-Content Teacher

For the purpose of this study, a non-content teacher was one whose primary teaching assignment was vocational, business, physical education, home economics, foreign language, guidance or library science.

Resource Teacher

A resource teacher is one who generally teaches basic skills and is responsible for assessment, developing objectives, and modifying the curriculum to meet student needs. "The resource teacher may also adapt materials and recommend strategies to be used by the regular classroom teacher" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 206).

Secondary School

For the purpose of this study, a secondary school was one containing grades 7-12.

Secondary Teacher

For the purpose of this study, a secondary teacher was one who taught in grades 7-12.

Special Education

Special education was defined in PL 94-142 as specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents to guardians, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, stated in the research format and tested at the .05 level of significance, were developed for testing in this study:

H₁ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary classroom teachers and secondary classroom teachers.

H₂ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between male and female teachers.

H₃ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers holding bachelor’s degrees and teachers holding advanced degrees.

H₄ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience.

H₅ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

H₆ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

H₇ There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who have mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who do not have mainstreamed students in their classrooms.
There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers of academic subjects and teachers of non-academic subjects.

There will be a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers that have taken course work in special education and teachers that have not taken course work in special education.

**Procedures**

The following procedures were followed in conducting the study:

1. A review of related literature was conducted in Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University.

2. A telephone call was made to Joan Berryman at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia, requesting her permission to use The Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale.

3. A letter was mailed to the superintendents of the 35 randomly selected local educational agencies from the Educational Directory of North Carolina 1985-86 asking that they mail a listing of classroom teachers.

4. A cover letter and questionnaire were mailed to 5% of the possible 5854 teachers from the participating units. A total of 280 letters were mailed.

5. Two weeks later a follow-up letter and another questionnaire were mailed to those teachers who had not responded.

6. When a period of 30 days had elapsed, the responses were compiled and analyzed.
7. The computer center at East Tennessee State University was used to analyze the findings of the study. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X) was used to analyze the findings.

8. A summary of the findings and analyses was prepared.

9. Conclusions and recommendations were formulated.

**Organization of the Study**

The study was organized into five chapters.

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, significance of the study, limitations, assumptions, definitions of terms, hypotheses, procedures, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature.

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology and instrumentation.

Chapter 4 contains a presentation, an analysis, and an interpretation of the data.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications.
Chapter 2
Review of Related Literature

Historical Background

The phrase "all men are created equal" has a profound meaning in a democratic society. Although its founders used the phrase to mean equality under the law, it has come to mean equality of opportunity. That meaning has been interpreted to mean educational opportunity for all children—the right for each child to have an education to help him/her reach their maximum potential. Recent laws and court cases have confirmed the right of all children for equal educational opportunities. American schools have modified and adapted the regular school program to meet the needs of handicapped students. These programs have become known as special education (Kirk & Gallagher, 1983).

The attitudes that people hold have long determined the extent and level of services provided for exceptional children. These attitudes have been slow to change. Persons capable of caring for themselves or with families willing to care for them have had a chance for a moderately happy life. But for the rest, they were often shipped out of town (Cegelka and Prehm, 1982).

According to Turnbull and Schultz (1979) history has evidenced a clear trend from more to less restrictive educational environments for handicapped individuals. In ancient times exceptional children were generally abused, neglected, and denied an education. Then in the 1800s residential schools were developed for the purpose of educating
the handicapped. It was not until the late 1900s that special schools and classes came into being, and in the 1970s the movement began to place students in regular classes as much as possible.

Historically, four distinct stages can be recognized in the development of attitudes toward the handicapped. First, during the pre-Christian era the handicapped were "stored away," mistreated, and neglected. Second, during the Christian era they were pitied and protected by their families and society. Third, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the handicapped were provided separate education in institutions and residential facilities. "Fourth, in the latter part of the twentieth century there has been a movement toward accepting handicapped people and integrating them into society to the fullest extent possible" (Kirk & Gallagher, 1983, p. 6).

Public schools first offered services for the handicapped in 1896 in an auxiliary school in Providence, Rhode Island. It was made up of all types and levels of handicapped individuals. Other cities soon followed. However, there was little consensus as to the purpose of special education, except that it was generally agreed upon that students would enter institutions after leaving school. During this time "nearly every argument for and against special education was put forth, including labeling and the educational rights of the children" (Cgelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 57).

During the early 1900s Walter E. Fernald (1855-1924) devoted much time toward working with the mentally ill. He referred to the mentally ill as feeble-minded, lazy, fond of idleness, and prone to become
vagrants and thieves. These comments reflected the general attitude of the day (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982).

During the 1920s education for the handicapped underwent significant changes. The attitudes about the purpose of education for the mentally ill changed from that of preparation for institutional life to that of preparation for life in the community. "Elizabeth Farrell, one of the outstanding early special educators, conducted a series of special class placement follow-up studies that did much to influence the change in attitude by Fernald and others" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 60). These follow-up studies revealed that if mildly handicapped students were given an appropriate education that meet their needs, they did not drop out of school and they enjoyed post-school success. Fernald also founded the Council for Exceptional Children in 1922 (Cegelka & Prehn, 1982).

As the mentally handicapped became more visible and demonstrated that they could adapt to community living, professionals in the field began to develop a comprehensive array of services. Attitudes continued to change during the 1930s. Special education was no longer considered an experiment. Attitudes concerning the handicapped had changed at the leadership level, and significant gains were finally being made (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982).

During the 1930s parent groups began to form with the purpose of demanding that the rights of handicapped students be considered. Parents of the mentally retarded had an opportunity to gather together and discuss their mutual problems at the annual meetings of the American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD) in 1947, 1949 and
1959" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 65). In 1950, at the AAMD meeting, 90 members representing 14 states attended. Subsequently, the National Association for Retarded Citizens (NARC) was formed to help promote the general welfare of the mentally retarded of all ages (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982).

Parents of special students have sought to fight educational inequities through the judicial system. They were the first to come to the rescue of their children and bring legal action against the schools. They can be considered the major impetus for change beginning in the 1950s (Turnbull & Schultz, 1979).

During the 1950s and 1960s special classes were the preferred type of educational service for children with mild impairments. Special schools and residential facilities flourished for the more severe handicapping conditions like blindness, deafness, and physically impairment (Turnbull & Schultz, 1979).

In 1954 Brown v. Board of Education declared that separate but equal education was unconstitutional. "Brown v. Board of Education offered hope for a new attitude toward the rights of handicapped students, the promise appeared in the Supreme Court's discussion of the importance of educating a child" (Johnson, 1986, p. 2). The justices further described the rights of a student to an education. This became the basis for many court decisions on equal educational opportunity (Johnson, 1986).

It was during the 1960s and 1970s that the mentally handicapped finally came out of the shadows. "Increased sensitivity toward
mentally retarded people was apparent and greater efforts were made to provide appropriate services for all affected individuals" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 69).

In the early 1960s President John F. Kennedy did much to herald the upswing in professional involvement and public awareness of mental retardation, due in part to the fact that he had a mentally retarded sister. President Kennedy established the President's Committee on Mental Retardation in 1961. In February 1963 Kennedy reported to Congress on the Committee's findings. The federal government became more involved than ever with the development of programs aimed at the prevention and treatment of mental retardation (MacMillan, 1982).

In 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed. This act provided special programs of assistance to disadvantaged and handicapped children. It was founded on the concept that the school systems that lacked equipment and materials for educating the economically and culturally deprived were those which needed these materials most and were least able to pay for them (Hazard, 1978).

According to MacMillan (1982) Congress created the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in 1966. "A department of the U.S. Office of Education, its purpose was to coordinate research, training, demonstrations, and service programs for handicapped children, including the mentally retarded" (p. 7). The Bureau's name was later changed to the Office of Special Education. It has been an important catalyst in the development of professional training programs, and in stimulating and funding research projects.
During the 1960s emphasis changed from quantitative to qualitative. Professionals began to question the quality of life of the handicapped and whether their legal rights were being violated. The concern shifted from merely providing services to whether the services being delivered were the best and most appropriate for the students (MacMillan, 1982). 

In the 1970s the movement was toward placement of handicapped students in regular classes. Handicapped individuals that had formerly been placed in residential institutions were served more in special classes with instruction in regular classes to the greatest extent possible (Turnbull & Schultz, 1979). Society and families of handicapped students became more involved with determining the type of services to be provided for handicapped students. Then in 1971 the landmark case of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania set the pace for rapid change in special education (Cegelka & Prehn, 1982).

This suit was filed on behalf of 13 mentally retarded school-age children. This was a class action suit, meaning that it was representative of all mentally retarded children in Pennsylvania (Ehlers, 1982). According to Cegelka and Prehm (1982) "the PARC Consent Agreement (1972) established the obligation of the state, through both the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Education, to provide free, appropriate public school education for all mentally retarded children" (p. 70). MacMillan (1982) stated that the PARC decision declared that excluding mentally retarded children from public school was unconstitutional. The case was settled out of court with both parties signing a consent agreement.
Another important court action affecting the education of handicapped students was the *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia* (1972). This case was similar to the PARC, but it covered a broader spectrum. It included the physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, and the mentally retarded (MacMillan, 1982). "The court stated explicitly that no child was to be deprived of the right to a free, public education unless there was an alternative that was clearly in the best interest of the child" (Ehlers, 1982, p. 113).

According to John Salvia and James Ysseldyke (1985), the three most important elements of the *Mills v. Board of Education* would include the following:

1. Exclusion of students labeled as behavior problems, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, or hyperactive is unconstitutional.

2. Any handicapped child has the right to a 'constructive education' including appropriate specialized instruction.

3. Due process of law requires a hearing prior to exclusion, termination, or classification into a special program.

(p. 43)

The Mills case and the PARC case helped to pave the way for federal legislation dealing with the education of handicapped children and the eventual development of PL94-142.

A major milestone for special education occurred in October, 1975 when the federal government passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law 94-142). This law is a Civil Rights law designed to protect the rights of a minority group, specifically
handicapped children (Roberts & Hawk, 1980). PL94-142 declared that all children have a right to appropriate education and further that it should take place in regular classes to the greatest extent possible.

According to Walter Ehlers, Jan Prothero, and John Langone (1982), a summary of the important elements of PL 94-142 would include the following:

1. The act emphasized the right to education for all the handicapped.
2. It specified due process and equal protection under the law.
3. Procedures were established for hearings and appeals in all due process cases.
4. No child could be excluded from school or stigmatized with a label without a notice of hearing that involved the child’s parents or guardians.
5. Many new services to the handicapped were to be made available.
6. An individualized education program (IEP) is required for each handicapped child and must be developed by mutual agreement among the parents, the teachers, and a qualified school representative.
7. Reliance on a single criterion, such as an IQ test was forbidden, because such test could be racially or culturally biased.
8. In cases of disagreement, reviews were possible that could include the use of legal counsel, calling witnesses, the right to present evidence, to cross-examine, and the right to written or electronic records and findings. (p. 111)
PL 94-142 changed drastically the services provided for exceptional children. According to Knezevich (1984) the law "provides federal assistance for and requires free appropriate education for all handicapped children in the 'least restrictive environment" (p. 225). It "assured that 'all' handicapped children, regardless of degree of disability, were entitled to an appropriate public education" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 366). Mainstreaming was now a legal reality.

Mainstreaming Defined

The term mainstreaming has been used in various ways over the past few years. However, the lack of a universally accepted meaning has caused much confusion for educational personnel. Definitions vary as much as philosophies of education. They differ, yet they all contain a certain element of sameness.

According to Gickling and Theobald (1975) mainstreaming is a particular orientation for providing educational services for the handicapped.

Turnbull and Schultz (1979) defined mainstreaming as "the educational arrangement of placing handicapped students in regular classes with their nonhandicapped peers to the maximum extent appropriate" (p. 52). They further stated that "mainstreaming is the social and instructional integration of handicapped students in regular classes" (p. 56). It involves social integration. Students become involved in peer relationships and have an opportunity to gain status and acceptance as a full class member. The handicapped student
must accept the same responsibilities and are granted the same privileges and rights as nonhandicapped students.

Kirk and Gallagher (1983) referred to mainstreaming in the following manner:

Mainstreaming means that the exceptional child, (1) will be placed with his or her normal peers, (2) will receive special services while enrolled in the regular classes (not special classes), and (3) will interact as much as possible with his or her normal peers in a least restrictive environment. (p. 23)

In an article from Exceptional Children, 1973, "What is Mainstreaming?" it was stated that certain components are evidenced in definitions of mainstreaming. These would include the following: (1) providing most appropriate education in the least restrictive environment, (2) recognizing individual needs instead of labels, (3) looking at alternatives to assist regular classroom teachers who serve exceptional children, (4) providing an equal opportunity for all students by utilizing the skills of both exceptional and regular classroom teachers. The article further stated that mainstreaming is not less expensive than special self-contained classes, and it is not a mass return of all special students to regular classes.

According to Bill R. Gearheart and Mel W. Weishahn (1976) the major emphasis of mainstreaming is the individualization of instruction. This particular component has given special students the opportunity to succeed at their own level. Failure for special students should be less likely than ever.
Warren (1979) confronted the question of what is wrong with mainstreaming. She contended that "one might make a case for placement in either a regular class or a special class on the basis of characteristics of the teachers" (p. 302). Thus, the practice is further complicated. Another problem with mainstreaming is the term is not operationally defined. The definition may well depend on a person's point of view. There are administrative and teacher headaches not evidenced with special class placements. Regular teachers have extra demands and mounds of paper work associated with mainstreaming.

Donald L. MacMillan, Reginald Jones, and C. Edward Meyers (1976) stated that definitions of mainstreaming fit two categories: (1) those which address desegregation and delabeling, and (2) those which feature procedures to assist the student in a regular educational program. Mainstreaming should mean more than the mere return of special education students to regular classrooms and programs.

Mere belief in the principle is not enough. Mainstreaming must be implemented by administrators and teachers. They further warned that failures of its proper implementation need not be interpretations of the failure of mainstreaming. "To place EMR children in the regular class for a portion of the school day is one step; however, having them succeed socially and academically is another" (MacMillan, Jones & Meyers, 1976, p. 4).

The authors further warned that most regular educators do not have course work in special education and are ill-prepared to deal with them. And that regular class teachers are not generally enthusiastic over
the return of handicapped students to their classrooms. They are not prepared to teach them (MacMillan, Jones & Myers, 1976).

They recommend that classroom teachers be involved at the planning stage of mainstreaming. They should be prepared in the affective areas as well as skill areas (MacMillan & Meyers, 1976).

**General Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming**

The physical presence of exceptional students does not ensure their inclusion and acceptance in regular classrooms. The role of teacher attitude and the success of mainstreaming has received little attention.

The attitude of the teacher regarding the exceptional student and his skill development, the adjustment of content of instruction, and the classroom environment or ecology which will include exceptional students, may be a far more potent and important variable in the successful integration of exceptional students into regular classrooms than any administrative or curricular scheme. (Mitchell, 1976, p. 302).

Teacher attitude toward his/her job is related to perceived success in performing the duties accompanying the position. These attitudes can change as a result of advancing age, related experience, and changes in level of information (Mitchell, 1976).

The teacher contributes to the climate by direct modeling and through behaviors which foster the climate among the students. "Teachers who respond favorably to differences among students in style, personality, independence, capability or motivation, are good models for other teachers and students" (Mitchell, 1976, p. 303).
The competence and credibility of the teacher and resource teacher and attitude of these two professionals toward each other and the students, can determine the success or failure of mainstreaming. The principal or school administrator is also a crucial person in mainstreaming. His role of school leader can serve to foster positive attitudes for teachers and students (Mitchell, 1976).

Labeling affects teachers' attitudes and peers' attitudes toward exceptional children. "Teacher attitudes and expectations can affect positively or adversely student achievement, teacher behavior, and student behavior" (Mitchell, 1976, p. 309).

Whether the student is in a resource room or a regular classroom, teachers' perceptions and expectations of the student must be positive if maximum positive academic and behavioral growth is to take place. For optimum cognitive and behavioral growth the regular teacher, the special teacher, and the administrator must assume responsibility for the student's well-being. (Mitchell, 1976, p. 310)

**Pro-Mainstreaming Studies**

Reynolds, Martin-Reynolds, and Mark (1982) conducted a study to determine attitudes toward mainstreaming EMR elementary students on the basis of teacher age, teaching experience, grade level, prior teaching experience, and academic training. The sample consisted of 510 K-6 teachers from a nine-county area in Northwestern Ohio. The teachers filled out a 28 item researcher designed mainstreaming opinionnaire and a teacher data sheet.
Results indicated there were no significant differences in attitudes toward mainstreaming when compared on the basis of age, training, teaching experience, grade levels, and prior experience with mainstreamed EMR children. Although no significant differences were found in teachers' attitudes, the overall responses indicated a positive attitude of elementary teachers toward mainstreaming. Teachers also indicated that they felt EMR students were educationally more like regular students than different, and that they benefited by being exposed to different teachers.

The regular class teachers indicated that the EMR teachers made wise choices as to which students would mainstream most successfully. Teachers indicated that they disagreed with the statement that elementary teachers have enough training and experience to teach mainstreamed EMR students and that mainstreaming meant extra work for the classroom teacher (Reynolds, Martin-Reynolds, & Mark, 1982). "The teachers also felt, however, that mainstreaming must involve a coordinated effort on the part of the EMR teacher, the elementary teacher, and the principal" (p. 175).

The study revealed a consistent pattern of acceptance and support of mainstreaming. They perceived benefits for the mainstreamed child and felt positive about support of the EMR specialist.

A study was conducted by Reginald Higgs (1973) to determine if knowledge, information, and experience with physically disabled persons created more positive attitudes. Ten groups of approximately 30 subjects representing different levels of contact and different levels of information were chosen as subjects for the study. Each subject completed an Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale.
Data analysis revealed that subjects with higher levels of contact tended to be more knowledgeable and had more positive attitudes toward physical disabilities. Results further indicated that females had more information, more contact, and more positive attitudes toward the disabled than males (Higgs, 1975).

High school subjects had lower knowledge levels, lower contact, and less positive attitudes toward the disabled than elementary. "This study reaffirmed the premise that attitudes do not endure as such, but change as a result of advancing age, related experiences, and changes in an individual's level of information" (Higgs, 1975, p. 497). Subjects with high levels of contact had more positive attitudes and positive attitudes increased as information levels increased.

Gilbert Guerin and Kathleen Szatlocky (1974) conducted a study using eight school districts in California. It examined the attitudes of regular teachers, special education teachers, building administrators, and central office administrators toward varying degrees of integration of exceptional children in regular classes.

The results indicated that the amount of integration practiced by a school district was related to the attitudes of the staff rather than the behavior of the special education child or his intellectual ability. It was noted that special education students behaved as "normally" as their regular classmates. The combination classes and resource centers provided the students with the maximum amount of integration. This combination received the strongest teacher support. The special education students were nearly always accepted as full class members (Guerin & Szatlocky, 1974).
Overall all attitudes toward the integration programs were generally positive and supportive. Building-level administrators expressed personal support among their teaching staffs and strongly supported the integration programs. "The attitudes of the special teachers appeared to be crucial to the regular teacher reaction to the program. Classroom teacher attitudes were nearly always identical to those of the special teacher" (Guerin & Szatlocky, 1974, p. 179). Most teachers approved of the integration programs and were supported by their central office and building administrators.

Phillip Vandiver and Stella Vandiver (1981) conducted a study to determine teacher attitudes toward different types of exceptionality and levels of severity. The results indicated that teachers favored mainstreaming for EDs and LDs over EMHs regardless of severity. No significant differences were found in attitudes between mainstreaming preference and sex of respondent, grade level taught, or years of teaching experience. Results indicated that teachers had more favorable attitudes toward LDs than EDs and felt least favorable toward EMHs.

A researcher questionnaire was designed to determine teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming mild, moderate, and severe LDs, EMHs, and EDs. Teachers were given data on LD, EMR and ED students at each level of severity: mild, moderate, severe. The teachers were then asked to choose the most appropriate program option from the following: None, Consultant, Resource, Half Day, Full Day, Special School. The teachers also provided data related to sex, age, years of teaching
experience, grade level, and whether they taught mainstreamed students in their regular classrooms.

Attitudes were considered promainstreaming if they chose none, consultation, or resource, and anti-mainstreaming if they chose half day, full day, or special schools. (Vandiver & Vandiver, 1981).

Teachers choose promainstreaming more often for EDs and LDs than EMRs. No relationships were found between mainstream preference and experience with exceptional students, sex of respondent, and grade level taught (Vandiver & Vandiver, 1981).

Vandiver and Vandiver (1981) noted that the findings revealed no relationship between mainstreaming attitudes and previous teaching experience with mainstreamed students. They recommended that further studies on factors related to change in attitudes toward mainstreaming.

**Negative Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Studies**

A study was conducted by Shotel, Iano, and McGettigan (1972) to determine the effect of a resource room program on teacher's attitudes toward handicapped students. The subjects were classroom teachers from six elementary schools in Philadelphia. Three schools were involved with an experimental resource room and three served handicapped students in the traditional manner with self-contained classes. Both groups were given a 13 item researcher designed questionnaire to measure attitudes toward:

1. Integration of handicapped children into regular classes with supportive resource room services

2. The academic and social potentials of handicapped children
3. Their own competencies to teach handicapped children
4. The need for special methods and materials in teaching handicapped children. (Shotel, Iano & McGettigan, 1972, p. 678)

Both the experimental group (schools with resource room programs) and the control group (schools with self-contained programs) were administered the questionnaire at the beginning and end of the school year. Pre- and post-test scores were compared. Results indicated that teachers from the experimental groups had more positive attitudes on the pre-test concerning integration of handicapped children into regular classes with resource room support, and toward the academic and social potential of handicapped children than did the control groups (Shotel, Iano & McGettigan, 1972).

The authors attributed this initial optimism to the fact that the experimental group teachers attended meetings in which the philosophy, goals and aims of the resource room were explained. As the year progressed those teachers apparently found that the handicapped students did not integrate well into the regular classes, even with support services from the resource rooms (Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan, 1972).

The experimental teachers responded more favorably on the pretest to the statement that exceptional children could function academically at their grade level with appropriate help. This score decreased significantly on the post-test.

Post-test scores changed significantly for both experimental and control groups to the statement that exceptional children could
function socially at their age or grade level. Both groups' scores increased for emotionally disturbed and EMH, but not for LD (Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan, 1972). When asked if they had the training to meet the educational needs of these children, no significant difference was demonstrated between groups on pre- and post-test scores.

Post-test scores showed that experienced teachers felt more competent to teach emotionally disturbed and learning disabled than did control teachers (Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan, 1972).

This study revealed that the use of resource rooms as support for integration of handicapped children into regular classes had only a slight effect on teacher's attitudes toward EMH and LD students and moderately positive effects on teachers of ED students. Overall, teachers in this study were more optimistic in their attitudes toward LD and EH (Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan, 1972).

The authors concluded that planned integration seemed to create a more positive teacher attitude. Workshops on methods, procedures, and strategies for working with the handicapped helped to create more positive attitudes. Also provisions for better communication and interaction among resource teachers and classroom teachers might affect the learner's attitude and lead to a more successful program (Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan, 1972).

Childs (1981) conducted a study to ascertain the opinion of regular classroom teachers who served mainstreamed students. The subjects were 200 regular class public school teachers of mainstreamed educable mentally retarded students. Fifty teachers were selected
from each of primary, intermediate, junior high, and senior high grade levels.

The author constructed a 14-item questionnaire for the purpose of obtaining information about teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming of EMH students. Item development was based on literature. Twelve of the items called for a yes/no response and two asked for a percentage. The two items that asked for a percentage dealt with what percent of regular class curriculum was taught to EMH students and what percentage of the EMH child's day was spent in regular classes.

The data revealed a general negative attitude by regular teachers toward mainstreamed EMH students. Only 38% of the teachers supported the concept of mainstreaming. This attitude was further indicated as teachers revealed a lack of preparation, lack of resources and consultant services, and a general feeling that EMH students should not be in regular classes. Teachers indicated that regular class goals become those for the mainstreamed child (Childs, 1981).

Most teachers indicated that they did not use a different text for EMH students and they understood the concept of mainstreaming. When asked if they supported the concept of mainstreaming EMH students, 38% of the teachers said yes and 2% said no. Approximately 73% of the curriculum for the EMH child was the same as regular class curriculum (Childs, 1981).

This study revealed that regular class teachers have not accepted the idea of mainstreaming EMH students. They felt unprepared and unsupported. The regular teacher was given responsibility for the
majority of the EMH students' school day. Secondly, the EMH student was getting a curriculum that focused on the regular classroom curriculum. The child was exposed to regular textbooks and curriculum goals. Third, "regular class teachers should receive more support services in order to serve the mainstreamed EMR children in their classes" (Childs, 1981, p. 227). More inservice needs to be offered to the regular class teacher.

Robert Williams and Bob Algozzine (1979) stated that "the effectiveness of mainstreaming may be related to the attitudes of the receiving teachers" (p. 63). They conducted a study to explore teachers' reasons for certain attitudes toward handicapped children. Teachers were asked to respond to two sets of five questions. The first set asked teachers to consider undergraduate preparation, graduate teacher training, availability of support personnel, and successful previous experience with handicapped children as it related to providing a meaningful educational program. The second set asked the teacher to consider the time it takes from other students, level of patience, lack of technical ability, lack of necessary support personnel, and unsuccessful previous experiences as it related to reasons why they would not voluntarily mainstream handicapped students.

Results indicated that teachers were reluctant to accept handicapped students in their classrooms because they felt they lacked technical ability and that the handicapped students took too much time away from other students (Williams & Algozzine, 1979).

Teachers who indicated a willingness to work with handicapped children chose three reasons for doing so:
1. The teachers had had successful experiences with handicapped children.
2. Specialized support services gave teachers confidence.
3. The teachers felt that programming for physically handicapped children was not different from regular programming. (Williams & Algozzine, 1979, p. 66)

Teachers had fairly consistent opinions concerning their strengths and weaknesses associated with teaching handicapped students regardless of handicap categories. "Regardless of the method used, the attitudes of the regular classroom teacher should be considered important in mainstreaming" (Williams & Algozzine, 1979, p. 66).

According to a survey by J. Allen Queen and John A. Grete (1982) many first year teachers feel that their teacher-training institutions did not adequately prepare them to teach learning-disabled children.

Secondary Level Studies

Gary Clark (1975) examined several issues concerning mainstreaming in secondary schools. He stated that secondary schools are larger, more diverse and more complex than elementary. The Carnegie unit and academic competitiveness with other schools is an obvious barrier.

Basic assumptions must be considered when discussing mainstreaming at the secondary level. These included:

1. The higher one goes up the grade-level hierarchy, the greater the discrepancies among students in intellectual functioning, academic achievement, social experience, and personal maturity.
2. The higher one goes up the grade-level hierarchy, the greater the desire and/or demand by students for school to be related to immediate and near-future needs.

3. The higher one goes up the grade-level hierarchy, the greater the need by students to have greater identification and personal interaction with one or two significant adults who by proximity and commitment are readily available for guidance and counseling.

4. A democratic philosophy of education and a realistic philosophy of normalization do not dictate that all persons have the same educational experiences. (Clark, 1975, p. 1)

Based on these assumptions several arguments were considered. Clark presented these arguments for mainstreaming and a response.

Argument: EMR students make just as much progress in regular classrooms as they do in special classrooms.

Response: There is evidence to indicate that EMR self-contained students make more successful community adjustments.

Argument: Special classes isolate the handicapped student.

Response: Special class placement does not isolate students any more than secondary vocational programs. In addition, the EMR students have ample opportunity to interact with other students in music, art, physical education, and home economics, as well as extra-curricular activities.

They concluded that research that applied to elementary mainstreaming cannot necessarily be applied to secondary. However, it should be recognized that evidence does support that special class
placement does contribute to successful adult adjustment. A work-study program for secondary students is much more valuable than academics. Mainstreaming as the only program option for EMR students at the secondary level is highly questionable (Clark, 1975).

General Attitude Studies

Gickling and Theobold (1975) conducted a study to determine the degree of communication between regular and special education personnel and their perceptions of mainstreaming. They investigated teacher and supervisor/administrator attitudes toward mainstreaming and the methods used to prepare both regular and special education teachers to work together. The sample consisted of 326 teachers and supervisors/administrators from a 10-county area surrounding Knoxville, Tennessee. They were asked to respond to a 46-item researcher designed questionnaire.

The results indicated that teachers and administrators felt special students were restricted from extra-curricular activities and they would participate if given the chance. Discrepancies were evidenced between regular and special teacher's perceptions about themselves. Both felt that regular teachers were imposed upon to help special students in regular classrooms.

A majority of the teachers felt that self-contained classes could provide adequate and effective education for handicapped students (Gickling & Theobold, 1975).

The authors emphasize the communication between special and regular teachers as a major problem encountered with mainstreaming. This was indicated by regular teachers that indicated they were
unfamiliar with a lot of information dealing with mainstreaming. They felt that follow-up by special teachers was inadequate and that they were not provided sufficient materials and information concerning mainstreaming from administrators/supervisors (Gickling & Theobold, 1975).

According to Childs (1979) "the best placement for the special child is the one furtherest away from the special class, and the best curriculum is the one that is most nearly that of regular class curriculum" (p. 300).

Childs (1979) argues that special students and normal students need very different curriculums. First, special students should have a curriculum that will help insure maximum development of limited potential and that it be different than the curriculum designed for students with normal intelligence.

The handicapped child needs a special curriculum that does not place emphasis on academics. Childs (1979) questioned whether a watered down regular class curriculum was better than a basic life experience curriculum.

He stated that regular class placement of the mentally retarded has become equated with a regular class curriculum. He conceded that too much change has occurred too rapidly.

According to Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, and Moultrie (1979) there are five major problems encountered when trying to mainstream children in regular classrooms. First, the teachers given the duty of teaching mainstreamed students lack confidence and training necessary to individualize.
Second, due to the high cost of support services, sufficient special education personnel cannot be employed for direct services to all exceptional children that need assistance. This means that the burden of modifying programs and meeting the needs of the students will be placed on regular teachers.

"Third, classroom teachers have no place to turn for immediate help" (Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, & Moultrie, 1979, p. 86). Special educators are generally so busy with classloads that they do not have time to go into regular classrooms and demonstrate or help teachers with teaching special students. Fourth, classroom teachers' problems seem to be intensified when special students are returned to the classroom. "The pressure of meeting the needs of special students as well as the 'twenty-nine' other children compounds the teacher's dilemma" (p. 86). Fifth, in many districts, teachers are referring 20% of their pupil population for special education. This means that the teacher feels that 1 in 5 students needs special instruction in addition to the regular classroom program. This situation may reflect that teachers feel that students with differences are the responsibility to special educators.

Teachers and principals in Highland Park, Illinois District 108, were surveyed to determine competency areas needed by teachers to deal more effectively with learning and behavioral problems of students. The responses showed a need for competencies necessary for: (a) individualization; (b) behavior management; (c) dealing with student attitudes and motivation; (d) communication with parents; (e) recognizing characteristics of handicapped students; (f) availability of materials (Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, & Moultrie, 1979).
The results of the study revealed that teachers had very individual need areas and that a traditional half-day or evening inservice would not resolve the specific concerns. The teachers indicated that they did not want more inservice. One teacher even wrote in red on the questionnaire: "NO MORE INSERVICE!!!" (Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, & Moultrie, 1979, p. 88).

However, the teachers did indicate that they needed assistance. Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, and Moultrie (1979) suggested the use of a type of teacher support system. This idea is based on five assumptions:

First, in many situations a regular classroom teacher can help a child with learning and behavior problems.

Second, in other instances a regular classroom teacher, with some assistance, can help a child with learning and behavior problems.

Third, teachers learn best by doing, i.e., by actively working with a child who has a problem.

Fourth, there is considerable knowledge and talent among the teachers themselves.

Fifth, teachers can resolve many more problems when working together than by working alone. (Chalfant, VanDusenPysh & Moultrie, 1979, p. 88)

These assumptions indicate that teachers can assume the responsibilities associated with exceptional children and that a teacher support system would prove beneficial.

One of the first teacher-support system models was developed in Highland Park, Illinois. Its major function was to help teachers work
with students who have learning or behavior problems. The Teacher Assistance Team (TAT) provided direct assistance or help. Teachers obtain follow-up from special education personnel. The TAT places the initiative for action in the hands of classroom teachers. (Chalfant, VanDussenPysh, & Moultrie, 1979).

According to Chalfant, VanDussenPysh, and Moultrie (1979), "the Teacher Assistance Team functions as a day-to-day problem-solving unit for teachers within a particular building" (p. 88).

The TAT Model offers a support system for classroom teachers by forming teachers into peer problem-solving groups which help children, parents and themselves by:

(a) Helping teachers understand individual learning and behavior problems.
(b) Providing immediate support.
(c) Improving evaluation of mainstreaming efforts.
(d) Utilizing a system whereby classroom teachers try to resolve problems prior to unnecessary referrals.
(e) Reducing the number of referrals at the building level.
(f) Creating a more positive attitude among regular teachers and administrators, with respect to working with handicapped children who learn differently.
(g) Initiating various strategies for teachers and parents to work with exceptional children.
(h) Giving moral support to regular classroom teachers.

(Chalfant, VanDussenPysh, and Moultrie, 1979, p. 94)
Proper utilization of the TAT model might be the first step toward successful mainstreaming of both elementary and secondary handicapped students. Open communication among teachers and administrators was emphasized throughout the literature. The TAT model recognizes the importance of the communication process and support services as a basis for successful mainstreaming.
The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes of selected elementary and secondary classroom teachers toward mainstreaming.

This chapter describes the research methods and procedures involved in the study. The chapter is divided into four sections. Section one contains a background and description of the data collection instrument. Section two provides a description of the procedures used to collect the data. Section three provides a description of the procedures used to analyze the data, and section four provides a listing of the hypotheses stated in the null form.

Background and Description of the Data Collection Instrument

The Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale (hereafter referred to as ATMS) was the instrument selected as appropriate for the study. The ATMS was developed by Joan Berryman, W. R. Neal, Jr., and Charles Berryman, at the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. The instrument was designed for use with subjects other than special educators. It was designed to be brief, easy to administer, and evidence satisfactory validity and reliability (Berryman & Neal, 1980). (See Appendix A)

The eighteen-item Likert-type scale was constructed to measure attitudes toward the psychological object "mainstreaming." The developer addressed the general disability categories of mentally
retarded, sensory impaired, physically handicapped, speech handicapped, health impaired, and behavior disordered. No reference was made to learning disability because of the difficulty in constructing unambiguous statements for that area of exceptionality (Berryman & Neal, 1980).

The survey items contained the word "should" in order to elicit expressions of attitudes rather than opinions based on knowledge (Berryman & Neal, 1980).

The subjects were asked to mark one of six forced-choice alternatives for each survey statement—strongly agree, agree, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree, or strongly disagree (Green, 1983). Berryman and Neal (1980) identified three major dimensions via a factor analysis of item responses. The first dealt with the Learning Capabilities of those whose disabilities do not affect academic progress (Items 5, 9, 10, 12-15). The second area identified by Berryman was interpreted as General Mainstreaming. Those items reflected the general feasibility of teaching exceptional students in regular classrooms (Items 1-4, 16-18). The third area was termed Traditional Limiting Disabilities. These statements dealt with mainstreaming the blind, deaf, and cerebral palsied (Items 6-8, 11). The instrument should not be used to investigate attitudes toward specific impairment categories.

According to Berryman and Neal (1980) "the adjusted reliability coefficient for the eighteen-statement instrument was .92 using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. The magnitudes of the
reliability coefficients for the eighteen-statement instrument indicated satisfactory internal consistency for the scale" (p. 202).

**Procedures to Collect Data**

Permission was obtained from Joan Berryman to reproduce and administer the ATMS for the purpose of this study. (See Appendix B) A stratified random sample was conducted as representative of the total population of classroom teachers in North Carolina. From the eight geographic regions in North Carolina, 25% of the local educational agencies were randomly selected. A total of 35 local educational agencies were selected from across the state. A letter was mailed to the superintendents of the 35 selected units asking that they participate in the study. They were asked to mail a listing of their regular classroom teachers. Three weeks later a follow-up letter was mailed to each superintendent who had not responded. (See Appendix C) When a 50% return was obtained from the superintendents and sufficient time had passed (twenty days), the data were compiled. After listings were received from each superintendent, 5% of the teachers from each participating unit was randomly selected and were sent questionnaires. On December 1 a cover letter, demographic data sheet, the survey instrument, and a return self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to the selected population. Two weeks later a follow-up letter and survey form were mailed to the subjects who had not responded. When 30 days had lapsed, the responses were compiled and analyzed. The data were submitted to the East Tennessee State University Computer Center for statistical analysis.
Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) was used for analysis of the data. A frequency and percentage count for each of the demographic variables was compiled. The $t$-test for independent samples, the analysis of variance, and the Newman-Keuls Procedure were selected to test for significant differences. The .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test was accepted as the basis for rejective null hypotheses (Champion, 1981).

The formulas used for the $t$-test were:

Separate Variance Formula

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

Pooled Variance Formula

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1) s_1^2 + (N_2 - 1) s_2^2}{N_1 + N_2}} \left( \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}$$

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the null form:

$H_{01}$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary classroom teachers and secondary classroom teachers.

$H_{02}$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between male and female teachers.
$H_0^3$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers holding bachelor's degrees and teachers holding advanced degrees.

$H_0^4$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience.

$H_0^5$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

$H_0^6$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

$H_0^7$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who have mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who do not have mainstreamed students in their classrooms.

$H_0^8$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers of academic subjects and teachers of non-academic subjects.

$H_0^9$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers that have taken course work in special education and teachers that have not taken course work in special education.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Data

The problem of this study was to determine if a significant difference existed between selected elementary and secondary classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming and further determine if differences existed between sex of the respondent, area of assignment, level of education, years of teaching experience, courses taken in special education, and whether or not the teachers served mainstreamed students in their classrooms.

Presentation of the Data

Data for this study were obtained from a questionnaire sent to a stratified random sample of classroom teachers in the North Carolina Public School System. Participants were asked to respond to eight items on the data sheet. These questions addressed level of assignment, sex of respondent, area of assignment, level of education, years of teaching experience, courses taken in special education, and whether or not they served mainstreamed students in their classrooms.

The questionnaire was comprised of eighteen questions for which the participant could respond with a number 1 through 6 to indicate an attitude ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Two hundred fifteen responses to the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale (ATMS) were received prior to the deadline. This accounted for a
75% return. Six responses received after the deadline and three incomplete questionnaires were not included in the analysis.

The respondents represented teachers of grades K-12. Data indicating this distribution are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Frequency Distribution for Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purpose of initial hypothesis testing the respondents were divided into two groups: elementary and secondary. The elementary group was composed of teachers of grades K-6 and accounted for a total of 118, or 54.9%. The secondary group was composed of teachers of grades 7-12 and accounted for 97, or 45.1%, of the total number of teachers. Data depicting this distribution are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary teachers</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teachers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The secondary teachers were further asked to denote their primary area of assignment. They could choose one of five options: English, Math, Science, Social Studies, or other. Teachers who checked other were asked to specify what area. These responses included: business, vocational, physical education, home economics, foreign language, guidance and library science.

For the purpose of this study English, Math, Science and Social Studies teachers were defined as content area teachers. Teachers who checked the category "other" were defined as non-content area teachers. Content area teachers accounted for 58, or 60% of the secondary
teachers, and non-content area teachers accounted for 39, or 40%, of the secondary teachers. Data depicting the frequency distribution of content and non-content area teachers are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Content and Non-Content Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Taught</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Teachers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-content Area Teachers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked to indicate their sex. The majority of the teachers 174, or 80%, were female, and 41, or 19.1%, were male. Frequency distribution for these data are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Sex of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 5 on the data sheet asked the participants to indicate their level of educational preparation. Four options were listed: Bachelors, Masters, Education Specialists, and Doctorates. These data were divided into two categories for hypothesis testing: persons holding Bachelor degrees and persons holding advanced degrees. There were 151, or 70.2%, of the teachers who had Bachelor degrees and 64, or 29.8%, who had advanced degrees. The frequencies for these data are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degrees</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Masters, Education Specialists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6 asked the respondent to indicate the number years of teaching experience. They could respond to one or three forced options. Most of the teachers 147, or 68.4%, had more than 10 years experience; 49, or 22.8%, had 6-10 years; and 19, or 8.8%, had 1-5 years teaching experience. The frequencies for these data are shown in Table 6.
Table 6

**Frequency Distribution for Years Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants could respond with a yes or no answer to item 7 on the data sheet. This question asked the respondents if they presently served mainstreamed students in their classrooms. Most of the teachers 149, or 70%, indicated that they did serve mainstreamed students and 64, or 30%, responded that they did not serve mainstreamed students in their classrooms. Data for these frequencies are shown in Table 7.
Table 7

Frequency Distribution for Teachers Who Serve Mainstreamed Students and Teachers Who Do Not Serve Mainstreamed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve mainstreamed students in class</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not serve mainstreamed students in classroom</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final item on the data sheet required that the teachers indicate the total semester hours completed in Special Education courses. They could choose one of four forced options: 0 semester hours, 1-3 semester hours, 4-6 semester hours, more than 6 semester hours. These responses were divided into two groups of hypotheses testing: persons without course work and persons with course work. Persons without course work accounted for 117, or 54.7%, of the total and persons with course work accounted for 97, or 45.3%, of the total number. The frequencies for these data are shown in Table 8.
Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Semester Hours Completed
in Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have not had course work</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have had course work in</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Interpretation of Findings

Nine null hypotheses were tested in this study. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 9 were tested using the t-test for independent samples. The pooled variance estimate was used because F-Values had a probability of >.05, indicating that the variances were statistically equal. Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6 were tested using the analysis of variance and the Newman-Keuls Procedure. All nine hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test.

H₀. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary and secondary classroom teachers. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary and secondary classroom teachers, as evidenced by a mean score of 68.179 and a standard deviation of 12.320 for elementary teachers, and a mean score of 67.410 and a standard deviation of 12.008 for secondary teachers.
An achieved $t$-value of 0.46 for the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale had a probability of 0.648. A $t$-value of 1.960 was needed in order to reject the null hypothesis. Based on the statistical analysis of the data $H_0^1$ failed to be rejected. Data for $H_0^1$ are presented in Table 9.

$H_0^2$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between male and female teachers. The data for $H_0^2$ are shown in Table 10.

Analysis of the data revealed a significant difference in mean scores on the ATMS for male and female teachers. A mean score of 64.317 and a standard deviation of 11.486 were obtained by male teachers and a mean score of 68.678 and a standard deviation of 12.196 were obtained by the female teachers.

Statistical analysis indicated a $t$-value for the variable sex of -2.08 with a probability of 0.039 which was significant at the .05 level. This revealed that female teachers had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did male teachers. Based on the statistical analysis of $H_0^2$ the investigator rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the research hypothesis.

$H_0^3$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers holding bachelor's degrees and teachers holding advanced degrees. In analyzing the data for $H_0^3$, no significant difference was found. Teachers holding bachelors degrees obtained a mean score of 67.530 on the ATMS with a standard deviation of 12.135. A mean score of 68.556 was obtained by teachers holding advanced degrees with a standard deviation of 12.281. Data for $H_0^3$ are shown in Table 11.
Table 9
Differences in Mean Scores on Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale
Between Elementary and Secondary Classroom Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers K-6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>68.179</td>
<td>12.320</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers 7-12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.410</td>
<td>12.008</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 0.46 \quad \text{d.f.} = 210 \quad P > .05 \]
Table 10

Differences in Mean Scores on Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale

Between Male and Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F 2-tailed Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Pooled Variance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS</td>
<td>Male 41</td>
<td>64.317</td>
<td>11.486</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 171</td>
<td>68.678</td>
<td>12.196</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -2.08 \quad \text{d.f.} = 210 \quad P < .05 \]
Table 11

Differences in Mean Scores on Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale

Between Teachers Holding Bachelors Degrees and Teachers Holding Advanced Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
<th>t Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>67.530</td>
<td>12.135</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMS Advanced Degree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.556</td>
<td>12.281</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -0.56 \]
\[ d.f. = 210 \]
\[ P > .05 \]
Statistical analysis revealed a t-value for the ATMS of -0.56 with a probability of 0.576. This was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H4. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience.

Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience. A mean score of 75.263 was found for teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience, and a mean score of 69.490 was found for teachers with 6-10 years teaching experience. Although teachers with 1-5 years experience had a slightly higher mean score on the ATMS, representing a slightly more positive attitude, it was not significant when analyzed with the Analysis of Variance. Consequently, the investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis. Data for H4 are found in Tables 12 and 13.

H5. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience. This was evidenced by a mean of 69.490 for the teachers
### Table 12

**Analysis of Variance for Scores on Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale and Years of Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F&lt;sub&gt;bet, within&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1525.5426</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>762.7713</td>
<td>5.3739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS bet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(MS bet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>29665.6791</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>141.9410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(MS within)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31191.2217</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Between groups df = K-1 (K=Number of groups); Within-groups df = Σ(Nk-1) (Nk = each sample size); and total df = ΣNk - 1.

<sup>b</sup> F<sub>bet, within</sub> = \( \frac{MS_{bet}}{MS_{within}} \) = 5.3739

"
Table 13

Newman-Keuls Procedure – Table of Ordered Means Between Mean Scores on AT,S and Years Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>More than 10 years</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>(q)(s^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>66.292</td>
<td>69.490</td>
<td>75.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.971^a</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.773</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Significant mean difference
with 6-10 years experience and a mean of 66.292 for teachers with more than 10 years experience.

Statistical analysis with the Analysis of Variance revealed that there was not a significant difference between the two means. Based on these data, the investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis. Data for H₀⁵ are shown in Tables 12 and 13 on pages 59 and 60.

H₀⁶. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

Analysis of the data indicated a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience. Teachers with 1-5 years received a mean of 75.263 and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience received a mean of 66.292. These mean scores disclosed that teachers with 1-5 years experience had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did teachers with more than 10 years experience.

Statistical analysis with the ANOVA and Newman-Keuls procedure revealed a significant difference between the mean of the two groups. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the investigator rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the research hypothesis. Data for H₀⁶ are shown in Tables 12 and 13 on pages 59 and 60.

H₀⁷. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who have mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who do not have mainstreamed students in their classrooms. Data for H₀⁷ are found in Table 14.
Table 14

Difference in Mean Scores on Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale
Between Teachers Who Serve Mainstreamed Students and Teachers Who Do Not Serve Mainstreamed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
<th>Pooled Variance Estimate</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>68.453</td>
<td>11.755</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66.419</td>
<td>13.239</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 - Teachers who serve mainstreamed students in their classrooms
Group 2 - Teachers who do not serve mainstreamed students in their classrooms

\[ t = 1.10 \]
\[ d.f. = 208 \]
\[ P > .05 \]
Analysis of the data showed no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who had mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who did not have mainstreamed students in their classrooms. This was evidenced by a mean score of 66.453 and a standard deviation of 11.755 for teachers who served mainstreamed students (group 1) and a mean score of 66.419 and a standard deviation of 13.239 for the teachers who did not serve mainstreamed students (group 2).

Statistical analysis of the data indicated a \( t \)-value of 1.10 with a probability of 0.272. A \( t \)-value of 1.960 was needed to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, \( H_0 \) failed to be rejected.

\( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between content area teachers and non-content area teachers.

Analysis of the data showed a significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between content area teachers and non-content area teachers. This was revealed by a mean score of 64.140 and a standard deviation of 12.529 for content area teachers and a mean score of 72.316 and a standard deviation of 9.355 for non-content area teachers.

Statistical analysis of the findings revealed a \( t \)-value of -3.43 with a probability of 0.001. This was significant at the .05 and the .01 levels, and indicated that non-content area teachers had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did content area teachers.
Based on the statistical analysis of the data for $H_0^8$, the investigator rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the research hypothesis. Data for $H_0^8$ are shown in Table 15.

$H_0^9$. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers that have taken course work in special education and teachers that have not taken course work in special education.

Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers that had taken course work in special education and teachers that had not taken course work in special education. The teachers without course work in special education (group 1) had a mean score on the ATMS of 67.183 with a standard deviation of 11.698, and teachers with course work (group 2) had a mean score of 68.604 with a standard deviation of 12.767.

Statistical analysis indicated a $t$-value of -0.84 with a probability of 0.400. This was not significant at the .05 level. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the investigator failed to reject $H_0^9$. Data for $H_0^9$ are shown in Table 16.

Summary

Nine hypotheses were formulated to determine if differences existed in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary and secondary teachers, and further, to determine if differences existed between sex of respondent, area of assignment, level of education, and whether the teachers served mainstreamed students in their
Table 15

Differences in Mean Scores on ATMS Between Content Area Teachers and Non-content Area Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Teachers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64.146</td>
<td>12.529</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cont Area Teachers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72.316</td>
<td>9.355</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -3.43 \]
\[ d.f. = 93 \]
\[ P < .05 \]
Table 16

Differences in Mean Scores on ATMS Between Teachers with Special Education Course Work and Teachers Without Special Education Course Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F 2-tailed Value</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
<th>t Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>67.183</td>
<td>11.698</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.604</td>
<td>12.767</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 - Teachers Without Special Education Course Work

Group 2 - Teachers With Special Education Course Work

$t = -0.84$  
d.f. = 209  
$P > .05$
classrooms. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

There was not a significant difference between elementary and secondary classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. In Hypothesis 1, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

In Hypothesis 2, sex of the respondent was analyzed to determine if a significant difference existed in attitudes toward mainstreaming. The data showed a significant difference at the .05 level. Female teachers had a significantly more positive attitude than did male teachers. The null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis was accepted.

The level of education of the respondent was examined in Hypothesis 3. There was not a significant difference between the two groups. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 examined the years of teaching experience. The analysis of the data revealed that a significant difference existed between the attitudes of teachers with 1-5 years experience and teachers with more than 10 years experience. There was no significant difference in attitude between teachers with 1-5 years experience and 6-10 years experience or between teachers with 6-10 years experience and more than 10 years experience. Therefore, it was concluded that teachers with 1-5 years teaching experience had significantly more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did teachers with more than 10 years teaching experience. Null Hypotheses 4 and 5 failed to be rejected. Null Hypothesis 6 was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.
An examination of attitudes between teachers who served mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who did not serve mainstreamed students in their classrooms revealed no significant difference. Therefore, null hypothesis 7 failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 8 compared teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming between content area teachers and non-content area teachers. Statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference at the .05 level.

Non-content area teachers had significantly more positive attitudes than content area teachers. The null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Finally, hypothesis 9 compared teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with course work in special education and teachers without course work in Special Education. There was no significant difference; therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications

This chapter contains a summary, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications based on the review of the literature and analysis of data.

Summary

A review of the literature revealed that limited research had been done concerning the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward the concept mainstreaming. According to Blatt (1979) changes had taken place in the literature, but not in the programs. The literature had educated professionals, as well as society, about the needs of the handicapped, but it had not specifically addressed the needs of the educators directly involved. Certifications, state and local funding patterns, and curricula have not changed enough to accommodate the needs of the teachers.

Laws have opened the doors to the education of all children, handicapped and nonhandicapped, "but they have by no means solved the problems of how the education should be provided" (Cegelka & Prehm, 1982, p. 71).

Many classroom teachers have been assigned the responsibility for mainstreaming handicapped students of all types and levels. These teachers often lack the training and confidence to manage
these students (Chalfant, VanDusenPysh, & Moultrie, 1979). The least restrictive environment without sufficient personnel, materials, and preparation.

Mainstreaming can no longer be considered as a passing trend. Legally it is here to stay. Mainstreaming is a reality. According to Blatt (1979), "if America wants to integrate its mentally retarded it needs merely to pledge itself to that idea" (p. 206).

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences existed between selected elementary and secondary classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming and further determine if differences existed between sex of the respondent, area of assignment, level of education, years of teaching experience, courses taken in special education, and whether or not the teachers served mainstreamed students in their classrooms.

Findings

From the results of the data analysis and interpretation, the following findings are presented:

1. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between elementary and secondary classroom teachers.

2. The results indicated that a significant difference did exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between male and female teachers.

3. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers holding bachelor's degrees and teachers holding advanced degrees.
4. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience.

5. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

6. The results indicated that a significant difference did exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

7. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who had mainstreamed students in their classrooms and teachers who did not have mainstreamed students in their classrooms.

8. The results indicated that a significant difference did exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers of content subjects and teachers of non-content subjects.

9. The results indicated that a significant difference did not exist in attitudes toward mainstreaming between teachers who have taken course work in special education and teachers who have not taken course work in special education.
Conclusions

As a result of the findings the following conclusions were drawn concerning the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming.

1. In general, all teachers surveyed had negative attitudes toward mainstreaming.

2. Female teachers have significantly more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did male teachers.

3. Beginning teachers and teachers with less than 5 years experience had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did teachers with more than 10 years teaching experience.

4. Non-content secondary teachers had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than content secondary teachers.

Recommendations

As a result of the study the following recommendations were made concerning the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming:

1. A study should be conducted to determine why differences existed between male and female teachers.

2. A study should be conducted to determine relationships between personality variables and regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming.

3. A study should be conducted to determine if a relationship exists between teaching style and elementary and secondary teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.
4. A replica study should be conducted in another state.

Implications

The findings of this study provided several implications for school administrators and classroom teachers. These include the following:

1. Local school systems should develop an in-service workshop to acquaint regular classroom teachers with methods and procedures for instructing exceptional children in regular classes.

2. A study should be conducted to measure attitude changes of regular classroom teachers toward mainstreaming after an in-service workshop designed to acquaint teachers with methods, procedures, and materials for identification and teaching exceptional children.

3. A study to determine if a relationship exists between degree of mainstreaming of exceptional children and passing the North Carolina Competency Test.

4. Colleges that do not require an orientation to special education course as part of their teacher preparation programs should consider one as part of the requirements for certification.

5. Personnel administrators should consider prospective teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming prior to assignment in schools with high degrees of mainstreaming.

6. School administrators should address the concept of mainstreaming with their staffs and encourage open communication between regular class teachers and special education teachers.
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APPENDIX A

ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINSTREAMING SCALE
ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINSTREAMING SCALE
(AIMS)

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Year of Birth __________________________ Sex ________ M ________

This scale concerns "mainstreaming" as one method of meeting the current legal requirements for placing students in the "least restrictive environment for educational purposes. In "mainstreaming," the handicapped student, to the greatest extent possible, becomes the responsibility of the regular classroom teacher who is assisted by specialists.

INSTRUCTIONS

On the blank line, please place the numerical value indicating your reaction to every item according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Do not omit a response to any item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In general, mainstreaming is a desirable educational practice.

2. Students should have the right to be in regular classrooms.

3. It is feasible to teach gifted, normal, and mentally retarded students in the same class.

4. Educable mentally retarded students should be in regular classrooms.

5. Visually handicapped students who can read standard printed material should be in regular classrooms.

6. Blind students who cannot read standard printed material should be in regular classrooms.

7. Hearing impaired students, who are not deaf, should be in regular classrooms.

8. Deaf students should be in regular classrooms.

9. Physically handicapped students confined to wheelchairs should be in regular classrooms.

10. Physically handicapped students confined to wheelchairs should be in regular classrooms.

11. Student with cerebral palsy who cannot control movement of one or more of their limbs should be in regular classrooms.

12. Student who scatters should be in regular classrooms.

13. Students with speech difficulties to understand should be in regular classrooms.

14. Students with epilepsy should be in regular classrooms.

15. Students with diabetes should be in regular classrooms.

16. Students with behavior disorders who cannot readily control their own behavior should be in regular classrooms.

17. Students who present persistent discipline problems should be in regular classrooms.

18. Mainstreaming will be sufficiently successful to be termed as a required educational practice.
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APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO USE ATMS
Dr. Joan Berryman  
556 Aderhold Hall  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602  

Dear Dr. Berryman:

I spoke with you last fall concerning the use of the AIMS for use in writing my dissertation. My dissertation topic deals with a comparison of elementary and secondary classroom teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming in North Carolina.

During the phone conversation you gave me permission to copy and use the instrument for my study. However, I need written consent to include in the appendix of my paper. I would certainly appreciate your attention in this matter.

My research is going quite well, and I plan to send the survey out in October. Numerous professional educators have expressed interest in this project and I am looking forward to obtaining the results. As soon as the project is completed, I will forward a copy to you.

Thank you very much for all your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Richard Tallent
September 17, 1985

Ms. Phyllis Tallent  
Route 4, Box 157  
Vale, NC 28166

Dear Ms. Tallent:

You have permission to copy the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale and to include a facsimile in your dissertation.

Good luck with your project. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joan D. Berryman, Ed.D.  
Associate Professor
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APPENDIX C

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SELECTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL UNITS
Dear

My name is Phyllis Tallent, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University; I am also an Exceptional Children's teacher with Lincoln County Schools. My dissertation, which I am currently writing, deals with regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Your administrative unit has been randomly selected, along with thirty-four other units from North Carolina, to be included in this study. The success of my research largely depends on your cooperation and participation.

I plan to randomly sample classroom teachers from each selected administrative unit. To do this I need a listing of all regular classroom teachers K-12. This could be provided in several ways: a directory or computer listing of the teachers would be ideal. Certainly this information will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study. You may return your list in the enclosed envelope or by courier to: Phyllis Tallent, Lincoln County Schools, 661.

If you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. This project could never be completed without your help. I will be anxiously awaiting your response so that I can proceed with this study.

Respectfully yours,

Phyllis Richard Tallent
Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Robert Shepherd
Chairman, Doctoral Program
Dear

My name is Phyllis Tallent, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University; I am also an Exceptional Children's teacher with Lincoln County Schools. My dissertation, which I am currently writing, deals with classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming.

I wrote to you several weeks ago concerning the participation of your unit in my research project. Perhaps it has not been convenient for you to respond to my request. Since your participation is crucial for the success of my study, I would again like to ask for your help.

Your administrative unit has been randomly selected, along with thirty-four other units from North Carolina, to be included in this study. The success of my research largely depends on your cooperation and participation.

I plan to randomly sample classroom teachers from each selected administrative unit. To do this I need a listing of all regular classroom teachers K-12. This could be provided in several ways: a directory or computer listing of the teacher would be ideal. Certainly this information will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study. You may return your list in the enclosed envelope or by courier to: Phyllis Tallent, Lincoln County Schools, 861.

If you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. This project could never be completed without your help. I will be anxiously awaiting your response so that I can proceed with this study.

Respectfully yours,

Phyllis Richard Tallent
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX D

TEACHER LETTER AND DATA SHEET
Dear Fellow Teacher:

My name is Phyllis Tallent and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University. I teach Exceptional Children for the Lincoln County School System. Currently, I am involved in research for my dissertation. My study involves a comparison of elementary and secondary classroom teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.

You have been randomly selected, along with approximately 300 other classroom teachers from North Carolina, to complete the enclosed data sheet and survey form. The survey is brief and should take only a few minutes to complete. The study will focus on group results and no individual will be identified. Neither your name or your school’s name will be associated with the information you provide.

Please take the time to respond, as your participation is crucial to the success of my study. The survey form and data sheet can be completed in only a few minutes. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take the time now to complete the forms and return them in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. If you would like to receive a summary of the findings of this research, please advise me.

Thank you very much for your time and efforts.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Richard Tallent
Doctoral Fellow
Data Sheet

Please mark the appropriate spaces below.

1. Sex: _____ Male  _____ Female

2. Present teaching position: (Circle One)
   K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

3. Primary area of assignment: (Select only one)
   _____ English
   _____ Math
   _____ Science
   _____ Social Studies
   _____ Other (Specify) ____________________________

4. Highest level of education:
   _____ Bachelor's
   _____ Master's
   _____ Education Specialist
   _____ Doctorate

5. Number of years of professional teaching experience:
   _____ 1-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ More than 10

6. Do you presently serve mainstreamed students in your classroom?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

7. Total semester hours completed in Special Education:
   _____ 0  _____ 4-6
   _____ 1-3  _____ More than 6
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