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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Special class placement has historically been a vehicle through which school systems have made special education provisions for children with exceptionalities. Since provisions for children with learning and behavioral disorders is of recent origin, having developed within the last decade, it is natural for the previously established self-contained class model to be replicated with children in this newly identified area of exceptionality (Morse, Cutler, Fink, 1964; Leadership Training Institute in Learning Disabilities, 1972; Glavin, 1974). It is recognized that other models are employed within the public school when providing alternative placement for the child with learning and behavioral disorders: Resource Room, Tutorial Services, Mainstreaming, and a host of various titles denoting a range from total self-contained special class, through partial participation in the regular class, to total placement in the regular class. Recognition of these alternatives in no way diminishes the need to focus attention on the child placed in a special self-contained class for children with learning and behavioral disorders.

Rationale

The literature is replete with imposing issues which contribute to the importance of focusing on the reintegration
of children with learning and behavioral disorders. The following twelve issues contribute to the expediency for studying the reintegration of these children from self-contained classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders to regular classrooms. Discussion and references for each issue is presented in Chapter II, Review of the Literature.

1. The self-contained special class is typically utilized in placing children with learning and behavioral disorders. The prevalence in utilization of the self-contained special class model warrants serious consideration of the reintegration process for children with learning and behavioral disorders (L/BD).

2. The philosophy of education is evolving toward the maximizing of integrative experiences with increased emphasis on the right to normalization for all areas of exceptionality. Regular and special educators are proliferating an expressed desire to provide appropriate normalization experiences while limiting segregated experiences. This creates a more receptive atmosphere for considering the reintegration process for children with learning and behavioral disorders.

3. The results from the efficacy studies on special class placement are inconclusive. In the absence of conclusive evidence to support special class placement per se, reintegration is a viable
placement procedure for some children in special self-contained classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders.

4. There are many eligible and identified children who remain in regular classrooms without receiving special education services. It is reasonable to expect that the reintegration of some children would permit other children to be included; children who may have more severe learning and behavioral disorders and who are presently not receiving special education services.

5. Regular classroom teachers have more positive attitudes toward receiving and assuming the responsibility for educating children with learning disabilities than they do for receiving children with some other handicapping conditions. If attitudes of regular teachers affect reintegration success, then children with learning disorders have increased probability for being effectively reintegrated.

6. There is a recognized movement at the local, state, and federal levels focusing on legal rights and educational accountability for all handicapped individuals. There are two major concepts explicated from the legal rights and accountability movements: (a) as more severely handicapped individuals are
included in public schools, the need to reintegrate children with relatively milder learning and behavioral disorders is intensified and (b) reintegration is an integral part of the accountability movement.

7. There is evidence of earlier identification combined with more preventive programs for children with learning and behavioral disorders. A relationship may exist between length of stay in a special class and the probability of reintegration, and increased reintegration is inherent in earlier, preventive programs.

8. Children with learning and behavioral disorders are identified as having average or better intellectual development and an absence of severe visual, hearing, or motor involvement. Since children with learning and behavioral disorders have average or better intellectual development and an absence of severe physical interference, reintegration considerations are most appropriate for children in this area of exceptionality.

9. There are overt attempts in regular education to go beyond the supposition stage and into implementation of individualized instruction which permits the teacher to have increased success with a wider range of children. Increased flexibility in regular classrooms optimizes reintegration potential.
10. The reintegration of (some) children with learning and behavioral disorders is a stated or inherent objective of self-contained special classes. Reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders is congruous with program outcomes.

11. Literature summarizing reintegration procedures is essentially nonexistent. The generality of and deficit in accessible summarized information on reintegration is a deterrent to the reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders.

12. The literature reveals a discrepancy between reintegration as an objective and as a reality. There is not only a minimum of information about reintegration procedures utilized but indeed a minimum of information which supports that children are being reintegrated.

Purpose and Statement of the Problem

Children with learning and behavioral disorders are those children who have average or better intellectual development; who do not have a severe visual, hearing, or motor involvement; but who do demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual achievement (Kirk, 1962; National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, 1968; Leadership Training Institute in Learning Disabilities, 1972; Ohio Comprehensive
Plan, 1973). Prevalence figures vary from state to state and according to the population from whom the data is gathered. Recent information disseminated through the final report of a Leadership Training Institute (LTI) in Learning Disabilities (1972) reflects incidence figures of one to fifteen per cent with Ohio using a five per cent incidence figure. Although a more precise estimate is not available, clearly a significant number of children are included in the exceptionality of learning and behavioral disorders. Ohio alone is providing self-contained special class services for approximately seven thousand children (Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Local 405 Plans, 1973). 

More than 86 per cent of the states utilize the historically established self-contained special class model when providing special education services to children with learning and behavioral disorders (LTI, 1972). Reintegration is a stated or inherent goal for children in these classes. Barsch (1965) stated that the purpose for having special education services for children with learning disabilities is "to correct whatever impediments stand in the way of the child taking full advantage of the offerings of the regular curriculum (p. 3)." There is conceptual agreement that these children are to be placed in self-contained special classes on a temporary basis in order to receive prescriptive help which enables them to be reintegrated into the regular classroom.
Contrary to the conceptual agreement about reintegration, the fact remains that there is little summarized information on reintegration procedures and almost no evidence that reintegration is being systematically accomplished. Although reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders is reasonable and acceptable, Grosenick (1972) reported that, "meager information exists with regard to the process, procedure, or techniques for such (re)integration (p. 315)." In discussing the lack of information about the reintegration of emotionally handicapped children, Morse, Cutler, and Fink (1964) suggested that the lack of reintegration is partially due to the fact that the sole responsibility for reintegration is thrust upon the special class teacher. Grosenick (1972) supports this supposition by Morse, et al. (1964) with the serious observation that, "the lack of information regarding integration may in reality be an accurate reflection of the actual practices and procedures (p. 315)."

**Purpose.** Although, sequentially, placement procedures would be explicated earlier than reintegration procedures; serious educators must focus attention on operationalizing the reintegration concept. The purpose of this study is to compare the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers of learning & behaviorally disordered children and university teacher educators on the effectiveness of specified procedures for the reintegration of children from self-contained special classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders into regular elementary classes.
Statement of the problem. The present investigation provides evidence helpful in solving the research problems as presented in the following three questions:

(1) To what extent do the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers of children with learning and behavioral disorders, and special university teacher educators agree as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

(2) To what extent are there discrepancies among responses of these three significant population samples as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

(3) Are there statistically significant differences among the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special classroom teachers of children with learning and behavioral disorders, and special university teacher educators on the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

Null Hypothesis

From the stated purpose and problem, the following null hypothesis was formulated. There are no statistically significant differences among the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special classroom teachers of children with learning and behavioral disorders, and special university teacher educators on the effectiveness of reintegration procedures.

\[ H_0: \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_3 = 0, \bar{x}_1 = \text{Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers}; \]
$X_2 =$ Special Teachers of Elementary Classes for Children with Learning and Behavioral Disorders; $X_3 =$ Special University Teacher Educators.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Due to the complexity of the problem and the extent to which the problem must be investigated, the present investigation was limited to: (1) an investigation of reintegration in elementary schools; (2) the utilization of three of the twelve significant populations identified in the "Selection of Samples" section (page 13) and (3) the State of Ohio. The present investigation is limited to elementary schools in Ohio due to the pragmatic limitations of time, personnel, and money as well as to program development considerations. More than 90 per cent of all L/BD classes in Ohio operate at the elementary school level, and presently, the limited number of secondary units in Ohio are considered to be research and development units. The three selected sample populations are: regular elementary classroom teachers, special elementary classroom teachers of L/BD children, and special university teacher educators. The selection of the special university teacher educators and special teachers of L/BD children was based upon the assumption that these educators will function as leaders in the reintegration of L/BD children. Selection of the regular classroom teacher as the third sample group was based on their inherent influence on reintegration.
In order to more accurately describe variables in this study, further delimitations are made: (1) in the operational definitions of the three population samples and (2) to the pragmatic and statistical support of the validity and reliability of the non-standardized data gathering instrument. Delimitations on the population samples are described in the operational definition of terms (pages 11 and 12). Briefly, special university teacher educators are restricted to the thirteen universities with state approved programs for the preparation of teachers of L/BD children (fixed); special classroom teachers must teach in state approved elementary classroom units (random); and regular classroom teachers must be in the same elementary school as the special classroom teacher (stratified-random).

The utilization of a non-standardized instrument for gathering the data required that certain statistical treatments be performed. Therefore, the findings are limited to statements appropriately made as a result of a Chi Square item analysis, a Hoyt reliability for the original instrument, a Chi Square analysis of the revised instrument, a Kuder-Richardson reliability for the revised instrument, a factor analysis, and two one-way analyses of variance. Sources of error are presented in Chapter IV.

Operational Definition of Terms

The terms included in the statement of the problem and in the stated questions to be answered are operationally
defined in order to clarify the meanings as they are intended in this study.

1. Learning and Behaviorally Disordered (L/BD)
   Children: children placed in approved Ohio self-contained classes for children with learning and behavioral disabilities, who meet other state standards, and who are included in the following definition:
   a) Functions within the normal range of intelligence, or above (attained IQ above 80), as determined through a multifactored assessment procedure administered by a qualified psychologist.
   b) Does not have severe visual, hearing, or motor involvements.
   c) Cannot meet the academic and social behavioral expectations of the regular instructional program because of a significant performance deficit . . . (Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Comprehensive Plan, 1973, p. 25).

2. Reintegration: the planned return of a child from a special self-contained class for children with learning and behavioral disorders to the regular classroom, ultimately on a full-time basis, as a more appropriate educational alternative for the child.

3. Special University Teacher Educators: the Chairman of the Faculty for Exceptional Children and faculty members with teaching responsibility in the area of learning and behavioral disorders from each of
the thirteen institutions of higher learning offering programs in learning and behavioral disorders with approval from the Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Certification.


5. Regular Classroom Teachers: regular teachers randomly selected from a list of teachers in the same elementary school as the randomly selected special classroom teachers of L/BD children. These regular teachers were selected from the SF 1 Form of the 1973-74 Principal's Report on file in the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education.

6. Receiving Teacher: a regular classroom teacher who receives an L/BD child who is reintegrated.

7. Specified Reintegration Procedures: professional opinion that was explicated from the literature and served as the basis for the reintegration procedures included in the data gathering instrument.
Procedures and Methodology

The reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders from special self-contained classes into the regular class inherently requires cooperative interactions among regular and special educators. Consequently, both regular and special educators are identified as significant and potential population groups.

Selection of samples. Initially twelve population groups, representative of regular and special education, were identified as sources of valuable reintegration data. The twelve population groups are presented in Figure 1.

This comparative study is limited to data collected from three of the twelve identified population groups; two special education groups and one regular education group. The assumption was made that special educators, field-based and university-based, will provide the leadership necessary for reintegrating children from special self-contained classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders into regular classes. Data from the special class teacher and the special university teacher educator are considered essential in initial investigations. The degree to which there is agreement and discrepancy between these three significant populations is a salient feature of comprehensive investigation of the reintegration process. In addition, the regular classroom teacher, the third population group, is directly involved in reintegration and will affect reintegration success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Category</th>
<th>Regular Education Group</th>
<th>Special Education Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Department of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Consultive Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teacher Educators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Twelve Identified Population Groups Important in the Reintegration of Learning & Behaviorally Disordered Children.
The special classroom teacher population included teachers of children in special self-contained learning and behaviorally disordered (Ohio term: disabilities) classes in the state of Ohio. This population sample was randomly selected from the 1973-74 Special Education Directory of 947 special elementary teachers in approved Ohio units for L/BD children. The regular classroom teacher group was randomly selected from teachers who teach children in the same elementary school as the special classroom teacher (stratified-random).

The special university teacher educator population group included university teacher educators in the area of learning and behavioral disorders. This population sample included the Chairman of the Faculty for Exceptional Children and all faculty members with teaching responsibility in learning and behavioral disorders in the thirteen institutions of higher learning with program approval for the preparation of teachers of L/BD children through the Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Certification.

Data gathering instrument. A non-standardized survey instrument was developed and mailed to subjects in the three population samples in order to gather the appropriate data. A copy of the survey instrument is presented in Appendix A. Professional opinion was explicated from a review of the literature and was formulated into statements of reintegration procedures. Subjects were asked to rate each reintegration procedure, on a six point scale, according to its judged
effectiveness. The six points on the rating scale were operationally defined and essentially yielded ordinal data. However, the six points on the rating scale are arbitrary quantifiers rather than discrete categories. That is, they represent the degrees to which an item is rated along an underlying continuum (Edwards, 1950). Kerlinger (1973) stated that such ratings suggest equal intervals when they fix a continuum in the mind of the participant. Therefore, the assumption was made that an interval of one exists between each point on the rating scale and consequently the data yielded from the survey instrument fulfills the requirement of interval data when utilizing parametric tests.

Instructions for using the six point rating scale were stated so that independence of response was allowed. Independence of items permitted subsequent statistical treatment and resulted in each item contributing to variance (Kerlinger, 1973). Possible response-set bias was minimized by: (1) not requiring that subjects rate the items to reflect current personal utilization, (2) presenting all items as potentially effective, and (3) having the respondent remain anonymous. In addition, clarity was increased and ambiguity decreased by providing a brief explanation which served as a contextual frame of reference.

T**reatment of the data.** Due to the non-standard nature of the survey instrument, responses by the subjects
were subjected to preliminary analyses as follows: (1) a Chi Square item analysis and hoyt reliability of the original instrument containing 107 items and (2) a Chi Square instrument analysis and a Kuder-Richardson reliability of the revised instrument containing the statistically significant (p < .05) items. Following the preliminary analyses, the significant items were factor analyzed. Subsequently, two analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed for all three groups. Interrelationships of significant items were not established or assumed; therefore, resultant significant items were treated as being independent of each other.

This comparative study utilized two ANOVA designs. A one-way univariate ANOVA, utilizing a mixed design, was performed in order to determine if there were statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the items for all three sample groups. Since a desired outcome of this investigation was to determine which group contributed most to the significance of a reintegration procedure, a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure was employed.

The eight threats to internal validity, as described by Campbell and Stanley (1963), were controlled for through the use of the means (\( \bar{X} \)) in the data analysis. The external threat of multiple-X interference (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) remains of concern; however, treatment of the data revolved around groups and was not intended to revolve around individuals as such.
Statistical procedures. Data was gathered from the three identified population samples (special university teacher educators (L/BD), special classroom teachers (L/BD), regular elementary classroom teachers) through the use of the mailed survey instrument (Appendix A). Respondents rated each specified reintegration procedure on a six point scale according to its judged effectiveness.

Responses from all subjects on all items were subjected to a Chi Square item analysis computer program which utilized a goodness of fit comparison in order to determine which items were statistically significant (p < .05). A Hoyt reliability of the entire instrument was contained as a component of the item analysis program and provided an estimate of the overall reliability of the instrument. In order to establish some indication of construct validity of the statistically significant items (p < .05) a Chi Square instrument analysis was performed. In addition, the data were subjected to a Kuder-Richardson instrument reliability analysis using the statistically significant items only (p < .05). The statistically significant items from the item analysis were subjected to a factor analysis computer program resulting in the identification of interpretable factors (Thurston, 1941; Kerlinger, 1973). Resultant factors were named, and the names of the factors were utilized in order to increase variable simplicity.

A one-way ANOVA, utilizing a mixed design, was then performed on the statistically significant items (p < .05)
for all three sample groups in order to determine if there were statistically significant differences among the groups. The data conformed to the assumptions of a one-way ANOVA as follows. The requirement that the variance tested must be between or among more than two groups for one variable was satisfied by including the three population sample groups for each significant item (reintegration procedure), or variable, resulting in a block design. The requirement for randomization was met with the mixed design in which two of the groups were randomly selected (special classroom) teachers and regular elementary classroom teachers and one group (special university teacher educator) was fixed. The requirement of resultant differences was met by identifying only that there were differences. The one-way ANOVA identified whether or not there were statistically significant differences among the items but is not capable of identifying which group of subjects contribute most to the significance of an item. Interaction was beyond the scope of the present investigation.

A desired outcome of the present investigation was to determine which sample group contributed most to the significance of a reintegration procedure. The one-way ANOVA has the capacity to detect overall differences for all three groups. In order to identify which group contributed most to the significance of an item, a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe procedure was employed.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is presented in two sections: (1) issues supportive of the reintegration of some children from classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders and (2) specific research involving reintegration.

In section one is presented twelve pertinent issues supportive of reintegration and the discrepancy between what is suggested in the literature and what is followed in actual practice. The twelve issues presented serve as the conceptual bases for the present investigation.

Specific research on reintegration is presented in section two. An effort was made to include research which directly focuses on: (1) the reintegration of children from classes for learning and behaviorally disordered children and (2) the research of reintegration per se. Since the terminology learning and behavioral disorders is of recent origin, the inclusion of selected research on the emotionally disturbed, behaviorally handicapped, and neurologically handicapped was considered to be desirable.
Juxtaposition of Pertinent Issues and the Reintegration of Children from Classes for Learning and Behaviorally Disordered Children

The conceptual basis for the present investigation is contained in the following twelve issues identifying conditions that are favorable to the study of reintegration.

1. Utilization of the self-contained special class as the typical model.
2. Focus on integrative experiences and increased normalization.
3. Inconclusiveness of the efficacy studies on special class placement.
4. Retention of eligible and identified children in regular classrooms.
5. Positive attitudes of regular class teachers toward learning disabled children.
6. Movement toward legal rights and accountability.
7. Focus on earlier identification and preventive programs.
8. Potential of learning disabled children included in definitional aspects.
9. Efforts to increase the range of individual differences accommodated in the regular classroom.
10. Inclusion of reintegration as a stated or inherent objective.
11. Inaccessibility of information on reintegration procedures.
12. Discrepancy between reintegration as an objective and as a reality.

**Self-Contained Special Classes Typically Utilized**

Tradition, supported by a financial advantage, has contributed to the utilization of the self-contained class in educating the learning and behaviorally disordered child.

**Historical bases.** As early as 1964, Morse, Cutler, Fink stated that,

Many school systems in many states have for a long time been committed to the special class concept as a means of dealing with children who have or who pose special problems.

Experimental programs are proliferating and the commonest involves the special class concept . . . Most of these developments take place in the context of little "firm" evidence for the utility of the special class design (p. 2).

Glavin (1974) described an historical isolation basis for the development of the self-contained class model as follows:

At one time, exceptional individuals were viewed as deviates from whom the remainder of society fled, as though the deviance was contagious. This general attitude was noticeably reflected in our educational policies through which we attempted to isolate the "abnormals" from the "normals." This took the format of special classes designed to carry on programs for children who couldn't adjust to the regular class program (p. 5).
Relative prevalence. Actual numbers of learning and behaviorally disordered (L/BD) children in self-contained special classes and other models vary depending on techniques used in data collection. The following list contains four criteria for relative prevalence of learning and behaviorally disordered children in self-contained special classes as well as available figures and sources.

1. Fifty-eight per cent of the teachers in L/BD programs are employed in self-contained special classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders (Rogan & Lukins, 1968).

2. Eighty-six per cent of the states utilize the self-contained class model for children with learning and behavioral disorders (Leadership Training Institute (LTI), 1972).

3. Forty-one per cent of these states utilize the self-contained class model as the only special education model for children with learning and behavioral disorders (LTI, 1972).

4. In Ohio, 6,707 L/BD children are in special self-contained classes compared with 5,967 L/BD children who are receiving tutorial services (Ohio Local 405 Plans, 1973).

In summary, the inclusion of data in this sub-section does not intend to assert the utilization of any one model. Instead, the objective is to establish that the prevalence in
utilization of the self-contained special class model warrants serious consideration of the reintegration process for children with learning and behavioral disorders.

**Integrative Experiences and Increased Normalization**

The decade of the seventies is characterized by a range of educational alternatives for the exceptional child which includes integrative experiences and increased normalization. As early as 1958, Haring, et al. stated that "exceptional children should have the benefit of experiences with their nonexceptional peers whenever possible (p. 3)." The investigators continued with the following rationale:

Because these children will eventually be required to achieve a satisfactory adjustment within a predominately normal society, the experiences they have as children with this society are invaluable to them. Furthermore, normal children should be given an opportunity to understand, accept and adjust to children with exceptionalities . . . having continuous and constructive experiences with these children throughout their formative years may assist normal children to accept and understand handicapped individuals as adults (p. 3).

Most recently, Long, et al. (1971) expressed recognition of the movement toward integrative experiences and normalization as follows:

There is a clear movement in special education to curtail the damaging psychological effects of labeling some children as "different" and of segregating them by developing special classes that polarize . . . (p. xi).
Glavin (1974) stated that the following two main trends, both of which reflect positive attitudes toward children, contribute to the support of a more recent philosophy of education that attempts to increase educational alternatives: "the increasing emphasis on personalizing and individualizing all instruction, and on normalizing the exceptional (p. 5-6)."

Lewis (1971) provided underlying concepts for this apparent shift in educational philosophy as follows:

The practice of excluding handicapped children from schools (regular classrooms) developed at the time when it was assumed that individual differences within a class group should be reduced to a minimum (p. 43) . . . . Today, teachers are more concerned with making provisions for individual differences and, fortunately, they are better able to cope with these differences in regular classrooms (p. 44).

Continuum of services. The framework of special education programs as presented by Reynolds (1962) represents one of the initial attempts to focus attention on a continuum of alternative models (Figure 2). Within this framework, Reynolds notes to the left of the figure that a great majority of the children have "less severe" problems and on the right of the figure that the "return (of these children) as soon as feasible" is an identified outcome.

Deno (1970) recommended a continuum of educational services as illustrated in Figure 3. The breadth of each level is used to indicate the relative number of children expected within each level. Note that a large portion of the children, approximately half, fall at the part-time special
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Fig. 3. Cascade System of Special Education Service. Reprinted from Evelyn Deno, Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 229-237. Copyright by the Council for Exceptional Children.
class placement and above with far fewer children being at the full-time special class level.

Deno (1970) further expressed two special education roles that are inherent in the philosophy of integrative experiences and normalization as follows:

The special education field must direct whatever forces it can muster to helping the regular system achieve the necessary understanding and tangible resources to become maximally accommodative to the needs of children who show different learning styles and, at the same time, to insure that specialized education facilities and appropriate treatment options will be available for those residual children who genuinely need special circumstances and methods outside mainstream provisions to maximize their learning (p. 14).

Subsumed within the above statement is the provision of special education services beyond that of regular education as well as increased adjustments within regular education. The result is that special education provisions will be made for: (1) direct service to children who may not be appropriately educated in a regular classroom or who may need special education on a part-time basis and (2) direct services to regular educators in order to increase successful educational experiences for children in the regular classroom. Fortunately, the astute reader of the literature recognizes that "conventional wisdom" does not advocate an either-or approach to educational alternatives but does advocate increased alternatives which include the regular classroom, especially for children with mild exceptionalities (Kirk, 1964; Rubin, et al., 1966; Dunn, 1968; Siegel, 1969; Deno, 1970; Long,

An integrative philosophy of education is supported by Birch (1971) when he described the need for both regular and special education in the following statements:

There is and there will probably continue to be a substantial need for many exceptional children to spend most of their school days with teachers specifically prepared to apply special education approaches. But there are other exceptional children for whom the regular personnel programs can be used with fully satisfactory results (p. 77).

As recently as the April, 1974 issue of Phi Delta Kappan, the trend toward integrative experiences and normalization was expressed by Gallagher (1974) as a move toward the reintegration of mildly handicapped children in the exceptionalities of educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disordered. Certainly, special educators are not presenting special class and regular class alternatives as an either-or choice (Kirk, 1964; Rubin, et al., 1966; Dunn, 1968; Siegel, 1969; Deno, 1970; Long, et al. 1971; MacMillan, 1971; Reynolds and Davis, 1971; Wallace and Kauffman, 1973, Glavin, 1974). Glavin (1974) cautions that:

It appears premature to abolish special classes even for the mildly handicapped until advances are made on several fronts, namely: individualizing diagnostic and remedial techniques, increasing regular classroom teachers' effectiveness in individualizing curriculum, and finally, motivating and managing individuals and groups of children (p. 14).
Supportive concepts. Many underlying concepts, supportive of the trend toward the maximizing of integrative experiences with increased emphasis on normalization, are cited in the literature. The following concepts occur with regularity.

1. Questioning of labeling practices (Glavin, 1974).
3. Potential disadvantages of segregated experiences including the influence of modeling and imitation (Miller and Dollard, 1941; Haring, et al., 1958; Dunn, 1968; Christoplos and Renz, 1969; Bandura, 1971; Long, et al., 1971; Gallagher, 1974; Glavin, 1974):
4. Litigation and accountability aspects of special class placements; especially in relationship to minority groups and exceptionalities (Dunn, 1968; Lilly, 1970; Reynolds and Davis, 1971; Ross, DeYong, Cohen, 1971; Vergason, 1973; Gallagher, 1974).
5. Inconclusive evidence from the efficacy studies (Siegel, 1969; Christoplos and Renz, 1970; Reynolds and Davis, 1971; Bradfield et al., 1973; Gallagher 1974; Glavin, 1974).
6. Potential to increase understanding of the handicapped as individuals through integrative experiences for the child in the regular classroom (Haring, 1958; Christoplos and Renz, 1970).

7. Effects of advancements in special education on regular education (Haring, et al., 1958; Siegel, 1969; Glavin, 1974).


In summary, the aforementioned framework contributes to a receptive atmosphere for the reintegration of children from learning and behaviorally disordered classes.

Efficacy Studies on Special Class Placement

Extensive utilization of the self-contained special class and a philosophy of education that is evolving toward integrative experiences and increased normalization was established within the two previously developed sub-sections. Some discussion of the efficacy of special class placement is needed before subsequent issues are treated.

A preponderance of the literature focuses on efficacy studies with the educable mentally retarded (EMR) and requires that inferences be drawn when considering learning and

A critical look at the way these studies were designed precedes interpretation of the findings. Macmillan's (1972) observations are crucial:

With few exceptions (e.g., Goldstein, Moss, Jordan, 1965) these (efficacy) studies could be described as poorly designed, replete with sampling biases which render the results uninterpretable. . . . Therefore, the finding that EMR children in the regular classes exceeded the EMR children in the self-contained classes on some achievement measures is difficult, if not impossible, to interpret (p. 19).

References to Kirk's (1964) frequently quoted review of research often do not include his criticisms of the efficacy studies. In addition to the previously cited sampling problem, he refers to: the use of instruments with questionable validity and reliability; the lack of control over duration of special class placement; and the lack of delineation of variables.

**Generalizations.** Five generalizations from the efficacy studies on special class placement are presented in Figure 3. Data contained in Figure 4 suggests that an inconclusive position is the most supportable position at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better Social/ Emotional Development</th>
<th>Better Academic Development in Regular Class</th>
<th>Mildly Handicapped Recommended for Regular Class Placement</th>
<th>Advantage for Neither Regular Nor Special Class</th>
<th>Can Function Satisfactorily in Regular Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. 4. Support of Five Generalizations from Efficacy Studies on Special Class and Regular Class Placement of Exceptional Children.
Better Social/ Emotional Development in Regular Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better Academic Development in Regular Class</th>
<th>Mildly Handicapped Recommended for Regular Class Placement</th>
<th>Advantage for Neither Regular Nor Special Class</th>
<th>Can Function Satisfactorily in Regular Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. For Regular Class:
- Recent Studies:
  - Kirk (1964)
  - Stanton & Cassidy (1964)
- Recent Studies:
  - Goldstein, et al. (1965)
  - Dunn (1968)
  - Christoplos & Renz (1969)

- Long, et al. (1971)
- Macmillan (1971)
- Reynolds & Davis (1971)
- Wallace & Kauffman (1973)
- Glavin (1974)

- Gustin & Spicker (1970)
- Zedler (1970)
- Reger & Koppman (1971)
- Tyler (1971)
- Vacc (1972)

- Grosenick (1972)
- Vacc (1972)
- Hewett & Forness (1974)
- Vacci (1974)
- Bradfield, et al. (1973)
- Gallagher (1974)

Fig. 4. Support of Five Generalizations from Efficacy Studies on Special Class and Regular Class Placement of Exceptional Children.
Christoplos and Renz, 1969; Guskin and Spicker, 1970; Gallagher, 1974 suggest that such a position has contributed to the present mainstreaming notions. A final caution was presented by Macmillan (1972) when he stated that such inconclusiveness, "must not be interpreted to mean that there are no differences in the two placements (p. 20)." Perhaps Tyler's metaphor that the efficacy studies have "generated more heat than light in the field of special education (p.1)" is appropos.

Influential factors. A concomitant product from the review of the literature on the efficacy of special class placement is the identification of influential factors which are inherent in the utilization of special classes. Stanton and Cassidy (1964) suggested that the priority of academic achievement must be determined before appropriate placement decisions can be made. Brown (1968) pointed out that there is a lack of evidence that a low pupil-teacher ratio leads to individualization of instruction and identified this as an erroneous assumption of special class placement. Perhaps Goldstein (1964) identified a relevant factor when he stated that special class teachers are not more competent to teach EH1R children than are regular teachers. This harsh statement may be more acceptable in relationship to the older studies and in view of Davis' (1970) argument that special class teachers did not meet even minimal requirements for credentials. The recent supply and demand relationship provides decreased support for the credentials argument and the special competencies argument.
In summary, this brief review of efficacy studies focusing on special class placement revealed that many authors advocate that further research be directed toward interactive effects of program and child as well as toward the answering of questions which go beyond an either-or position for special class placement (Reynolds, 1963; Goldstein, 1964; Stanton and Cassity, 1964; McCarthy and Scheerenberger, 1966; Tyler, 1971; Macmillan, 1972). The present investigation does not assume an either-or position for regular and special class placement. In view of the findings on special class placement, the present study suggests that reintegration is a viable placement procedure for some children in self-contained classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders. Therefore, the investigation of specified reintegration procedures is a significant undertaking.

Retention of Eligible and Identified Children In Regular Classes Without Special Education Services

The number of children in need of, but not receiving, special education services varies with the exceptionality and is difficult to ascertain. Data on the retention of exceptional children in the regular classroom without special education services is presented in Figure 5. Examination of this data supports the notion that eligible and identified children are presently functioning within the regular class without special education services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Descriptors</th>
<th>Source Location</th>
<th>Source %</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mckinzie et al. (1967)</td>
<td>BOCES Buffalo, N.Y. area</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Silverman &amp; Metz (1970)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds &amp; Davis (1971)</td>
<td>Racine, Wisc.</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Ohio 405 Plans (1973)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Hewett (9174) Santa Monica, Madison Plan Calif.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Retention of Exceptional Children in Regular Classes Without Special Education Services.
In summary, McCarthy and McCarthy (1972) suggested that children with mild exceptionalities are presently recognized under such titles as "the culturally disadvantaged, the dropout, the educationally retarded, the slow learner, and the child with learning disabilities (p. 74)." While some of these titles would elicit more agreement than others, agreement would be anticipated for the authors' statement that children with mild exceptionalities are, "generally found in the regular classes (p. 74)." The LTI Final Report (1972) concurs by stating that:

Perhaps, because their handicap (learning disabilities) is in many cases less obvious and therefore more difficult to diagnose, they are not going to be identified as needing services as quickly as the deaf, speech impaired, and the mentally retarded (p. 267).

In addition, Siegel (1969) included even the severely handicapped when he stated that:

In many of these programs it is the intention of the educators to include these severely handicapped individuals in regular classes; in other instances it happens fortuitously (p. 4).

Inferences from Chalfant's (1967) investigation of special education services for the deaf, speech handicapped, or EMR child suggest that more services are being provided for learning disabled children in locations where parents have a higher educational level, are consequently better informed about learning disabilities, and find the label more acceptable than previous labels. Reynolds and Davis (1971) indicated
that, "a majority of the nation's handicapped children and youth now, as in the past, are educated in regular classrooms by regular teachers (p. 1)." The assumption is made that some children, who may have more severe learning and behavioral disorders and who are presently not receiving special education services, may be included as other children are reintegrated into the regular classroom.

Positive Attitudes of Regular Classroom Teachers Toward Learning Disordered Children

Deno (1971) asserted two basic premises underlying the reintegration process. In one she says that:

In asking regular education to be more accommodative to handicapped children, special educators are asking regular educators to work harder, at greater pain and cost, and with the prospect of less success per system effort . . . (Reynolds and Davis, Ed., p. 13).

Responsible educators must indeed seek means of decreasing the response cost while providing incentives for the regular classroom teacher.

The second premise focused on the influence of the historical aspects of special class development. Deno (1971) suggested the following approach:

What we now must do, to some degree, is to un-teach what we previously taught. Regular teachers need reason to have confidence in their ability to deal with the majority of the needs of children we previously defined as too "special" to be ministered to by a regular teacher. This confidence can only be accomplished by providing the teachers with the skills and teaching circumstances required to meet children's needs (Reynolds and Davis, Ed., p. 14).
The present investigation of reintegration procedures is a related approach to the provision of skills and conditions conducive to a successful partnership between the regular and special educator rather than the limited symbiotic relationship described by Davis and Wyatt (1971) as, "the living together of two dissimilar organisms in a close association or union that is mutually beneficial (p.4)."

**Classic research.** A discussion of educators' attitudes toward learning disordered children must include the classic investigation by Haring, Stern, and Cruickshank (1958). Here again, the more recent use of the term learning disordered necessitates that inferences be drawn from what the authors termed behavior disorders and emotional disturbances.

Haring, et al. (1958) reported that responses to five of the six case studies representing children with behavior disorders in their original pilot instrument (Classroom Integration Inventory - CII) recommended that the child with a behavior disorder be placed in the regular classroom with part-time consultant service. These cases described children classified as (1) Bully, (2) Disobedient, (3) Tearful, (4) Schizoid, and (5) Delinquent. The assumption may be made that many behaviors described in these cases are applicable to learning and behaviorally disordered children. The one remaining behavior case, the sex deviate, was recommended for placement in the regular classroom with services from a full-time specialist who provides supplementary instruction and consultant services.
None of the behaviorally disordered children were recommended for placement in a special class, placement in a special school, or for exclusion from regular or special public education. The least acceptable cases, recommended for special class or special school placement, described a child orthopedically handicapped, a child lacking sphincter control, an hearing impaired child, and two visually handicapped children.

The CII placement instrument was revised, doubled in length and included case studies representing emotionally disturbed children. Since the purpose of the investigation was to compare pre- and post-test placement recommendations by the teachers, the authors focused on significantly different pre- and post-test recommendations. However, visual inspection of the data on pages 65 and 66 reveals that cases describing behaviorally disordered and emotionally disturbed children received high acceptance ratings on the pre-test and consequently did not have statistically significant differences on the post-test.

The categories representing behaviorally disordered and emotionally disturbed children had higher pre-test and post-test reintegration acceptance ratings than (1) hearing handicapped, (2) orthopedic and cardiac disorders, (3) seizures, (4) speech handicapped, (5) special toilet handling, and (6) visually handicapped. Only two areas received higher acceptance ratings: intelligence (gifted and retarded) and physical attractiveness. Cases intended to represent mentally
retarded children (40, 60, 80 IQs), when inspected in the Appendix, may be interpreted to represent some children with learning disorders; although, the term was not used until years later. For example, Item 5 reads:

- Earl is eight and wears cowboy boots to class because he hasn't learned to tie his own shoe-laces; he is generally cheerful and well behaved, but talks very little and is incapable of following any but the most simple directions (p. 143).

Item 23 reads:

Chuck doesn't seem to catch on to things as quickly as most, and needs to have things explained over and over again; eventually, though, he appears to learn everything the others do even though it has taken longer (p. 144).

The interaction of grouping the mentally retarded with the gifted is not known but is suspected to have weighted the intelligently different category in a favorable direction. In addition to this possible influence, the authors stated that:

The bright normal (child) was considered more immediately acceptable than the moron. . . . The respondents appear to have had some difficulty in scaling the mentally retarded children solely on the basis of behavioral cues (p. 39).

The authors' investigation of teacher attitudes toward placement recommendations for learning and behaviorally disordered children, though pertinent to this discussion, is included in section two. Reference here is limited to the following statement by Haring, et al. (1958:}
On the post-test for the acceptance scores, the teachers showed a trend toward the placement of children with behavior disorders into the regular classroom without specialized assistance. Consequently, their (regular classroom teachers) increased acceptance was greater than the specialist felt was realistic . . . (p. 83).

The classic investigation by Haring, et al. (1958) suggests an acceptance of and confidence in working with children who have learning and behavioral disorders by regular classroom teachers.

Recent research. Combs and Harper (1967) and Kingsley (1967) established that acceptance of the exceptional child by teachers is dependent upon the specific exceptionality. Fine (1967) reported that personal and social adjustment factors are less valued by regular classroom teachers than academic efforts and perhaps performance of the child.

Shotel, Iano, and McGettigan (1972) conducted one of the most recent and comprehensive investigations of teacher attitudes related to (re)integration utilizing resource room support. Since this investigation is reviewed in detail in section two, information is limited to the following summary statement by the authors:

The teachers were generally more positive in their attitudes toward the learning disabled than toward the emotionally disturbed and educable retarded child. . . . teachers were generally more positive in their attitudes toward the emotionally disturbed child than they were toward the educable retarded child . . . . they were least positive when referring to the educable retarded child (p. 681-682).
In summary, although inferences drawn from much of the research on teacher attitudes toward exceptional children must be approached cautiously, in view of definitional difficulties; the findings suggest that regular classroom teachers have more positive attitudes toward receiving and assuming responsibility for educating children with learning and behavioral disorders than children with some other exceptions. Recent research, utilizing the term learning disordered, supports this inference. Consequently, if attitudes of regular teachers affect reintegration success, then children with learning and behavioral disorders have increased probability for effective reintegration.

Legal Rights and Educational Accountability Movement

The concern for the legal rights of and accountability for exceptional children, while not new, has only recently been activated to the level of a recognized movement (Abeson, 1972; Vergason, 1973; Gallagher, 1974). The historically permissive legislation for handicapped children has been replaced by mandatory legislation. Abeson (1972) identified that approximately 70 per cent of the states have mandatory legislation that focuses on services to handicapped children by school districts. In addition to mandates for the provision of services, Vergason (1973) reported that, "thirteen legislatures have or are in the process of passing laws relative to accountability (p. 367)." Gallagher (1974) presented the
following two underlying concepts of the past decade and a half:

If the 1960s could be characterized as the decade in which state and federal legislation brought substantial benefits to the handicapped children and their parents, then the beginning of the 1970s represented a different movement which called upon the courts to restate the scope of the legal rights of handicapped children (p. 518).

Related concepts, supportive of integrative experiences and increased normalization, have been presented in the previous section, Integrative Experiences and Increased Normalization (pages 24 through 31) and will not be repeated here.

Gilhool (1973) and Gallagher (1974) identified the following three areas of educational rights for handicapped children:

1. The right to treatment; exclusion cases.
2. The right to free public education. This has been described as a "zero reject" model.
3. The rights involved with due process in labeling and placing; especially apparent with minority group children.

Although a comprehensive presentation is not intended, recent landmark cases need to be noted. Eight selected cases are listed with a brief statement as to the focus of each case (Christoplos and Rentz, 1969; Franks, 1971; Abeson, 1972; Vergason, 1973; Gallagher, 1974).
Arreola: due process; focus on Mexican/American discrimination.

Corarrubias: mislabeling; extended Arreola and Diana to include blacks and other minorities.

Diana: due process; Mexican/American discrimination.

Hobson: tracking program in Washington, D.C.; included EMR.

Mills: right to "treatment" for all children; against exclusion.

PARC: publicly supported education for all mentally retarded; against exclusion.

Stewart vs. Phillips: mislabeling; punitive damages sought.

Sprangler: discriminatory placement; racial imbalance in special programs.

In addition to the above legal cases, charges of discriminatory placement involving socio-economic status is voiced; especially in relationship to EMR programs (Dunn, 1968). When considering discriminatory placement practices in learning disabilities, as compared to EMR, a charge of reverse discrimination is leveled. Franks (1971) reported from his research that while thirty-four per cent of the EMR enrollment was black, only three per cent of the learning disabilities enrollment was black. The Final Report of the LII in Learning Disabilities (1972) summarized by stating that, "The relationship of the culturally different and the field of learning disabilities remains unclear (p. 282)."

Martin (1972) identified the development of a strong legal foundation as a crucial factor in providing educational
programs for handicapped children, while McCarthy and McCarthy (1972) predict that, "the role of the federal government in all aspects of special education will probably expand (p. 120)." Vergason (1973) indicated that, "special educators have been affected little in the past by accountability but they will be in the future (p. 371)." Gallagher (1973) stated that:

The American society of the 1970s has spoken through its legislative and judicial branches in strong support of appropriate education for all. All educators, both general and special, bear the burden of meeting the needs of the different child with quality programs—and we still have a long path to tread (p. 520).

The 1970 Gallup poll, which reported that seventy-six percent of the public wants educational accountability from principals and teachers, supports Gallagher's statement.

In view of reverse discrimination in learning disabilities and the potential influence of the "zero reject" model against exclusion, the assumption is made that (1) as more severely handicapped individuals are included in public schools, the need to reintegrate children with relatively milder learning and behavioral disorders is intensified and (2) if reintegration of some children is a more appropriate placement, then reintegration is an integral part of the accountability movement.

**Earlier Intervention and Preventive Programs**

More than half of the states have at least permissive legislation for the provision of early programs for handicapped
Children commencing before the usual mandatory entrance age (Trudeau, Ed., 1972; Gallagher, 1974). For example, Ohio House Bill 160 (1973) represents this type of legislation for children as young as three years old. Ohio's rationale for such legislation is stated in their Comprehensive Plan (1973) as follows:

   Early identification and services to young handicapped children and their parents clearly alleviate the impact of a handicap on the child and his family. Further, the child's potential to profit from an educational experience is increased (p. 90).

Evidence that the notion of earlier intervention programs has been actualized in Ohio is reflected in the following percentage relationships gained from an investigation of Local 405 Plans (1973) from school districts. Approximately 66 percent of the allocated units in learning and behavioral disabilities include children of younger primary ages (6-9), 33 percent include children of older intermediate elementary ages (9-12), and one per cent includes secondary units at the junior and senior high school levels (Levin, 1974).

As early as 1958, Haring, et al. in their classic study established the impetus for early intervention and preventive programs as follows:

   As professional people in medicine, education and psychology have become more aware of the importance of early diagnosis for children who show symptoms of exceptionality, educational services have been strengthened and broadened (p. 2).
The authors further asserted that, "as a result, many exceptional children are being detected in time to take full advantage of early planning and training for education, care, and treatment (p. 2)."

Melcher (1971) identified five circumstances which require consideration relative to the de-emphasis of isolationism in special education. One of those five circumstances, relating to the early intervention notion, is: "Increased interest in professional and lay communities in the early identification of the multifaceted needs of children with 'soft-sign' disabilities (p. 84)."

One of the most recent discussions of early intervention and preventive programs was presented by Gallagher (1974). The author recognized that, "The trend toward early intervention for handicapped children has been marked in the past decade (p. 518)." Early childhood programs have emphasized basic developmental processes and direct parent participation (Farber, 1968; Karnes, Teska, Hodgins, 1970; Lillie, (Ed.), 1972; Schaefer and Aaronson, 1972; Shearer and Schearer, 1972). Gallagher (1974), and others, assert that early intervention and preventive programs may not only prevent undesirable learning but may provide important environmental stimuli (Gallagher and Bradley, 1972; Frankenburg, 1973; Gallagher, 1974).

In addition to the aforementioned aspects of early intervention and preventive programs, a slightly older study by
Wing (1963), and quoted by Grosenick (1972), deals with the "institutionalism" syndrome which relates length of stay in a special setting to probability for return outside the special setting. Grosenick (1972) draws the following inferences from the above mentioned institutional theory, "Translated into special education, this suggests that integration into the regular setting may become more difficult with increasing length of stay within the special setting (p. 316)."

The assumptions are made that (1) there may be a relationship between length of stay in a special class and the probability of reintegration; the "institutionalism" syndrome and (2) that an increased probability of reintegrating children is inherent in earlier, preventive elementary programs. Since 66% of Ohio's units in learning and behavioral disabilities are with primary age children; and since this present investigation is concerned with the reintegration of elementary children in learning and behavioral disabilities classes in Ohio; the literature related to early intervention and preventive programs suggests that appropos conditions are present.

Definitional Aspects of Learning Disorders

Kirk (1969) suggested that the divergent literature in learning disabilities is analogous to the blind men's descriptions of an elephant. Perhaps a review of the historical development of the exceptionality, followed by widely cited
definitions, will serve to clarify.

**Historical development.** Strauss and Lehtinen's classic text (1947), in which they applied Goldstein's (1942) earlier work with brain-injured war veterans to children, is perhaps an early point of departure for tracing the area of learning disabilities. The symptoms which the authors described later became known as the Strauss syndrome. Those symptoms provided an early foundation because they were representative of many children who could not be categorized according to other areas of exceptionality but who did exhibit learning difficulties in school.

Birch (1964) charged that the term and definitions of brain-injured children has resulted in confusion and asserts the following two criticisms:

1. A lack of evidence that children possessing the identified symptoms have actual damage to the brain.
2. A lack of the identified symptoms in some children who have verified brain damage.

In addition, Birch (1964) noted that the use of the adjective "minimal" served no function of clarification. It was not until the early sixties that the term learning disabilities came into usage (McCarthy and McCarthy, 1969). This term focused on behavior instead of etiology and was used as a synonym for the earlier term, brain-injured. The Final Report of the LTI on Learning Disabilities (1972) presented information on the following two major points of view, each having
developed from the specific discipline of its proponents: (1) the minimal brain dysfunction (MBD)—neuropsychological dysfunction and (2) the underachievement-treatment orientation.

The MBD-neuropsychological dysfunction orientation is based on a medical model. Pragmatically, lack of school achievement is what focuses the educator's attention on the child and not a concern for MBD-neuropsychological dysfunction (Stephens, 1974).

Early intervention approaches were cited in several sources (Barbe and Frierson (Ed.), 1967; McCarthy and McCarthy, 1969; LTI Final Report, 1972). Seven frequently cited approaches to intervention are:


Bryant, as early as 1964, and Stephens, as recently as 1974, have encouraged educators to focus their attention on instructionally relevant information and to consider instruction as a major variable in the learning process.
Definitional development. Definitions of learning disabilities were advanced during the decade of the sixties. Certainly Kirk (1962) advanced one of the earliest and most wide-spread definitions, which was modified in 1968 to read: "A learning disability refers to a specific retardation or disorder in one or more of the processes of speech, language, perception, behavior, reading, spelling, writing, or arithmetic (p. 5)."

In addition to Kirk's (1968) definition, The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children (1968) developed one of the most widely accepted definitions; A learning disability refers to one or more significant deficits in essential learning processes requiring special education techniques for remediation.

Children with learning disability generally demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual achievement in one or more areas, such as spoken, read, or written language, mathematics, and spatial orientation.

The learning disability referred to is not primarily the result of sensory, motor, intellectual, or emotional handicap, or lack of opportunity to learn (p. 34).

The application of Goldstein's (1942) early work with brain-injured war veterans to children by Strauss and Lehtinen (1947) represents the origin of the exceptionality of learning and behavioral disorders. Presently there are two major viewpoints which have evolved since the use of the term, learning disabilities, in the early sixties: (1) the BMD-neuropsychological dysfunction; a medical orientation and (2) the
underachievement treatment viewpoint; an educational-instructional orientation.

Two of the most widely accepted definitions of learning disabilities were advanced by Kirk (1962, 1968) and The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children (1968). Ohio's Comprehensive Plan (1973) incorporates essential aspects of these two definitions in the following excerpted eligibility statements (p. 25).

Learning and behaviorally disabled children:
1. Have normal or above intelligence.
2. Have a significant performance discrepancy and cannot meet the academic and social behavioral expectations of the regular instructional program.
3. Do not have severe visual, hearing, or motor involvements.

Since children with learning and behavioral disorders have average or better intellectual development and an absence of severe visual, auditory, or motor interferences, the assumption is made that reintegration considerations are most appropriate for children in this area of exceptionality.

Efforts to Increase the Range of Individual Differences Accommodated in the Regular Classroom

A review of the literature revealed overt attempts in regular education to go beyond the supposition stage and into
the implementation of individualized instruction which permits
the regular classroom teacher to have increased success with
a wider range of children. In recognition of individual dif­
ferences in teachers and an extreme range in conditional var­
iables within and between school systems, this "increased
success" is intended to represent a relative position. None­
theless, any relative increase in success, supported by the
previously discussed philosophy of education of maximizing
integrative experiences and normalization, represents a decis­
ive step in the ordinarily long gap between theory and prac­
tice.

An extensive presentation of the "State of the Art" on
increased successful accommodation in the regular classroom
would constitute a separate major review and is not possible
here. An attempt is made, however, to present an overview
which includes key people, their recent books, and specific­
ally titled implementation models which may serve as referen­
ces for the reader who wishes to have more extensive informa­
tion.

Key authors. This sub-section is limited to the iden­
tification of key people who have published pertinent books
which were intended to assist the regular classroom teacher
as well as the special educator. Certainly this section is
only a sampling and is not intended to be all inclusive. In
addition, the sampling undoubtedly represents this writer's
frame-of-reference; consequently, the overall concept is of
more importance than the specific inclusion and placement of an author's work in the organizational framework.

In Figure 6 is presented the organization framework containing the authors' works classified according to the focus of the content. The four classifications that evolved when organizing the sources are described as follows:

1. General, Focus Not Specified for Exceptional Children: These books deal with relevant content for increasing success with a wider range of individual differences but do not specify a focus on exceptional children. Sixteen books, published within the last decade, are cited in Figure 6.

2. General, Exceptional Children: Books in this classification have general applicability to regular education although they originally focused on exceptional children. Eight books, published within the last eight years, are listed.

3. Exceptional Children; Regular and Special Class: The nine books cited in this classification focus on different areas of exceptionality and direct attention to regular classroom implementation; although they also have applicability for the special class.

4. Learning Disabilities; Regular and Special Class: These nine books have as their main focus the child
### Fig. 6. Organizational Framework of Authors' Works Classified According to the Focus of the Content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. General: Focus Not Specified for Exceptional Children</th>
<th>B. General Exceptional Children</th>
<th>C. Exceptional Children: Regular and Special Class</th>
<th>D. Learning Disabilities: Regular and Special Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Deibert &amp; Harmon (1970)</em></td>
<td><em>Glavin (1974)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with learning and behavioral disabilities. They concentrate on application in the regular classroom and serve to develop a closer working relationship between the regular and special educator.

Specifically titled implementation models. Due to the dearth of specifically titled models, an organizational framework is presented in Figure 7. While this section is not intended to be all inclusive, and while the categories are not mutually exclusive, the information in Figure 7 serves to communicate that documented implementation exists for both field-based and university-based models.

Examination of the entries in Figure 7 reveals the inclusion of a limited number of administrative-organizational arrangements which do not in and of themselves insure individualization; however, individualization is increased as the intent of such arrangements is implemented (i.e., Nongraded schools, Open Classrooms, Team Teaching, Houston Plan, Prescriptive Instructional Center).

In addition, several of the field-based entries have not enjoyed unequivocal success; notably, performance contracting. In Vergason's (1973) accountability review, he quoted an Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) report of extensive testing in eighteen cities. Vergason stated that although the OEO has maintained great hope for the more than 7.2 million dollar performance contracting approaches, the OEO report stated that:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD BASED</th>
<th>TEACHER EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impetus Regular Education</td>
<td>Impetus Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstart</td>
<td>Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Guided Instruction (IGE)</td>
<td>Directive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Reading</td>
<td>Engineered Classroom: Madison Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI)</td>
<td>Houston Plan-Texas Plan A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded Schools</td>
<td>Precision Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Classrooms</td>
<td>Prescriptive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contracting</td>
<td>Racine, Perscriptive Instructional Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek, Colorado Texarkana Project</td>
<td>Responsive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Reading</td>
<td>Selected Child Service Demonstration Programs (CSDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Specialist i.e. Title I</td>
<td>Temple Resource Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Organizational Framework of Specifically Titled Implementation Models.
The results of the experiment clearly indicate that the firms operating under performance contracts did not perform significantly better than the more traditional school system (Vargas, 1973, p. 369).

A review of (1) the recent books intended to assist the regular as well as the special teacher in providing for individual differences and (2) the specifically titled implementation models supports the individualization advocacy of the past fifty years. The National Society for the Study of Education devoted their 1925 yearbook to the principles of and plans for individualizing instruction (Reynolds and Davis, Ed., 1971). Perhaps Lord's (1971) statement describing the principle of individualization is still largely true; "No principle of instruction has had such universal support at the theoretical level and, at the same time, such limited genuine application (p. 23)." Yet, the 50 year gap has certainly been narrowed during the last decade with the advent of newer technology and competencies. Birch (1971) suggests that:

The recent rebirth of a broad commitment of the individualization of instruction took place in classrooms for typical children. . . . Perhaps such designs for education can include many exceptional children (p. 77-78).

The LTI in Learning Disabilities (1972) identified the following specific programs under the heading general education:

Work in individualized instruction, precision teaching, classroom management, programmed instruction, math education . . . etc. could be extremely important to learning disabilities (p. 27).

Finally, Kreuter (1969) asserted that:
Deeper knowledge and greater insight concerning the needs of these handicapped children have been a by-product of various programs attempted within the past few years. . . . focus on modifications of the curriculum that recognize the actual needs of children, and they serve to influence the disappearance of the specious and disparaging separation of these children from the mainstream of school life (p. ix).

Attempts in regular education to increase the success of the regular teacher with a wider range of children are obvious. In full recognition that this increased success falls along a continuum, the assumption is made that the regular classroom teacher is more competent in accommodating an increased range of individual differences than ever before, and that this factor optimizes reintegration potential.

**Reintegration Is A Stated Or Inherent Objective**

Investigation of reintegration revealed that statements in the literature either recognize reintegration as an objective or indicate that reintegration is an inherent requirement of the statement. In Figure 8 is presented sources supportive of statements in both classifications: (1) as an inherent objective and (2) as a stated objective.

In summary, the objective of reintegration is supported by the following four classifications of statements from the literature:

1. Reintegration is inherent in references to the mildly handicapped.
2. Reintegration is inherent in statements which indicate that a child may not need a special
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referring to Mildly Handicapped and/or Temporary Placement Indicated</th>
<th>Use of Descriptor: Should Be</th>
<th>Use of Descriptors: Objective, Aim, Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirk (1964)</td>
<td>Ohio Five Year Plan (1970)</td>
<td>Barch (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deno (1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacMillan (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace &amp; Kauffman (1973)</td>
<td>Ohio Comprehensive Plan (1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glavin (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Reintegration: A Stated or Inherent Objective for Learning or Behaviorally Disordered Children.
class placement indefinitely.

3. Reintegration is stated as a "should be" objective.

4. Reintegration is clearly stated as an objective, an aim, or a goal.

Reintegration of children from a special class for children with learning and behavioral disorders is congruous with program outcomes.

Inaccessibility of Information on Reintegration Procedures

Less than one-fifteenth of the 550 sources located through the ERIC and Mechanized Information Center searches contained usable information on reintegration procedures. Although a low return of pertinent sources is common for such computer searches, a total absence of crucial descriptors increased the expectation of a low helpful return. Presently, the system does not contain an appropriate integration or reintegration descriptor.

Generality of reintegration procedures. In reviewing the related literature containing references to reintegration procedures for returning children from the special class to the regular class, the researcher typically encounters general statements. Consequently, one notion expressed in the literature sometimes served as the basis for several more specific procedures explicated in the data gathering instrument (Appendix A).
Studies which directly investigated reintegration are described in the next sub-section, Discrepancy Between Reintegration as an Objective and As a Reality, and are presented in more detail in Section Two, Specific Research Involving Reintegration. Such studies are basically efficacy studies on reintegration and invariably exclude the description of reintegration procedures as such.

Deficit in summarized information. No one source attempting to summarize reintegration procedures was located; however, Schultz (1973) did investigate the role of the director of special education in the reintegration of emotionally disturbed children. Schultz's study, which is presented in Section Two, represents the most direct investigation of reintegration procedures; although, its focus is specific to the director of special education. Typically, general statements must be searched out from where they are embedded in a number of different sources. For example, the following five general procedural areas were advanced by the authors as noted.


2. The provision for gradual reintegration (Rubin, et al., 1966; MacMillan, 1972; Shotel, 1972; Gallagher, 1974; Glavin, 1974).

5. The provision for visitations and observations in the special class (Grosenick, 1972; Shotel, 1972).

The deficit in accessible information on reintegration procedures serves as a deterrent to the reintegration of children from classes for children with learning and behavioral disorders.

**Discrepancy Between Reintegration as an Objective and as a Reality**

Approximately 20 investigations relating to the reintegration of children into the regular classroom appear in the literature. Since these investigations are reviewed in detail in section two, summary statements are provided at this time. More than one-third of the studies did not investigate the process of reintegrating children but instead investigated the retention of eligible children in the regular classroom and consequently the prevention of special class placement.

Reintegration, the successfully planned return of children to the regular classroom, was identified as having occurred in 12 of the reports. Of these 12 reports, only five included the actual placement of children into the regular classroom. This total of five investigations, reported during eight years, represents less than one study per year in which children were actually reintegrated.
The comprehensive report by Morse, et al., (1964) provided information on the per cent of children reintegrated. The authors reported that 62 per cent of the 74 teachers responding, stated that no children were (re)integrated from their classes while 29 per cent reported that some children were (re)integrated. Apparently, less than one-third of the children were being reintegrated. Although this study of emotionally handicapped children is ten years old, the data may still be representative of today's ratio. Interestingly enough, when asked if their children would need special class placement for most of their school lives, the response was "no" for 42 per cent and "yes" for only 35 per cent.

McKinnon (1969) reported that a three year follow-up of emotionally disturbed children revealed that 46 per cent of the children are in regular classes. Unfortunately, the number of children returned to the regular class because there is no continued special class for his age is not known. Hewlett (1971), describing his Madison Plan, reported that 20 per cent of the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled children, when included in a forced reassignment to the regular class, were never referred back to the special class.

Summary of Supportive Issues

In view of the widespread support of reintegration developed in the preceding section, there is only meager information in the literature confirming that reintegration is
occurring. In addition, the previously established inaccessibility of information on reintegration procedures is viewed as a deterrent. Ohio's Five Year Plan (1970), Comprehensive Plan for the Education of the Handicapped (1973), and Local 405 Plans (1973) describing special education provisions neither request nor contain reintegration information. The literature suggests that such a lack of information represents the current national picture.

Morse, et al. (1964) suggested two main reasons for the lack of information about reintegration:

1. A large majority of the children remain in the special class and reintegration does not occur.
2. The special class teacher is solely responsible for reintegration.

Perhaps Siegel's (1969) explanation is appropriate; the notion of whether a handicapped child is found in a special class or in a regular class is largely dependent on fortune.

Grosenick (1972) cautions that, "The lack of information regarding integration may in reality be an accurate reflection of the actual use of such practices and procedures (p. 315)." There is an apparent discrepancy between support for reintegration and the implementation of reintegration for children with learning and behavioral disorders. More accessible information on reintegration procedures, such as that presented in the present investigation, will assist in closing the gap between theory and practice for the phenomenon of reintegration.
Specific Research Involving Reintegration

In addition to the conceptual framework presented in section one, it is necessary to focus in on the review of specific research involving reintegration. The following two broad classifications evolved. One classification includes research that was related to reintegration but which did not investigate reintegration per se. The second classification includes studies which directly investigated reintegration.

Research Related to Reintegration

Two types of studies are included in the research related to reintegration: (1) research on the retention of eligible children in regular classes with supportive services and (2) ex post facto studies of children who had been returned to the regular classroom (Figure 9). These two types of studies are basically efficacy studies: (1) the efficacy of retaining children in the regular classroom and preventing special class placement and (2) the efficacy of having children returned to the regular classroom. Since studies in these two efficacy classifications do not focus directly on reintegration per se, general summaries of their findings and conclusions are presented.

Retention studies. All eight of the retention studies (Figure 9) reported success in maintaining the exceptional child in the regular classroom utilizing supportive services. Six of the studies reported descriptive indicators of success.
### Retention Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Ex Post Facto Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowden and Otto (1964)</td>
<td>Hayball and Dilling (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark and Bentzen (1965)</td>
<td>McKinnon (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield, et al. (1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Plan: Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan A (1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine Perscriptive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewett and Forness (1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 9.** Classification of Research Related to Reintegration.
For example, Reger & Koppman (1971) used (1) the indicator of increased number of resource room units instead of self-contained classes and (2) the indicator of additional use of the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) model as measures of success. Hewett (1974) used the indicator that 20 per cent of the children included in their "forced integration" were not referred back to the special class. Two of the studies, Zedler (1970) and Bradfield, et al. (1973), utilized statistical treatment of data as the basis for determining that educationally handicapped children were effectively retained in the regular classroom.

**Ex post facto studies.** The four ex post facto studies represent the investigation of different variables. Since the investigation of different variables does not permit reasonable summary statements to be made about the studies as a group, each study is summarized individually.

Hayball and Dilling (1969) and Saunders (1971) pursued investigations in the social realm. Hayball and Dilling (1969) investigated the social adjustment of 57 children who had been returned to the regular classroom from four types of learning disabilities classes: (1) opportunity class (educable slow learners); (2) perceptual difficulties; (3) behavioral difficulties (including the multiply handicapped); and (4) special reading difficulties. Data from questionnaires distributed to the regular classroom teachers revealed that personal and social adjustment was perceived to be similar for all four
groups. Data gathered through interviews with the students revealed that all groups gave favorable responses to questions related to their feelings about regular classes, with the opportunity class students (educable slow learners) giving the most positive responses. Since this research was presently available only on microfisch, questions about the definition of terms and treatment of the data remain unanswered.

Saunders (1971) investigated behavioral contagion when children were placed in a regular fourth, fifth or sixth grade class from a class for emotionally disturbed children. The findings were analyzed for three different seating arrangements and revealed that after three months there was no behavioral contagion observed at any grade level.

Vacc (1974) conducted a follow-up of 16 matched pairs of emotionally disturbed children; half in special classes and half in regular classes. Data collected four years after the 16 children were returned to the regular class from the special class, and five years after they had entered the special class were analyzed for the 21 children for whom information was available. He found that there was no statistically significant difference in academic achievement, overt behavior, and social position of children who did not receive special class intervention and those who did receive special class intervention.
Vacc's (1968) earlier investigation of the same children did show a statistically significant difference (p > .10) for children with special class intervention in academic achievement and overt behavior at the end of the first year in the special class. The investigator concluded that early advantages for children in the special class did not result in long term changes. Visual inspection of the data (p. 12) does not clearly support this conclusion for within group comparisons. Children who had remained in the regular class had a 6.74 reading achievement score and a 3.69 gain in reading achievement in the follow-up study while the special class children had a 4.96 reading achievement score and a 2.26 gain when there was no statistically significant difference on the pre-test. That is, the regular class children had a gain of 1.54 years greater than the gain of the special class children at the time of follow-up four years later.

McKinnon (1969) investigated psychological variables of 65 emotionally disturbed children who had been returned to regular class for an average of three years. Analysis of the data revealed that:

The most academic achievement change occurs for pupils who have less learning disability and are younger at the beginning of placement; are more dependent by the end of placement; have higher intelligence; and come from higher socio-economic classes (p. 1872-A).

The most behavior adjustment change occurs for pupils who have the most learning disability and are younger at the beginning of placement; have the greatest lack of self-confidence at the end of placement; and come from higher socio-economic classes (p. 1972-A).
Research on Reintegration

Three types of studies were identified which investigated reintegration per se: (1) studies in which children were reintegrated into the regular classroom; (2) studies of attitudes toward the reintegration of exceptional children; (3) studies of role identification in the reintegration of exceptional children. Classification of the eight studies investigating reintegration is presented in Figure 10.

Children reintegrated. The investigation by Rubin, et al. (1966) is basically an efficacy study in which 28 emotionally handicapped elementary school children in kindergarten through second grade were retained in regular classes (control group), and 28 matched children were placed in special education classes (experimental group). The experimental children were reintegrated into the regular classroom when they were evaluated as being able to (1) cope with academic demands, (2) engage more adequately in peer interactions, and (3) respond to the teacher appropriately. Comparative post-test data were gathered six months after reintegration without any other intervening services. The findings were:

1. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups in classroom behavior and performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

2. There was a statistically significant difference ($p > .05$) in favor of the experimental group in
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mood, friendly approach, daydreaming, attitude toward school, and perception of stress at school.

3. There was a statistically significant difference (p > .01) in favor of the experimental group on impulse control, intensity of overt anger, popularity, and quarrelsomeness.

The authors conclude that:

The results, themselves, are not dramatic nor do they contribute to an overwhelming confirmation of the initial hypothesis—that special class programming is generally beneficial to emotionally handicapped children as a specific method of intervention and correction (p. 550).

The lack of conclusiveness is the basis for two implementation questions: (1) Would there be a statistically significant difference in favor of the regular class placement if supportive services and adjustments were provided concurrently with re-integration? (2) Would there be a statistically significant difference in favor of the regular class placement if the matched pairs of children exhibited only minimal handicapping conditions? These questions, though relevant to the present investigation, can only be posed at this time. The last two findings do support the concept of reintegration as a favorable placement consideration.

Martin, et al. (1968) investigated the effectiveness of the use of three plans for preparing nine teenage students to return to the regular class. These students had been placed on home instruction because of extremely deviant social behavior and were enrolled in special education classes in a
community mental health center; therefore, this investigation involved the returning of students to the regular classroom from a special day-school setting.

The three plans used in preparing these students to return to their schools were:

1. A fixed ratio token economy.

2. A variable ratio token economy. Teachers were observed to provide social reinforcement in Token Economy II.

3. A five phase system including Preliminary, Intermediate, Advanced, Honors, and Postgraduate phases. Each phase utilized contingency management techniques for specific behaviors in conjunction with a token economy delivery system. There is some indication that social modeling was also employed. At each of the five steps in the phase system, performance demands were increased and contingent concrete reinforcers were decreased in lieu of social reinforcers.

The design of this study does not permit clear comparisons of the techniques used. Description of only the phase system was provided so judgments about the two token economies are limited. The statistical treatment of the data is unclear, since no tabular presentation was made and notations lack sophistication by today's standards. In spite of the possible weaknesses of this investigation, the frequency tables presented do support the investigators' conclusion that the phase
system was the most effective in (1) increasing work behavior and (2) decreasing disruptive behavior.

Martin's, et al. (1968) investigation also described several reintegration procedures used after the student had successfully completed phase five. Some students were reintegrated into new schools, since there was great alienation at their home schools. Weeks of negotiation were spent with administrators, counselors, and teachers before reintegration occurred. Gradual reintegration was implemented in which the student often took only one course at first.

In summary, the investigators provided valuable information dealing with two issues that are essential to the present investigation:

1. They investigated the conscious preparation of children in a special setting to be returned to the regular class and
2. They consciously utilized special procedures when reintegrating the children.

Grosenick (1970) investigated the use of direct observation of classroom behaviors as a technique for assessing the effectiveness of reintegration for five boys in a special elementary class for emotionally disturbed, learning disabled children. These subjects were reintegrated because they were performing on or near grade level academically and had demonstrated appropriate improvement of social behaviors. A second group was comprised of all of the children enrolled in the five classes into which the five boys were reintegrated. A
third group of 20 children was comprised of four children from each of the five receiving classes; two whom the teacher chose because they exhibited good study habits and two who exhibited poor study habits.

The investigator analyzed data on the following academic and social behaviors:

1. Arithmetic performance: rate correct per minute.
3. Study behaviors during independent study time: attention to the task.
4. Four social behaviors: talking out, out of seat, hand raising, and teacher response (verbal or non-verbal) to the other three behaviors.

Grosenick (1972) reported on the results from her 1970 study as well as reporting on sequential reintegration procedures that were delineated from the study. Treatment of the data was not presented in the report; therefore, the findings include the investigator's use of the term significant which could not be established as being statistically significant. The findings were:

1. All special class boys maintained or improved their arithmetic performance and oral reading performance.
2. There was no significant difference on arithmetic performance between the special class boys and the teacher-selected children after reintegration (a period of three weeks to two months).
3. All special class boys spent a significantly greater amount of time in study behaviors while only three of the 20 teacher selected students improved significantly in study behavior.

4. There were no significant differences on any of the four social behaviors for special and regular class students.

Grosenick (1972) concluded that: (1) direct measurement of behavior is an effective means of assessing the effects of reintegration, (2) reintegration of special students did not produce significant changes in the performance measured for the regular class students, and (3) reintegration of special students was not associated with an undesirable change in their academic or social behaviors.

Grosenick's (1972) investigation represents the most comprehensive report of specific reintegration procedures reviewed. The sequence of the reintegration procedures is presented in Figure 11. The sequential reintegration procedures are classified into three areas: (1) pre-reintegration, (2) reintegration, and (3) post-reintegration. Since the children were reintegrated from a special school setting, some of the procedures may be less pertinent when reintegrating a child from a special class within the regular school setting. Details, beyond those which could reasonably be included in Figure 11 are provided in the report. Although Grosenick's (1972) procedures evolved from working with a
1.0 PRE-REINTEGRATION

1.1 Determine Readiness

Special Teacher:

1.11 Records target behaviors
1.12 Notifies appropriate personnel.
1.13 Provides list of preferred subjects and activities when gradual reintegration recommended.
1.14 Visits each receiving class proposed by Special Education Director.*
1.15 Discusses plans with principal.

Reintegration Team:

1.16 Evaluates alternatives and selects receiving class.

1.2 Prepare for Change

Special Teacher:

1.21 Utilizes experience charts about the receiving school (names and activities).
1.22 Meets with personnel of regular school.
1.23 Liaison person administers pre-reintegration measures to students in receiving class.
1.24 Investigator coordinates major activities identified in receiving class with adjustments needed in special class.
1.25 Receiving teacher meets with parents.

*Visitation to the special class by the receiving teacher was found to be beneficial.

Fig. 11. Sequential Reintegration Procedures.
2.0 REINTEGRATION

2.1 Reintegration Occurs Toward the End of Week
Not on a Monday or following a holiday.

2.2 Investigator Visits Receiving Teacher or
Communicates with Receiving Teacher on
Reintegration Day.

3.0 POST-REINTEGRATION

3.1 Ongoing Assessment of Behavior Maintenance.

3.2 Communicate Data to Receiving Teacher Regularly.

3.3 Decrease Frequency of Observations and Contacts.

3.4 Periodic Communication Kept Between Receiving
Teacher and Investigator.

3.5 Final Evaluation Held by Special School Staff.

3.6 Discuss Recommended Placement for Next Year.

Fig. 11. Sequential Reintegration Procedures.
limited number of children, they represent the most complete
description reviewed. Procedures from Grosenick's (1972) study
constituted a major contribution to the data gathering instru­
ment used in the present investigation.

Attitudes toward reintegration. Three major studies
were reviewed which investigated attitudes toward reintegra­
tion (Figure 10, p. 74). Haring's et al. (1958) classic
study was reviewed in the earlier sub-section, Positive Atti­
tudes of Regular Classroom Teachers Toward Learning Disordered
Children, pages 39 through 43. Consequently, only the follow­
ing summary statements are presented in this sub-section.

1. Five of six case studies representing behavior
disorders were recommended for placement in the
regular classroom with part-time consultant ser­
vice. The sixth case was also recommended for
placement in the regular classroom but with sup­
plementary instruction and consultant services
from a full-time specialist (Pilot study).

2. None of the behaviorally disordered children were
recommended for placement in a special class,
placement in a special school, or exclusion from
regular or special public education (Pilot study).

3. Behaviorally disordered and emotionally disturbed
children had higher pre- and post-test reintegra­
tion acceptance ratings than six of the eight
other areas of exceptionality. Only intellectual
and physical exceptionalities had higher acceptance.

4. Teachers' post-test reintegration acceptance scores were statistically greater (p > .05) than pre-test acceptance.

5. Teachers had a greater reintegration acceptance of behaviorally disordered children than was recommended by the experts.

Shotel, et al. (1972) compared the attitudes of regular class teachers in schools where there were integrative resource rooms (experimental group) with the attitudes of regular teachers in schools where there were self-contained special classes (control group). Analysis of the questionnaires revealed that:

1. Teachers were the most positive in their attitudes on reintegration, academic and social potential, and their own teaching competencies toward learning disabled children, next toward emotionally disturbed children, and were least positive toward educable retarded children.

2. There were no statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups of teachers on their responses as to attitudes on reintegration, academic potential, social potential, their own teaching competencies, and the need for special methods and materials.
The investigators suggest the provision of the following procedures for encouraging reintegration success and confidence among regular classroom teachers:

1. In-service workshops on special methods and techniques,

2. Opportunities to observe in resource rooms (special classes),

3. Increased interaction among regular and special educators.

Aspects of these three procedures were explicated in the data gathering instrument used in the present investigation.

The final study of attitudes, by Proctor (1967), was an investigation of the relationship between knowledge of exceptional children, kind and amount of experience, and attitudes toward classroom reintegration. The sample included 154 elementary teachers from ten schools; five with special classes and five without special classes. Four types of positions were represented: (1) 120 regular class teachers, (2) 18 special class teachers, (3) 10 ancillary personnel (consultant-supervisory), and (4) six student teachers. The findings were:

1. Special education teachers and ancillary personnel had significantly higher agreement with the opinion of authorities and had more extensive course work pertaining to exceptional children.

2. The most knowledgeable group was the ancillary personnel group, next were the special teachers,
and then the regular class teachers.

3. Amount of teaching experience rather than type of experience was related to agreement with expert opinion on educational placement of exceptional children.

4. Amount of special coursework, closer and more continuous type of experience, and the giving of consultant help on exceptionality were related to agreement with expert opinion.

The investigator concluded that orientation programs designed to increase knowledge, understanding, and more positive teaching approaches with exceptional children are effective approaches to increasing successful reintegration. The data gathering instrument used in the present study incorporated procedures suggested by Proctor (1967).

**Role identification in reintegration.** Two studies were reviewed which focused on role identification in reintegration. Brabner (1964) presented a point-of-view for the administrator; particularly related to but not limited to the mentally retarded. His conceptual framework included (1) a philosophy of (re)integration, (2) a policy of (re)integration, and (3) a process of (re)integration. Based on the aforementioned framework, Brabner (1964) recommended that the administrator:

1. Utilize social-psychological research; particularly studies of group interaction.
2. Appraise staff efforts realistically.

3. Avoid equating mere physical juxtaposition of children or staff with positive integrative experiences; although, the location of children and staff may be an influence.

4. Provide at least some opportunity for positive interactions.

5. Make deliberate efforts to understand and facilitate (re)integration.

6. Engage in formal and informal public relations functions which provide accurate information and counteract misunderstanding.

While Babner's (1964) report provided a conceptual framework for the administrator, his report did not provide the research basis for role identification in reintegration that Schultz's (1973) study provided.

Schultz (1973) investigated the role of the Director of Special Education as related to the (re)integration of emotionally disturbed children. The analysis of questionnaire responses from 20 directors of special education formed the basis for 13 suggestions for administrators concerned with (re)integration.

Excerpted recommendations for the director of special education are:

1. Relate goals, needs, and objectives of learning disabled children to the regular staff.
2. Plan and execute in-service for regular staff.
3. Seek out, develop, and maintain special competencies of the regular staff.
4. Present the special education staff as resource specialists.
5. Inform the (re)integration team of goals, needs, and characteristics. Include parents, receiving teacher, and principal on the reintegration team.
6. Acknowledge that the principal is directly responsible for communicating with regular class teachers; be a resource and support person for the principal.
7. Indicate that appropriate academic and social behavior on or near grade level are prerequisites for (re)integration.
8. Present (re)integration as gradual and contingent upon continued successful performance.
9. Assure the receiving teacher of adequate communication and supportive services after (re)integration.
10. Provide the receiving teacher with instructionally relevant information.
11. Identify the responsibility of the director of special education and regular educators to exceptional children.
12. Translate research in learning disabilities into practice with entire staffs.
13. Assess and strengthen communication relevant to learning disabled children.
The study by Schultz (1973) represented the most closely allied investigation that was reviewed; although, Schultz limited his scope to the role of the director of special education. He sought to determine consensus in a specific role identification in order to provide direction for reintegrating children from classes for the emotionally disturbed. The present investigation seeks to determine the consensus of three significant population groups in order to provide similar direction. Schultz (1973) identified the impetus for his investigation in the following manner:

For a great number of emotionally disturbed children, special education should be regarded as a temporary intervention which can prepare students for their return to regular classes (p. 39).

The present investigator concurs and suggests that the objective of reintegration will be better achieved through research that focuses directly upon the phenomenon of reintegration.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of the present investigation was to compare the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers of learning and behaviorally disordered children, and special university teacher educators on the effectiveness of specified procedures for the reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders from special self-contained classes into regular elementary classes.

The findings are presented in the following four sections: section one, the sampling results; section two, the findings from the preliminary investigation of the non-standardized data gathering instrument; section three, the interpretable factors from the factor analysis; section four, the results from the two analyses of variance. A one-way univariate ANOVA was employed in order to identify statistically significant differences \( (p < .05) \) among the three groups, across the reintegration procedures. In order to determine which group contributed most to the identified differences \( (p < .05) \), the data were subjected to a multi-comparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure.
Sampling Results

The data gathering instrument was mailed to three sample groups: Group 1, Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers; Group 2, Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children; and Group 3, Special University Teacher Educators. Data on the numbers and per cents of return for each sample group are presented in Table 1. The highest per cent of return (80%) was from Group Two, Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children. There was little difference between the returns for Group One (68%) and Group Three (70%). The total number of 120 returns resulted in a 73 per cent return for all three groups.

Preliminary Investigation

The data from the non-standardized data gathering instrument were subjected to four computer analysis programs in order to: (1) identify statistically significant (p < .05) items to be used in further analyses and (2) to establish support for instrument reliability and validity.

Maximum likelihood Chi Square item analysis. All responses to each response choice for every item was subjected to a maximum likelihood Chi Square item analysis which utilized a goodness of fit comparison (FORTAP: Test Analysis Package, 1973). Results from this analysis revealed that 41 of the original 107 items attained the specified level of statistical significance (p < .05). The corresponding numbers of the 41 items, the significant response choice for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Groups</th>
<th>Total Number in Mailing</th>
<th>Total Number of Returns</th>
<th>Per Cent of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average % 73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group 1: Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers  
Group 2: Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children  
Group 3: Special University Teacher Educators
each item, and the item Chi Square values are presented in Table 2.

The reintegration procedures stated in the 41 statistically significant items may be found in Appendix B. In order to increase clarity, interpretation of these 41 items is presented in section three which contains the results of the factor analysis. Twenty-eight of the statistically significant items had a preferred response choices of a one, which was described on the instrument as the most effective procedures; 11 of the items had preferred response choices of six, which was described as highly ineffective procedures; and two items had preferred response choices of two, which was described as very effective procedures. All subsequent analyses were performed using only the 41 statistically significant items (p < .05).

The remaining 66 items were classified into two groups. One group of items, though not statistically significant at the established level of significance (p < .05), indicated a clear directional trend toward agreed upon effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The second group of items were not statistically significant at the established level of significance (p < .05) and did not indicate a clear directional trend.

The 28 items indicating a directional trend toward effective procedures (Appendix C) had combined ratings of response choices of one (Most Effective), two (Very
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Significant Response Choice</th>
<th>Chi Square Values* Using 5 df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Number of respondents > 112 < 121.

\(^a\) = Most effective procedures.

\(^b\) = Very effective procedures.

\(^c\) = High ineffective procedures.

* \( p < .05 \) for all items.
Effective), and three (Effective) which were equal to or greater than 80 per cent of all responses made to the item. That is, 80 per cent or more of the respondents rated the procedure at the first, second, and third levels of effectiveness, while 20 per cent or less of the respondents rated the procedure as ineffective. Items indicating a directional trend toward ineffective procedures (Appendix C) were identified in a like manner using the combined ratings of response choices four, five, and six. The remaining 38 procedures included in the original instrument did not reach the established level of significance ($p < .05$) and did not indicate a directional trend. That is, responses to the remaining 38 procedures were more distributed throughout the six response choices and indicated a lack of decisive agreement or a less clear level of agreement.

**Hoyt reliability of original instrument.** In order to determine an estimate of the reliability of the entire original instrument, a Hoyt reliability analysis was performed for all 107 items. The Hoyt reliability analysis was a component of the maximum likelihood Chi Square item analysis (FORTAP; Test Analysis Package, 1973). Results of the Hoyt reliability analysis are presented in Table 3. The reliability coefficient of .977 provided support for the original instrument, for using only the 41 statistically significant items ($p < .05$) in further analyses, and for eliminating the remaining 66 items.
TABLE 3

HOYT RELIABILITY ANOVA
FOR ORIGINAL INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents (N)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>98.609</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>43.879</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>0.9772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12614.</td>
<td>238.210</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12839.</td>
<td>340.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi Square analysis of revised instrument. A Chi Square analysis of the revised instrument was performed using the 41 statistically significant items (p < .05) in order to obtain a measure of construct validity for the revised instrument (Fortran: Scientific Subroutine Package, 1968). The obtained Chi Square value of 4243.28 using 200 df was significant at the .001 level of significance (p < .001). Such results indicate that something other than chance is operating 99.9 per cent of the time. That is, the responses to the items may be attributed to a more valid influence than chance and that the probability of attaining such results due to a chance factor is only one in a thousand.

Kuder-Richardson reliability of revised instrument. The 41 statistically significant items (p < .05) were subjected to a Kuder-Richardson reliability computer analysis program in order to obtain an estimate of the reliability of the revised instrument (Kuder-Richardson Component, STATPACK, 1969). The resulting reliability of .882 provided support for further analysis of the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) procedures.

Factor Analysis

The results from the factor analysis are presented in section three (BMD Principal Components Analysis Program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 1970). Initially, individual responses to the 41 statistically significant items (p < .05) were factor analyzed (see Table 4). Utiliz-
### TABLE 4

**UNROTATED EIGENVALUES OF FORTY-ONE ITEMS AND THE FIRST TEN FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Per Cent of Variance</th>
<th>Cum Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.110</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.841</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ing the resulting unrotated eigenvalue cut-off criterion of 1.0, ten factors were identified which accounted for 82.2 per cent of the total variance (Finkbeiner, Liathrop, Schuerger, 1973). The 10 identified factors included all 41 statistically significant items (p < .05), with factor loadings of .300 or higher (Kennedy, 1965; Cattell, 1966; Kerlinger, 1973).

The data were then submitted to an orthogonal rotation (Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 1970). The resulting eigenvalues are presented in Table 5. Inspection of the rotated factor matrix revealed that all ten factors contained items with factor loadings at the established criterion of .300 or greater. Since all ten factors were clearly interpretable, further rotation was eliminated (Cronbach, 1960; Kennedy, 1965; Cattell, 1966; Kerlinger, 1973). The ten factors and the 41 items with their respective factor loadings are presented in Table 6.

Twelve of the 41 items loaded higher than the established criterion of .300 in more than one factor. Since all 41 items had formerly been subjected to a Chi Square item analysis which established their statistical significance (p < .05), and since the objective was to clearly interpret the ten factors identified, the 12 items that loaded in more than one factor were utilized in interpreting the ten factors.

The ten salient factors were labeled as follows:

Factor 1: Non-Academic Participation
## TABLE 5

### ROTATED EIGENVALUES OF FORTY-ONE ITEMS AND TEN FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Per Cent of Variance</th>
<th>Cum Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.698</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.469</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

**Summary of the Factor Analysis of Forty-one Statistically Significant Items and Their Respective Factor Loadings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factors 1</th>
<th>Factors 2</th>
<th>Factors 3</th>
<th>Factors 4</th>
<th>Factors 5</th>
<th>Factors 6</th>
<th>Factors 7</th>
<th>Factors 8</th>
<th>Factors 9</th>
<th>Factors 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Factor loading criterion of .300 used. Highest factor loadings per item are underlined. All decimal points omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factor loading criterion of .300 used.
Highest factor loadings per item are underlined
All decimal points omitted
Factor 2: Polity
Factor 3: Mutuality
Factor 4: Establishing Performance Criteria
Factor 5: Administrative Resoluteness
Factor 6: Utilization of Determinants
Factor 7: Consultant Service
Factor 8: Assessing & Reporting Performance
Factor 9: Co-Curricular Participation
Factor 10: External Support Variables.

Subsequent findings are presented in accordance with the ten aforementioned factors.

**Factor 1: Non-Academic participation.** Items 29, 30, and 31 had their highest factor loadings in Factor 1 which accounted for 36 per cent of the total variance. The three reintegration procedures described in these items focused on the participation of L/BD children in the non-academic activities or recess, lunch, and appropriate assemblies with children in regular classes. The preferred response choice for all three items was a one: Most Effective. In addition, item 33 also had a loading above the established criterion of .300 in Factor 1, although its highest loading was in Factor 9. The reintegration procedure described in item 33 focused on the same participation for L/BD children in the area of music, which also had a preferred response choice of one: Most Effective.
Factor 2: Polity. Items 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21 had their highest loadings in Factor 2, which accounted for 13.8 per cent of the total variance. The reintegration procedures described in these items focused on a policy making group for reintegration. The establishment of such a policy making group had a preferred response choice of two: Very Effective. The agreed upon membership of the reintegration team, which had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective, was: a special class teacher of L/BD children, a regular classroom teacher, a special consultant/supervisor in L/BD, and a school psychologist. The seven other roles described in items 20 and 22 through 27 did not reach the established level of significance (p < .05) and were, therefore, not included in the factor analysis. Six of the roles did attain a directional trend and are included in Appendix B.

Factor 3: Mutuality. Items included in Factor 3 described mutually desirable relationships between the regular and special teacher and contributed to 10.2 per cent of the total variance. Such reciprocity was expressed in items 1, 67, 68, 69, and 71. These items had their highest factor loadings in Factor 3 and had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective. The reintegration procedures described the sharing of the day in order to affect gradual reintegration, the visitation by the special class teacher to the class of the potential receiving teacher, the
attending of staff meetings and the sharing of duties by the special class teacher, the provision of current information on academic development by the special class teacher to the regular class teacher, and the provision of compatible practice in activities commonly used in the regular classroom.

In addition, four other items attained a loading higher than the established criterion of .300 (items 38, 70, 88, 89), although their highest loadings appeared in other factors. Procedures described in these items all had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective and included the following relationships: The utilization of specific assessment data on academic and social behaviors, the provision of current information on social development by the special class teacher (academic development was included earlier), the provision of in-service education in preparation for becoming a receiving teacher, and the eligibility of the regular class teacher to receive help from the special education consultant/supervisor.

Factor 4: Establishing performance criteria. Items 62 and 63 had their highest factor loadings in Factor 4 which accounted for 9.6 per cent of the total variance. The two reintegration procedures described in these items had preferred response choices of six: Highly Ineffective. The procedures stated that the child has reading and math performance (to be determined locally) that is more than two grade levels below the classroom into which the child is to
be reintegrated. Since items describing other levels of achievement (items 56 through 61) did not attain the established level of significance (p < .05), the suggested cut-off point is when reading and math performance are more than two years below that of the receiving class. In addition, item 66 had the highest positive factor loading in Factor 4, although this item had a higher negative loading in Factor 10. Item 66 established a minimum social performance criterion of being highly ineffective when the child's social behavior deviates more than any other child in the receiving class.

Factor 5: Administrative resoluteness. The six items that had their highest factor loadings in Factor 5, accounting for 8.1 per cent of the total variance, all focused on administrative reintegration by default. All items described procedures which had preferred response choices of six: Highly Ineffective.

The six items described extraneous administrative bases for reintegration, such as: the most financially advantageous placement; reintegration because there is no opening in an appropriate class, or because the appropriate class is housed outside the child's regular attendance school; reintegration into a regular class at the appropriate grade level that has the lowest enrollment regardless of the teacher's acceptance or willingness to be a receiving teacher; reintegration in order to remove a child who has such
severely deviant social behavior from children in the special class because they are more easily upset than children in the regular class; allowing a child to remain in the special class for an indefinite number of years without a case study for possible reintegration. In addition, item 66 had a loading in Factor 5 that was above the established .300 criterion and also had a preferred response choice of six: Highly Ineffective. This item, whose highest loading was a negative loading in Factor 10, was described in Factor 4 and focuses on social behavior that deviates more than any other child in the receiving class.

Factor 6: Utilization of determinants. Items 35, 36, and 37 had their highest loadings in Factor 6, which accounted for 6.2 per cent of the total variance. The three items with their highest loadings in Factor 6 as well as the one item with a loading above the established criterion of .300, had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective. These items described procedures for utilizing data as determinants for reintegration. The procedures included the utilization of specific academic and social performance data in reintegration decision making as well as the utilization of such data when complying with due process procedures.

Factor 7: Consultant service. Four items (38, 89, 91, 92) had their highest loadings in Factor 7, while one other item (21) had a loading above the established
criterion of .300. Factor 7 accounted for 5.3 per cent of the total variance, and all items included in Factor 7 had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective. The items described consultive procedures for the regular class teacher as follows: consultant service in utilizing specific academic and social performance data; consultant service from the special education consultant/supervisor, the school psychologist, and the special education teacher. Inclusion of the school psychologist again in item 21 (highest loading in Factor 2, Polity) indicates the use of consultative services from the school psychologist prior to reintegration.

Factor 8: Assessing and reporting performance. Six items with their highest loadings and three items with loadings above the .300 criterion were included in Factor 8 which accounted for 4.3 per cent of the total variance. Eight of the nine items had preferred response choices of one: Most Effective and one had a response choice of two: Very Effective. The items described administrative procedures as well as procedures to be used by both regular and special class teachers when assessing and reporting performance.

Assessment procedures included: gradual reintegration on a part-time basis in a subject(s) in which the child's performance is acceptable in comparison to other children with whom he participates; the provision of current assess-
ment data on the child's academic and social performance by the special class teacher; the provision of academic assessment based on criterion referenced tests and social assessment based on observational data. Procedures focusing on reporting included: the provision of academic assessment data by the special class teacher and the conducting of a parent conference by the regular class teacher shortly (to be determined locally) after reintegration. Two items described procedures which incorporated both assessing and reporting performance: the establishment of a reintegration team to identify reintegration procedures and visitation to the special class by the regular class teacher prior to reintegration of a child.

Factor 9: Co-Curricular participation. Three items with their highest loadings and one item with a loading which met the .300 criteria were included in Factor 9, which accounted for 3.4 per cent of the total variance. Three of the procedures described co-curricular participation with children in the regular classroom for art, music, and physical education activities. An interesting observation is that these three co-curricular activities had their highest factor loadings in Factor 9, while participation in the activities of recess, lunch, and assemblies had their highest loadings in Factor 1, Non-Academic Activities. Music activities, item 33, were observed to load in both Factor 1 (.432
loading) and Factor 9 (.738 loading). This suggests that participation in music with children in the regular classroom involves some non-academic aspects (Factor 1), as well as some co-curricular aspects (Factor 9).

Interestingly enough, the one remaining procedure in Factor 9 described what is referred to as a co-curricular activity for the teacher; that is, visitation by the regular class teacher to the special class prior to reintegration (highest loading in Factor 8, Assessing and Reporting Performance).

**Factor 10: External support variables.** Two classes of items were included in Factor 10: (1) two items with positive loadings and preferred response choices of one (Most Effective) and (2) three items with negative loadings and preferred response choices of six (Highly Ineffective). This factor accounted for the remaining 3.1 per cent of the total variance. Item 88 had its highest positive loading in Factor 10. This item described, as an external support variable, the provision of in-service education to regular classroom teachers in preparation for becoming receiving teachers for children who are reintegrated. The other positive loading described the participation of the reintegrated child in art as a source of external support for the special and the receiving teacher. The three items with negative loadings described procedures which do not provide sources of support for regular and special class teachers.
The sources of nonsupport referred to the child being reintegrated, the parents of the child, and the role of the special class teacher. The results suggest that it is highly ineffective and nonsupportive when: (1) the child's social behavior deviates more than any other child in the class into which he is to be reintegrated, (2) when the parents are consistently antagonistic and pessimistic about the school in general, and (3) when the special class teacher is solely responsible for initiating and completing reintegration.

One-Way Analyses of Variance

The first step in analyzing the data involved the construction of a matrix, through the use of a computer analysis program, which revealed the means and standard deviations of each group for each item or reintegration procedure (Clyde Computing Services, 1969). The means and standard deviations are presented in Appendix D.

In order to determine if there were statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the three groups, across the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) reintegration procedures, the raw data were subjected to a one-way univariate ANOVA computer program (Clyde Computing Services, 1969). Subsequently, a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffé procedure was performed in order to determine which group contributed to the identified differences.

Univariate analysis. The results of the 41 univariate F tests are presented in Table 7. The sources of variance,
### TABLE 7

**SUMMARY TABLE OF ONE-WAY UNIVARIATE ANOVA AMONG THREE GROUPS ACROSS FORTY-ONE ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.438*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.138*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.640*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.685*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.773*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.248*</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.561*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.710*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.973*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.344*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.798*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.977*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.244*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.913*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.066*</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.112*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. df = 2, 112-117
* p < .05
sum of squares, and mean squares for the univariate ANOVA are presented in Appendix E. Twenty-one of the reintegration procedures had statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the three groups. That is, regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers of L/BD children, and special university teacher educators rated the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of 21 reintegration procedures differently (Items 1, 2, 8, 12, 16, 17, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 45, 67, 69, 70, 73, 74, 88, 89 and 92 in Appendix B).

Multicomparison ANOVA, Scheffe procedure. Results from the one-way univariate ANOVA identified overall differences among the three groups on the 21 reintegration procedures (p < .05). Since one of the outcomes of the present investigation was to determine where differences existed among the three groups, and since the univariate ANOVA has the capacity to detect overall differences only, the data were subjected to a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe procedure. The multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe procedure was employed in order to detect if the significant differences (p < .05) existed between the regular elementary classroom teachers (Group One) and special class teachers of L/BD children (Group Two); between regular elementary classroom teachers (Group One) and special university teacher educators (Group Three); or between special class teachers of L/BD children (Group Two) and special university teacher
educators (Group Three). The results of the multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe procedure are presented according to seven classifications.

Classification one included five items describing reintegration procedures that were rated significantly (p < .05) higher in effectiveness by Group 3, (Special University Teacher Educators) than by the other two groups (Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers and Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children). The following items were included: Item 1, 69, 70, 74, 88.

The following reintegration procedures were described in the five aforementioned items:

Gradual reintegration of the L/BD child by utilizing the regular classroom for part of the day.

Provision of current information on the child's academic and social development by the special class teacher.

Visitation to the special class by the regular class teacher prior to reintegration.

Provision of in-service education to the regular class teacher in preparation for receiving reintegrated children.

All procedures had factor loadings in Factor 3 (Mutuality) and/or Factor 8 (Assessing and Reporting Performance). In addition, the in-service education procedure also loaded in Factor 10 (External Support Variables). Although the
preferred response choice for the items across all three groups was a one, Most Effective; the Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) rated the five reintegration procedures as significantly (p < .05) more effective than the other two groups (Regular Classroom Teachers and Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children).

Classification two included five items describing reintegration procedures that were rated significantly (p < .05) lower in effectiveness by Group 1 (Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers) than by Group 2 (Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children) and Group 3 (Special University Teacher Educators). The following items were included: Items 2, 31, 36, 37, 92.

The following reintegration procedures were described in the five aforementioned items:

Reintegration in a subject(s) in which the child's performance is comparable to other children with whom he participates (Factor 8, Assessing and Reporting Performance).

Participation in appropriate assemblies with children from regular classes (Factor 1, Non-Academic Participation).

Utilization of specific academic and social performance data when making the reintegration decision (Factor 6, Utilization of Determinants).
 Provision of additional consultant help to the receiving teacher from the special class teacher of L/BD children (Factor 7, Consultant Service).

Although the preferred response choice for items 31, 36, 37, and 92 across all three groups was a one, Most Effective and the preferred response choice for item 2 across the three groups was two, Very Effective; Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) rated the five aforementioned reintegration procedures as significantly (p < .05) less effective than did the other two groups.

Classification three included five items describing reintegration procedures that had dual significant (p < .05) differences as follows:

1. Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) rated the procedures as significantly (p < .05) more effective than did the other two groups (Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers, Group 1 and Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children, Group 2) and

2. Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2) rated the procedures as significantly (p < .05) more effective than did the Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1).

The following items all had preferred response choices of one, Most Effective: Items 35, 38, 41, 67, 89. The following reintegration procedures were described in the five aforementioned items:
Complying with due process (Factor 6, Utilization of Determinants).

Utilization of specific academic and social performance data when making the reintegration decision (highest loading Factor 7, Consultant Service).

Utilization of criterion referenced testing when determining academic performance (Factor 8, Assessing and Reporting Performance).

Visitation by the special class teacher to the classroom of the potential receiving teacher (Factor 3, Mutuality).

Provision of additional consultant help to the receiving teacher from the special education consultant/supervisor (highest loading in Factor 7, Consultant Service).

Although the preferred response choice for the items across all three groups was a one, Most Effective; the three groups had statistically significant differences (p < .05) in their ratings of the procedures. The following order reflects the ratings of the five aforementioned procedures:

Special University Teacher Educators: Most Effective.
Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children: Second Most Effective.
Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers: Least Effective.

The reader should note that the preferred response choice for all three groups was a one, Most Effective.
Classification four included two items describing reintegration procedures that had a preferred response choice of six, Highly Ineffective (Items 12 and 73). These two items had dual significant (p < .05) differences as follows:

1. Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) rated them as significantly (p < .05) more ineffective than did the other two groups (Regular Elementary Class Teachers and Special Class Teachers) and

2. Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) rated them as significantly (p < .05) more ineffective than did the Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2).

The following highly ineffective reintegration procedures were described in items 12 and 73:

- Permitting the child to remain in the special class for an indefinite number of years without a case study for possible reintegration (Factor 5, Administrative Resoluteness).
- Having the special class teacher be solely responsible for initiating and completing reintegration (Factor 10, External Support Variables).

Although the preferred response choice across all three groups was a 6, Highly Ineffective; the three groups had statistically significant differences (p < .05) in their ratings of the procedure. The following order reflects
their ratings of the two aforementioned procedures:

- Special University Teacher Educators: Most Ineffective.
- Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers: Next Most Ineffective.
- Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children: Least Ineffective.

Classification five included only Item 8, which had a preferred response choice of six, High Ineffective. Item 8 had dual significant differences ($p < .05$) as follows:

1. Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) rated the procedure as significantly ($p < .05$) more ineffective than did the other two groups (Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children and Special University Teacher Educators).

2. Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2) rated the procedure as significantly ($p < .05$) more ineffective than did the Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3).

The highly ineffective reintegration procedure was to ultimately base the reintegration decision on what is the most financially advantageous for the school district (Factor 5, Administrative Resoluteness). Although the preferred response choice across all three groups was a 6, Highly Ineffective; the three groups had statistically significant
differences (p < .05) in their ratings of the procedure. The following order reflects the ratings of item 8:

Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers: Most Ineffective.

Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children: Second Most Ineffective.

Special University Teacher Educators: Least Ineffective.

Classification six included only Item 17, which had a preferred response choice of one, Most Effective. Item 17 had dual significant differences (p < .05) as follows:

1. Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2) rated the procedure as significantly (p < .05) more effective than did the other two groups (Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers and Special University Teacher Educators).

2. Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) rated the procedure as significantly (p < .05) more effective than did the Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3).

The reintegration procedure described in Item 17 was to include a representative of special class teachers of L/BD children on the reintegration team. Although the preferred response choice across all three groups was a one, Most Effective; the three groups had statistically significant differences (p < .05) in their ratings of the procedure.
The following order reflects the ratings of item 17:

Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children: Most Effective.

Regular Elementary Class Teachers: Second Most Effective.

Special University Teacher Educators: Least Effective.

The reader should note that the preferred response choice for item 17 across all three groups was one, Most Effective.

Classification seven included two items (16 and 45) which were identified on the univariate ANOVA as significant \( p < .05 \) but were not significant \( p < .05 \) when multiple comparisons were made utilizing the Scheffé procedure. The resulting significant differences \( p < .05 \) for items 16 and 45 might possibly have been due to the chance factor or to interaction effect which is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

In summary, the data from the over-all sampling return of 73 per cent were first subjected to preliminary analyses in order to provide validity and reliability support for the non-standardized data gathering instrument. Significant \( p < .05 \) items were then factor analyzed in order to identify interpretable factors as a means of increasing clarity and decreasing variable complexity. The data were then submitted to two analyses of variance. Significant differences \( p < .05 \) among the three groups were identified through
the use of a one-way univariate ANOVA. Since one of the outcomes of the present investigation was to identify which groups contributed most to identified significant differences \((p < .05)\), a multi comparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffé procedure was performed.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Twelve imposing issues which contribute to the importance of focusing on the reintegration of children with learning and behavioral disorders were identified in Chapter I and developed in Chapter II. These twelve imposing issues provided the conceptual framework supportive of the present investigation. Although 20 investigations relating to the reintegration of children into the regular classroom were reviewed, a total of only five investigations included the actual placement of children into the regular classroom. Eight studies, investigating reintegration per se, were reviewed. This ratio represents less than one investigation per year and depicts the discrepancy between the concept of reintegration and the attention given to affecting reintegration.

Summary

The summary of the present investigation includes an overview of the purpose and statement of the problem; limitations and delimitations; procedures and methodology; findings from the preliminary investigations, factor analysis,
analyses of variance; and sources of error.

**Purpose and Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of the present investigation was to compare the responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers of learning and behaviorally disordered children, and special university teacher educators on the effectiveness of specified procedures for reintegrating children with learning and behavioral disorders from special self-contained classes into regular elementary classes.

The following three research questions were posed:

1. To what extent do the responses of regular classroom teachers, special class teachers of learning and behaviorally disordered children, and special university teacher educators agree as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

2. To what extent are there discrepancies among responses of these three significant population samples as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

3. Are there statistically significant differences among the three sample groups as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

The following null hypothesis was formulated from the stated purpose and problem. There are no statistically significant differences among the mean score responses of regular elementary classroom teachers, special class teachers
of learning and behaviorally disordered children, and special university teacher educators. \( H_0: \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_3 = 0. \)

Limitations and Delimitations

Due to the complexity of the problem and the extent to which the problem must be investigated, the present investigation was limited to: (1) an investigation of reintegration in elementary schools, (2) the utilization of three of the twelve potential population groups, and (3) the state of Ohio. Further delimitations were made in (1) the operational definitions of the three population samples (mixed design) and in (2) the pragmatic and statistical support of the validity and reliability of the non-standardized data gathering instrument.

Procedures and Methodology

The selection of samples, construction and use of the data gathering instrument, and the statistical procedures utilized in the present investigation are summarized in this section.

Selection of samples. Selection of the three population samples is described in the operational definitions of terms and is briefly summarized as follows. The special class teachers of L/BD children were randomly selected from the 1973-74 Special Education Directory of 947 special elementary teachers in approved Ohio units for L/BD children. The regular classroom elementary teachers were randomly
selected from the same elementary school from which a special class teacher had been selected (stratified - random), utilizing the SF I Form of the 1973-74 Principal's Report on file in the Ohio Department of Education. The special university teacher educator sample frame included the Chairman of the Faculty for Exceptional Children and faculty members with teaching responsibility in the area of learning and behavioral disorders from each of the thirteen institutions of higher learning offering L/BD programs with approval from the Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Certification. The total per cent of returns from all three groups was 73 per cent (Table I).

**Data gathering instrument.** Professional opinion was explicated from a review of the literature and served as the basis for the reintegration procedures included in the data gathering instrument. The non-standardized data gathering instrument was mailed to subjects in the three population samples. Subjects were asked to rate each reintegration procedure, on a six-point scale, according to its judged effectiveness. The data gathering instrument is presented in Appendix A.

**Statistical procedures.** Due to the non-standardized nature of the data gathering instrument, the data were submitted to preliminary analyses as follows: (1) a Chi Square item analysis of all items, (2) a Hoyt reliability of the entire instrument, (3) a Chi Square instrument analysis of the statistically significant \( p < .05 \) items, and (4) a
Kuder-Richardson instrument reliability utilizing the statistically significant (p < .05) items. Following the preliminary analysis, the statistically significant (p < .05) items were factor analyzed in order to increase clarity. Subsequently, two analyses of variance were utilized: a one-way univariate ANOVA, in order to detect statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the items for all three groups; and a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe procedure, in order to determine which group contributed most to the identified differences.

**Summary of Preliminary Investigation**

The preliminary investigation utilized analyses of the original instrument including all 107 procedures and analyses of the revised instrument. Subsequent factor analysis and the two one-way ANOVAs utilized significant (p < .05) procedures from the revised instrument only.

**Original instrument.** The results from the maximum likelihood Chi Square item analysis revealed that 41 of the original 107 reintegration procedures attained the specified level of statistical significance (p < .05). Twenty-eight of these procedures had a significant response choice of One, which was described on the instrument as Most Effective. Eleven of the procedures had a significant response choice of six, Highly Ineffective and two had a significant response choice of two, Very Effective (Table 2). In addition, 28 items,
although not statistically significant (p < .05), were identified as indicating a directional trend toward agreed upon effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

The Hoyt reliability of the entire original instrument was .977 (Table 3) and provided support for using the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) items in subsequent analyses, while eliminating the remaining 66 items.

Revised instrument. The Chi Square revised instrument analysis, utilizing only the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) items, was significant at the .001 level of confidence. This statistical finding is an indicator of construct validity suggesting that the responses made to the items may be attributed to a more valid influence than chance. That is, the probability of attaining such results due to a chance factor is only one in a thousand. The Kuder-Richardson reliability of the revised instrument was .882 and provided support for further analysis of the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) procedures.

Summary of Factor Analysis

The 41 statistically significant (p < .05) reintegration procedures were included in ten unrotated factors and contained factor loadings equal to or higher than the established criterion of .300 (Table 4). Inspection of the factor matrix resulting from an orthogonal rotation revealed that all ten factors contained procedures with factor loadings at the established criterion of .300 or higher (Table 6).
Since all ten factors were clearly interpretable, further rotation was eliminated.

**Ten factors identified.** The ten salient factors were labeled as follows:

- Factor 1: Non-Academic Participation
- Factor 2: Polity
- Factor 3: Mutuality
- Factor 4: Establishing Performance Criteria
- Factor 5: Administrative Resoluteness
- Factor 6: Utilization of Determinants
- Factor 7: Consultant Service
- Factor 8: Assessing and Reporting Performance
- Factor 9: Co-Curricular Participation
- Factor 10: External Support Variables

**Relationships among factors.** Twelve of the procedures had loadings of .300 or higher in more than one factor. Since the outcome of the factor analysis was not to determine a strict category or factor for a specific procedure but was to identify clearly factors operating among the procedures; the 12 overlapping procedures were helpful in fully interpreting a factor as well as in identifying relationships among the factors.

The most obvious reciprocal relationship existed between the factors of Mutuality (Factor 3) and Assessing and Reporting Performance (Factor 8). This relationship was indicated by dual loadings for three procedures. The most
frequent relationship among factors involved Factor 3, Mutual-
ity. Seven instances of dual loadings were revealed. Rela-
tionships were previously identified between Mutuality (Fac-
tor 3) and Assessing and Reporting Performance (Factor 9). A
relationship also existed between Mutuality (Factor 3) and:
Utilization of Determinants (Factor 6), Consultant Service
(Factor 7), External Support Variables (Factor 10). That is,
Mutuality was revealed to be important for Assessing and
Reporting Performance, Utilization of Determinants, Consultant
Service, and External Support.

The second most frequent relationship among factors
involved Factor 8, Assessing and Reporting Performance. Four
instances of dual loadings were revealed. In addition to
the aforementioned reciprocity with Mutuality (Factor 3),
there was also a relationship indicated between Assessing and
Reporting Performance (Factor 8) and Polity (Factor 2), as
well as with Co-Curricular Participation (Factor 9).

Summary of Analyses of Variance

In order to determine if there were statistically sig-
nificant differences (p < .05) among the three groups, across
the 41 statistically significant (p < .05) reintegration pro-
cedures, the raw data were subjected to a one-way univariate
ANOVA. Subsequently, a multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the
Scheffe' procedure was performed in order to determine which
group contributed most to the identified differences.
Univariate analysis. The results of the 41 univariate F tests revealed that 21 of the reintegration procedures had statistically significant difference (p < .05) among the three groups (Table 7).

Multicomparison ANOVA, Scheffé procedures. Significant differences (p < .05) were revealed among the groups for 19 of the 21 statistically significant (p < .05) procedures identified in the univariate analysis.

Two procedures were identified as significant (p < .05) on the univariate ANOVA but were not significant (p < .05) when multiple comparisons were made utilizing the Scheffé procedure. The resulting significant differences (p < .05) for these two procedures may be attributed to the chance factor or to interaction effect, which is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

The Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) contributed significantly (p < .05) to the differences identified for 14 of the procedures; Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) contributed significantly (p < .05) to the differences identified for 11 of the procedures; Special Class Teachers of L/BD children (Group 2) contributed significantly (p < .05) to the differences identified for only three procedures.

Sources of Error

The following three potential sources of error are treated in this sub-section: sampling, the non-standardized
Data gathering instrument, and the statistical analyses used.

Sampling error. Sampling error was minimized through the formation of sample frames that were as complete and as accurate as the available data would reasonably permit. Data for the two teacher sample frames were submitted in October. Although selection was not made until March, no questionnaires were returned because of inaccurate sample frames. The sample frame for special university teacher educators was formed during the same month that the questionnaires were mailed. Randomization in the mixed design was adhered to with the two teacher groups and was adjusted for the special university teacher educators only because of their small potential number (N = 44). Fixed selection was utilized with this group in order to assure the minimum number (30) required for the statistical analysis of the data. The overall return of 73 per cent assisted in minimizing sampling error.

Data gathering instrument. The utilization of a non-standardized data gathering instrument must be regarded as a potential source of error. Since operationally the use of such an instrument was required, attempts were made through the utilization of preliminary analyses to establish support for the reliability and validity of the instrument. The original instrument was subjected to a Hoyt reliability and a Chi Square item analysis which supported subsequent analyses utilizing the revised instrument. The Chi Square analysis of
the revised instrument was significant at the .001 level and served as an indicator of desirable construct validity. The Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient of .882 exceeded the .80 indicator of acceptable reliability.

Although the data gathering instrument still must be regarded as nonstandardized the preliminary analyses indicate that error was minimized.

**Statistical analyses.** Review of the statistical analyses available supports that the analyses used were appropriate for the data available and for the investigation of the problem identified.

**Conclusions**

Thirteen conclusions were drawn from the findings of the preliminary investigation, the factor analysis, and the two analyses of variance. Presentation of the conclusions is organized in relationship to the three research questions posed and in response to the null hypothesis stated.

**Question One**

To what extent do the responses of regular classroom teachers, special class teachers of learning and behaviorally disordered children, and special university teacher educators agree as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?
The findings from the Chi Square item analysis support the agreement of the three groups across 41 statistically significant (p < .05) reintegration procedures. The factor analysis revealed ten interpretable factors which included the 41 agreed upon procedures.

Conclusions. The following three conclusions were drawn in answer to question one.

1. There was statistically significant (p < .05) agreement established among the three sample groups for 38 per cent (41) of the original 107 reintegration procedures.

2. The established agreement was related to reintegration procedures which were rated as both effective and ineffective, but the greatest agreement was found to exist among procedures which were rated as one, Most Effective (68%). Procedures which were rated as six, Highly Ineffective, had the second greatest agreement (27%); and procedures rated as a two, Very Effective, had the least agreement (5%).

3. The salient features of the 41 identified procedures were related to: (a) Non-Academic Participation, (b) Polity, (c) Mutuality, (d) Establishing Performance Criteria, (e) Administrative Resoluteness, (f) Utilization of Determinants, (g) Consultant Service, (h) Assessing and Reporting Performance, (i) Co-Curricular Participation, and (j) External Support Variables.
Question Two

To what extent are there discrepancies among the responses of the three significant population samples as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

Discrepancies among and within the three sample groups were revealed in the elimination of 66 reintegration procedures as a result of the Chi Square item analysis.

Subsequent differences among the three groups were identified in the one-way multicomparsion ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure. Statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the groups were revealed for 19 of the 21 procedures which had statistically significant differences (p < .05) identified in the univariate ANOVA.

Conclusion. Conclusions four through eleven were drawn in response to question two.

4. Significant differences (p < .05) were identified among the three groups for 46 per cent (19 our of 41) of the statistically significant (p < .05) procedures retained in the revised instrument.

5. Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) contributed significantly (p < .05) to most of the identified differences; Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) accounted for the second highest number of differences; and Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2) accounted for the least number of the differences.
6. The Special University Teacher Educators (Group 3) contributed significantly (p < .05) to 50 per cent (14 out of 28) of the identified differences, which involved 14 of the 19 reintegration procedures with identified differences on the multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure.

7. Seventy-one per cent (10 out of 14) of the identified differences for Special University Teacher Educators were attributed to their rating the reintegration procedure as more effective than did the other two groups.

8. The Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) contributed significantly (p < .05) to 39 per cent (11 out of 28) of the identified differences, which involved 14 of the 19 reintegration procedures with identified differences on the multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure.

9. Ninety-nine per cent (10 out of 11) of the identified differences for Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers (Group 1) were attributed to their rating of the reintegration procedure as lower in effectiveness than did the other two groups.

10. The Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children (Group 2) contributed significantly (p < .05) to 11 per cent (3 out of 28) of the identified differences, which involved 3 of the 19 reintegration procedures with identified differences on the multicomparison ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure.
11. The identified differences for the Special Class Teachers of L/BD Children were not clearly attributed to a directional trend of rating the procedures consistently more effective or ineffective than the other two groups.

**Question Three**

Are there statistically significant differences among the mean score responses of the three sample groups as to the effectiveness of specified reintegration procedures?

The Chi Square item analysis and the multicomparsion ANOVA utilizing the Scheffe' procedure provided the data used in responding to question three.

12. As a result of the analysis, there were statistically significant differences (p < .05) identified among the three groups for some (19) of the reintegration procedures. Specific qualifications were presented in conclusions four through eleven.

**Null Hypothesis**

The following null hypothesis was formulated for the present investigation. There are no statistically significant differences among the mean score responses of the three groups. $H_0: \overline{X}_1 = \overline{X}_2 = \overline{X}_3 = 0$.

**Conclusion:**

13. The null hypothesis was not found to be tenable as a consequence of the 19 statistically significant differences (p < .05) revealed through the univariate one-way ANOVA
Implications

Fifteen implications are presented in relationship to: (1) the dissemination of information on the reintegration of children, (2) the need for further research, and (3) the education of teachers in both regular and special education.

**Implications for the Dissemination of Information**

The deficit in summarized information on the reintegration process, revealed in the review of the literature, served as the basis for the following two implications.

1. Information on reintegration needs to be disseminated in the literature and through pre-service and in-service teacher education programs.

2. Investigators need to be encouraged to disseminate even limited and partial answers to the problem of reintegrating children from special classes into regular classes.

**Implications for Further Research**

Due to the limitations, delimitations, and results of the present investigation and the deficit of available information, there is a need for further research as follows:
3. Replication of the present investigation is needed with samples from the same population groups living in other states wherein terminology is compatible.

4. Replication is needed which includes other significant populations, i.e., consultant-supervisors in both regular and special education, university teacher educators in regular education, administrators, and others.

5. Research is needed to determine if perception of reintegration procedures is dependent upon such variables as: years of experience, recent professional education and level of professional education, personal participation in the reintegration of children, etc.

6. Investigation is needed to establish more in-depth parameters for the significant procedures identified in the present study.

7. Attempts are needed to prioritize the significant procedures identified in the present investigation.

8. Investigation is needed in order to determine generic properties of the significant procedures identified in the present investigation as well as the identification of procedures particular to specific areas of exceptionality.
9. Investigation of the extent to which specified reintegration procedures are being utilized in the field is needed.

10. Further development of the salient factors in reintegration is needed.

11. Further research is needed which utilizes the research loop described by Rosenshine (1973) as a:

   Descriptive + Correlational + Experimental Loop

The present investigation utilized comparative techniques in order to describe reintegration procedures more accurately. Correlational studies are needed to establish a relationship between the presence of specified reintegration procedures and indicators of successful reintegration. Concurrently with and after correlational evidence, experimental studies are needed in which combinations of procedures are manipulated.

Implications for Teacher Education

12. The judged adequacy of the preparation of both regular and special teachers, on the reintegration of children, needs to be determined from input by teachers, other field personnel, and university teacher educators.
13. The extent to which the topic of reintegration is included in the pre-service education of both regular and special teachers needs to be assessed, curriculum modification in teacher education determined; and changes implemented which direct attention toward successful reintegration and which provide opportunities for participants to actively engage in reintegration considerations.

14. Graduate programs designed to prepare curriculum and administrative personnel for leadership positions, in both regular and special education, need to undergo the same sequence for change: assess, identify changes needed, implementation of changes, and evaluation.

15. In-service education programs, designed for both regular and special educators, need to focus directly on the reintegration of children from special classes into regular classes.
APPENDIX A

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT
Dear Participant,

Your help is requested in the investigation of the effectiveness of reintegration procedures used when returning a child from the special education self-contained class for children with learning and behavioral disorders to the regular elementary classroom.

You are asked to rate each reintegration statement according to the judged effectiveness of the procedure when returning a child from the learning and behavioral disordered (L/BD) classroom only. Although some of the reintegration procedures may be applicable for children in other areas of special education, your response must relate to the reintegration of L/BD children. Please rate every reintegration statement.

Your responses will remain anonymous; do not sign your name. In case a survey is not returned, a code will permit the participant to be contacted again. You will remain anonymous when the findings are reported since the findings will be reported for groups only - not for individuals.

Completion of this survey will require approximately thirty minutes of your valuable time. Please complete this survey and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope that is provided no later than May 6, 1971. This deadline is crucial to completion of the study. Your return of this survey prior to or no later than May 6, 1971 will be greatly appreciated. So, if at all possible, complete the survey and mail it today. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. Joyce Levin
Research Associate
Faculty for Exceptional Children
The Ohio State University
Definition

This study does not intend to indicate that reintegration is appropriate for all children in L/3D classes but does intend to identify reintegration procedures judged to be effective when reintegration is appropriate for some children in L/3D classes.

Learning and behaviorally disabled or disordered (L/3D) children are defined according to Ohio Standards as follows:

a) Normal or higher IQ (attained IQ above 80).

b) No severe visual, hearing, or motor involvement.

c) Significant discrepancy between academic and social behavioral performance and expectations of the regular instructional program.

Use of Rating Scale

Please rate each reintegration statement according to the following six codes and descriptions by circling one appropriate code. There is no limit or requirement on the number of times a code may be used. The codes appear at the bottom of every page for easy reference.

1 = MOST EFFECTIVE: this reintegration procedure is judged to be one of the most effective procedures and receives the highest recommendation.

2 = VERY EFFECTIVE: this procedure is judged to be a very effective procedure and receives a strong recommendation.

3 = EFFECTIVE: this procedure is judged to have average effectiveness and receives an average recommendation.

4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS: this procedure is judged to have low effectiveness and receives a low recommendation if recommended at all.

5 = INEFFECTIVE: this procedure is judged to be ineffective and is not recommended.

6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE: this procedure is judged to be highly ineffective and is definitely not recommended.
Please return only pages 1 through 8.
Please circle the number of the title which describes your position.

1. Regular Elementary Classroom Teacher
2. Special Teacher of Learning and Behavioral Disabilities (L/BD) Class
3. Special University Teacher Educator

A. General and Administrative Procedures
   Please Circle Code

1. The reintegration of an L/BD child is accomplished gradually by utilizing the regular classroom for part of the day at first and by utilizing a special education setting (special L/BD class, resource room, tutorial program) the other part of the day.

2. The child is reintegrated into the regular classroom on a part-time basis in a subject(s) in which the child's performance is acceptable in comparison to the performance of the other children with whom he participates.

3. There is a limit on the number of children (determined locally) who can be reintegrated into the same regular classroom.

4. The child is always reintegrated to a regular classroom that is at least one grade level below the grade appropriate for his age or number of years in school.

5. A primary age child (6-9) may be reintegrated to a regular class that is no more than one grade level below the appropriate grade for his age or years in school.

6. An intermediate age child (9-13) may be reintegrated to a regular class that is no more than two grade levels below the appropriate grade for his age or years in school.

7. The child is always reintegrated to a regular class that is at the same grade level that the child would be in according to his birthday and number of years in school.

8. The reintegration decision is ultimately based on which placement is the most financially advantageous to the school district.

9. The child is returned to a regular class when there is no opening in an appropriate L/BD class for next year.

10. The child is returned to a regular class because the appropriate L/BD class for the next year is housed in a school other than the child's regular attendance school.

11. A child is permitted to remain in the special L/BD class for only a specified period of time (i.e. 1 year, 2 years, etc.) without a case study for possible reintegration.

CODES
1 = MOST EFFECTIVE  3 = EFFECTIVE  5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE  4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS  6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE
A. General and Administrative Procedures

12. A child may remain in the special L/BD class for an indefinite number of years without a case study for possible reintegration.

13. Reintegration is planned to occur on, but may not be limited to, a specified day or days of the week.

14. Reintegration is planned to occur on, but may not be limited to, specified intervals throughout the year.

15. A reintegration team (whose membership is determined locally) that participates in reintegration decision making should be formed and utilized.

16. A reintegration group (whose membership is determined locally and may be the same as the reintegration team) participates in identifying reintegration procedures to be used locally.

17. The reintegration team representation should include:
   a special L/BD class teacher
   a regular class teacher
   a special L/BD consultant/supervisor
   a regular education consultant/supervisor
   a school psychologist
   a parent of a child in an L/BD class
   a parent of a reintegrated child
   a parent of a child in a regular class
   a university teacher educator in special education
   a university teacher educator in regular education
   an administrator

18. The child is reintegrated into the regular class, at the identified grade level, having the fewest number of children regardless of that teacher's acceptance or willingness to be a receiving teacher. Explanation: A receiving teacher is a regular classroom teacher who receives an L/BD child when he is reintegrated.

Please Circle Code

| Code | Most Effective | Effect | Low 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. General and Administrative Procedures

29. Children in special L/30 classes, whose social behaviors permit it, ordinarily participate in the following activities with children of appropriate ages in regular classes:
   - recess
   - lunch
   - appropriate assemblies
   - art
   - music
   - physical education

30. Due process is complied with when reintegrating a child. Explanation: Due process, by law, requires that parents be informed of the recommended placement change, have a right to counsel, have a right to a hearing and have a right to appeal.

31. The child's specific academic performance, as indicated by data collected from a variety of sources, is utilized in making the reintegration decision.

32. The child's specific social behavior, as indicated by a variety of data, is utilized in making the reintegration decision.

33. Both the child's specific academic performance and specific social behavior, as indicated by a variety of data, are utilized in making the reintegration decision.

34. The child's academic performance is based upon information from:
   - standardized group tests
   - individual tests
   - criterion referenced tests
   Explanation: These are tests where the child's performance on a skill is compared to a predetermined level that is acceptable as mastery of that skill.

35. The child's social behavior is determined from information from:
   - standardized group tests
   - individual tests
   - criterion referenced tests
   - observational data

CODES
1 = MOST EFFECTIVE  3 = EFFECTIVE  5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE  4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS  6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE
A. General and Administrative Procedures

46. As evidence of an early consideration for reintegration, academic and/or social behaviors desired for reintegration are identified at the time the child is placed in the L/BD class.

47. Although effectiveness has been rated for previous reintegration procedures, the reintegration of L/BD children is a negotiable item; procedures and guidelines are to be agreed upon by representatives of the classroom teachers and the Board of Education.

B. The child to be reintegrated...

48. Has expressed a desire to return to the regular classroom.

49. Has expressed that he expects to meet academic success in the regular classroom.

50. Has expressed that he has friends he wants to be with in the regular classroom.

51. Has expressed that he expects his social behavior in the regular class to be acceptable:
   to his peers in his regular class
   to his regular classroom teacher

52. Has such severe social problems that he is reintegrated in order to remove him from the children in the L/BD class because they are more easily upset than children in the regular class.

53. Participates in a resource room for L/BD children for part of the day before being reintegrated for a full day in the regular class.

54. Receives tutorial services for L/BD children for a period of time following reintegration.

55. Demonstrates performance (determined locally) in the following academic areas that is at least the same grade level as the classroom into which he is to be reintegrated:
   reading achievement
   math achievement

56. Demonstrates performance (determined locally) in the following academic areas that is no more than one grade level below the classroom into which he is to be reintegrated:
   reading achievement
   math achievement

CODES
1 = MOST EFFECTIVE  3 = EFFECTIVE  5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE  4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS  6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE
B. The child to be reintegrated...

60. Demonstrates performance (determined locally) in the following academic areas that is between one and two grade levels below the classroom into which he is to be reintegrated. Please Circle Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIGH EFFECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VERY EFFECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>INEFFECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- reading achievement
- math achievement

61. Demonstrates performance (determined locally) in the following academic areas that is more than two grade levels below the classroom into which he is to be reintegrated.

- reading achievement
- math achievement

62. Demonstrates social behavior that does not deviate markedly from many children in the class into which he is to be reintegrated.

63. Demonstrates social behavior that deviates enough to be similar to that of only a few children in the class into which he is to be reintegrated.

64. Demonstrates social behavior that will deviate more than any other child in the class into which he is to be reintegrated.

C. The special teacher of the D/BD class...

67. Visits the regular classroom of potential receiving teachers. The receiving teacher is a regular classroom teacher who receives the L/BD child when he is reintegrated.

68. Attends staff meetings and shares duties as a member of the total staff.

69. Provides current information on academic skills development according to locally determined criteria.

70. Provides current information on social behaviors according to locally determined criteria.

71. Provides compatible practice in activities commonly used in the regular classroom; such as: going to the restroom, lunchroom, lining up, etc.

72. Receives a new replacement child whenever a child is reintegrated (up until a locally determined cut-off date).

73. Is solely responsible for initiating and completing reintegration without support from others.

CODES
1 = MOST EFFECTIVE 3 = EFFECTIVE 5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE 4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS 6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE

---over---
D. The regular classroom teacher who is to receive the reintegrated child. ... 

74. Visits the special L/BD class and observes the child before reintegration. 

75. Is eligible to participate in special education or other related in-service education: 
   on released time 1 2 3 4 5 6 
   with expenses reimbursed according to local policy 1 2 3 4 5 6 

76. May be expected to participate in special education or related in-service education according to local policy. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

77. Has a lower pupil-teacher ratio based on the number of children reintegrated. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

78. Is paid additional money (to be determined locally) if the special L/BD teacher is paid additional money. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

79. Is required to take college course work as locally specified (may be required courses toward L/BD certification and/or courses on individualizing instruction): 
   if paid additional salary 1 2 3 4 5 6 
   even if not paid additional salary 1 2 3 4 5 6 

80. Receives an additional budget (to be determined locally) for the purchasing of special individualized materials. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

81. Will meet the parent(s) prior to reintegration. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

82. Will conduct a parent conference shortly (to be specified locally) after the child is reintegrated. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

83. When experienced at being a receiving teacher, may serve as a consultant (on the topic of reintegration), to other special and regular classroom teachers. Explanation: A receiving teacher is a regular classroom teacher who receives an L/BD child who is reintegrated. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

84. Requests to become a receiving teacher. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

85. Is selected, according to local requirements, to become a receiving teacher. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

86. Receives in-service education in preparation for receiving reintegrated children. 1 2 3 4 5 6 

**CODES**

1 = MOST EFFECTIVE  3 = EFFECTIVE  5 = INEFFECTIVE 
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE  4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS  6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE
D. The regular classroom teacher who is to receive
the reintegrated child...

89. Is eligible for added consultant help from:
   the special education consultant/supervisor
   the regular education consultant/supervisor
   the school psychologist
   the special L/BD classroom teacher

93. Is eligible for an aide or paraprofessional help (where
such help is already available, is eligible for increased
help from an aide or paraprofessional).

94. Is eligible to receive a student teacher (where a student
   teacher is already available, is eligible to have more
   frequent student teachers).

95. Will receive no incentive (salary, budget for
   individualized materials, in-service participation,
   consultant service, help from aides, paraprofessionals,
   or student teachers) for their participation as a
   receiving teacher for the reintegration of L/BD children.

96. All regular classroom teachers are equally identified as
   receiving teachers without:
   their request or acceptance of being a receiving
   teacher.

97. being selected to be a receiving teacher.

E. The Parent(s) of a child in the L/BD Class...

98. Frequently expresses dissatisfaction with the special
   class program and having the child in it.

99. Is cooperative with the special class teacher and friend
   indications (determined locally) is expected to be
   cooperative with the regular classroom teacher.

100. Requests that the child be evaluated, at the soonest
     appropriate date, for possible reintegration.

101. Requests, after conferencing on the matter, that the
     child be returned to the regular class when this is
     not recommended.

102. Expresses agreement with the recommendation that the
     child be reintegrated.

CODES
1 = MOST EFFECTIVE    3 = EFFECTIVE    5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE    4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS   6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE
E. The Parent(s) of a child in the L/BD Class...

103. Is from the upper-middle or upper socio-economic class and will provide for that child even if he is not successful if returned to the regular classroom.

104. Is consistently antagonistic and pessimistic about the school in general.

105. Is consistently optimistic and positive about the school in general.

**CODES**

1 = MOST EFFECTIVE    3 = EFFECTIVE    5 = INEFFECTIVE
2 = VERY EFFECTIVE    4 = LOW EFFECTIVENESS   6 = HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE

---

Thank you for your valuable responses.

Will you please answer just two more questions? In cases where a child is returned to the regular classroom, how often do you feel it is a result of conscious plans to successfully reintegrate the L/BD child? Please check one response:

- ________ 0 to 5%
- ________ 10 to 20%
- ________ 25 to 45%
- ________ 50 to 70%
- ________ 75 to 95%
- ________ 95 to 100%

Of those reintegration procedures which you rated as 1. MOST EFFECTIVE and 2. VERY EFFECTIVE, how frequently would you say those procedures as a group are utilized when reintegrating an L/BD child? Please check one response.

- ________ 0 to 5%
- ________ 10 to 20%
- ________ 25 to 45%
- ________ 50 to 70%
- ________ 75 to 95%
- ________ 95 to 100%

I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your cooperation. Please drop your survey in the mail box on or before May 6, 1974. If you wish to have an abstract of this study, please send a request after August, 1974. Due to postage provisions, be sure to return only pages 1 through 8.

Sincerely,

A. Joyce Levin
Research Associate
Faculty for Exceptional Children
The Ohio State University

Return Address:
5431 Maple Canyon Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43229
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FORTY-ONE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT (p < .05)

REINTEGRATION PROCEDURES
A. General and Administrative Procedures

Item:

1. The reintegration of an L/BD child is accomplished gradually by utilizing the regular classroom for part of the day at first and by utilizing a special education setting (special L/BD class, resource room, tutorial program) the other part of the day.

17. The reintegration team representation should include:

   a special L/BD class teacher

18. a regular class teacher

19. a special L/BD consultant/supervisor

21. a psychologist

29. Children in special L/BD classes, whose social behaviors permit it, ordinarily participate in the following activities with children of appropriate ages in regular classes:

   recess

30. lunch

31. appropriate assemblies

32. art

33. music
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A. General and Administrative Procedures.

Item:

34. physical education

35. Due process is complied with when reintegrating a child.

Explanation: Due process, by law, requires that parents be informed of the recommended placement change, have a right to counsel, have a right to a hearing and have a right to appeal.

36. The child's specific academic performance, as indicated by data collected from a variety of sources, is utilized in making the reintegration decision.

37. The child's specific social behavior, as indicated by a variety of data, is utilized in making the reintegration decision.

38. Both the child's specific performance and specific social behavior, as indicated by a variety of data, are utilized in making the reintegration decision.

41. The child's academic performance is based upon information from:

   criterion referenced tests

Explanation: these are tests where the child's
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performance on a skill is compared to a pre-determined level that is acceptable as mastery of that skill.

45. The child's social behavior is determined from information from:

   observational data

C. The Special Teacher of the L/BD Class.

67. Visits the regular classroom of the potential receiving teachers. The receiving teacher is a regular teacher who receives the L/BD child when he is reintegrated.

68. Attends staff meetings and shares duties as a member of the total staff.

69. Provides current information on academic skills development according to locally determined criteria.

70. Provides current information on social behaviors according to locally determined criteria.

71. Provides compatible practice in activities commonly used in the regular classroom; such as: going to the restroom, lunchroom, lining up, etc.

D. The Regular classroom teacher who is to receive the reintegrated child.

74. Visits the special L/BD class and observes the child before reintegration.
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D. The regular classroom teacher who is to receive the reintegrated child.

84. Will conduct a parent conference shortly (to be specified locally) after the child is reintegrated.


89. Is eligible for consultant help from:
   the special education consultant/supervisor
   the school psychologist
   the special L/BD classroom teacher

SIGNIFICANT RESPONSE CHOICE OF SIX: HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE

A. General and Administrative Procedures

  8. The reintegration decision is ultimately based on which placement is the most financially advantageous to the school district.

  9. The child is returned to a regular class when there is no opening in an appropriate L/BD class for next year.

 10. The child is returned to a regular class because the appropriate L/BD class for next year is housed in a school other than the child's regular attendance school.
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A. General and Administrative Procedures.

12. A child may remain in the special L/BD class for an indefinite number of years without a case study for possible reintegration.

28. The child is reintegrated into the regular class, at the identified grade level, having the fewest number of children regardless of that teacher's acceptance or willingness to be a receiving teacher.

Explanation: A receiving teacher is a regular classroom teacher who receives an L/BD child when he is reintegrated.

B. The Child to be Reintegrated.

53. Has such severe social problems that he is reintegrated in order to remove him from the children in the L/BD class because they are more easily upset than children in the regular class.

62. Demonstrates performance (determined locally) in the following academic areas that is more than two grade levels below the classroom into which he is to be reintegrated:

   reading achievement

   math achievement

66. Demonstrates social behavior that will deviate more than any other child in the class into which he is to be reintegrated.
Appendix B (Con'd)

C. The Special Class Teacher of L/BD Children.

73. Is solely responsible for initiating and completing reintegration without support from others.

E. The Parent(s) of a Child in the L/BD Class

104. Is consistently antagonistic and pessimistic about the school in general.

SIGNIFICANT RESPONSE CHOICE OF TWO: VERY EFFECTIVE

A. General and Administrative Procedures.

2. The child is reintegrated into the regular classroom on a part-time basis in a subject(s) in which the child's performance is acceptable in comparison to the performance of the other children with whom he participates.

16. A reintegration group (whose membership is determined locally and may be the same as the reintegration team) participates in identifying reintegration procedures to be used locally.
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TWENTY-EIGHT ITEMS INDICATING A DIRECTIONAL TREND
### TWENTY-EIGHT ITEMS INDICATING A DIRECTIONAL TREND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directional Trend: 90% of Responses Effective Procedures&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Directional Trend: 80% of Responses Effective Procedures&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Items:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>90% of all responses were effective ratings of 1, 2, and 3.

<sup>b</sup>80% of all responses were effective ratings of 1, 2, and 3.

<sup>c</sup>80% of all responses were ineffective ratings of 4, 5, and 6.
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MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
THE THREE GROUPS AND FORTY-ONE ITEMS
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE THREE GROUPS
AND FORTY-ONE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Item</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.421</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>5.688</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>5.272</td>
<td>1.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.184</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>5.545</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.461</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>5.152</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.631</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>1.909</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.205</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>5.377</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>5.636</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.863</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**
- Group 1: Regular Elementary Class Teachers
- Group 2: Special Class Teachers
- Group 3: Special University Teacher Educators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Item</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.025</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>4.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.846</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>5.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.894</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>5.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.236</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>5.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>1.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>1.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>4.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>2.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>2.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>1.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>1.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.236</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>4.795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group 1: Regular Elementary Class Teachers  
Group 2: Special Class Teachers  
Group 3: Special University Teacher Educators
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SUM OF SQUARES AND MEAN SQUARES FOR ONE-WAY
ANOVA AMONG THREE GROUPS, ACROSS FORTY-ONE
REINTEGRATION PROCEDURES
### Sum of Squares and Mean Squares for One-Way Univariate ANOVA Among Three Groups, Across Forty-One Reintegration Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>6.794</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>4.438*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>89.572</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>10.240</td>
<td>5.120</td>
<td>9.130*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>65.552</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>4.640*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>44.408</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>159.640</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>2.331</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>76.999</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>5.318</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>3.778*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>80.960</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>11.077</td>
<td>5.538</td>
<td>3.248*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>192.681</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>5.206</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>3.561*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>83.323</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>114.009</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>5.983</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>156.016</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>2.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>118.852</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>2.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>90.574</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>2.219</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>89.772</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.522</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>3.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>67.755</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>4.917</td>
<td>2.458</td>
<td>6.244*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>46.073</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>1.566</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>169.233</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>1.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>117.701</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>169.443</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 35:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>3.913*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>123.824</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132.325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 36:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>11.324</td>
<td>5.662</td>
<td>7.066*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>92.961</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>16.759</td>
<td>8.379</td>
<td>11.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>88.232</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>6.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>29.293</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 41:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>6.964</td>
<td>3.482</td>
<td>3.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>120.289</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127.254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 45:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>3.685*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>31.131</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 53:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>7.647</td>
<td>3.823</td>
<td>2.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>175.344</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 62:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>7.707</td>
<td>3.853</td>
<td>2.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>152.275</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 63:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>2.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>149.149</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
### Appendix E (Con'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 66:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>1.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 67:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>10.611</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td>7.710*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>79.825</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 68:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>1.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>102.777</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 69:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>7.350</td>
<td>3.675</td>
<td>5.973*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>70.760</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 70:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>6.289</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>5.344*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>68.265</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74.554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 71:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>86.756</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 73:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>11.099</td>
<td>5.549</td>
<td>3.798*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>166.593</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 74:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>23.590</td>
<td>11.795</td>
<td>6.977*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>192.717</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 84:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>140.512</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
### Appendix E (Con'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 88</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>11.350</td>
<td>5.675</td>
<td>6.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>103.231</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 89</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>7.223</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>5.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>80.615</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 91</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>106.722</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108.551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 92</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>6.688</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>5.283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>72.803</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 104</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Gp.</td>
<td>5.410</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Gp.</td>
<td>128.028</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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