

A STUDY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING
AND SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS'
ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIAL
EDUCATION TOPICS

By

ROBERT STANLEY NEEL

Bachelor of Arts in Education
Southwestern State College
Weatherford, Oklahoma
1970

Master of Education
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Weatherford, Oklahoma
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1988

Thesis
1988D
N378s
cop. 2

A STUDY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING
AND SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS'
ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIAL
EDUCATION TOPICS

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth A. Clair

Thesis Advisor

A. Kenneth Steu

V. J. Denson

Emogene L. Land

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express thanks and sincere appreciation to the members of his doctoral committee. A special thanks goes to Dr. Kenneth St.Clair, Chairman, for his expertise, advice, and extreme patience in guiding the writer through this phase of his professional growth.

A thanks is given to the public school administrators who consented to participate in this study by responding with the information necessary to its development.

A special thanks to the employees of the Oklahoma State Department of Education for their assistance rendered in gathering data for the analysis of this study. The Department of Special Education Assistant-Director Connie Siler, Assistant Lou Norman, and the Director of State Aid Mr. Don Shive were of considerable help, and a great debt of gratitude is owed to each.

The author is grateful to his wife, Linda Neel, and his children, Melanie and Kellie, for their faith and encouragement to him in accomplishing this goal of professional development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I.	INTRODUCTION 1
	Overview of Special Education. 1
	Statement of the Problem 11
	Initial Proposals os the Study 11
	Final Focus of the Study 13
	Assumptions. 17
	Limitations. 18
	Defining Terminology 18
	Purpose of the Study 21
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 24
	Literature Related to
	Governmental Regulation. 24
	State Versus Federal Regulation. 25
	"Mainstreaming" of Special Education 30
	Funding of Special Education 33
	Oklahoma Research on Special Education Administration 38
III.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES 41
	Introduction 41
	Statistics and Implications. 49
	Evaluation of the Test
	Between Groups 49
	Evaluation of the "Study"
	Group Scores 54
IV.	FINDINGS 62
V.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 77
	Summary of the Study 77
	Summary and Discussion of
	the Findings 78
	General Observations 86
	Recommendations for Programs 91
	Recommendations for Superintendents. 92
	Recommendations for Further Research 94

Chapter	Page
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	99
VII. APPENDIXES103
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE.103
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE106
APPENDIX C - DATA FOR "STUDY" GROUP.111
APPENDIX D - DATA FOR "TEST" GROUP113

LIST OF TABLES

Table

I.	Analysis of Variance Computations Using "Test" Group Answers Versus "Study" Group Answers.	52
II.	Analysis of Covariance of Selected Variables Using School Size to Evaluate Responses.	53
III.	Descriptive Statistics of Large Schools Versus Small Schools	56
IV.	Analysis of Variance Computations Using "Study" Group Answers of Large Schools Versus Small Schools	57
V.	Descriptive Statistics of "High" Aid Schools Versus "Low" Aid Schools of Special Education Budgets	59
VI.	Analysis of Variance Computations Using Study Group Answers of "High" Aid Schools Versus "Low" Aid Schools	61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Special Education

With the advent of Public Law 94-142 on November 29, 1975, the Congress of the United States undertook its greatest effort in history to influence the practices of public education. This law was the culmination of years of effort by groups interested in the welfare of the handicapped and educationally deprived. Numerous laws preceded this act; however, none were so encompassing as to require all states to enact laws requiring and financing the education of all handicapped persons. This act has been referred to by Maynard C. Reynolds as a:

...quiet revolution' which occurred when P.L. 94-142 established legislatively the principal that every handicapped child, regardless of the severity of the handicap, has the right to education. Previously schools had the privilege of refusing to admit children for whom no programs were provided or who were considered "unteachable." The corollary to this principle is the mandate in P.L. 94-142 to schools to find, locate, and evaluate every handicapped child in the age range 3-21. (20)

This revolution to establish for the handicapped the same right to an education that already exists for the nonhandicapped has been occurring throughout the nation, in state and local school

board rooms, state legislative chambers, and, perhaps more importantly, in the nation's courts. (Weintraub 7)

The fundamental element of P.L. 94-142 is the right to a free, appropriate public education for every handicapped child who needs special help. The entire thrust of the law is based on the right of all children, with no exceptions, to an education. (Shyrbman 4)

The roots of P.L. 94-142 lie in federal legislation and litigation dating back to the 1950's. They were a natural growth of a line beginning with Brown vs. Board of Education which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1954. That historic case established the constitutional principle of equal educational opportunity in saying:

Today education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. (Shrybman 5)

In Brown vs. Board of Education the Supreme Court

was focusing on racial inequalities; however, later litigation brought the decision in this case to bear on the treatment of handicapped persons. The case of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (P.A.R.C.) vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1972 determined that the state must:

1. ...provide all retarded persons between the ages of 6 and 21 years with access to a free public program of education and training appropriate to their learning capabilities, and
2. provide a free program of education and training appropriate to the learning capacities of every mentally retarded child less than 6 years of age whenever it offered (sic) a preschool program for the nonhandicapped of the same age.
(Reynolds 19)

That same year a second landmark case, Mills vs. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, expanded the decision of P.A.R.C. to include all handicapped persons, not just those who were mentally retarded. (Shyrbman 11) In evaluating the Mills case, Abeson cited:

The lack of funding is frequently cited by public officials as the primary reason for the absence of adequate education programs for exceptional children. In their Mills defense, the District School System and the school board stated that it was impossible to provide special education for the handicapped unless Congress appropriated millions of dollars for that purpose. The judge responded by saying, "the inadequacies of the District of Columbia public school system, whether occasioned by insufficient funding or administrative inefficiency, certainly cannot be

permitted to bear more heavily on the exceptional or handicapped child than on the normal child."
(2)

These cases had a widespread effect on the way which each state approached their (sic) responsibility to educate all citizens. By the end of 1972, 43 states had emplaced laws which required services for the handicapped. Of these, 28 states had passed legislation extending educational services for these persons.
(Shrybman 5)

In 1974, in response to the momentum toward a responsible program of education for the handicapped, the United States Congress passed the Educational Amendments (Public Law 93-380) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This bill required states to provide assurances that:

1. ... all handicapped children residing in the state, regardless of the nature or severity of their dysfunction, would be given special educational services and that the state would work toward full educational opportunities for them,
2. confidentiality of data and information on these handicapped young persons would be protected,
3. that full educational opportunities to all handicapped children would be established,
4. that there would be procedural safeguards in the special education decision-making process, including: prior notice to parents before a child's educational placement was changed, opportunity for parents to obtain an impartial due process hearing, opportunity for parents to examine all records involving the child's placement, procedures to protect the child's rights when the pupil lacks parents or guardians, procedures to ensure that, whenever possible, handicapped children were educated along with the

nonhandicapped, and procedures to ensure that testing and evaluation materials were not racially or culturally discriminatory. (Shrybman 11)

The next revision to Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was so comprehensive that it became known as the "Bill of Rights" for the education of handicapped children. Its new title, and the one known today as the beginning of modern special education, was P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

According to Mayer, in the process of studying the needs of education for the handicapped children to develop this law, Congress found that:

1. There were more than eight million handicapped children in the United States,
2. Their special educational needs were not being met fully,
3. More than half of these children did not receive appropriate educational services that would enable them to have full equality of opportunity,
4. One million of them were excluded entirely from the public school system and would not go through the educational process with their peers,
5. Their handicaps prevented many of those participating in regular school programs from having a successful educational experience because their dysfunctions were undetected,
6. The lack of adequate services in the public schools often forced families to find services outside the system, often at great distances from

their residence and at their own expense,

7. Developments in teacher training and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and methods had advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, state and local educational agencies could and would provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of handicapped children, (author emphasis added)

8. State and local educational agencies had a responsibility to provide education for all handicapped children but their financial resources were inadequate to do so (author emphasis added), and

9. It was in the national interest that the federal government assist state and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of the handicapped in order to assure equal protection of the law. (Mayer 92-93)

The paramount goal of the U.S. Congress in enacting P.L. 94-142 was to make a free appropriate public education available to every handicapped child in the nation. (Heatly 29)

The philosophy of serving all handicapped children presented a number of problems inasmuch as there was no consensus regarding the range of persons to be served. The difficulty in this arose from the fact that there was "...no general agreement about the size of the target population--the number of handicapped school-aged persons in the United States--except that it is large." (Helge 514) The National Association for Retarded Citizens (NARC) estimated at the time that three percent of the total population, or 2.4 million

school-age children, were handicapped in some way. Pullin noted the estimate that there were 1.75 million handicapped youth receiving no educational services in the school year of 1974-1975. (1/4) Other estimates ranged up to 9.2 percent. (Helge 514) Ballard, et al, noted in 1981 that:

...based on the current child counts of the five states reporting the largest proportions of disabled children served, the U.S. Office of Special Education (OSE) projected "There could be as many as 5.8 million school-age handicapped children in the United States." (27)

To compound the problem of implementation of this new law, schools were viewed as opposed to the service of those persons for whom the law was emplaced. As stated in 1975 by Turnbull:

There are many reasons why the schools have been guilty of these education-limiting practices. The cost of educating or training the special child is normally higher than the cost of educating the normal child. Resources for the handicapped--manpower, money, and political clout--are limited absolutely and relatively compared with the same resources for normal children. (12)

In fact it was even held by some that, "School authorities kept handicapped children out by using strategies such as postponement, suspension, exclusion, and straightforward denial of entry." (3-4)

It was with these problems in mind that Congress undertook to end practices of exclusion by emplacing Public Law 94-142 and the subsequent revisions and

interpretations of it.

Did P.L. 94-142 accomplish its goals? Apparently it did not, as indicated by the volume of litigation which occurred following it. A case in point may be the case of Frederick L. vs. Thomas. (Tillery 367) This case began in 1975, as an effort to force service to all children of the school district of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, rather than just the elementary level students. This case, the subsequent cases, and the motions for contempt citations which were made a part of the case, lasted until 1980 and included seven separate causes of action. The point of reporting just this one of many cases is the fact that it was filed prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142 and lasted until three years after its full implementation. Its results, however, have become a part of every state's regulations for the service of all school age children. In some states, such as Oklahoma, this was expanded even further to include children from birth until age 21. (47 O.S. 1981)

The litigation under this law would fill volumes. To undertake to evaluate these, a study by the reader of the litigation will offer an idea as to the extreme volume which resulted under this law and the evident evolution of special education which continues to

this date.

Aside from the aspect of litigation, the federal government has apparently failed to live up to its promise to be the driving force in the financial support of these programs. Lavine and Wexler state that, "...the appropriations of federal funds for the states to carry out their responsibilities under the law have in no way met the ceilings established by PL 94-142." (166) This is illustrated by a study by Barresi and Ramirez of the various programs of the government as to authorized sums of money versus the amounts actually appropriated for the programs. The sums almost uniformly are less than those envisioned to be given for the programs. (83-89) One can only derive from this that the government has not lived up to the promise of P.L. 94-142 while leaving in place the requirements of the law. It was expected, therefore, to find agreement among the administrators of western Oklahoma that the federal support for their programs was completely inadequate. The findings regarding this matter are addressed later.

As stated, the development of special education systems did not cease with P.L. 94-142, but began an evolutionary process of growth. With this mandate the

states individually began to emplace state law and programming to comply with the federal law. The resultant litigation from disagreement over these programs is, to this date, still changing the special education systems.

As the evolution toward a standardized set of special education regulations for all states was developing, Oklahoma was responding to the trend to serve the handicapped with the emplacement of a series of laws designed to address the particular areas of special education ultimately mandated by P.L. 94-142. These laws were designed to make Oklahoma comply with the intent of the federal mandate when adopted. Interestingly, the majority of states were passing laws to this purpose before the passing of P.L. 94-142. Oklahoma was one of those states. An examination of the state laws by Bolick revealed that the new laws focused on the problems of identification of the population, evaluation and placement of the special education students, administrative responsibility for the programs, finance, administrative structure and organization, and the services provided. (36-1, 36-4)

Oklahoma law was being designed to meet each of these responsibilities, and when P.L. 94-142 was

passed, the Oklahoma law went into effect almost immediately. (O.S.D.E. 1988)

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Initial Proposals of the Study

McCarthy and Sage observed that:

Funding formulas to permit differential distribution of state level resources to local providers of special education services have resulted from recognition that such services cost more per child than regular educational programs and that the burden of meeting such extraordinary needs should be spread as broadly as possible across governmental jurisdictions. (415)

The basis for the regulation and administration of special education in Oklahoma, as well as in the rest of the United States, is a composite of traditional educational practice, federal government law, and court litigation which has the effect of law. These have combined to create a system for the education of handicapped children in the state which is, in fact, one of the influences primarily outside the scope of control of the educational bureaucracies of the state, and essentially beyond the control of the local school district. Have these mandates and controls been effective for special education in Oklahoma? Are the basic structure of the programs and the financial and

professional support of the programs adequate? With these questions in mind, an initial research plan was made to evaluate the extent of offerings, the financial base for the programs, and the related attitudes of the schools' chief administrators in the following areas:

1. Is the state and federal financial support to schools of western Oklahoma adequate to manage special education programs effectively?

2. How much federal funding is reaching the schools of western Oklahoma after the first twelve years since the passing of P.L. 94-142, and since its required year of full special education programming in 1979?

3. What are the types of students served in the programs offered in the schools of western Oklahoma? What are the program offerings for the area?

4. Are the programs of the schools of western Oklahoma viewed as being effective and within the intent of the law by the superintendents of the area, or are they perceived to be inadequate due to excessive federal and state mandates as to procedure and structure and as to monetary support?

5. Does the court mandate of "mainstreaming" and localizing of services facilitate effective education programs as viewed by superintendents, or is the philosophy viewed as detrimental to the educational process, and would a consolidation of programs to satellites serving the various types of special education student be regarded as better?

The volume and complexity of the special education regulation, programming, and funding under this focus were found to be overwhelming. A complete survey could not be undertaken in a work of this size. Therefore, due to constraints of time and finance, it was decided to limit the study.

Final Focus of the Study

As the movement for special education legislation was gaining momentum in the 1960's and early 1970's at the national level, there were those persons actively engaged in evaluating the need for programs and structure for special education in the western states. As early as March 28-31, 1966, a group of administrators of special education programs from several states met in Denver, Colorado, under the sponsorship of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). (Jordan I)

Attendants at this commission from Oklahoma were Victor O. Hornbostel, then Associate Professor of Education at Oklahoma State University. Also LeRoy Taylor, Director of Special Education for the Oklahoma Department of Education, as well as forty-seven other educators and governmental officials from the area were in attendance. (Jordan 25)

The recommendations of the WICHE commission for the needs of states with primarily rural populations and their recommendations for research have been adopted as the focus of this study. The study of the commission was centered upon four primary areas of interest as those most important to a successful rural

area special education program. These four areas are as follows: "Administrative Organization, Financial Patterns, Personnel, and Supportive Services." (Jordan ii)

The observation of one of the presenters of the commission, Harriet Miller, was that:

Most of the current special education programs are designed to serve clusters of children with similar exceptionalities. Cities and metropolitan areas can and do provide separate programs for the hard of hearing, educable and trainable mentally retarded, blind, partially seeing, emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, and gifted. Translation of these urban area programs into similarly organized programs for use in less populous areas has not been successful. The results have been less than adequate. The programs fall far short of providing equal educational opportunities for the exceptional children who reside in sparsely populated areas.

If one considers that the large percentage of our national population is concentrated within a small number of metropolitan areas, it is easy to realize that very different educational organizational patterns are necessary in various regions and within individual states themselves to reach all youth. (Jordan 1)

One may argue that the federal government has failed to address this problem of the need for regulation which recognizes the difference between urban and rural education. The structure of P.L. 94-142 is one of a single set of mandates with no effort made to address unique needs of certain areas for additional financial and supportive help. As

Heatly recognized from study of the overall structure of the regulation, it is a result of a focus on earlier litigation primarily from urban areas, such as the P.A.R.C. vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Mills vs. The Board of Education cases. Heatly observes the following:

Because the federal role in education is more requirement oriented than assistance oriented, the local school districts are left to provide an education for every eligible handicapped child within their boundaries. This process is generally acknowledged to be much more expensive than that of providing for non-handicapped children. However, little in the way of federal financial assistance is provided to the schools.

The fiscal impact of the federal mandates on the more than 600 school districts operating within Oklahoma is difficult to determine. These school districts are characterized by their diversity. Many are located in metropolitan areas but many more are found in smaller towns and sparsely settled rural areas. This diversity in all likelihood affects the cost of providing special education. (2)

This raised the question as to whether the amount of financial support received from state and federal sources was adequate for special education programs in the schools of western Oklahoma, and whether there was a difference of opinion on the part of the school administrators as to its adequacy based upon the amount each receives. Is there a difference of opinion based upon the degree of support versus total special education budget between schools? Do school

superintendents who receive a higher amount as opposed to a smaller amount of aid have the opinion that they are receiving adequate support?

In 1981, Helge surveyed rural area problems in a study which found that state officials reported the greatest difficulty in staffing, attitudinal variables, and problems based on rural geography. She identified financial problems as being great, with as much as 55% of the survey schools having difficulty in this area. (516)

The questions of support for rural versus urban schools in the nation may be even further expanded to question whether there are distinct differences in the larger versus smaller schools within Oklahoma. Do the school superintendents of the schools of western Oklahoma view their support from state and federal sources as different when considering their size and locus of program? This question was raised as a part of this study, and a comparison of larger as opposed to smaller schools was made on the selected variables.

The personnel problems are still of a major concern to the schools of western Oklahoma. Recruitment, training, and placement of special education personnel remain major problems in special education programming. The success of these

programs, as viewed by school administrators, is a worthy study in itself. Thus, it was decided to limit the study to the other three areas recommended by the commission and to exclude this item.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study it was assumed that special education programs throughout the rural areas of the United States would be experiencing similar problems, and that the attitudes of the school superintendents surveyed would reflect those of other regions of the state and the nation.

An assumption was made that each state would have similar special education laws and regulations. This was based upon the mandate of P.L. 94-142, and the resultant litigation, both being of national/federal origin.

It was assumed that all surveyed schools were actively administering a special education program for their students with special needs. The assumption was that each superintendent was knowledgeable about his/her program, and was active in the administration of it. Each superintendent was viewed as possessing knowledge about his district's funding for special education, the support systems for special education,

and the law regarding special education.

The data gathered from the Oklahoma State Department of Education were assumed to be correct. This included all information reported to the State Department by the school superintendents, and that compiled by the State Department officials.

Limitations

This study was limited to a definite focus of a very complex system of education. The questions asked of the school superintendents were in regard to specific topics of special education administration and did not evaluate any other area of special education. The areas of staffing, programs, curriculum, effectiveness of programs, types of programming, and parental involvement were not addressed.

This study was limited in that it was done when the state of Oklahoma was economically depressed, and when school budgets were being reduced by state government. This may have influenced the opinions of the superintendents in a negative manner.

Defining Terminology

Several terms were used in the development of this work which apply to this study alone. Definitions are

offered by the author to assist in understanding this work. Other definitions were taken from Subchapter I, Paragraph 1401 of P.L. 94-142. These are as follows:

Average Daily Attendance (ADA). The Oklahoma method of dividing the total number of days attended by all students by the number of school days taught to determine an average daily attendance for a given school.

Large School. Schools with an ADA of 1,000 or more students for the school year 1986-1987.

Small School. Schools with an ADA of 999 or fewer students for the school year 1986-1987.

Public School. Those school districts which are a separate governmental unit, paid for by public taxation or public funds, and operate as an independent education facility for the use of the general public.

Independent School District. A school in the state of Oklahoma which offers all grades, from kindergarten through twelfth, and operates as a separate governmental unit of public education.

Dependent School District. Those schools in Oklahoma which offer only the first eight grades of school and are considered elementary schools only. These were excluded from the survey.

Variable. One of twenty-five items of research for this study. The first ten variables were the budget and demographic information of the surveyed schools, and the last fifteen variables were the questions asked the school superintendents in the survey instrument.

Question. One of the last fifteen variables of the study. These are the actual questions asked in the survey instrument which were the basis for the superintendents' attitude information.

Schools of Western Oklahoma. All independent school districts west of an arbitrary line using Interstate Highway 35 as a boundary. The total of the population was 176 schools.

"Full" Group. The study group consisting of approximately twenty-five percent of all independent schools in western Oklahoma. Attitude mean scores are computed using this group.

"Test" Group. A randomly selected group of ten schools taken from the "Full" Group, and used to refine the survey instrument.

"Study" Group. The remaining selected schools of the "Full" Group. These were surveyed using the refined questionnaire, and statistical treatments were applied.

State Educational Agency (SEA)

...the state board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the state supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by state law. (20 U.S.C. 1401,7)

Local Education Agency (LEA)

...a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a state for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a state.
(20 U.S.C. 1401,8)

Special Education

...specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions. (20 U.S.C. 1401,16)

Excess Cost

...those costs which are in excess of the average annual per student expenditure in a local educational agency during the preceding school year for an elementary or secondary school student.... (20 U.S.C. 1401,20)

For additional definitions as to specific special education terminology the author would refer the reader to P.L. 94-142, Subchapter 1, Chapter 1401. (20 U.S.C. 1401-1420)

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study was to examine school

superintendents' attitudes toward three selected areas from the proposals of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. These three included the financial support given schools for the management of special education programs with a focus on the amounts, their distribution to the selected schools, and the adequacy of the amounts. Also surveyed were the views of the chief administrators of western Oklahoma toward the regulation and support of the state and federal bureaucracies as they affect their school's special education systems. A particular area of regulation observed was the requirement for "mainstreaming" of the special education student population. Finally, the supportive services were evaluated as to the administrators' views regarding support from the state, and to the adequacy of the support as currently structured.

The intent of the study, ultimately, was to draw conclusions as to the adequacy of finances, support services, and administrative systems of special education in western Oklahoma. The study was as viewed from the perspectives of the school superintendents of the area. The potential outcome was to derive proposals for improvement of those programs, at least in the eyes of the practicing administrators most

responsible for making the services work for children with special needs.

Three questions were raised in this study. What are the attitudes of school superintendents toward specific special education questions regarding financing, regulation, and support? Will the attitudes of the superintendents differ when viewed from the perspectives of larger versus smaller schools? Will the attitudes of the superintendents differ when viewed from the perspectives of their receipt of varying amounts of state and federal aid. Will those receiving a larger percentage of their special education budgets from state and federal aid programs disagree with those who receive lesser percentages?

An examination of supporting research found in Chapter II will prepare the reader for the analysis of the study in later chapters.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature Related to
Governmental Regulation

McCarthy and Sage recognized the problem of rural versus urban and densely populated settings versus sparsely populated settings in the financing of special education. They state:

Variations in system costs, or costs for units of resources in particular localities, have been included in the development of general educational fiscal policy in many states. Because of basic cost of living variances, everything that goes into the operation of schools may cost more in one location than another. (417)

Since variations in need result from geographical population differences, distribution policies allowing for regional variations should be recognized. Densely populated urban areas with a disproportionate number of special needs students might best be aided by a different formula than the rest of a state, using an "urban multiplier." The unique problem resulting from a particular geographic location should not constrain flexible programming. (418)

As referred to earlier, Helge, in her study of rural area problems in special education programming of eighteen states, found that state officials reported problems of the greatest difficulty in three areas;

"(1) staffing problems, (2) attitudinal variables, and (3) problems based on rural geography." (516) She reported that:

Poverty and low tax bases further inhibited full service delivery to handicapped students--particularly culturally different special needs students, even though geographic variations of this trend were identified. (516)

Her study identified financing problems in at least one half of the respondent states. A low tax base upon which to finance educational programs was found in 55% of the cases, and even a high level of poverty was noted in 11% of the cases. (516)

Helge also found that states reported their schools to be resistant to change. She noted:

Resistance to change was reported as a major inhibitor by 16 of the 19 state education agencies (88%) queried. (517)
Suspicion of "outside interference" was identified as a major problem in all regions; 72% of state education agencies surveyed reported that this attitude contributed to difficulties in implementing P.L. 94-142.
...In the West, strong feelings of resentment toward federal bureaucracy were evident.
...It was reported that such suspicions were sometimes more strongly held by school officials and board members than rural citizens in general. (518)

State Versus Federal Regulation

Levine and Wexler stated that there was a general distrust on the part of state and local officials

regarding federal agencies. They reported:

State and local public officials are innately suspicious of federal agencies. Washington is looked upon as a far-removed entity which can never fully understand the complexities of local problems. Even when the federal government responds to the needs of states with some kind of legislation, the states and localities seem to remain unappreciative of federal efforts. Furthermore, when the federal government tries to establish some sort of uniform system throughout the nation,...it is bound to have only limited success. (172)

Local officials...realize that the localities within a given state are also different from one another and it is very difficult indeed to invoke a state-wide edict on basically different localities. (173)

They went on to note that the federal government's intents in the passing of P.L. 94-142 have not been met due to a number of problems. These were as perceived by state and local officials (SEA's and LEA's) toward federal bureaucratic requirements and regulations. The state and local education authorities looked upon the federal government's attempts to make them comply with the law as "overly excessive." (174) They stated that the SEA's and LEA's "...saw the problems of compliance centering on..."

1. Not Enough Federal Funds to Begin With.
...several states found themselves strapped for funds. They wanted either federal relief specifically for these kinds of costs or release from PL 94-142's requirement to educate all handicapped children equally.
2. The Teacher Problem. ...there was a continual

problem of balancing off their role in the regular classroom in which a handicapped child had been placed between dealing with the handicapped child and not taking too much time away from the non-handicapped children. Teachers were becoming clerks and bureaucrats, and many of them resented it.

3. Too Much Paperwork. The ever-increasing paperwork was a constant complaint.

4. The Opposition of Parents of the Non-Handicapped. Their children were now receiving less attention than previously, and they felt they were being short-changed.

5. The Complaints about the BEH. (Bureau of Education for the Handicapped) ...the BEH looked upon itself as the Federal Agency charged with bringing about State and Local compliance with PL 94-142, the SEA's and LEA's wanted the BEH to be more of a support group and less of a compliance agency. (174-177)

Levine and Wexler stated that the distrust for federal intervention in special education found in the aforementioned areas had prevented the intent of PL 94-142 from ever being completely achieved.

The above views were contradictory to those of the BEH. The Deputy Commissioner of the BEH, Edwin W. Martin, Jr., wrote in his foreword to a first quarter of 1977 report on P.L. 94-142 that:

Together with our partners in governors' offices, legislatures, state education agencies, and state boards of education, we have learned that there is a deep reservoir of good will and great ability which can, indeed, be tapped to realize fully the vast promise of P.L. 94-142 and Section 504. To turn those "landmark acts" into living reality is not merely our responsibility but our welcome challenge. (Boston v)

This work recognized the problems faced by the rural areas, at least to an extent. The report stated:

The law provides that no LEA may receive an entitlement unless its child count is able to generate a minimum entitlement of \$7500, i.e. approximately 107 children.... The basic problem experienced here, particularly in those states where there are large rural areas and sparse populations, is that it is difficult for school districts to generate entitlements. When entitlements cannot be generated by child counts within districts, the mandate of the law is not obviated. The burden shifts to the SEA to provide educational services. (Boston 30-31)

The study noted that the states may retain 25% of the federal funds for use in "Child Find" programs, personnel training, and other "activities." It also alluded to the fact that this should be sufficient for the states to provide for their needs. Also noted was the complaint by the states of too much paperwork required of the teachers, but the heavy requirement was defended as a necessary management tool, not an instructional guide or plan for teaching.

These statements gave rise to several questions as to whether these problems were addressed and solved in the ten years since this conference. Has the federal government made sufficient change to alleviate these concerns? Is there adequate funding support for special education from federal and state sources? Are schools able to offer programs at the local setting as

envisioned by the makers of P.L. 94-142? These questions will be addressed in the findings of this study in relation to the opinion of the school administrators of western Oklahoma.

Would school districts provide special education services if they were not required to do so? Hill and Marks hold that without the influence methods exerted by the two branches of federal government charged with carrying out special education mandates, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the Office of Special Education (OSE), the schools would not respond. They observed that these offices use a variety of methods to ensure that State Education Authority (SEA) and Local Education Authority (LEA) agencies carry out the intent of the law. They observed that:

...both agencies have used the threat of funding cut-offs to effect compliance, and both have encouraged beneficiaries to use local publicity to prod local officials to change certain practices.
(40)

Corporate penalties--the reduction of state or local agencies' income through fines or withholding of future grant funds--are the bedrock of the enforcement process. (41)

In an evaluation of the effects of federal influence and funding on special education, David examined programs of Federal Categorical Assistance to schools. She noted:

Because the federal share of the costs is small relative to state and local funding for special education, the regulations requiring specific procedures and 'least restrictive environments' have had larger effects than dollars per se. (111)

At the district level...the combination of declining resources, criticism of public education, and political pressure to allocate resources differently strongly suggests that resources would not be targeted to special needs students without requirements to do so. (114)

Wirtz observed that school personnel approach special education financing with the "hot potato" approach, with a philosophy that no one wants to shoulder the responsibility for paying for these programs. He stated the following:

The feeling of many local administrators and boards of education is that special education is the responsibility of the state or federal government---anyone except the local district. (19)

Wirtz stated that the local school district must accept that it is their responsibility for financing these programs, and that they should be "...prepared to spend at least as much for handicapped children...as they do for others within their schools." (20)

"Mainstreaming" of Special Education

Schmelkin found that the attitudes of special education teachers, regular teachers, and non-teachers (college students) toward mainstreaming and academic

costs of mainstreaming to:

...reflect an attitude that mainstreaming will not have negative effects on academic achievement..., with "...special teachers perceive(ing) the effects to be less negative than do regular teachers and nonteachers. (45)

This study went on to state that there were attitudinal differences as to the negative effects on academic achievement of mainstreaming found on the part of the three groups of teachers studied. Special education teachers disagreed:

"...with such statements more strongly than the other two." However the general findings were an "...overall positive attitude toward mainstreaming, on the part of the groups studied..., and was contrary to "...what appear to be negative attitudes toward mainstreaming on the part of the general public and regular teachers." (46)

Gearheart and Weishahn presented several "facts" regarding mainstreaming. They stated the following:

Handicapped students should be enrolled in the regular class for as much of the school day as appropriate, given their unique needs.

Mainstreaming may be either more costly or less costly than education in a special class setting. This depends on the needs of the student under consideration. In most cases, given provision of proper support services, it will cost the same or perhaps slightly more.

If the regular classroom teacher is assisted through special materials and alternative teaching strategies, all students may benefit academically. If such assistance is not provided, or if students who should be in special programs are placed in regular classes, nonhandicapped students may suffer academically. (25)

Hilliard in his "The Pedagogy of Success" stated:

Educators as a group have not been in the forefront of the mainstreaming movement, but have rather tended to be in the first line of resistance. Even now, much of the mainstream effort represents our minimum attempt to accommodate ourselves to the mandates imposed upon us. The mainstream movement remains, among educators, more of a political than a pedagogical change. (qtd. in Sunderlin: 45)

Ivarie, Hogue, and Brulle, in two separate studies of teacher time spent helping special education students versus non-handicapped students, found that teachers spent significantly more time helping students labeled as severely handicapped than in helping students with handicaps which were not debilitating or non-handicapped students in their classrooms. Also, they did not spend significantly more time helping learning disabled students in their classrooms than the non-handicapped. They concluded, however, that the process of mainstreaming students may not be effective due to this as:

...these conclusions raise serious questions concerning efficiency of regular classroom placements for labeled children. If labeled children receive more individualized instruction by virtue of their resource placements, but still engage in overall active learning at a rate only equal to those nonlabeled students who are not served in resource programs, then might not the labeled students be less actively engaged when they are in mainstream settings? (Ivarie 148)

Schmelkin in a study of teacher and non-teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming found that there was an:

...overall positive attitude toward mainstreaming, on the part of the groups studied...in contrast to what appear to be negative attitudes toward mainstreaming on the part of the general public and regular teachers.... (46)

This study was conducted using special education teachers, regular classroom teachers, and students of the graduate school of Education, Health, Nursing, and Arts Professionals at Fordham University. While it was not necessarily generalizable to the superintendents of western Oklahoma, it does point to the fact that many education professionals have a more positive attitude toward mainstreaming than perceived by the general public. The question of positive attitude toward special education was raised as a part of this study, and the results will be addressed in subsequent chapters.

Funding of Special Education

As is the case with many programs mandated by the federal government, a "carrot and stick" approach was adopted to achieve acceptance of the law. Federal funding was established to provide assistance to state and local education authorities in providing special

education services.

To accomplish the funding support for special education programs P.L. 94-142 stated:

...the maximum amount of the grant to which a state is entitled under this subchapter for any fiscal year shall be equal to--(A) the number of handicapped children aged three to twenty-one who are receiving special education and related services; multiplied by--5 per centum for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978...20 per centum for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980...30 per centum for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981...and 40 per centum for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982...except that no state shall receive an amount which is less than the amount which such state received under this subchapter for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977. (20 U.S.C. 1401-1420)

The law further directed the distribution of funds for the state and local education authorities as follows:

Of the funds received under subsection (a)...for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978--50 per centum of such funds may be used by such state... Of the funds received...for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for each fiscal year thereafter--25 per centum may be used by such state...75 per centum of such funds shall be distributed by such state...to local education agencies and intermediate educational units in such state.... (20 U.S.C. 1401-1420)

This raised questions as to how the funds would be distributed and managed. What was the method to be used to get the most good out of the federal dollars to be earmarked for special education? How would Congress assure that the children were getting the most assistance under P.L. 94-142?

In 1986, writing about federal funding, Turnbull observed:

Congress' initial step was to provide money for state and local school programs. The second step was to ensure that the public agencies would spend the money on the children it was intended for. (222)

The basis of the authorization is the number of handicapped children in all states. The basis of the allocation to each state is the number of handicapped children in the state in proportion to the number in the United States. (223)

SEA's are limited in how they may use funds not passed through. They may not use more than 5% of the funds, or \$200,000, whichever is greater, for administrative costs...the SEA must use the remainder of the funds (those not allocated to allowable costs of administration) to provide support and direct services for the benefit of handicapped children.... (225)

...Congress set out to make sure that federal funds would not be diluted--that it would get the biggest bang for its buck. It required LEA's and IEU's to assure the SEA's that federal funds would be spent only for "excess costs" related to child identification, confidentiality of records, full-service goals (including personnel development, adherence to the service priorities, parent participation, and least restrictive placement).

An LEA meets the excess cost requirement if it spends a certain minimum amount of its own money on each handicapped child. ...The purpose of the excess-cost requirement is to ensure that children served with federal funds have at least the same average amount spent on them (from sources other than federal funds) as on children in the school district as a whole. (227)

Under the formula for qualification for special education funding, a LEA may be excluded if it is not able to generate a minimum of \$7,500 annually.

Thornbull, in the same text, further observed:

Some LEA's may not be eligible for funds because they do not generate \$7,500 annually, because their application is not approvable, or because they are unable to establish and maintain programs of sufficient size and scope to effectively meet the educational needs of handicapped children. To maintain control of these LEA's, Congress authorized SEAs to require consolidated LEA applications and to allocate funds to LEA's submitting a consolidated LEA application [Sec. 1414(c) and Sec. 300.190-.192]. This provision clearly prevents LEA's from escaping the provisions of the Act. (230)

Has Congress lived up to the structure of funding which it set forth in P.L. 94-142? Was the increase of funding to be directed to the local level achieved?

According to Jones it was not. Jones observed that:

The appropriation for fiscal year 1976 was 100 million dollars. The hold-harmless feature of the law applied to the next fiscal year (fiscal 1977), during which the appropriations doubled to 200 million dollars. The actual appropriation for fiscal year 1978 was 315 million dollars. The count of handicapped children served when utilizing the formula did not require the full 315 million dollars.... The unused funds were carried over to fiscal 1979, to be added to the basic appropriation and supplemental appropriation to reach the full 10 percent level.

The national average expenditure figures rose per child from 1430 dollars in fiscal 1978 to 1561 dollars in fiscal 1979 and about 1650 dollars in fiscal 1980. On a per child basis, 5 percent of the national average expenditure for fiscal 1978 amounted to approximately \$71.50. The 10 percent for fiscal 1979 amounted to approximately \$156 per child. For fiscal 1980, 20 percent amounted to approximately \$330 per child, but in reality the actual appropriation was sufficient to fund at about \$214 per child (approximately 13 percent). In fiscal year 1981, the actual appropriation was

sufficient to fund at about \$227 per child (13%).
(Jones, 1981)

During that same year, Ward, working with the School Finance Project staff of the National Institute for Education surveyed national, state, and local level officials regarding funding for education. She found that most respondents:

Ranked funding as the foremost problem in education today. Favored increased federal and state financial support for elementary and secondary education, and the maintenance of local support levels. (505)

The equity of financing schools was of considerably less importance to most respondents than the problem of adequacy.... A majority of respondents favored increased funding for elementary and secondary education.... Federal and state aid were identified as the preferred sources for increases, with many respondents, especially those in the West, wanting local support to remain about the same. (507)

Has this desire to increase or maintain state and federal support been met? Recent information would indicate not. To bring this line of thought into a more modern perspective, and to center more on the area of this study, a look at Oklahoma's figures pertinent to financial aid from the two governmental sources reveals interesting information. According to Mr. Don Shive of the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OK SDE), Oklahoma is not receiving the projected 40% funding envisioned by the Act. During the 1986-1987

school year Oklahoma spent \$67,677,281.00 for special education children. This amounts to \$920.34 per child. That year the state received a total of federal funds for special education in the amount of \$19,677,281.00, or only 29 percent of the total amount. The federal funds totaled only \$266.90 per child. Clearly the federal government has not met the projections of P.L. 94-142 in providing support for Oklahoma's special education. (OK SDE 1988)

Oklahoma Research on Special
Education Administration

There has been little research done in Oklahoma regarding the condition of modern special education since its inception with the passage of Public Law 94-142. A review of the literature revealed only one study in Oklahoma which evaluated spending for these programs. It is "A Cost Analysis Of Special Education Programs In Eleven Selected School Districts In Oklahoma" by Richard B. Heatly. While this study did draw conclusions about special education spending in a small sample of central Oklahoma schools, it was limited in scope and did not have significant relevance to the rural schools of the western one-half of the state.

Heatly's study was the evaluation of special education spending by program area, type of class assignment, expenditure by school size per program, and program memberships. His work draws heavily from data generated by the National Education Finance Project (N.E.F.P.) studies in several states. He identifies the largest of his schools sampled as being similar in structure to the typical N.E.F.P. school in size, program membership, and structure.

The N.E.F.P. studies, which were a project of the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were conceived to accomplish the following:

1. Identification of the dimensions of educational programs in the nation/area,
2. Identification of the target populations,
3. Measure the cost differentials among the different educational programs,
4. Relate the variations in educational needs and costs to the ability of school districts, states, and the federal government to support education,
5. Analyze economic factors affecting the financing of education,
6. Evaluate present state and federal programs for the financing of education, and
7. Construct alternative school finance models, both state and federal, and

analyze the consequences of each.
(qtd. in Heatly: 35)

The studies were conducted in several states beginning in 1968 within five states (Wisconsin, Florida, California, Texas, and New York) which offered:

"...comprehensive, high quality special education programs." It was upon these studies that a great deal of the structure of Public Law 94-142 was derived. (qtd in Heatly: 36)

The foregoing survey of research and writing concerning special education is not to be considered a comprehensive study of information. There are literally hundreds of writings concerning this area of education. Interestingly, however, there has been little work done on the specifics of the administration of special education. This study, therefore, will undertake to evaluate some areas of special education administration in an effort partially to answer the need for research in this area. The subsequent chapters undertake to structure and evaluate a survey for that purpose.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was undertaken to examine special education in western Oklahoma. A survey was conducted of school superintendents regarding school populations, budgets, and the amount of state and federal aid which the schools of the western one-half of the state of Oklahoma receive. Also, an inquiry into the attitude of those school superintendents as to the adequacy of this aid was attempted. Their opinions regarding the regulations which are placed upon them through the management systems were included in their responses. The focus of this study was derived from the recommendations of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education meeting of 1966.

To consider these areas, an attempt was made to survey 25 percent of the independent school districts in western Oklahoma through random selection. These schools were polled in each of the aforementioned content areas using a scaled checklist inventory

instrument. Additionally, a study was made of the funding and program data recently provided by each school to the Oklahoma State Department of Education under the mandate of Public Law 98-199. This was done to determine if the differences of school size and the influence of size has an effect on program expenditures and effectiveness. Also surveyed was the question of the amount of aid the schools received in comparison to the total expenditure for special education to determine whether this was a factor in the attitudes reported by the superintendents.

A study was conducted which solicited information from forty-five schools located in the western one-half of Oklahoma. This was determined to represent a close approximation to 25% of the school population of the 176 independent school districts of western Oklahoma. The total population of all schools west of the arbitrary line of Interstate Highway 35 was the population from which the sample was taken. All of the independent school districts were assigned a rank according to Average Daily Attendance (ADA). From this ranking, the sample schools were selected using a table of random numbers. (Steel 428) From the total of forty-five randomly chosen schools ten schools were

used for the refinement stage of the survey. These were randomly selected as well. Of the thirty-five schools surveyed with the refined instrument, twenty-six respondents completed the survey instrument properly and were used in the sample. Seven schools did not respond to the survey, and two respondents offered information which could not be coded. They were excluded from the sample. Of the forty-five schools originally selected, ten were randomly assigned to a pilot group (hereafter referred to as the "test group"), and thirty-five were assigned to a final surveyed group (hereafter referred to as the "study group"). The purpose of the "test group" was to refine the survey instrument through statistical treatment, and to draw conclusions through personal interviews with the administrators who participated in this phase of the study. To accomplish those interviews, telephone contacts were made when possible, and personal interviews were conducted at the offices of the superintendents. Eight respondents make up this "test group" part of the sample. Two of the ten elected not to participate in the study. The remaining sample of administrators was polled using the refined instrument with those questions which were deemed valid and relevant to the study as established

by the pilot test.

Hereafter the reader will find references to several distinct groupings. To clarify these, one must consider the two aforementioned test samples as a "full sample" in the mean data given. This was done as it was felt that the random selection of all of the superintendents polled lent credibility to the use of all answers to derive an average "opinion" on the questions asked. This full sample mean was compared to the means of the two sortings of the "study group." A discussion of these is found in the "Findings" chapter. To summarize the groupings: the "test group" is the first ten superintendents polled to refine the instrument, the "study group" is the group surveyed after the refinement, the "full group" is composed of all superintendents polled. Additionally the reader will find reference to two "sortings." These were mechanical sortings of the "study group" to which statistical measures were applied to test the influence of school size and financial aid received on the opinions of the superintendents.

The data used to determine the answers to the questions of finance and regulation were gathered from two sources. The author made a study of the State Department of Education required survey forms (based on

a Federal Government required survey of special education) which were filled out by each superintendent and forwarded to the State Department of Education. Also, data regarding the budgets of the selected schools completed the information which was related to the findings from an attitudinal survey of the superintendents of the selected schools.

The author reviewed the special education reports of the selected schools to the Oklahoma State Department of Education (SDE) at the SDE offices in Oklahoma City. These data were assumed to be correct as to total expenditure, number and types of students served, and types of teachers, aides, and support personnel on staff to serve those students.

The State Department of Education reports were reviewed for the demographic and budgetary data required. These items were used to validate the superintendent's reported school size, budget, special education budget, state and federal aid amounts, and to derive the percentages of aid versus total special education budget for each school. Additional information was obtained from the SDE Special Education Section and the Finance Section to cross-check for error in reporting.

The next step of the study was the development and mailing of a sixteen-item questionnaire which focused on the attitudes of the selected schools' superintendents as to their views regarding three critical areas of special education programs. Those three selected areas, as stated earlier, were taken from the focus of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education meeting in Denver. (Jordan ii) These areas were financial support adequacy from governmental sources; views on regulation by state and federal sources, including "mainstreaming"; and the adequacy of the structure and amount of support services from state sources.

The questions given to the initial sample of ten were examined statistically to determine their acceptability as research questions. Of the twenty original questions, fifteen were found to be acceptable and were deemed useful to the survey. The others were determined to be unacceptable due to repetition, possible prejudice, and lack of relevance. These were questions raised by the eight respondents to the refinement of the instrument, and their suggestions were used to eliminate or revise the questions.

The questionnaire consisted of the fifteen questions coupled with three other questions about the

school size and budgets. (Appendix B) In all there were four questions asked pertaining to finances, nine regarding regulation with four of these related to the "mainstreaming" requirement and localized placement, and two questions pertaining to state support adequacy and structure. The other question on the questionnaire gathered information on the demography of the school.

Additionally, data were used to compare the sample school superintendents' answers on the questions to determine if there were differences in those views as influenced by school size and by demand on their budgets.

Next the "study group" sample was evaluated using the eight member "test group" sample to determine if the derived data differed between the two groups. This step was added to make one final check for errors in selection of the two groups which might have biased the samples. There was some question as to bias of the "test group" due to the eight schools of this sample possibly having atypical size and wealth. A question arose as to whether the refinement would have been valid with this taken into consideration. The two groups were deemed acceptable after completing this step.

Schools of the "study group" sample were then split

into two groups. The first was a sorting in descending order based upon the size of the student population as reported on state ADA reports. This sorting was divided at the median into two equal groups of "larger" and "smaller" schools. The other sorting was based upon the size of the combined state and federal aid for special education considered as a percentage of each school's total special education budget. This sorting was also divided into two equal groups of "high aid" and "low aid" schools.

Each question was treated by means of a two-way Analysis of Variance between the two groups of each sorting. This was done to determine if there was a significant difference in the views of the superintendents when examined from those perspectives.

Lastly, the survey sample was examined as a total unit on a question-by-question basis to determine the overall opinion of the superintendents of western Oklahoma concerning the current status of their special education programs in the three areas of concern. A statistical mean of each survey variable was computed to determine the degree of agreement or disagreement of the superintendents regarding each question. This was referred to as the overall "opinion" of the surveyed.

Statistics and Implications

Examination of the Test Between Groups.

The initial step in drawing conclusions regarding the study was to evaluate the "test group" as opposed to the "study group" to determine if the two samples were similar in variance distribution for each of the variables tested. This was done, as stated earlier, to control for concerns regarding the validity of the pilot group giving valid refinements to the instrument. Appendix "C" lists the variables examined for both the "test" and the "study" group. The first ten variables deal with the items regarding; (1) school size stated as total membership, (2) size of special education population, (3) the percentage of special education students versus school population, (4) the total school budget, (5) the special education budget, (6) the percentage of special education budget versus the total budget, (7) the amount of state aid for special education, (8) the amount of federal aid for special education, (9) the total of the state and federal aid combined, and (10) the percentage the combined state and federal aid is of the total special education budget for each school. These comprise the first 10

variables listed in the descriptive statistics tables in this chapter. Variables 11 through 25 consist of the attitudinal questions asked on the survey questionnaire. Variable 11 corresponds to question 2 of the questionnaire, Variable 12 to question 3, and so forth.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed for each of the variables numbers 11 through 25 of the questionnaire using the "test group" versus the "study group." Table I illustrates the findings of the by-item ANOVA computations.

An evaluation of data in the ANOVA table reflects a disagreement between the "test group" and the "study group" means as to variable 15 at the .10 level; variables 17, 18, 22, and 25 at the .05 level of significance; and on one variable, number 24, the two groups differ in a highly significant fashion at the .01 level.

Under normal circumstances these questions on which disagreement occurred might be discarded as potentially inaccurate. It was concluded at this point, however, that there may have been built-in bias in the statistics due to sample size, sample make-up, or particular circumstance of the "test group".

A closer look at the "test group" at this point

revealed what appeared to be a bias built into the sample by a randomly chosen, but disproportionate number of large schools as compared to small schools in the sample as opposed to the larger "study group." This led to the conclusion that an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) using variable one, (school size as measured by student population) as the covariate, should be conducted. It was felt that this would eliminate the bias of size in the test sample and reveal more usable data concerning the assumption of variances between the two groups. Table II is the result of that analysis.

An examination of the two variables which were significant in variation after treating the data for school size between the "test group" and the "study group" reveals that they deal with two controversial subjects.

Variable 18, or question 9 from the questionnaire, asked whether the superintendent believed that "mainstreaming" was in the best interest of the handicapped child. One might intuitively expect disagreement on this subject among administrators. A further look at the mean score values between the "test" and "study" groups revealed that the two groups somewhat agreed with this statement. The adjusted mean

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPUTATIONS
USING TEST GROUP ANSWERS VERSUS
STUDY GROUP ANSWERS

Variable	Sum of Squares	degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Computed F
11 - Federal funds adequate for programs?				
Between	.06	1	.06	.14
Within	13.38	32	.42	
12 - Federal regulation cumbersome?				
Between	0.00	1	.00	.00
Within	65.99	32	2.06	
13 - State assistance adequate?				
Between	.62	1	.62	.26
Within	74.91	32	2.34	
14 - LEA control best rather than government?				
Between	3.35	1	3.35	1.83
Within	58.53	32	1.83	
15 - Cooperatives are best system of management?				
Between	4.18	1	4.18	2.49 *
Within	53.85	32	1.68	
16 - Small school ability to offer locally?				
Between	1.65	1	1.65	.82
Within	64.62	32	1.94	
17 - Separate regulations for small schools?				
Between	9.56	1	9.56	4.93 **
Within	61.99	32	1.94	
18 - Mainstreaming best for special children?				
Between	8.42	1	8.42	5.46 **
Within	49.35	32	1.54	
19 - Mainstreamed child detriment to others?				
Between	2.10	1	2.10	1.18
Within	56.84	32	1.78	
20 - Handicapped child deserves education locally?				
Between	.20	1	.20	.30
Within	5.91	32	.18	
21 - Excess cost formula would be best?				
Between	.18	1	.18	.42
Within	13.85	32	.43	
22 - Centralized co-ops. for all sp. ed. students?				
Between	5.43	1	5.43	4.63 **
Within	37.54	32	1.17	
23 - Centralized co-ops. for all but L.D. students?				
Between	3.90	1	3.90	2.39
Within	52.22	32	1.63	
24 - Regional service centers effective?				
Between	11.24	1	11.24	8.37***
Within	42.99	32	1.34	
25 - Small school's costs higher than larger ones?				
Between	5.21	1	5.21	4.19 **
Within	39.85	32	1.25	

* P < .10

** P < .05

*** P < .01

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF SELECTED
SELECTED VARIABLES USING SCHOOL
SIZE TO EVALUATE RESPONSES

Variable	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Computed F
15 - Cooperatives are best system of management?				
Covariate	4.97	1	4.97	3.15
Variable	2.28	1	2.28	1.44
Within	48.88	31	1.58	
17 - Separate regulations for small schools?				
Covariate	12.86	1	12.86	8.12
Variable	4.99	1	4.9	3.15
Within	49.14	31	1.59	
18 - Mainstreaming best for special children?				
Covariate	1.49	1	1.49	.97
Variable	6.58	1	6.58	4.26 *
Within	47.85	31	1.54	
22 - Centralized co-ops. for all but L.D. students?				
Covariate	.16	1	.16	.13
Variable	4.79	1	4.79	3.97
Within	37.38	31	1.21	
24 - Regional service centers effective?				
Covariate	2.17	1	2.17	1.65
Variable	8.70	1	8.70	6.61 *
Within	40.82	31	1.32	
25 - Small school's costs higher than larger ones?				
Covariate	1.42	1	1.42	1.14
Variable	3.87	1	3.87	3.12
Within	38.43	31	1.24	

* P < .05

score for the "test group" was 2.83, with the raw score mean being 2.75. The adjusted mean score for the larger "study group" was 3.90, with the raw mean score being 3.92. This group indicated a very high level of agreement on this variable. Since both groups reflected agreement, and the difference in variance of means appears to be a reflection of sample size and chance selection, it was decided to retain this variable in the analysis of the final survey. Caution in acceptance of this variable was noted.

Variable 24, or question 15 from the questionnaire, asked the superintendent's opinion concerning the effectiveness of the use of regional service centers in Oklahoma as the administrative organizational support unit. An analysis of the means of the "test" and "survey" groups revealed a distinct degree of disagreement on this variable. The "test group's" adjusted mean was 2.48, or to a degree in disagreement as to the regional service centers being effective. The larger "study group" had an adjusted mean score of 3.70, reflecting a relative degree of agreement of opinion on this variable. It was decided to retain this variable in the analysis of the "study group." A caution in acceptance of the findings was noted. An evaluation of the variable, specifically between the sorting for school size and the sorting for percent of aid, was planned to examine for deviations in score variance.

Evaluation of the "Study Group" Scores.

The surveyed "study group" was evaluated for response scores in two manners. First, the group was split into two units, larger schools versus smaller schools. This was to determine if the superintendents' attitudes regarding the selected special education topics

differed when they were grouped into size category divisions. Secondly, the sample was sorted as to percentage of combined state and federal aid to the schools in regard to the total special education budget, and an examination was made. In both treatments, descriptive statistics were calculated, and an analysis of variance was computed for each variable to determine if the two groups differed in opinion on the question.

In the examination of the data as to school district size, the schools were mechanically sorted by total enrollment. An arbitrary level of 1,000 students was selected as the lower limit for the large schools. This was felt to offer an easily identifiable grouping when considering the demographic data of the schools of the area. Those schools with 999 or smaller enrollments were those in the small schools group. It was found that there were six schools with large enrollments and twenty with smaller enrollments

($n/1 = 6$, $n/2 = 20$). These groups were then compared in regard to the variables. Table III gives the data for the two groups. An abbreviated variable identification is included to help the reader identify the item measured by each.

An examination of the descriptive statistics

TABLE III

 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS LARGE
 SCHOOLS VERSUS SMALL SCHOOLS

Variable Number and Name	Small Schools n = 20		Large Schools n = 6	
	mean	SD	mean	SD
1. School Population	352.95	168.16	1954.17	735.56
2. Sp. Ed. Population	36.00	22.34	197.50	85.85
3. % Sp.Ed. of Total	9.50	3.99	9.42	1.78
4. Total Budget	\$1,083,539		\$5,114,430	
5. Sp. Ed. Budget	\$56,654		\$434,187	
6. % Sp.Ed. Of Budget	4.35	1.79	9.27	3.69
7. State Aid Total	\$18,410		\$104,438	
8. Federal Aid Total	\$8,525		\$47,425	
9. Total All Aid	\$26,924		\$152,201	
10 % Aid Of Sp.Ed. Spent	56.99	25.53	37.533	19.59
11.Fed. Aid Adequate?	1.40	.75	1.17	.41
12.Fed. Reg. Cumbersome	4.11	1.41	3.67	1.37
13. State Asst. Adeq.	3.33	1.38	2.83	1.72
14.LEA Control Best	3.10	1.33	2.17	.98
15.Co-ops. Best Method	3.65	1.23	3.33	1.37
16.Small Sch Offer Local	1.95	1.28	3.33	1.86
17.Separate Reg. Small	3.75	1.25	2.67	1.51
18.Mainstrm. Best Child	3.95	1.23	3.83	1.17
19.Mainstrm. Detriment	3.30	1.17	2.17	1.84
20.Handicap. Des. Local	4.80	.41	4.83	.41
21.Excess Cost Best	4.30	.66	4.83	.41
22.Co-Op For All Sp. Ed.	2.15	1.27	2.33	1.03
23.Co-Op All But L.D.	2.33	1.38	2.83	1.17
24.Ser.Cent. Effective	3.80	1.06	3.50	1.64
25.Small Sch Costs Higher	3.95	.99	3.83	1.17

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPUTATIONS
USING STUDY GROUP ANSWERS LARGE
SCHOOLS VERSUS SMALL SCHOOLS

Variable	Sum of Squares	degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Computed F
11 - Federal funds adequate for programs?				
Between	.25	1	.25	.52
Within	11.63	24	.48	
12 - Federal regulation cumbersome?				
Between	.87	1	.87	.44
Within	47.13	24	1.96	
13 - State assistance adequate?				
Between	1.01	1	1.01	.47
Within	51.03	24	2.13	
14 - LEA control best rather than government?				
Between	4.02	1	4.02	2.50
With	38.63	24	1.61	
15 - Cooperatives are best system of management?				
Between	.46	1	.46	.29
Within	37.88	24	1.58	
16 - Small school ability to offer locally?				
Between	8.83	1	8.83	4.39 **
Within	48.28	24	2.01	
17 - Separate regulations for small schools?				
Between	5.42	1	5.42	3.16 *
Within	41.08	24	1.71	
18 - Mainstreaming best for special children?				
Between	.06	1	.06	.04
Within	35.78	24	1.49	
19 - Mainstreamed child detriment to others?				
Between	5.93	1	5.93	3.31 *
Within	43.03	24	1.79	
20 - Handicapped child deserves education locally?				
Between	5.13	1	5.13	.03
Within	4.03	24	.17	
21 - Excess cost formula would be best?				
Between	1.31	1	1.31	3.49 *
Within	9.03	24	.38	
22 - Centralized co-ops. for all sp. ed. students?				
Between	.16	1	.16	.10
Within	35.88	24	1.50	
23 - Centralized co-ops. for all but L.D. students?				
Between	1.31	1	1.31	.73
Within	43.03	24	1.79	
24 - Regional service centers effective?				
Between	.42	1	.42	.29
Within	34.70	24	1.45	
25 - Small school's costs higher than larger one's?				
Between	.06	1	.06	.06

revealed a significant disagreement of means between the larger and smaller schools on study variables number 16 (questionnaire number 7 - Ability to offer locally for small schools), number 17 (questionnaire number 8 - Separate regulations for small schools), number 19 (questionnaire number 10 - Mainstreamed child detriment to others), and number 21 (questionnaire number 12 - Excess cost formula would be best).

Table IV presents the findings of the calculations of the ANOVA scores when evaluating the individual variables for the sorting based on school size. These calculations yielded several distinct differences between the two groupings.

A discussion of the implications of the statistics calculated using the sorting for size will be presented in chapter IV.

In the examination of the schools studied as to the impact of state and federal financial aid on the attitudes of the superintendents, the same procedure was basically followed. The schools were mechanically sorted into two groups of thirteen members each ($n/1 = 13$, $n/2 = 13$). The variable used for sorting was number 10. This variable was a percentage of the amount of aid from both state and federal sources combined and computed as a percentage of the reported

TABLE V

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS "HIGH" AID SCHOOLS VERSUS
"LOW" AID SCHOOLS BASED ON PERCENTAGE
OF SPECIAL EDUCATION BUDGET

Variable Number and Name	Small % Schools n = 13		Large % Schools n = 13	
	mean	SD	mean	SD
1. School Population	798.62	866.26	646.31	702.77
2. Sp. Ed. Population	77.00	85.79	69.54	80.64
3. % Sp.Ed. of Total	9.29	2.96	9.68	4.21
4. Total Budget	\$2,215,040		\$1,812,449	
5. Sp. Ed. Budget	\$204,548		\$83,006	
6. % Sp.Ed. Of Budget	6.81	3.57	4.61	1.88
7. State Aid Total	\$38,828		\$37,695	
8. Federal Aid Total	\$18,489		\$16,514	
9. Total All Aid	\$57,458		\$54,210	
10 % Aid Of Sp.Ed. Spent	31.81	12.84	73.20	15.67
11. Fed. Aid Adequate?	1.31	.48	1.39	.87
12. Fed. Reg. Cumbersome	4.15	1.46	3.85	1.35
13. State Asst. Adeq.	2.77	1.54	3.62	1.26
14. LEA Control Best	3.15	1.41	2.62	1.19
15. Co-ops. Best Method	3.69	1.11	3.46	1.39
16. Small Sch. Offer Local	2.23	1.48	2.31	1.60
17. Separate Reg. Small	3.77	.93	3.23	1.69
18. Mainstrm. Best Child	3.77	1.17	4.08	1.26
19. Mainstrm. Detriment	3.15	1.46	2.92	1.38
20. Handicap. Des. Local	4.85	.38	4.77	.44
21. Excess Cost Best	4.39	.65	4.46	.66
22. Co-Op For All Sp. Ed.	2.31	.61	2.08	1.26
23. Co-Op All But L.D.	2.54	1.33	2.31	1.38
24. Ser. Cent. Effective	3.69	1.03	3.37	1.36
25. Small Sch. Costs Higher	4.00	1.08	3.85	.99

total budget expenditure for special education programs within each school. Descriptive statistics were then calculated on all twenty-five variables of the examination. These are represented in Table V.

The next step was to examine each of the variables of the questionnaire (11 - 25) for agreement between the two groupings. An ANOVA was calculated for each of these variables. The result of this step was that no statistically significant differences were found. The findings are presented in Table VI.

With the development of the instrument completed, and the data gathered and evaluated, conclusions could be made from the survey. Chapter IV discusses the findings and summarizes conclusions derived from it.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPUTATIONS USING
STUDY GROUP ANSWERS "HIGH" AID SCHOOLS
VERSUS "LOW" AID SCHOOLS

Variable	Sum of Squares	degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Computed F
11 - Federal funds adequate for programs?				
Between	.04	1	.04	.77
Within	11.85	24	.49	
12 - Federal regulation cumbersome?				
Between	.62	1	.62	.31
Within	47.38	24	1.97	
13 - State assistance adequate?				
Between	4.65	1	4.56	2.36
Within	49.38	24	1.97	
14 - LEA control best rather than government?				
Between	1.88	1	1.88	1.11
With	40.77	24	1.70	
15 - Cooperatives are best system of management?				
Between	.35	1	.35	.22
Within	38.00	24	1.58	
16 - Small school ability to offer locally?				
Between	.04	1	.04	.02
Within	57.08	24	2.38	
17 - Separate regulations for small schools?				
Between	1.88	1	1.88	1.01
Within	44.62	24	1.86	
18 - Mainstreaming best for special children?				
Between	.62	1	.62	.42
Within	35.23	24	1.47	
19 - Mainstreamed child detriment to others?				
Between	.35	1	.35	.17
Within	48.62	24	2.03	
20 - Handicapped child deserves education locally?				
Between	.04	1	.04	.23
Within	3.99	24	.17	
21 - Excess cost formula would be best?				
Between	.04	1	.04	.09
Within	10.31	24	.43	
22 - Centralized co-ops. for all sp. ed. students?				
Between	.35	1	.35	.23
Within	35.69	24	1.49	
23 - Centralized co-ops. for all but L.D. students?				
Between	.35	1	.35	.19
Within	44.00	24	1.83	
24 - Regional service centers effective?				
Between	.04	1	.04	.03
Within	35.08	24	1.46	
25 - Small school's costs higher than larger ones?				
Between	.15	1	.15	.14
Within	25.69	24	1.07	

* P < .10

** P < .05

*** P < .01

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The first ten variables of the study offer information important to an understanding of the differences among the schools of western Oklahoma. A few observations have been made in the descriptive statistics which were of particular merit. It is suggested that the reader familiarize himself with this information to achieve a full understanding of the demography of the studied area. A discussion of the variables of the questionnaire follows.

When the schools were sorted by size, it was found as expected that the special education populations and the budgets were larger for the bigger schools. Variable 6, however, yielded an interesting observation. It was found that the smaller schools spent approximately five percent more of their total budgets on their special education programs than did the larger schools. This finding, when coupled with the finding in variable 10 that the percent of aid from state and federal sources amounted to almost twenty percent higher for smaller schools than for larger

schools, leads to an observation on funding. It reflects a possibly preferential treatment of smaller schools in funding allocation, and a possible recognition of the rural setting problems at the state and federal levels.

When the sorting for percentage of aid as to special education budget was examined another interesting observation arose. Variable four, the total budget of the schools, was found to average approximately \$400,000.00 higher for the smaller percent-of-aid group than those of the larger percentage recipient schools. A look at Variable 10 (the comparison of the part of the total special education budget that all aid represents) again revealed that the total of aid for special education versus all expenditures was over forty percent higher for the schools in the lower recipient group than the larger recipient one. This was expected, but not to the degree found in the study. The sorting based on variable 10 should have yielded the discovered difference, as this was the criterion upon which the sorting was done, but in examining the rest of the first ten variables, one will find the statistical means to be very close, indicating a close relationship. This unexpected distribution was

probably a function of the weightings in the state funding formulas for type of handicap service, and the demographic distribution of the students among the schools of the survey. This was probably a result of the more "severe" handicapping conditions on the weighting formulas being allocated greater amounts of aid in order to serve those needs.

Variables 11 through 25 were the attitudinal questions from the questionnaire. They will be discussed individually from the perspective of the sortings, and from the perspective of the "full group" response means including all superintendents who responded. The findings regarding each question follow:

Variable 11/Question 2. "The amount of federal funds my school receives is adequate to finance my special education program.

In evaluation of this variable, it was found that the superintendents were in agreement in all cases. The computed "F" score indicated a very high degree of agreement in both sortings. The mean score of the full sample was 1.35. The mean scores of all groupings reflect agreement with this score. Based upon the scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest or most in disagreement, the responses to this variable were found to show a high level of disagreement among the superintendents toward the federal funds being

adequate. The conclusion drawn by this finding is that the superintendents believe to a high degree that the federal government does not provide adequate funding support for their programs.

Variable 12/Question 3. "The amount of federal regulation is cumbersome and detrimental to running a good special education program in my school."

The respondents to this variable were found to be high in agreement throughout the survey. The computed ANOVA scores for all groupings were not significant, indicating a general agreement when viewed from the perspectives of larger versus smaller schools, and higher versus lesser aid recipient schools. The mean score for the full sample was 4.00 which indicated agreement that the variable was correct. The mean scores of the different sortings agreed with this finding. The conclusion on this variable is that the superintendents feel that the federal regulation is cumbersome and detrimental to the best administration of their special education programs.

Variable 13/Question 4. "State assistance in running the special education program in my school is adequate."

The "F" scores of the groupings of this variable were not found to be significant, and the means of the groupings were accepted as in agreement. There was a

calculated "F" score which approximated significance when considering this variable from the perspective of Variable 10 (percentage of aid). This was, however, not adequate to reject the hypothesis of equal variances between the groups. An examination of the mean scores of the groupings showed a close grouping of responses centered around the neutral position. There was some deviation, however. These responses indicated a degree of mixed emotion regarding this question. The full sample mean was 3.19 for this variable which indicates agreement with the question of state assistance being adequate. The mean scores of the higher aid recipient schools and of the smaller populated schools both agreed with the full sample mean. The lesser aid recipient schools and the larger populated schools in the sortings reflected a tendency toward disagreement with this variable. The conclusion on this question was that the superintendents mostly believed state assistance to be adequate. However, one could not say unequivocally that the superintendents agree as to the state assistance being at an acceptable level.

Variable 14/Question 5. "The Local Education Authority (LEA), or local school district, should control special education, and local district control of special education programs would be

more effective than the current system."

The calculated "F" scores for both sortings indicated a level of agreement on this variable. In both cases the hypothesis of equal variance between the groups of the sortings was accepted. Again, the "F" score of the large versus small schools was statistically of interest, but not significant enough for rejection. An examination of the mean scores for the sortings revealed a higher degree of agreement with this variable in the smaller schools than in the larger, and a higher degree of agreement in the lesser aid recipients than the larger recipients. All of the school sorting showed either a degree of disagreement or neutrality with this question. None fully agreed with it. The full sample mean score was 2.88. This reflected a slight degree of disagreement with the question. The conclusion on this variable was that the superintendents disagreed somewhat with this question, but there is a somewhat mixed reaction to it. The responses were determined to be neutral with the superintendents viewing local control in a slightly negative attitude.

Variable 15/Question 6. "A "cooperative" program between my school and others in my area, with consolidated services for my special education students, would be more effective than one offered at the local school."

The calculated ANOVA scores for this variable were not significant, and the hypothesis of equal variances was accepted. A study of the means of all sortings reflected general agreement of the superintendents around the moderate level of agreement. The "full group" mean of 3.58 was in agreement with the range of both of the sorting means. The conclusion on this variable was that the superintendents were somewhat in agreement with the cooperative program concept rather than local offerings.

Variable 16/Question 7. "I am able to offer locally, in my district, the services for all of the handicaps for which my special education students have need."

It was on this variable that the first significant disagreement was found. The "F" score for the large versus small schools was calculated to be 4.39 and was significant at the .05 level. The amount of aid sorting reflected agreement of mean scores. The "full group" mean score for this variable was 2.27, and reflected disagreement with the statement. Observing the mean scores of the amount of aid sorting, one finds that the mean is in agreement with this finding. However, when viewed from the perspective of larger versus smaller schools, it was found that small school superintendents strongly disagreed with this statement

while large school administrators did not. The conclusion on this variable is that small school superintendents view themselves as unable to offer programs to fit the needs of their students' handicaps, while large school superintendents show a relative agreement that they are able to offer what is needed for their students.

Variable 17/Question 8. "A separate set of regulations for special education offerings for small schools, as opposed to large schools, would make special education programs much more effective."

This variable was found to have a significant "F" calculation at the .10 level for the sorting as to school size. While not rejected at the standard level of .05, it does reflect some level of disagreement between the superintendents of the large versus small schools. The sorting for aid received was not found to be significant in variation and was accepted as no disagreement based on aid considerations. An examination of the mean scores showed that the "full group" mean score was 3.50, or in agreement with this statement. The aid recipient sorting reflected a slightly higher agreement on the part of the smaller recipients, but with both agreeing somewhat with this variable. The size sorting revealed, however, a disagreement again between smaller and larger schools.

The small schools' mean of 3.75 reflected a general agreement for separate regulations, while the larger school mean of 2.67 reflected some disagreement with the variable. The conclusion on this variable is that the larger schools are in relative disagreement that smaller schools should have a separate set of regulations, and smaller school superintendents feel that they should be administrated differently from larger schools.

Variable 18/Question 9. "The "Mainstream" philosophy of educating special education students in the local classroom is in the best interest of the needs of special education children."

This variable reflected calculated ANOVA scores which were not significant. All sortings were accepted as equal in variance. Superintendents were found to be in agreement on this question in all examinations. The mean score for the "full group" was 3.92, and the sorted groupings were all within a close range to this mean.

When analyzing the results on this variable in light of the earlier findings between the "test group" and the "study group," it was determined that the disagreement found in this evaluation was probably a function of those particular samples. The findings of the other two sortings were in such good agreement that

the earlier caution was discarded, and the variable accepted.

The conclusion on this variable was that, as a whole, superintendents agreed that "mainstreaming" was in the best interest of special education students.

Variable 19/Question 10. "'Mainstreamed' special education students are often a detriment to the education of other students in the classroom."

The calculated "F" score for the school size sorting was found to be significant at the .10 level. While not rejected at the standard level of .05, this does point to some disagreement among the superintendents when viewed from this perspective. The "F" score for the other sorting was not significant. The mean score for the full sample was 3.04 reflecting relative neutrality on this question on the part of the superintendents as a whole. The aid recipient sorting agreed in range with this mean. The school size sorting, however, reflected a view on the part of the larger school superintendents to disagree with this statement, while superintendents from smaller schools were tending slightly toward agreement. The conclusion on this variable is that in large school settings, superintendents view "mainstreaming" in a slightly more positive manner than those superintendents in small school settings.

Variable 20/Question 11. "The handicapped student deserves, and is entitled to, the best education which we can offer at the local school setting."

This variable was accepted as having equal variances in both sortings. Calculated "F" scores were very low, reflecting a relatively strong agreement of all means. The mean score for the full sample was 4.81, or a very high agreement among the superintendents on this question. Mean scores of the sortings reflected a very close agreement in range. The conclusion on this variable was that the school superintendents' attitudes were very strong in agreement toward offering handicapped students the best possible education at their local schools.

Variable 21/Question 12. "An "excess cost" formula for funds from the state or federal governments for funding of special education student programs (funds given for all costs for special education over normal costs for educating a student) rather than the currently used formulas would improve education for special education students."

The responses to this variable were found to be in agreement when the variance was calculated in the "study group" sorting for aid recipients; however, it was found to be different in variance at the significance level of .10 for the school size sorting. While not rejected at the standard level of .05 this does point to some disagreement among the

superintendents in the school size sorting. The mean score for the full sample was 4.42, reflecting a high agreement among the superintendents as a whole group. The mean scores for the aid recipient sorting were in very close agreement with the "full group" mean. The discrepancy was found in the mean score of the larger schools. This score reflected a very strong agreement with this question. The smaller schools agreed somewhat with the statement. The conclusion on this variable was that the superintendents did agree with the need for this approach to financing, and the large school superintendents reflected the highest degree of agreement.

Variable 22/Question 13. "The state of Oklahoma should set up a consolidated, cooperative system for special education programs, and centralize all special education students at those satellite locations."

This question may be viewed as the inverse of the "mainstreaming" or local offerings questions. The calculated "F" scores for this variable were found to be not significant. Both sortings were determined to be in agreement of variance, and the "full group" mean was accepted as accurate. The full sample mean score was 2.19, which reflected a disagreement among the superintendents as a whole on this question. The

sorting means were close in range to this mean, and it was determined that there was a general disagreement with this question when viewed from all perspectives. The conclusion on this variable was that the school superintendents did not agree with the consolidation of programs, and were in agreement with the earlier finding of a positive attitude toward local and "mainstreamed" programs.

Variable 23/Question 14. "The state of Oklahoma should set up a consolidated, cooperative system for special education for all special education programs other than learning disorders, and centralize students requiring other offerings at those locations."

The ANOVA scores for this variable were found not to be significant for both sortings. The groupings were accepted as equal in variance. The mean score for the "full group" was 2.42, which reflected a degree of neutrality leaning toward disagreement. The mean score of the two sortings was relatively close in range to this full sample mean. There was a slightly higher degree of agreement with this on the part of the large school superintendents. The conclusion on this variable was that the superintendents somewhat disagreed with the question.

Variable 24/Question 15. "The current system in the state of Oklahoma, using regional service centers to assist schools, is effective in administering special education programs."

The calculated "F" scores for this variable reflected agreement of variances for both sortings. The "full group" mean score was 3.73, and reflected a general agreement on the question with a slight tendency toward neutrality. The mean scores for the two sortings of the "study group" reflected a relatively close range of agreement with this full sample mean.

The responses to this variable were found to be in disagreement between the "test group" and the "study group" calculations as stated earlier. As the two sortings on this variable were in very close agreement, the earlier caution was discarded with the qualification that there is apparently some disagreement among the surveyed superintendents on this variable.

The conclusion on this variable was that the superintendents generally supported the current concept of administration using regional service centers, but that the attitude was not a very strong one.

Variable 25/Question 16. "Small schools' costs for special education programs are disproportionately higher than larger schools offering the same programs, and a better consolidation of programs should be allowed for smaller schools."

The responses to this variable were found to have agreement of variances for both sorting. The "full

group" mean score was 3.92, which reflected agreement of the superintendents as a whole with this statement. When viewed from the perspectives of the sortings, the mean scores were very close in range. The conclusion on this variable was that the school superintendents agreed that small-school costs were greater, and that they should be allowed better consolidation of programs.

Chapter V will undertake to analyze these findings and make recommendations for their use. From this information, certain conclusions will be drawn, and recommendations for further study will be made.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The objective of this study was to compile demographic and budgetary data regarding the independent public school districts of western Oklahoma and to survey the attitudes of the school superintendents of that area. The subject of the survey focused on special education using the recommendations of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (Jordan ii)

Three of the recommendations for research by the commission were selected as the focus of this study. Those were the financial, administrative, and support services problems of special education programs in the western states.

A randomly chosen sample of approximately twenty-five percent of the independent school districts of the western one-half of the state of Oklahoma was surveyed. Of these, ten were selected to act as a test refinement group, but were included in the mean score summary of all superintendents at the conclusion stage

of the report. The remaining thirty-five were surveyed using the refined instrument, asking both demographic and attitudinal questions.

Additionally a study was made at the Oklahoma State Department of Education of the mandated report of each school as to special education programs. Also examined were financial reports from those schools.

Upon receipt of the survey forms, the schools of the final group were mechanically sorted into two groups and compared for similarity in answers. The two perspectives chosen for this examination were the large (1,000 or more students) versus small (999 or fewer students) size schools as stated by total student average daily attendance (ADA) figures, and the higher versus lesser percentage of each school's special education budget that the amount of state and federal aid to each school represents. Conclusions were drawn as to the difference of opinion of the school superintendents viewed from the total group of all respondents as well.

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study reflect general agreement among the superintendents of western Oklahoma

regarding the questioned areas of finance, administration, and support services. There were some relative disagreements on five of the questions which drew distinction between the larger and the smaller schools of the state. There were two questions on which the group of superintendents were in slight disagreement in the sorting based on percentage of aid received.

Variable thirteen, the question on adequacy of state support for special education programs, demonstrated nearly a full scale unit of disagreement when viewed from the perspective of the higher versus lower percentage recipients of aid. The means of the two parts of the sorting were both centered close to a point of neutrality; however, those recipients who received a lesser percentage of their special education expenditures in aid tended toward disagreement with this, while the superintendents receiving the higher percentages of aid tended toward agreement to approximately the same degree.

Variable fourteen, the question of local district control being best and most effective, reflected one full unit of disagreement in the size of school sorting. The small schools were neutral while the

larger were negative toward this philosophy. The aid percentage sorting was closer in agreement, but there was one-half value of disagreement on this variable. The smaller percentage schools were in the neutral range, and the larger were also, but leaned toward a negative attitude. The finding on this variable was surprising to the researcher. Considering Helge's (518) report of a distrust of bureaucracy, it was expected to find the superintendents as wanting to control their programs locally, and that they would view this as the best method of administration of special education programs. The relatively negative response on this question seemed to reflect a desire on the part of the superintendents for coordination and control from governmental sources. This would appear to be in conflict with Helge's determinations.

No other variables reflected disagreement in the aid recipient sorting. The mean scores for each variable were deemed to reflect accurate superintendent opinion regarding each selected topic.

Variable sixteen, the question on ability to offer the necessary programs and services for handicapped students at the local level, was found to be in high disagreement between the larger and smaller schools. The small school superintendents felt that they were

unable to provide services as reflected by the negative mean of 1.95; while the large schools were neutral with a tendency toward agreement with the question. This was thought to be a factor of the larger budgets of bigger schools based on tax base and state support being based on ADA or ADM (average daily membership) qualification. There may be other factors contributing to this difference; however, they are not evident based upon this study.

The responses to variable seventeen, the question on a separate administrative regulation for smaller schools, were found to be in disagreement between larger and smaller schools. There was not a full numerical value of disagreement on this variable. The small schools strongly agreed with this question as was expected, but the large schools only disagreed with this to a small deviation from the neutral position. This might reflect a recognition on the part of the larger school superintendents of the problems of budgetary and staffing problems faced by the smaller schools, and a feeling of need for special regulation or assistance to address these problems.

Variable nineteen, the question of mainstreaming being detrimental to other students in the classroom where the special education student is placed,

reflected another small disagreement between the superintendents. There was not a large amount of disagreement with the smaller school mean centering as neutral with a placement slightly toward agreement. The larger school superintendents disagreed with this statement with a slight tendency toward neutrality. The reasons for this disagreement are difficult to determine. It could be a usually larger population of special education students in the bigger schools which would result in more experience with them and their programs on the part of the larger schools' superintendents. This greater exposure may offer experience to those administrators which has led them to believe in the process of mainstreaming. The reason might in fact be the opposite, or a lack of experiences in the smaller schools. Another possible reason might be the greater ability of schools with larger budgets to provide support personnel, services, materials, and training with which to deal with the mainstreamed child. This question may well be a future focus of research.

The final variable which reflected a disagreement was one with only a small degree of difference. Variable twenty-one, the question of governmental

sources paying all costs of special education over the normal per pupil budget cost of the school, showed some difference of opinion. The larger schools reflected an extremely high level of agreement with the need for this support. Their opinion mean for this variable of 4.83 was the highest agreement for any mean calculation for the size sorting examination. The smaller school superintendents also agreed with this statement, but reflected a moderately lower agreement, toward the "somewhat agree" level of the questionnaire. The reason for this is perhaps the previously stated distrust of governmental involvement in the local schools, or of a greater degree of independence in more rural settings as was found by Helge, as quoted earlier. The full reason is not evident through this survey.

The remaining responses by the superintendents to the variables were found to be in agreement in all sortings and groupings. An examination of the three focal points of the study will therefore be undertaken without further examination of the individual questions.

The superintendents reflected attitudes of agreement with the structure of administrative

organization using the regional service centers in the state of Oklahoma. There was some reservation on this, but as a whole they were supportive of this system. The disagreement with the administrative system came as a general displeasure with federal regulation, and a feeling of excessiveness in this area. This question was reflected in the mostly positive attitude toward the support services which are being given to the schools.

One aspect of the regulation of the administrative system was found to be opposite of the popular view regarding school personnel's attitudes toward required programs. The superintendents were positive toward local offerings for their special education students. They felt that mainstreaming was the right approach for the best interest of the placed child, while it was not necessarily a detriment to the other children in the regular classroom where the child was placed. The superintendents did not agree with the thought that the more severe handicapping conditions be addressed through consolidated programs, and they retained their positive attitude toward local offering in this variable also. These conclusions were consistent with Schmelkin's (45) finding of teacher attitudes toward

mainstreaming as being positive. This finding indicated that Wirtz's (19) statements that school administrators did not want this responsibility were erroneous.

The support service level of administration, or the state system of support, was generally accepted as adequate. The superintendents, as a whole, agreed that state support was adequate, but a few respondents did not agree.

The financial findings of this study reflect a strong feeling among the superintendents of western Oklahoma that the federal government is not supporting this requirement in a proper manner. The smaller schools feel that they are inadequate in being able to offer all of the necessary programs on the local level. When this is viewed in the perspective of regulation requiring the mainstreaming of children at the local district if at all possible, and that local schools should finance this, the superintendents begin to disagree with the government. There is general agreement that the governmental sources should pay for all costs over the normal expenses of educating children at the local level. The author would offer that this is an extension of an attitude that the

source of the requirement should have a responsibility to provide funding to support it.

The author would refer the reader to the computational tables in Chapter IV for further analysis of individual questions of interest.

General Observations

There are certain inherent problems in studying Oklahoma's special education programs from the federally required approach based upon the N.E.F.P. surveys. The N.E.F.P. studies were typically done within districts of a large size (a school average daily membership of 20,000 and a handicapped population of 1768). The results of the studies and the subsequent laws were written, it would appear, with areas of larger population in mind. This, it would seem, could result in many ineffective practices being mandated upon the small membership districts of western Oklahoma. Indeed, there are only five communities in the entire western one-half of the state with populations larger than this "typical district," one of these being the school district of Oklahoma City which is only partially within the area of this study.

(Oklahoma ODT) None of the communities of the study

area has a school population of this magnitude.

(Oklahoma S.D.E)

The N.E.F.P. studies approached the programs from the ideal situation of state and federal support in the financing of special education programs. The structure of the law attempted to apply philosophies of equal educational opportunity regardless of cost, with the federal government being a driving force in the financing of these programs. This has proven not to be the case by the 1986-1987 school year. As has been found, superintendents of the survey were opposed to the federal regulation. This would appear to be, to this author, a result of the unrealistic approach of urban rule for rural Oklahoma.

The variables of this study are perhaps, as one respondent put it, "...too simplistic of an approach to an extremely complex problem." Many may argue that special education cannot be viewed from the narrow focus of the attitudes of superintendents only. The attitudes of the special education teachers may have a greater effect on the success of a program. The classroom teachers functioning under the mandate of mainstreaming may be most important to the successful education of the special education student. Attitudes

may not even be an important factor in the program. After all, the emplacement and operation of special education programs in western Oklahoma, as well as most of the nation, is a moot question. The law is passed, the courts have upheld it, and it is the obligation of educators to provide the required services.

One can, however, defend this approach as being worthwhile. Attorneys, parent groups, and proponents have stated, as noted earlier, that without the law there would be no dedication and commitment on the part of professionals to have special education programs.

This author contends that without the desire and commitment of the professionals, there can be no effective law. The passing of regulation often has little effect in actual application. It takes people truly wanting the programs to work for them to be properly operated. If the administrators, in subtleness, practice subterfuge in operating programs as a result of a negative attitude, then the law is of little or no value. The intent is lost to a facade of fulfilling federal and state requirement while going about "business as usual" with no real improvement for the needy child.

If, on the other hand, the administrators are positive in attitudes toward the principles of

providing the handicapped and deprived child the best possible services for his or her education, then the law is merely a guidance in application. It would not even be necessary in most cases.

This author believes that the good intent was discovered. Though there is not the "...great reservoir of good will" which one bureaucrat was noted to report (Boston V), there was found a general positive attitude toward providing the best possible program, with the best resources available, and that it would be best to provide services in the local school district for the special education students.

The negative attitude was not toward providing for the students, but was found to be toward the federal government regulation and the government's general lack of providing adequate funding for its mandates. As one superintendent put it, "I feel blackmailed by the government. They have demanded the programs, then reneged on their promise to provide the help in having them."

While this study may not be generalizable to all states, it does speak for the attitudes of rural, low populous area superintendents of one state. The events of economic crisis, and the particular "modus-operandi"

of Oklahoma education systems, have resulted in a special education system which is most probably unique to this state. However, the author would challenge others to determine the attitudes of the superintendents of the rural parts of all states. I would venture to hold the opinion that the discovered attitudes would be found to be the norm rather than the exception.

The author must admit to several errors in the structuring of this study. It was later determined that the question design often forced the superintendents to respond from a bilevel, or two objective, point of view. For example, if one would examine Variable 25/Question 16 of the survey, it reflects consideration by the superintendents regarding funding problems for small schools and consolidation as the answer to these problems. Perhaps future researchers who may wish to use this as a basis of their surveys may wish to redesign their questions to reflect more singular and simple questions. One must admit to a possible difference in findings should some of the questions have been more simply stated.

More specific questions as to particular points may be more appropriate in future research. While

general attitude is of merit, there were several questions which left one with the feeling of unanswered underlying reasons for the responses. The future researcher may wish to couple the general approach of this study with questions of a more exacting nature to determine which factors are the causes of the positive-negative attitude of their respondents.

Recommendations for Programs

The most obvious recommendation derived from this study is for the federal government to take a serious approach to providing adequate funding for programs upon which it chooses to place legal emphasis. If the programs are important enough to legislators to be recognized with the strength of direct mandate of law to all of the states, then they are important enough to support through funding.

Secondly, the bureaucratic regulations and requirements have obviously become cumbersome and a bother to school professionals. If this is not a case of simple suspicion or distrust of government, then there must be too much paperwork required, more than is viewed as necessary by the administrators. The federal government should attempt to de-regulate this program,

or to "stream-line" reporting and recordkeeping so as to afford the professional more time to apply to the real problem at hand, that of educating the child with special needs. It is recommended that a reduction of paperwork mandate be passed by Congress to direct the federal and state bureaucracies to address this problem.

It is recommended that the individual states survey their internal service resource centers for replication of requirements, and to place more emphasis on the aiding and facilitating function of these agencies rather than the enforcement function.

It is recommended that states consider the addition of more resource persons for assistance to school districts in offering programs at the local level. The feeling reflected in the inadequacy of being able to offer programs locally could be offset with a larger, better trained, and better equipped pool of resource persons available through the regional resource centers.

Recommendations for Superintendents

The greatest recommendation for the school superintendents which this author can offer is that

they become more vocal proponents of their need for support from federal and state sources. They need to tell their story to the public. The commonly held reluctance on their part for these programs does not exist, at least as reflected by this study, and this fact should be conveyed to the proponent groups, and to the general public as well.

Another recommendation to the superintendents is to "know your sources and what they are offering you." It was very surprising to this author to find that the school superintendents could not state what they were getting from the federal government, especially considering the negative responses on the question of adequacy of federal funding support. These data had to be obtained from State Department of Education records. The funding to the school comes as a "flow through" grant in a payment with other monies for special education from the state. State money is added to this based upon the weightings and types of handicap which each school is serving. The majority of the superintendents have not determined what is state money and what is federal money in this grant.

Most superintendents did not know how much money they were spending on special education. Their

statements on the surveys were only approximations, and often in disagreement with their own reports to the State Department of Education. Members of the Special Education Section of the SDE could, therefore, not surmise what the true expenditure for special education was in the state of Oklahoma. It is strongly recommended that a better reporting system of funding and expenditures for special education be created, and that the educational personnel of Oklahoma "get a handle" on what is going on regarding the state's support of these programs. This author offers that most will be truly surprised when the actual amount of support for these programs comes to light.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are a great number of areas which could be expanded from this work. Each of the three selected focal points alone offers a myriad of potential research topics.

The administrative systems lend themselves for the research of design and practice, such as: effective versus ineffective regulations; difference from state to state, or school to school, as to structure and offerings by resource centers; special education

assistance systems of one state versus another. A comparison could be made of those serving a relatively low percentage of the handicapped population, and of states who serve a relative large percentage of their school populations.

A recommendation for further research on the financial status of the programs of each state is made. One cannot help but wonder if other states are experiencing the same difficulty in knowing what is really being spent for their support systems. This research should include private resource support as well as school and governmental sources to reflect a true total of fiscal dedication to the programs.

Further research in the areas of finances should focus on exactly how much money from the federal government is reaching the local schools. The regional service center system, the minimum student-served populations as required by the federal funding rules, the allowance for various amounts to be retained by the states for administration and programming ("...up to 25%"), and the distribution formulas from state to state have, with many other mitigating rules, resulted in a mass confusion as to just how much is reaching the local level. This question should be addressed by each

state so that a valid question of the extent of demand for support from the federal government can be made.

It is recommended that attitudinal surveys be made as to the feelings of principals, special education teachers, and regular classroom teachers to determine if there is agreement in these groups with the findings of this study for their chief administrator.

It is recognized that restrictions on surveys are caused by the federal privacy laws, and that the best approach for research may be a participant observer type of approach. To accomplish this, local employees may be used to observe actual administrative behavior of their superintendents and principals. This would offer a more realistic evaluation of administrative practice in their school districts.

In conclusion the author would offer that this topic has been one of an extremely interesting nature. This being the first really in-depth attempt of the federal government to mandate development and method of operation for education to the states, it is intriguing to observe the way which this has been received in the field, and to observe how effective this method of federal manipulation has been in truly effecting

change. The field is, after eight years of operation, still not fully explored. The field of special education administration and operation is a fruitful arena for study to any person interested in the evolution of American education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abeson, Alan, Legal Change for the Handicapped Through Litigation. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1972.
- Ballard, Joseph, Bruce A. Ramirez, and Frederick J. Weintraub. Special Education in America: Its Legal and Governmental Foundations. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1981.
- Bolick, Nancy. Digest of State and Federal Laws: Education of Handicapped Children. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1975.
- Boston, Bruce O. Education Policy and The Education For All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142): A Report of Regional Conferences, January-April, 1977. Institute for Educational Leadership. Washington, D.C. 1977.
- David, Jane L. "School Improvement and Programs for Special Populations: Finance and Governance Linkages." School Finance and School Improvement: Linkages for the 1980's. Ed. Allan Odden and Dean L. Webb. Fourth Annual Yearbook of the American Education Finance Association. Ballinger Publishing Company. Cambridge, Mass. 1983.
- Gearheart, Bill R. and Mel W. Weishahn. The Handicapped Student in the Regular Classroom. The C. V. Mosby Company. St. Louis, Missouri. 1980.
- Geren, Katherine. Complete Special Education Handbook. Parker Publishing Company, Inc. West Nyack, New York. 1979.

- Hallahan, Daniel P. and James M. Kauffman. Exceptional Children: Introduction to Special Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 1986.
- Heatly, Richard B. A Cost Analysis of Special Education Programs in Eleven Selected School Districts in Oklahoma. Diss. The University of Oklahoma, 1984.
- Helge, Doris I. "Problems in Implementing Comprehensive Special Education Programming in Rural Areas." Exceptional Children, Volume 47, Number 3. April 1981.
- Hill, Paul T. and Ellen L. Marks. "Federal Influence Over State and Local Government: The Case of Nondiscrimination in Education." The National Institute of Education Report-2868-NIE. The Rand Corporation. Santa Monica, California. 1982.
- Hilliard, Asa G. III. "The Pedagogy of Success." The Most Enabling Environment: Education Is for All Children. Ed. Sylvia Sunderlin. Association for Childhood Education International. Washington, D. C. 1979.
- Ivarie, Judith, Dorothea Hogue, and Andrew R. Brulle. "An Investigation of Mainstream Teacher Time Spent with Students Labeled Learning Disabled." Exceptional Children. Volume 51, Number 2. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1984.
- Jones, Philip R. A Practical Guide to Federal Special Education Law: Understanding and Implementing PL 94-142. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York, New York. 1981.
- Jordan, June B., Editor, and others; Special Education Services in Sparsely Populated Areas: Guidelines for Research. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. University East. Boulder, Colorado. 1966.

- Levine, Erwin L. and Elizabeth M. Wexler. PL 94-142: An Act of Congress. Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc. New York, New York. 1981.
- Marinelli, Joseph J. "Financing the Education of Exceptional Children." Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children. by Weintraub, Frederick J., et al. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1977.
- Mayer, C. Lamar. Educational Administration and Special Education: A Handbook for School Administrators. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Boston, Massachusetts. 1982.
- McCarthy, Eileen F. and Daniel D. Sage. "State Special Education Fiscal Policy: The Quest for Equity." Exceptional Children. Volume 48, Number 5. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1982.
- McDonald, Stephen Haskell. An Analysis of the Relationship between the Local Wealth and Distribution of State Support for the School Districts of Oklahoma During the 1977-1978 School Year. Diss. The University of Oklahoma, 1980.
- National School Public Relations Association, The. Educating the Handicapped: Where We've Been, Where We're Going. N.S.P.R.A. Arlington, Virginia 1980.
- Oklahoma Citizens' Commission on Education. Strengthening Oklahoma's Education. Oklahoma State Legislature. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1982.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. School Census Data, Accreditation Section. O.S.D.E. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1987.
- , Policies And Procedures Manual: For Special Education in Oklahoma. Oklahoma State Department of Education. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1988.

- Oklahoma, State of. 1980 Census of Population.
Oklahoma Department of Transportation.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1987.
- , Laws of the Fortieth Legislature. 47 O.S.
1981, Oklahoma Congressional Report.
Section 53, Chapter 259.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1981.
- Podemski, Richard S., et al. Comprehensive
Administration of Special Education.
Aspen Systems Corporation. Rockville,
Maryland. 1984.
- Pullin, Diana. Special Education: A Manual for
Advocates, Volume 1. The Center for Law
and Education, Inc. Cambridge, Mass. 1982.
- Reynolds, Maynard C. "Interpreting Public Law
94-142." The Most Enabling Environment:
Education Is for All Children. Ed. Sylvia
Sunderlin. Association for Childhood
Education International. Washington, D.C.
1979.
- Schmelkin, Liora Pedhazur. "Teachers' and
Nonteachers' Attitudes toward Mainstreaming."
Exceptional Children. Volume 48, Number 1.
The Council for Exceptional Children.
Reston, Virginia. 1981.
- Shrybman, James A., J.D. Due Process in
Special Education. Aspen Systems
Corporation. Rockville, Maryland. 1982.
- Steel, Robert G. D. and James H. Torrie. Principles
and Procedures of Statistics. McGraw-Hill
Book Company, Inc. New York, New York.
1960.
- Tillery, Win L. and Joseph C. Carfioli. "Frederick L.:
A Review of the Litigation in Context."
Exceptional Children. Volume 52,
Number 4. 1986.
- Turnbull, H. Rutherford, III, "Legal Aspects of
Educating the Developmentally Disabled."
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational
Management. National Organization on Legal
Problems of Education. Topeka, Kansas. 1975.

---, Free Appropriate Public Education: The Law and Children with Disabilities. Love Publishing Company. Denver, Colorado. 1986.

United States. Education of All Handicapped Act of 1975. (P.L. 94-142). November 29, 1975. 89-081-0.

Ward, Cynthia V. L. "School Finance Project Opinion Survey." Journal of Education Finance. Annual Conference of the American Education Finance Association. Gainesville, Florida. 1981.

Weintraub, Frederick J. "New Education Policies for the Handicapped: The Quiet Revolution." Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children. Weintraub, et al. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia. 1976.

Wirtz, Morvin A., EdD. An Administrator's Handbook of Special Education: A Guide to Better Education for the Handicapped. Charles C. Thomas, Publisher. Springfield, Illinois. 1977.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE

Superintendent of Schools
 _____ Public Schools
 _____ Street
 _____, Oklahoma 73_____

Dear Colleague,

I would like to solicit your assistance to evaluate the status of special education programs in the western one-half of the state of Oklahoma.

The focus of my study is to gather data in the areas of funding support, government assistance, and to evaluate programs for the area.

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which I request that you take a few minutes to respond to. The information which you give will be kept in the strictest confidence. Neither the school nor you will be referred to in any specific way in the study.

A copy of the results of this study is available to you upon request. If you wish to receive a copy of the finished data, fill out the information below, and return it with your questionnaire in the enclosed, prepaid envelope.

Again, thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely Yours,

Robert S. Neel, Principal
 Granite High School

Yes, I would like to receive a copy of the completed information from the study on special education. Please forward the information to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____, Oklahoma zip_____

Reminder Post Card Sent After First Mailing

REMINDER

Dear Superintendent,

Recently you were mailed a survey form to evaluate special education in your school district. The return of the completed form is very important to the success of this study. Please take the time today to complete the survey and return it in the prepaid envelope.

Thank You,

Bob Neel

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

SPECIAL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the following questions by checking the appropriate box which most closely is your answer to the question. Answer each question on the merits of the question only; do not add to the question, or try to qualify your answers. Answers rank from one for greatest degree of disagreement to five for highest degree of agreement.

The answer blocks are: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = undecided or both agree and disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Other questions are based upon your school setting and the answers are self-explanatory.

1. The student population of my school is _____.

1a. My total school budget is _____.

1b. My total expenditure for special education in my school is _____.

2. The amount of federal funds my school receives is adequate to finance my special education program.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
----------------------	----------------------	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

3. The amount of federal regulation is cumbersome and is detrimental to running a good special education program in my school.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
----------------------	----------------------	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

4. State assistance in running the special education program in my school is adequate.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

5. The Local Education Authority (LEA), or local school district, should control special education, and local district control of special education programs would be more effective than the current system.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

6. A "cooperative" program between my school and others in my area, with consolidated services for my special education students, would be more effective than one offered at the local school.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

7. I am able to offer locally, in my district, the services for all of the handicaps for which my special education students have need.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

8. A separate set of regulations for special education offerings for small schools, as opposed to large schools, would make special education programs much more effective.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

9. The "mainstream" philosophy of educating special education students in the local classroom is in the best interest of the needs of special education children.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

10. "Mainstreamed" special education students are often a detriment to the education of other students in the classroom.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

11. The handicapped student deserves, and is entitled to, the best education which we can offer at the local school setting.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

12. An "excess cost" formula for funds from the state or federal governments for funding of special education student programs (funds given for all costs for special education over normal costs for educating a student) rather than the currently used formulas would improve education for special education students.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

13. The state of Oklahoma should set up a consolidated, cooperative system for special education programs, and centralize all special education students at those satellite locations.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

14. The state of Oklahoma should set up a consolidated, cooperative system for special education for all special education programs other than learning disorders, and centralize students requiring other offerings at those locations.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

15. The current system in the state of Oklahoma, using regional service centers to assist schools, is effective in administering special education programs.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

16. Small school costs for special education programs are disproportionately higher than larger schools offering the same programs, and a better consolidation of programs should be allowed for smaller schools.

strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	undecided	somewhat agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

DATA FOR SCHOOLS OF "STUDY" GROUPING

TABLE OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION
SCHOOLS OF "STUDY" GROUPING

SCHOOL NUMBER	VARIABLE NUMBER									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	3058	287	9.39	\$9,462,276.99	\$753,662.00	7.97	\$148,239.00	\$68,923.05	\$217,162.05	28.81
2	2240	278	12.41	\$6,000,000.00	\$350,000.00	5.83	\$136,591.00	\$66,761.00	\$203,352.70	58.10
3	2150	206	9.00	\$5,300,000.00	\$252,000.00	4.75	\$114,478.00	\$49,470.00	\$163,948.90	65.06
4	1997	226	8.48	\$4,918,900.00	\$650,000.00	13.21	\$157,339.00	\$54,273.90	\$211,612.90	32.56
5	1280	89	6.95	\$2,605,400.00	\$349,461.00	13.41	\$ 32,897.00	\$21,373.35	\$ 54,270.35	15.53
6	1000	99	9.90	\$2,400,000.00	\$250,000.00	10.42	\$ 37,085.00	\$23,744.85	\$ 62,859.85	25.14
7	695	50	7.19	\$1,744,868.00	\$ 42,626.58	2.44	\$ 30,576.00	\$12,007.50	\$ 42,583.50	99.90
8	650	74	11.38	\$1,413,000.00	\$100,000.00	7.08	\$ 25,162.00	\$17,771.10	\$ 12,933.10	43.93
9	625	61	9.76	\$1,485,000.00	\$272,000.00	5.46	\$ 34,124.00	\$14,649.15	\$ 48,774.15	17.93
10	490	73	14.90	\$1,200,000.00	\$ 65,000.00	5.42	\$ 33,033.00	\$17,530.00	\$ 50,563.95	77.79
11	440	26	5.91	\$1,485,000.00	\$ 26,513.00	1.79	\$ 11,921.00	\$ 4,082.55	\$ 16,003.55	60.36
12	439	77	17.54	\$1,499,118.00	\$106,814.55	7.13	\$ 39,631.00	\$18,491.55	\$ 58,122.55	54.41
13	400	40	10.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$ 45,000.00	3.46	\$ 21,340.00	\$ 9,606.00	\$ 30,946.00	68.77
14	380	33	8.68	\$1,180,000.00	\$ 35,000.00	2.97	\$ 25,526.00	\$ 7,924.95	\$ 33,450.95	95.57
15	376	37	9.84	\$1,039,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	3.85	\$ 11,148.00	\$ 8,885.55	\$ 20,033.55	50.08
16	360	17	4.72	\$1,100,000.00	\$ 42,000.00	3.82	\$ 6,006.00	\$ 4,082.55	\$ 10,088.55	24.02
17	330	19	5.76	\$ 953,393.00	\$ 33,000.00	3.35	\$ 16,835.00	\$ 4,562.85	\$ 21,397.85	64.84
18	310	48	6.46	\$ 925,459.00	\$ 50,000.00	5.40	\$ 19,474.00	\$11,527.20	\$ 31,001.20	62.00
19	300	44	14.67	\$1,400,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	4.29	\$ 16,535.00	\$10,566.60	\$ 26,901.60	44.84
20	240	26	10.83	\$ 830,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	7.23	\$ 22,447.00	\$ 6,243.90	\$ 28,690.90	47.82
21	233	33	14.16	\$ 764,000.00	\$ 46,328.00	6.06	\$ 23,251.00	\$ 7,684.80	\$ 30,935.80	66.78
22	200	25	12.50	\$ 900,000.00	\$ 32,500.00	3.61	\$ 8,418.00	\$ 6,003.75	\$ 14,421.75	44.37
23	186	7	3.76	\$ 568,941.00	\$ 29,500.00	5.19	\$ 2,366.00	\$ 1,681.05	\$ 4,407.05	13.72
24	155	17	10.97	\$ 453,000.00	\$ 21,800.00	4.81	\$ 14,468.00	\$ 4,082.55	\$ 17,550.55	80.51
25	140	4	2.86	\$ 725,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	0.69	\$ 3,913.00	\$ 960.60	\$ 4,873.60	97.47
26	110	9	8.18	\$ 673,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	2.97	\$ 3,003.00	\$ 2,161.35	\$ 5,164.35	25.82

VARIABLE 1. = School size based upon ADA; VARIABLE 2. = Special education student enrollment; VARIABLE 3. = Percent two is of one; VARIABLE 4. = Total school budget; VARIABLE 5. = Special education budget for school; VARIABLE 6. = Percent five is of four; Variable 7. = State aid to school for special education; VARIABLE 8. = Federal aid to school for special education; VARIABLE 9. = Total of state and federal aid to school; VARIABLE 10. = Percent nine is of five.

APPENDIX D

DATA FOR SCHOOLS OF "TEST" GROUPING

TABLE OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION
SCHOOLS OF "TEST" GROUPING
VARIABLE NUMBER

SCHOOL NUMBER	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	4800	237	4.94	\$15,000.000.00	\$550,000.00	3.67	\$114,979.00	\$56,915.55	\$171,894.55	31.25
2	3000	71	2.37	\$7,246,166.77	\$646,585.55	8.92	\$306,852.00	\$85,733.55	\$392,585.55	60.72
3	500	120	24.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$354,201.70	27.25	\$152,243.00	\$61,958.70	\$214,201.70	60.47
4	400	44	11.00	\$1,020,089.65	\$ 49,313.60	4.83	\$ 19,247.00	\$10,566.60	\$ 29,813.60	60.46
5	384	48	12.50	\$1,469,318.46	\$ 42,927.00	2.92	\$ 10,602.00	\$11,527.20	\$ 22,129.20	51.60
6	350	39	11.14	\$2,064,000.00	\$ 78,000.00	3.78	\$ 26,936.00	\$ 9,365.85	\$ 36,301.85	46.54
7	391	23	5.88	\$1,174,000.00	\$ 32,000.00	2.73	\$ 14,606.00	\$ 5,523.45	\$ 20,129.45	62.90
8	260	35	13.46	\$1,136,000.00	\$ 25,741.25	2.27	\$ 17,336.00	\$ 8,405.25	\$ 25,741.25	100.00

VARIABLE 1. = School size based upon ADA; VARIABLE 2. = Special education student enrollment; VARIABLE 3. = Percent two is of one; VARIABLE 4. = Total school budget; VARIABLE 5. = Special education budget for school; VARIABLE 6. = Percent five is of four; Variable 7. = State aid to school for special education; VARIABLE 8. = Federal aid to school for special Education; VARIABLE 9. = Total of state and federal aid to school; VARIABLE 10. = Percent nine is of five.

VITA

Robert Stanley Neel

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctorate of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING AND
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD
SPECIAL EDUCATION TOPICS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Mangum, Oklahoma, on
August 21, 1946, the son of Stanley and
Louise Neel. Married Linda L. Trussler
on May 25, 1968. Two children, Melanie
Dawn Neel and Kellie Renae Neel.

Education:

Graduated from Mangum High School,
Mangum, Oklahoma, in May 1964.
Attended Southwestern State College,
Weatherford, Oklahoma, receiving
a Bachelor of Arts Degree in 1970 and
a Master of Education Degree in 1974.
Completed requirements for an Education
Doctorate at Oklahoma State University
in July 1988

Professional Experience:

Teacher/Coach: Martha Public Schools
Martha, Oklahoma, 1970 to 1972;
Teacher/Coach: Mankato Schools
USD #278, Mankato, Kansas, 1972 to 1976;
Principal: Yarbrough Schools, Eva,
Oklahoma, 1976 to 1979;
Principal: Granite Public Schools,
Granite, Oklahoma, 1985 to 1988.
Present: Director of Development/
Admissions, Panhandle State University.

Professional Organizations: Member, Oklahoma
Cooperative Council of School
Administrators, N.A.S.S.P., Phi Delta
Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi