INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4621

7926007

DAVIS, BONITA
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS CONCERNING ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, PH.D., 1979

University Microfilms International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS CONCERNING ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

BONITA DAVIS

Norman, Oklahoma

1979

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS CONCERNING ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

By

R E Rogland
Chair

Member

Member

Loy E Prickett
Member

Leon V Crowley
Member

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to express gratitude to those individuals who actively participated in the research of this study. I'm especially indebted to Dr. Robert Ragland, Chairperson of my doctoral committee for his conscientious efforts and continuing interest in my program.

I would also like to acknowledge the other members of my committee: Dr. Leon Crowley, Dr. Lloyd Korhonen, and Dr. Loy Prickett for their assistance. A very special thought of appreciation goes to Dr. Charles E. Butler for his academic assistance as well as his emotional support throughout my entire doctoral program.

I'm most appreciative to the various school districts as well as the participating superintendents who gave permission for the study, along with their secretarial staff for assisting.

To my family, my most humble thanks, thanks for being. Lastly, thanks to Him for making all things possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES. vi

Chapter

I. BACKGROUND OF STUDY 1

Introduction. 1
Pros. 5
Cons. 5
Purpose of the Study. 7

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. 9

History and Development of Public Law 94-142. . 9
The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 Public Law 94-142 18
Attitudinal Development and Assessment. 26
Related Attitudinal Studies 41
Summary 47

III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 49

The Problem and Hypotheses. 49
Definitions 53
Limitations 54
Instrumentation 54
Attitude Toward Public Law 94-142 Scale (ATPLS) 55
Knowledge Toward Public Law 94-142 Survey (KPLS). 59
Statistical Design. 60
Sample. 61

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 67

Attitudes 68
Knowledge 74
Correlation Between Knowledge and Attitudes . . 79
Summary of Findings 81
Discussion. 85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . .	89
Summary	89
Conclusions	91
Recommendations	91
REFERENCES.	93
APPENDICES.	99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
A.	NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIABLE CATEGORIES IN POPULATION AND SAMPLE.	63
B.	NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSTITUTED OF THE TOTAL POPULATION	63
C.	NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSTITUTED OF THE FINAL SAMPLE	64
I.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS REGARDING ATTITUDES.	69
II.	COMPARISON OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS REGARDING ATTITUDES	69
III.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES.	70
IV.	COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES.	71
V.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING ATTITUDES	71
VI.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES	72
VII.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION AND ELEMENTARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS REGARDING ATTITUDES.	73
VIII.	COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL AND SECONDARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING ATTITUDES.	73

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE		Page
IX.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE.	74
X.	COMPARISON OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE. . . .	75
XI.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE	75
XII.	COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE	76
XIII.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONADRY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE.	77
XIV.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS AND SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE.	77
XV.	COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL AND ELEMENTARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE.	78
XVI.	COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION AND SECONDARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS REGARDING KNOWLEDGE.	79
XVII.	MEANS OF VARIABLE GROUPS CONCERNING ATTITUDES TOWARD PUBLIC LAW 94-142	81
XVIII.	MEANS OF VARIABLE GROUPS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142	82
XIX.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD AND KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING PUBLIC LAW 94-142	83

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS CONCERNING ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF STUDY

Introduction

> On the opening day of school in September, 1978, a quiet revolution will end. The end will not come silently, easily nor dispassionately. The officers and soldiers who led and fought the revolution will not fade away for they recognize that the passing of this revolution may merely be signalling the beginning of the next. Accompanying this end, however, will be celebration--celebration for children who are handicapped and who, since the beginning of public education in the United States, have been the victims of discrimination that often prevented them from receiving an education. On that day in 1978, it will be a violation of federal law for any public education agency to deny to a handicapped child in need of a special education an appropriate program. As stated by the National Advisory Committee on the Education of the Handicapped (1976), "In law and as national policy, education is today recognized as the handicapped person's right" (Abeson and Zettel, 1977, p. 143).

The above statement succinctly summarizes the essential concerns of educators who are concerned with the

implementation of Public Law (P.L.) 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. The signing of this act on November 29, 1975, by President Ford signaled the beginning of the end of the quiet revolution mentioned by Abeson and Zettel.

The revolution has actually been an evolution. The evolution began with enactments of statutes making education of the handicapped a requirement in the state of New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts between 1910 and 1920. Today, all states have similar statutes except Ohio and Mississippi (Annual Report of National Advisory Committee on Handicapped, 1976).

The federal contribution to this revolution began in 1864 with the establishment of Gallaudet College to serve the deaf in Washington, D. C. In 1879, the American Printing House for the Blind was created by federal statute in Lexington, Kentucky. Then, after a 75-year lapse, federal concern for the handicapped was revitalized by the passing of legislation providing for cooperative research in education, a part of which was devoted to the mentally retarded (Annual Report of National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, 1976).

Relatively minor legislation dealing with materials and teacher training for all groups of disabled children was broadened by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, in 1965. In the same year,

Public Law 89-313 amended the previous act, providing support for the education of handicapped children in state operated hospitals and schools. A year later, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I (ESEA) was again amended by P.L. 89-750. This amendment created a new Title VI of the act and created the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. In addition, it established a grant program to strengthen state programs for the handicapped.

Public Law 93-380 amended the educational amendments of 1974 and provided for comprehensive planning, additional financial assistance to the state, protection of the rights of handicapped children by due process procedure and assurances of confidentiality (National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., 1977).

President Ford's signal was strengthened by the signing of federal implementation regulations by Joseph Califano, Secretary of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the summer of 1977. Undergirding recent efforts of state and federal agencies are significant court decisions. Prior to 1969, most of the court decisions did not support equality of educational opportunities for the handicapped. Since that time, the courts have been more supportive by affirming the rights of public education for all children (Collings & Singletary, 1973).

Perhaps the cornerstone of efforts in behalf of the handicapped was the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decision in 1971. In this case, the courts found that handicapped children had been denied due process and equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution (Annual Report of National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, 1976). Shortly thereafter, U. S. District Judge Joseph Waddy ruled in the Mills vs. District of Columbia Board of Education Case of 1972 that all handicapped children had a right to a free public education appropriate for their own individual needs. He further ruled that the states were financially responsible and that monies expended for public education must be equally distributed for handicapped and non-handicapped children alike (Abeson & Zettel, 1977).

The end of the revolution came in September, 1978 when local school districts were required to serve all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 18. This requirement will be broadened to include ages 3 to 21 by September, 1980 (National Information Center for the Handicapped, 1977).

The impact of P.L. 94-142 is being felt by school districts across the nation. The major impact is financial. Even though the federal government is expected to provide 40% of the cost of implementing the new law, local

school districts must provide the remaining 60% (Oklahoma Teacher, 1977). Given the financial postures of school districts, generally, implementation is expected to require either increase in taxes or a reordering of educational program priorities. Both alternatives bear a considerable political risk. However, school districts are legally required to implement the program regardless of the financial burdens. The Oklahoma Teacher (1977) summarizes the issues involved in the implementation of the new law as follows:

Pros

1. The law assures an education for students denied in the past because of handicaps.
2. Parents are assured rights and input into the process.
3. Teachers are assured involvement.
4. There will be less misclassification of students. The law defines and separates mental retardation from a learning disability.
5. The law brings more money into the state for the education of the handicapped.
6. Schools are forced to seek out handicapped children.
7. The law focuses on the individual needs of handicapped students.
8. Better agency coordination will result.
9. It provides an opportunity for non-handicapped students to see coping skills modeled.

Cons

1. The law brings financial hardship on the school.
2. Paperwork, procedures, and techniques are too time-consuming.
3. The timeline for implementation is much too tight.
4. The law could create an adversary relationship between schools, parents, and teachers.
5. Mainstreaming abuses could result if not properly enforced.
6. Local school district frustration is likely.
7. A vehicle for providing in-service training is not clearly defined.
8. There are no provisions for problems resulting from impact of the law on teacher contractual rights.
9. There are no funds for suggested smaller classes and teacher aides.

The pros and cons listed above have been the basis for discussions by all quarters of the educational community. These discussions have also explored implications for both parents and professionals.

According to Abeson and Zettel (1977), discussions of the new law have not centered on implementation. Too often, they feel, the discussions are based on misinformation and misinterpretation. Weintraub (1977) urges that we invest in learning the law and its meaning accurately, since it is such knowledge that can be used effectively by advocates to deal with detractors. The importance of

having accurate knowledge about the law is emphasized by the National Information Center for the Handicapped (1977).

Of equal importance in the implementation of the new law are the attitudes of educators who are responsible and involved. This concern is highlighted by the California Court of Appeals which wrote:

> With minor exceptions, mankind's attitudes toward its handicapped population can be characterized by overwhelming prejudice. The handicapped are systematically isolated from the mainstream of society. From ancient to modern times, the physically, mentally or emotionally disabled have been alternately perceived by the majority as dangers to be destroyed, as nuisances to be driven out, or as burdens to be confined. Treatment resulting from a tradition of isolation has been invariably unequal and has operated to prejudice the interest of the handicapped as a minority group (Lori Case vs. State of California, 1973).

These negative attitudes enumerated by the courts were confirmed by Mussen and Barker (1944); Barker, et al. (1953); Johnson (1950); Grebler (1952); and, Badt (1957).

Not only will implementation of the new law likely be affected by attitudes toward the handicapped, but also it is apt to be affected by attitudes of territoriality on the part of special educators (Weintraub, 1977), by the general attitudes of teachers regarding increased work load and salary differential (Oklahoma Teacher, 1977), by attitudes about the federal government, and by attitudes about the law itself in terms of fairness.

Because of the impact of P.L. 94-142 and the absence of related research, it is important that research efforts

be undertaken to provide information for implementation and evaluation purposes. This exploratory study has that goal.

Purpose of the Study

A comprehensive search revealed a dearth of literature and research concerning P.L. 94-142. Ostensibly, this paucity results from the fact that the law itself is relatively new and implementation procedures have barely begun because of the absence of guidelines prior to the summer of 1977. The absence of related research suggests that school systems will be implementing the new law without the necessary research base. If the new law is to achieve its noble goals, research must be available upon which to base initial implementation efforts and continuous improvements. This exploratory study purports to contribute to the development of such a research base by focusing on the educator groups which have the major implementation responsibilities and bear the brunt of the criticism and problems associated with the implementation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The problem of this study was to determine the attitudes and level of knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of randomly selected elementary and secondary school teachers and elementary and secondary school administrators employed by selected Oklahoma County Public School Districts. The study sought to determine if there were relationships between attitudes and knowledge levels regarding P.L. 94-142.

This review of literature is reported in several sections: (1) History and development of Public Law 94-142, (2) attitudinal development and assessment, (3) related attitudinal studies, and (4) summary.

History and Development of Public Law 94-142

The passage of Public Law 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, culminated an evolutionary process which began before the turn of this century. In spite of historical concern for education

of the handicapped on the part of this nation, state statutes requiring education of the handicapped made their appearance during the decade 1910-20. Such legislation was first enacted in Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York (American Education, 1976). Prior to that time, mentally handicapped children faced one of two rather bleak prospects: isolated existence at home or institutionalization (Tonn, 1974).

The legislative efforts of states on behalf of education for the handicapped came in spite of the decision in Watson vs. City of Cambridge, 1893 (Collings & Singletary, 1973). The court found that a pupil too weak-minded to derive profit from instruction could be excluded from school. Later efforts of this period were also undoubtedly affected by the Wisconsin Supreme Court Decision in State ex. rel Beattie vs. Board of Education of Antigo, 1919. The Wisconsin High Court held that the right of a child to attend school could not be insisted upon when his presence was harmful to the best interests of the school. Both of these cases suggest that the courts generally felt that school attendance for the handicapped was a privilege, not a right. As late as 1958, the courts found in the Department of Public Welfare vs. Haas Case that public schools were not responsible for providing education for the handicapped, especially the mentally retarded (Collings & Singletary, 1973).

However, since 1969, courts have tended to rule more favorably for handicapped students in matters of education. Though the 1969 Wolfe et al. vs. Legislature of Utah decision affirmed the right to education for all children (Collings & Singletary, 1973), the landmark case came two years later in 1971. In that year

> the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) brought a class action suit against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the alleged failure of the state to provide all of its school age children who were retarded with access to free public education. [It was ruled that] states could not adopt any policy that would postpone, terminate, or deny children who were mentally retarded access to a publicly supported education. . . . all retarded children in the state of Pennsylvania between the ages of 6 and 21 were to be provided with a publicly supported education by September, 1972 (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Consent Agreement, 1972).

The final legal nail was pounded into the coffin of unequal education for the handicapped when a federal district court ruled that severity of handicap could not be a basis for not providing handicapped children with free public education (Mills vs. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 1972).

Judicial activity of the types mentioned above stimulated activity on the part of state legislature to the extent that only two states are without statutes mandating education for the handicapped: Mississippi and Ohio (American Education, 1976).

Even though states have assumed increasing financial responsibility for educating the handicapped, it was not until 1968 that the concept of "mainstreaming or integrating the handicapped" became generally acceptable. From the early 1900's to that time, education of the handicapped took place either in totally separate public or private institutions or in separate classes within the regular public elementary or secondary schools (Tonn, 1974).

Federal involvement in the education of the handicapped is long-standing. The establishment of Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C. in 1864 to meet the needs of the deaf was the beginning. The American Printing House for the Blind was established in 1879 at Lexington, Kentucky. These relatively paltry efforts were supplemented by the assignment of a U.S. Office of Education monitor in the 1930's. This person had the responsibility of "keeping up" with the progress of education for the handicapped (American Education, 1976).

The first sign of recognition by the United States Congress of the need for categorical aid for the education of the handicapped since the establishment of the printing house came in 1957. At that time, one million dollars were appropriated to fund the Cooperative Research Act, Public Law 85-531, which had been signed into law three years earlier by President Eisenhower; $675,000 of the appropriation was to be spent on research related

to education of the handicapped (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

In 1958, Public Law 85-905 was signed into law, providing for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf. Subsequent amendments in 1962 and 1965 greatly broadened these services. Development, production, acquisition, and distribution of materials were not included, as was the training of teachers to use media (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

Public Law 85-926, passed within a week of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, granted monies to institutions of higher learning and state educational agencies to train teachers to work with mentally retarded children. Grants for training teachers of the deaf were made possible in 1961 through Public Law 87-276 (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

An administrative high point was reached in 1961, when President Kennedy created the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth within the U.S. Office of Education by signing Public Law 88-164. This law expanded teacher training, established a new research program in handicapped education, and with the Captioned Film Program, constituted the new division (Meisgeier & King, 1970). Public Law 88-164, Section 301 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 amended Public Law 95-926 and expanded the scope

of handicapped to be served. This expansion resulted in handicaps other than deafness and retardation becoming eligible for services. Section 302 of the same law made public non-profit agencies and organizations eligible for grants for research and demonstration projects related to handicapped (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

Continuing efforts to improve the education opportunities for handicapped children were significantly supported by the munificence of the 89th Congress (Meisgeier & King, 1970). This Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This act, commonly known as the ESEA Act, Public Law 89-10, is often regarded as the first "general" aid legislation relating to education in this country. This act included assistance for programs for children in disadvantaged categories, support for state educational agencies, innovative instructional materials, and research and innovation centers. It is perhaps most significant in that it first overcame traditional barriers to federal aid to education of this nature (Meisgeier & King, 1970). Though ESEA was aimed primarily at children in low-income areas, handicapped children in such areas were also to be served. Other children were served through other titles of this Act, especially Title III, which provided support for supplemental centers and innovative programs. More direct sources of support for the education of the handicapped were provided through

the provisions of Public Law 89-313, Section 6. This section amended Title I to provide assistance of an educational nature to handicapped children, who, to this time, had received only custodial care and training. Prior to this time, only local school agencies were eligible for Title I funding (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

Public Law 89-36, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act, authorized the establishment of a postsecondary technical education building for young deaf adults. The Rochester Institute of Technology of New York City developed such a facility through agreement with the Secretary of HEW (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

In the Summer of 1966, HR 16847 was introduced by Congressman Carey. His proposed bill, the Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Act, followed the pattern of Public Law 89-10 and

> provided for grants to the states for education of children in the elementary and secondary schools, grants for the purchase of instructional materials, support for innovative programs and policies to strengthen state departments in the special education area. In addition, it proposed: (a) expansion of the Captioned Films for the Deaf to include materials for all types of handicapped children; (b) new programs for recruitment and distribution of information; (c) expansion of research and training authorities; (d) a statutory National Advisory Committee on Education of the Handicapped; and, (e) a new bureau within the U.S. Office of Education specially for education of the handicapped (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

Though the bill was not passed, many of its major features became law as amendments to Public Law 89-10

in Public Law 89-750, Title, VI, Education of the Handicapped Children.

However, Representative Carey, aided by Senator Hill, was successful in gaining passage of legislation which created a Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act, Public Law 89-694. This school served children from the District of Columbia and was built on the Gallaudet College campus (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

While the 90th Congress was completing work on its massive and broadest program of benefits for handicapped children, it passed Public Law 90-170 as amendments to Public Law 85-926. Public Law 90-170 added a new title to the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This new title, Title V, provided assistance for professional training and research and demonstration projects in the area of physical education for handicapped children, including the mentally retarded (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

The legislative package of the 90th Congress related to the education of the handicapped was passed as Public Law 90-247, amendments to the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In its final form, P.L. 90-247 provided funding for

> (a) Regional Resource Centers; . . . (b) recruitment and informational services; (c) expansion of the various media services; . . . (d) centers and services for deaf-blind children; (e) innovative programs for the handicapped under Title III

> of ESEA; (f) expansion of Title I, ESEA for handicapped children in state schools; (g) expansion of research and demonstration activities; and, (h) expansion of Title VI eligibility to include the Departments of Defense and Interior (Meisgeier & King, 1970).

Public Law 91-230, Amendments to ESEA, repealed Title VI of ESEA and created, as of July 1, 1971, the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA). Part B of the Act generally provided for improving and expanding programs of service for the handicapped. Again, the Act provided eligibility for state departments of education and outlying territories (National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., 1977).

Public Law 93-380 amended the Educational Amendments of 1974 and provided for comprehensive planning, additional financial assistance to the states, protection of the rights of handicapped children by due process procedures and assurances of confidentiality (National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., 1977).

Weintraub suggests that much of what is required in Public Law 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was set forth in Public Law 93-380 (Weintraub, 1977).

The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975

Public Law 94-142

President Ford's signing of P.L. 94-142 on November 29, 1975 was the culmination of efforts by advocacy groups concerned with improving the educational quality and opportunities for all handicapped children. While prior federal enactments focused on special categories of the handicapped, placed the bulk of the responsibility on state agencies, supported financially (and often indirectly) programs of training, research and materials development and dissemination, P.L. 94-142 focused on the public schools, where basic educational responsibilities have traditionally lain. The political implications of the law became clear immediately and delayed the development and issuance of guidelines for the implementation until the Summer of 1977. Immediately prior to the issuance of the guidelines by the Secretary of HEW, the country was wracked by demonstrations by advocacy groups and other representative groups of the handicapped.

P.L. 94-142 is generally considered to be the "Civil Rights Act" for the handicapped (Oklahoma City Times, Thursday, October 20, 1977), and can be expected to be as controversial and difficult to implement as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (A copy of the law and the implementing regulations are included in Appendix A. Clearly, the legislation and the regulations are subject to judicial

interpretation as to meaning and intent. However, at this time, there appears to be consensus on certain aspects of the law. The necessity of the law itself is substantiated by the 94th Congress itself, which found that:

> (a) There are more than eight million handicapped children in the United States today; (b) the special educational needs of such children are not being fully met; (c) more than half of the handicapped children in the United States do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity; (d) one million of the handicapped children in the United States are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers; (e) there are many handicapped children throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose handicaps prevent them from having a successful educational experience because their handicaps are undetected; (f) because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside the public school system, often at great expense; (g) developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instuctional procedures and methods have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, state and local educational agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of handicapped children; (h) state and local educational agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all handicapped children, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special educational needs of handicapped children; and, (i) it is in the national interest that the federal government assist state and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of handicapped children in order to assure equal protection of the law. . . . the purpose of the law is to assure that <u>all</u> handicapped children have available to them, within the time periods specified in section 612(2) (B) a <u>free appropriate</u> public education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist states

and localities to provide for education of all handicapped children and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children (Public Law 94-142, unverified copy, 1976).

The National Information Center for the Handicapped (1977) lists the following as key provisions of P.L. 94-142:

1. Highest priority must be given, first, to handicapped children who are not now receiving an education, and second, to the most severely handicapped children whose education is inadequate.

2. Strong safeguards of the due process rights of parents and children must be guaranteed by states and localities. These safeguards protect parents' rights in all procedures related to the identification, evaluation and placement of their children, and the provision of an appropriate education for their children. They also provide for the opportunity to protest educational decisions made by school officials.

3. The law gives strong impetus to educating children in the "least restrictive environment." It requires that children be placed in special or separate classes only when it is impossible to work out a satisfactory placement in a regular class, with supplementary aids and services. This will be one of the basic considerations in designing appropriate programs for each child.

4. All methods used for testing and evaluation must be socially and culturally non-discriminatory and must be in the primary language or "mode of communication" of the child. No one test or procedure may be the sole means of making a decision about an educational program.

5. Individual education plans are to be prepared for each child, with parents participating on the team that draws up the plan. (The child, too, is to be included when appropriate.) The prescriptions must include

short and long-term educational goals and specific services to be provided. This provision goes into effect in the school year beginning in 1978, and says that all individual plans must be reviewed at least annually and revised according to the child's changing needs.

6. When children are placed in private schools by state or local education systems in order to receive an appropriate education, this must be done at no cost to parents; private school programs must meet standards set by law and schools must safeguard the rights of parents and children guaranteed by law.

7. The law encourages the development of programs for preschool children by creating a special incentive grant to states for providing services to handicapped children aged 3 to 5. Grants can be up to $300 for each child served.

8. Each state must set up an advisory board, including handicapped individuals, teachers and parents of handicapped children. This board is to advise the state on unmet needs, comment publicly on rules and regulations and assist in evaluating programs.

9. Funds can be withheld if, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, a state is found by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to have failed to comply with the act.

10. Payments by the state to local school systems may also be suspended for non-compliance. If the state determines that a locality is unable or unwilling to set up or consolidate programs, or has children who can best be served by regional or statewide programs, the state will use the funds to provide services directly to those children.

In addition, the new law requires an extension of the provision of the act to include handicapped children between the ages of 18 and 21 by September, 1980. However, if a state does not furnish free education to non-handicapped children 3 through 5 or 18 through 21, it

is not obligated to provide it for handicapped children. The requirement to locate and identify children younger than 3 is intended to make states become aware of and plan for children who must be served in the next few years (The Oklahoma Teacher, November, 1977). Each school district is required to submit to the state educational agency its plan for compliance with the new law. Each state educational agency is required, in turn, to submit a state plan to the U.S. Office of Education for approval before funds are made available (Cole & Dunn, 1977).

The provisions of the bill that ostensibly provoke the greatest concern and controversy are those related to the Individualized Educational Plans (IEP), operationalizing the concept of "the least restrictive environment," and funding (Cole & Dunn, 1977).

With respect to funding, a crucial element in the implementation of the new law, reimbursement by the federal government, is expected to be deliberate (Cole & Dunn, 1977). In fiscal year, 1978, the federal share will be 5 percent of the national average expenditure per public school child times the number of handicapped children being served in the school districts of each state; in fiscal year, 1979, 10 percent; in fiscal year, 1982 and each year thereafter, 40 percent (Ashley, 1977). Most importantly, the provisions of the new law take effect regardless of the availability of federal funding. There appears to

be some concern over whether or not the President will request and appropriate the sums of money the law authorizes. For the current fiscal year, 1978, state educational agencies must distribute 50 percent of the allocated monies to the school districts of the state; for fiscal year, 1979 and thereafter, the states must pass on 75 percent of the monies to the local school districts (Goodman, 1976).

The impact of the financial situation is clearly being felt by school districts, particularly in the state of Oklahoma. The inadequacy of current funding is frequently cited by school administrators in discussions concerning implementation of the new law (The Oklahoma Teacher, 1977). Other writers echo this concern as well (Cole & Dunn, 1977; Ashley, 1977; and Killackey, 1977).

Not unrelated is anxiety on the part of the teachers about the IEP's (Ashley, 1977). The IEP, as required by the new law, means a written statement for each handicapped child which includes: (a) a statement of the present educational levels; (b) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, (c) a statement of specific educational services to be provided and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular educational programs; and, (d) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of the services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis,

whether the instructional objectives are being achieved (Ashley, 1977).

It seems clear that major problems will be training teachers to develop IEP's and the increased work load and paperwork required for their development (Killackey, 1977). At a more emotional level lies the question of accountability. Teachers are concerned that they will be held responsible for failure of handicapped students to achieve the goals set out in the IEP's (Ashley, 1977). Regulations from the U.S. Office of Education do not "require" that teachers be held responsible for such failures, but do not clearly absolve teachers (Ashley, 1977). Obviously, many educators, particularly teachers, will view the new law as threatening.

One of the biggest potential sources of headaches for school administrators in the new law is the concept of the "least restrictive environment" (Cole & Dunn, 1977). Section 612(5) (B) of the new law requires the states to establish procedures to assure that, to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicapped is such that education in regular classes

with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (Public Law 94-142, unverified copy, 1976). This provision has been popularly interpreted to mean that the regular classroom is the "least restrictive environment" in which to educate all but the very severely handicapped students (Federal Register, 1977). However, others interpret the provision to mean that handicapped students are to be educated in self-contained special education classes (Abeson & Zettel, 1977). Ballard and Zettel (1977) point out that neither is correct. In fact, the common term used to connote educating handicapped children in regular classrooms, "mainstreaming," is not used in the new law. Nor does it abolish any particular educational environment. What will determine the "least restrictive environment" are the IEP's which are to be developed for each handicapped student. The IEP must clearly "show cause" if and when one moves from a "least restrictive" to a "more restrictive" environment, and it must include a statement indicating the extent to which the handicapped student will be able to participate in regular educational programs.

The operationalization of the "least restrictive" principle seems likely to require additional personnel and additional training for individuals already employed in special education (Killackey, 1977). It can be anticipated that frustration will result from even the best

efforts by teachers who are not trained to handle the special educational needs of handicapped students (Oklahoma City Times, October 20, 1977).

Due process requirements involving the parents in the development of the IEP's and the related student placement will necessitate changed power and status relationships between the parent and the teacher. The possibility of conflict between professional judgment and parental and/or child desires highlights the probability of legal proceedings and ultimately withdrawal of federal funding, a prospect the schools can hardly afford. Equally likely are conflicts between parents of non-handicapped children, school teachers and other educators if the former perceive that the educational progress of their children is negatively affected by the presence of handicapped children in the same classroom.

Ashley (1977) raises perhaps the more poignant issue of real acceptance of handicapped children in the regular classroom by teachers and other students, rather than pity, tolerance isolation, and rejection, prevalent attitudes and behaviors which P.L. 94-142 implicitly attempts to erase.

Attitudinal Development and Assessment

While attitudes have undoubtedly been of interest since the advent of mankind, they became a focal point in experimental research about the first decade of this

century (Saunders, 1969); their study has occupied a central place in social psychology, education and anthropology during the past fifty years (Shaw & Wright, 1967; Allport, 1935; Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb, 1937; and Sherif & Cantril, 1947).

A central belief of psychology is that all behavior is caused or determined by some variable operating in the physiological or psychological realm. Regarding the latter realm, Shaw & Wright (1967) indicate that a number of latent variables have been posited. The construct, attitude, is one such variable which is often invoked to account for consistency in social behavior. Shaw and Wright (1967) believe that attitudes are the results of the socialization process and that they significantly influence man's responses to cultural products, to other persons, and to groups of persons. If a person's attitude toward a given object or class of objects is known, it can be used in conjunction with other variables to predict and explain reactions of the person to that class of objects. Or, to the extent that principles related to attitudinal change are known, they may be used to manipulate the individual's reactions to relevant objects. More succinctly stated, attitudes can cause behaviors and/or vice-cersa.

Part of the difficulty encountered in dealing with the construct, attitude, lies in reaching a consenses regarding its definition. Sherif and Sherif (1958) indicate

that attitudes refer to functional readiness states formed in relation to objects of value to one. Attitudes are more or less lasting and imply a characteristic and selective response to relevant objects. Shaw and Wright (1967) point out that, in addition to being predispositions to respond to social objects, attitudes have the following general characteristics: (a) they are based upon evaluative concepts regarding characteristics of the referent object and give rise to motivated behavior; (b) they are construed as varying in quality and intensity (or strength) on a continuum from positive through neutral to negative; (c) they are learned, rather than being innate or a result of constitutional development and maturation; (d) they have specific social referents, or specific classes thereof; (e) they possess varying degrees of interrelatedness to one another, and (f) they are relatively stable and enduring.

Chisman (1976) contends that an attitude has three components: affective, cognitive and behavioral. The affective component deals with the person's feelings of liking or disliking and his "emotional" reactions toward the attitudinal referent (object). The cognitive component deals with the person's knowledge or beliefs about the referent. Psychologists generally believe that an individual expresses his knowledge or beliefs about an object if he makes statements about the object which

describe it in some way. Some of these statements, however, may be evaluational in nature and appear to be part of the affective component, but psychologists attempt to distinguish between the two on this basis. The behavioral component consists of overt, non-verbal actions towards the object. Shaw and Wright (1967) reject the attitudinal trinity, suggesting that the affective component, alone, constitutes the attitude.

Generally, when psychologists say that an individual has an attitude, they mean, in part, that the three components are consistent in that his belief and action tendencies reflect his feelings about the attitudinal referent. They also mean that, not only are these components consistent with each other at one point in time but also, over a period of time (Chisman, 1976).

Though beliefs and feelings are often inconsistent, they are more often consistent than inconsistent. This occurs because of selective exposure, selective perception and selective retention processes that serve to keep the individual in psychological balance. Of importance is the general finding that the behavioral components of attitudes are more often inconsistent with the cognitive and affective components than the cognitive and affective components are with each other (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960). Individuals who accept beliefs inconsistent with their feelings will often,

change or forget those beliefs. If the individual has a number of beliefs inconsistent with his feelings, psychologists expect that his feelings will change and he will form a new attitude in which his beliefs and feelings are inconsistent. It has been found that when an individual is forced to take actions inconsistent with his beliefs and feelings, those beliefs and feelings will change to become consistent with his actions (Chisman, 1976).

Finally, it seems clear that individuals do not always acquire beliefs, feelings and action tendencies at the same time, and hence, may be said to have partially formed attitudes, consisting of only two components, usually belief and feelings.

It is because attitudes are defined as tendencies of belief, feelings, and actions, and are consistent, that we have been able to develop techniques for measuring them. Without the assumptions stated above, one must conclude that the task would be virtually impossible, particularly when a given attitudinal assessment was examined against a behavior for which the attitude was a predictor.

The continuing difficulties in measuring attitudes are in fact derived from the difficulty in defining them. Clearly the ability to measure attitudes cannot exceed the accuracy of the measuring instruments employed.

While Cattell was credited with doing the pioneer work in the measurement of social values Saunders (1969), Thurstone (1929) and Thorndike (1935) were among the first to attempt to develop attitudinal assessment instruments in a scientific manner.

Campbell (1959) classified the methodological approaches to the assessment of attitudes as follows: (a) disguised-nonstructured; (b) nondisguised-nonstructured; (c) nondisguised-structured; and (d) disguised-structured. The disguised-nonstructured approaches are similar to projective techniques (Peterson, 1967) that use pictures or ambiguous visual forms as stimuli. As a rule, respondents are shown a picture and asked to tell a story about it, to indicate what they think it represents, or to choose among alternative interpretations (Shaw & Wright, 1967). Nondisguised-nonstructured techniques include association or free interviewing, questions requiring essay type answers, and open-ended questioning. Nondisguised-structured instruments include point-blank questioning, public opinion polling and direct rating scales. The disguised-structured techniques differ from the nondisguised-structured approaches in that the subjects being tested are unaware that their attitudes are being measured. Subjects are generally informed they will be serving as judges for the testing situation (Peterson, 1967).

The "structured" category of approaches to the measurement of attitudes appears to have an advantage over the "unstructured" category in that it lends itself more easily to quantification and subsequently to statistical analysis. It also tends to reduce tester bias and restricts the "irrelevant" information output associated with non-structured approaches.

In spite of the weaknesses associated with the non-disguised approaches, subject response resistance and subject positive response set, primarily, they would appear to have decided advantages over the disguised approaches. The advantages are related to instrument validity and reliability and to instrument construction difficulty. Particularly, the nondisguised approaches appear advantageous in assessing attitudes towards groups and objects (Peterson, 1967).

Measurement is the assignment of numbers to objects or events according to a rule or a set of rules (Campbell, 1940; Stevens, 1951). According to Green (1954), when numbers are assigned to persons according to a set of rules that are intended to create an isomorphism between the assigned numeral and a person's attitude toward the object in question, we attempt to measure attitudes. Since an attitude is a hypothetical, or latent, variable rather than an immediately observable variable (Green, 1954), attitude measurement consists of the assessment of an

individual's responses to a set of situations. The set of situations is usually a set of statements (items) about the attitude object, to which the individual responds with a set of specified response categories, e.g., "agree" and "disagree". The value assigned to an individual's response to a given item is called an item score, and the number derived from his item scores represents his position on the latent attitude variables. The set of items, along with the scores is referred to as an attitude scale (Shaw & Wright, 1967).

Attitude scales differ from one another in method of construction, method of response and bases for interpreting scores (Selltiz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1976). A useful attitude scale has several desirable properties: (a) reliability, the degree to which a scale yields consistent scores within individuals when the attitude is measured a number of times; (b) validity, the degree to which the scale measures the attitude it is supposed to measure; (c) equality of units, the extent to which the differences between any two points on scale is equal to the difference between any other two points, i.e., say between 8 and 10 and between 12 and 14; (d) unidimensionality, the extent to which the scale measures a single attitude; and (e) a zero point, a neutral point on the scale or a point at which the quality of the attitude changes from positive to negative, or vice versa (Shaw & Wright, 1967). Selltiz,

et al. (1976) suggest that there are three basic types of scales for measuring attitudes: differential scales, in which a person's response specifies that person's position; summated scales, in which individuals indicate their agreement or disagreement with each item, and their total score is determined by adding the subscores assigned to their responses to all the separate items; and cumulative scales, in which the individual whose attitude is at a certain point on the dimension being measured will answer favorably all the items on one side of that point and answer unfavorably all those on the other side. The Q-sort and semantic methods of attitudinal measurement are recent types which do not fit into the three basic types described above.

The most commonly used of the differential scales is the Thurstone Scale utilizing equal appearing intervals (Selltiz, et al., 1976). The steps involved in constructing the Thurstone Scale are as follows: (a) a large number of items concerning the object of the attitude are formulated; (b) these items are sorted by a sizable number of judges - usually from fifty to three hundred (Selltiz, et al., 1976) - into 11 piles or categories which appear to the judges to be equally spaced in terms of the degree to which agreement with the item reflects the underlying attitude; (c) the piles are numbered from 1 to 11 and a scale value is computed for each item, taken as the

median of the position given the item by the group of judges; (d) the interquartile range, or Q value is computed as a measure of interjudge variability, and all items for which there is much disagreement are rejected; and (e) a small number of items for the final scale are selected so that they are spread more or less evenly along the attitude continuum (Shaw & Wright, 1967). The same authors indicate that in using the scale, the respondant is asked to check each item with which he agrees; his score is the median of the scale values of all the items checked. The reliability of scales developed by this procedure is usually satisfactory (.75 or better). The validity of such scales depends largely upon the attitude being measured and the skill of the person who formulates the items; in general, however, valid scales can be constructed using this technique.

The type of summated scale most frequently used in the study of social attitudes follow the method used by Rensis Likert and is referred to as a Likert-type scale. In such a scale, the subjects are asked to respond to each item in terms of several degrees of agreement or disagreement; for example, (1) strongly approve; (2) approve; (3) undecided; (4) disapprove; and (5) strongly disapprove (Selltiz, et al., 1976).

The procedure for constructing a Likert scale is as follows:

1. The investigator assembles a large number of items considered to be relevant to the attitude being investigated that are either clearly favorable or clearly unfavorable.

2. These items are administered to a group of subjects representative of those with whom the questionnaire is to be used. The subjects indicate their responses to each item by checking one of the categories of agreement-disagreement.

3. The responses to the various items are scored in such a way that a response indicative of the most favorable attitude is given the highest score. It makes no difference whether five is high and one is low or vice versa. The important thing is that responses be scored consistently in terms of the attitude direction they indicate. Whether "approve" or "disapprove" is the favorable response to an item depends, of course, upon the content and wording of the item.

4. Each individual's score is determined by adding the individual's item scores.

5. The responses are analyzed to determine which of the items discriminate most clearly between the high scores and the low scores on the total score. For example, the responses of those subjects whose total scores are in the upper quarter and the responses of those in the lower quarter may be analyzed in order to determine for

each item the extent to which the responses of the criterion groups differ. Items that do not show a substantial correlation with the total score, or that do not elicit different responses from those who score high and those who score low on the total test, are eliminated to insure that the questionnaire is "internally consistent"--that is, that every item is related to the same general attitude (Shaw & Wright, 1967).

The problems of reliability and validity is a continuing one in attitude measurement. In theory, the problems are not unrelated. Concern with reliability arose from the difficulty of obtaining evidence of validity. The notion of construct validity has made it possible to bring more information to bear in the assessment of validity, thus reducing the need for evidence about reliability per se. However, reliability can never be a substitute for validity; a valid measure with low reliability is more useful than a reliable measure of something the researcher is not desirous of measuring (Selltiz, et al., 1976). Nonetheless, the ideal is to produce a measuring instrument that is as reliable and as valid as possible.

Shaw and Wright (1967) list three empirical methods for estimating the reliability of rating scales: test-retest, equivalent-forms, and split-half.

In the test-retest method, the scale is administered to the same group of persons at two different times

times and a correlation coefficient, usually the Pearson r, is computed between the two sets of scores. If the tests are given several times the average of the intercorrelations among the various scores is used as a reliability estimate.

Two different, presumably equivalent, forms are administered to a group on the equivalent-forms method. The two sets of scores are correlated to obtain an estimate of reliability.

The split-half method involves treating each of two or more parts of an attitude scale as a separate scale. In reality, the term split-half is a misnomer, since it is only one alternative procedure. Often, all of the even items are treated as one scale and all of the odd items are treated as another. Sometimes, each item is treated as a separate scale; other times, exactly half of the items are randomly selected as one scale and the remaining items are treated as the others. The correlation coefficient, often the Spearman-Brown formula (Spearman, 1910; Brown, 1910) is computed as an estimate of reliability. When using each item as a separate scale, the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 is frequently used (Kuder & Richardson, 1937).

Estimates of validity are generally more difficult to derive in an empirical fashion. There are four general procedures for estimating the validity of psychological tests (American Psychological Association Committee,

1954; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955): predictive validity, concurrent validity, content validity and construct validity.

Predictive validity is estimated by showing how accurate some future performance on an external criterion can be predicted from a knowledge of a presumed related attitude score. The performance (behavior) is quantified and correlated with the attitude score to produce the coefficient or estimate of validity.

Concurrent validity differs from predictive validity primarily in regard to the time the criterion measure is obtained. If the criterion measure and the attitude scale are administered at the same time, the obtained correlation is regarded as an estimate of concurrent validity.

Content validity refers to the degree to which the items of the instrument sample the content of the attitude domain, i.e., the extent to which the content of the attitude scale corresponds to the content of the attitude system. In practice, the evaluation of content validity is a subjective, judgmental procedure. If the items of a scale designed to measure attitudes about the police are statements about the police, the items may be said to have content validity. However, item validity does not insure that the scale has content validity. Two judgments must be made before it can be said that a scale has content validity. The first judgment has to do with

whether and to what degree each item pertains to the attitude object; the second with whether and to what degree the set of items represent all aspects of the attitude object.

Construct validity is more complex than other types of validity and probably is more meaningful theoretically. It is evaluated by a determination of the relationships between the attitude score and other aspects of the personality. Theoretical conceptualizations that we have about the attitude in question necessitate postulating certain kinds and degrees of relationships between the attitude and other specified variables. These postulations most hold true if construct validity is to be demonstrated (Ghiselli, 1964).

The stimulus-group approach is a variation of the known-groups approach in which a stimulus group, all members of which are suspected of being similar in some regard is used. The important question is whether respondents discriminate among groups to which the attitudinal statements may be applied. For example, if one wished to validate a scale to measure attitudes towards Indians, subjects would be asked to respond to the statements with several ethnic groups, including Indians, as the referents. If the scale is a valid measure of attitudes toward Indians, the attitude score should vary with the simulus group in theoretically expected ways.

Correlation matrices constitute the second approach to the establishment of construct validity. In this approach, these generally computerized correlations are based on the assumption that different methods of measuring the same attitude should yield similar results, whereas different attitudes should yield different scores regardless of the method of measurement. Correlations are computed among scores for a given attitude measured by different scales. Failure to find a significant correlations might indicate lack of validity, while very high correlations would support validity (Shaw & Wright, 1967).

In other cases, measures of internal consistency (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) and test-retest reliability may be used to establish estimates of validity (Shaw & Wright, 1967).

Related Attitudinal Studies

Because of the central place the study of attitudes has occupied in social psychology during the past half century (Shaw & Wright, 1967), a munificence of attitudinal studies exist. Of the many studies of attitudes available, approximately 80% of the total relate to ethnic, religious and cultural groups. Peterson (1967) points out that of all the attitudes, racial prejudice has been studied more than any other. Investigations of attitudes towards specific disability groups, such as the blind or mentally ill, constitute 5% of the total and attitudinal

studies related to the disabled in general constitute less than 1.5% of total (Saunders, 1969). The relative paucity of research studies related to the disabled or handicapped and the lack of agreement of the results of the few that are available is pointed out also by Yuker et al. (1966) and Lippman (1972). Ostensibly, the bulk of the available research is centered on mental retardation (Lippman, 1972), rather than the handicapped, in general.

Wolfgang (1968) tested the following hypotheses: (1) a normal person will place a greater personal distance between himself and a handicapped person than he would a normal peer; (2) there will be an increasing physical interpersonal distance between a normal person and persons with varying degrees of handicap; and (3) students majoring in physical education will place a greater personal distance between themselves and physically handicapped persons than will students majoring in physical therapy. The results supported the first hypothesis, and corroborated the findings of Centers and Centers (1963), Meyerson (1948), and Richardson et al. (1961), who noted a greater social rejection of disabled persons than well-bodied ones. Wolfgang (1968) supported his second hypothesis when he found that the closest personal distance was observed in relation to normal and broken arm figures, the next closest to the clubfoot and amputated leg figures and the farthest distance to the obese figures. There was no

significant difference in the personal distances maintained by the two groups, but the physical therapy students maintained slightly less personal distance than did the physical education majors.

Badt (1957) used the questionnaire method to investigate the attitudes of education and non-education majors at the University of Illinois towards exceptional children and toward providing educational services. It was discovered that the students did not understand the handicapped and were not inclined to be their teachers. The education students were found to be as unwilling to teach exceptional students as non-education majors, but showed less acceptance of crippled children than did non-education majors. The education students expressed unfavorable attitudes which were based on concepts of handicapped children as dependent, demanding and unstable. They desired to have these children segregated. The non-education students were openly hostile toward mentally retarded and maladjusted children.

Meyers (1964) investigated college students' desires to teach the mentally retarded. Using a questionnaire, he asked male and female students in two teacher training institutions to indicate their preferences of ten possible teaching assignments. All of the students were enrolled in a teacher training program but none had taken or were taking the teaching methods courses. Most

were uncommitted to an area of specialization and could, theoretically, select any one of the teaching assignments. He found that men tended not to respond to questions concerning the handicapped and women were not favorable toward teaching the handicapped. He reported that a high percentage of the students indicated that they would never teach classes of the handicapped. Meyers concluded that those entering the teaching profession do not, for the most part, want to work with the disabled and would leave the teaching field rather than teach handicapped children.

Using a rating scale for 24 personality characteristics ranging from favorable to unfavorable, Mussen and Barker (1944) assessed the attitudes of college students towards crippled individuals. The ratings of the students were unfavorable. Saunders (1969) found no significant differences in attitudes between college students who chose people-oriented courses (special education and elementary education) and those who chose technically oriented courses (engineering, business and mathematics). In fact, technically oriented students generally showed more positive pretest attitudes towards handicapped students.

In addition, major, age, sex and classification had no significant effects on the attitudes of the tested students. Interestingly, in 1969, Saunders discovered that exposure to an introductory course dealing with

handicapped children did not result in significantly improved attitudes as measured by a post-test of the referent attitudes. One group actually recorded significantly less favorable attitudes as a result of the introductory course. This finding supports the findings of Dixon (1967), who found that changes in attitudes are more closely related to the teacher's position than to course materials related to disability, and those of Costin and Kerr (1962), which indicated that the results of an abnormal psychology course were negative in terms of attitudinal change toward the mentally ill. Cohen and Struening (1959), however, found that in-service training resulted in favorable attitude changes in a large mental hospital.

After an exhaustive review of the literature Barker, Wright, Meyerson and Ganick (1953) indicated that the attitudes of other people toward handicapped persons are mostly unfavorable, as are the attitudes of the handicapped themselves. This latter finding by Barker et al. was confirmed by Johnson (1950) in his work with mentally retarded students. He found that mentally retarded students were rejected more than normal students and that rejection scores decreased steadily as intelligence increased. Grebler (1952), using the case study approach with parents of mentally retarded children, found that most of the parents studied felt ambivalent or rejecting

toward their retarded child. Similarly, Gildston (1967) found that children who stuttered perceived less acceptance from parents than did non-stutterers. Swanson (1969) found that emotionally disturbed (ED) children felt less acceptance by others in the family than did normals or learning disabled (LD) students. LD's felt more acceptance from the family than the other two groups. ED's, however, experienced fewer positive feelings from fathers and mothers, but, in turn, had more positive feelings toward parents and fewer positive feelings towards other siblings in the family than did the normals and the LD's.

Swanson (1969) and Sherer (1949) found positive correlations between acceptance of self and acceptance of others on the part of their handicapped subjects. Meyerowitz (1962), using the Illinois Index of Self-Derogation, found that educable mentally handicapped (EMH) children had significantly more negative self-concepts than normal children and that EMH children mainstreamed into regular classrooms were less self-derogatory than EMH children in special education classrooms. Guthrie, Butler, and Garlow (1963) discovered that institutionalized girls held more negative self-attitudes than did girls who were not institutionalized.

Haring, Stern, and Cruickshank (1958), assumed that the attitudes of teachers toward exceptional children in their regular classrooms are reflected in their

behavior toward the children and influences the social growth of the exceptional children. They subsequently pointed out the need for exploring the attitudes of those who are regular classroom teachers or are preparing to become teachers.

Summary

The reported review of literature has dealt with the development of Public Law 94-142, attitude development and measurement and relevant attitudinal research studies.

It is clear that the evolution of Public Law 94-142 reflects an evolution of the contemporary attitudes regarding the necessity for providing all handicapped students with equal opportunity, particularly with regard to education. That the law is far-reaching in its goals is unquestioned. The effectiveness with which the law will be implemented is questionable given the current economic posture of the country generally and the public school system particularly. Without doubt there will be problems in implementing the law. This review reveals both strengths and weakness in the law and the related pros and cons that attend any controversial law. This writer's basic assumption, that many of the fears and doubts that threaten the effective implementation of the law can be erased if people are aware of its provision, cannot easily be questioned

if the law is examined carefully and completely. This author feels that this examination has been accomplished through this review.

A limited review of attitude development and measurement has also been presented in this review. It was anticipated that, in the absence of an instrument for assessing attitudes towards the law, such an instrument would necessarily be developed. Because "attitude" is a theoretical construct, the review provided a conceptual framework from which to develop such an instrument. The basic steps in the development of an attitude-measuring instrument were presented, including data on the important properties of reliability and validity.

This review indicated a relative dearth of research studies of the handicapped in general and of attitudinal-type studies, particularly. It is apparent that very few if any attitudinal research studies related to the handicapped have been done since 1972. This writer's exhaustive search failed to uncover any completed during this time period. These studies suggest that the attitudes of educators generally are negative towards certain categories of the handicapped, particularly those with learning-related handicaps. Additionally, studies indicate that students with handicaps have negative feelings about themselves and feel themselves to be the victims of negative feelings from others.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines and describes the procedures followed by this researcher in completing the study. It treats the important elements: instrumentation, statistical treatment, sample, definitions, and limitations.

The Problem and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes and knowledge regarding Public Law 94-142 on the part of randomly selected elementary and secondary teachers and elementary and secondary school administrators employed in the public schools of Oklahoma County, State of Oklahoma. Specifically, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What is the status of selected public school educators relative to knowledge and attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142?
2. Are there differences in attitudes and knowledge levels concerning Public Law 94-142

on the part of public school educators related to assignment level, special or non-special teaching status and administrative or non-administrative status?

3. What are the relationships, if any, between attitudes and levels of knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of selected elementary and secondary teachers and administrators?

The following related null hypotheses were tested:

HO_1: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary and secondary teachers, as measured by the Attitudes Toward Public Law 94-142 Scale (ATPLS).

HO_2: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between special and non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_3: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_4: There is no difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_5: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_6: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary school administrators and elementary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_7: There is no significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education and elementary non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_8: There is no significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

HO_9: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary and secondary teachers, as measured by the Knowledge of Public Law 94-142 Survey (KPLS).

HO_{10}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between special education teachers and non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{11}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary

special education teachers and elementary school administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{12}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{13}: There is no significant differences in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{14}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary and secondary administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{15}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{16}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

HO_{17}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of elementary administrators.

HO_{18}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary administrators.

HO_{19}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS on the part of elementary special education teachers.

HO_{20}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary special education teachers.

HO_{21}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary non-special education teachers.

HO_{22}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of elementary non-special education teachers.

Definitions

Special education teacher: An elementary or secondary school teacher with a special education certificate, who regularly teaches a class approved by the state as a special education class.

Non-special education teacher: An elementary or secondary school teacher with appropriate certification who regularly teaches classes not designated by the state as special education classes.

Administrator: A certified principal or assistant principal with administrative responsibilities in an elementary or secondary school.

Secondary School: A public school in which the lowest grade level is grade six (6).

Elementary School: A public school in which the highest grade level is grade six (6).

Limitations

This study had the following limitations. It was limited:

(1) To all of the public school districts of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, except the Oklahoma City, Jones and Edmond School Districts.

(2) By the accuracy of the measuring instruments utilized in the study.

(3) By the time frame in which the study was conducted.

Instrumentation

To conduct this study, it was necessary to develop two instruments, one for assessing attitudes, the other

for assessing knowledge. The instrument developed to assess attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 was titled, Attitudes Toward Public Law 94-142 Scale (ATPLS). The instrument developed to measure knowledge of Public Law 94-142 was titled, Knowledge of Public Law 94-142 Survey (KPLS).

Attitudes Toward Public Law 94-142 Scale (ATPLS)

This researcher followed attitude construction procedures suggested by Shaw and Wright (1967). After a careful examination of the attitude scales developed by those authors and by Saunders (1969), approximately seventy (70) items felt to relate to attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 were assembled. The draft instrument was then administered to four (4) graduate education classes, totaling one hundred fifty (150). These classes were chosen because they contained educators representative of the groups to be included in the study.

Respondents on the ATPLS, both the draft and final versions, were to respond to each of the items by assigning to them values ranging from +3 to -3. These values corresponded to responses ranging from "agree very much" to "disagree very much". They were forced to choose among the six possible qualitative categories since the neutral category of "undecided" was excluded. In order to facilitate analyses, it was necessary that the scoring be done in such a manner that high total scores represented

positive attitudes and low total scores represented negative attitudes. This was done by converting the scale so that all negative numbers were eliminated. +3 was converted to 6, +2 to 5, +1 to 4, -1 to 3, -2 to 2, and -3 to 1 for positive items. The scheme was reversed for negative items. The maximum score possible was 240 and the minimum, 0. The former represented the most positive attitude; the latter, the most negative. Those items of the ATPLS left blank were recorded as "0". Instances of this occurrence were minimal.

The data from this initial administration of the instrument were analyzed using the factor analysis subprogram taken from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) technical manual. According to Kerlinger (1964) factor analyses can be conceived as a construct validity tool, since it aids in identifying the factors or constructs inherent in a measuring instrument, in this case, factors identified by the ATPLS.

Theoretically, factor analysis techniques identify clusters of items on a test which are highly correlated, indicating that these items share common variance and are predictive of each other. For a large number of items it is difficult and laborious to identify clusters or factors. The sub-program used in this study identified the factors on the printout, through a factor matrix, determined by varimax rotations or orthogonal rotations

of the coordinate axes. Those test items, questions, which did not have a factor correlation or loading of .40 were eliminated. Nineteen (19) test items were eliminated through this procedure.

Consistent with theory, these rotations reduced the amount of shared variance among the items as a whole and increased the amount of shared variance within an identified factor.

The second draft instrument, which contained fifty-one (51) items, was then administered to one hundred five (105) educators representative of the groups that were to be a part of the study. The data received through this administration of the ATPLS was transferred again to computer cards and subjected to analyses using the SPSS Factor Analysis sub-programs.

Through consultation with Dr. William Graves, three varimax rotations were completed. The first rotation identified eleven (11) clusters, the second, seven (7) clusters and the third, five (5) clusters. Except for items 5 and 10, those test items that had factor loadings of less than .40 were eliminated from the instrument. Eleven (11) items were eliminated through this process. Observation of the factor matrix allowed the identification of seven (7) clusters or factors. These factors appeared to identify the following constructs: (a) educational philosophy, (b) handicapped, (c) bureaucracy, (d) leadership, (e) change,

(f) followership, and (g) law. Factor I (educational philosophy) was identified by test items 12, 13, 16, 23, 33, 36, and 39; Factor II (handicapped) was identified by test items, 5, 7, 8, 17, 29, 32, 34, and 38; Factor III (bureaucracy) was identified by items 10, 11, 19 and 24; Factor IV (leadership) was identified by items 26, 28, 31, 35, and 37; Factor V (change) was identified by items 3, 6, 21, 25, and 40; Factor VI (followership) was identified by items 1, 2, 14, 18, 22, and 27; Factor VII (law) was measured by items 4, 9, 15, 20, and 30. Thus, it appears that attitudes regarding Public Law 94-142 are composed of attitudes related to the handicapped, bureaucracy, leadership, change, followership, law and educational philosophy.

According to Kerlinger (1964) loading of .30 or greater are regarded as significant. It was assumed by this researcher that the ATPLS was statistically valid and reliable. According to Guilford (1965) who indicates that item-test correlations between .30 and .80 or item intercorrelations between .10 and .60 provide tests of satisfactory reliability and validity. The final 40-item ATPLS is included in Appendix B. The maximum score is 240 and the minimum is 40.

A Pearson-Moment split half correlation was done to establish a reliability coefficient for the ATPLS. The data for this correlation resulted from administering

the instrument to another group of nineteen (19) educators attending a graduate class at the University of Oklahoma. Two "different" tests for each of the students were achieved by determining a score for "even" numbered items and a score for "odd" numbered. The following formula was used in the computation to arrive at the Pearson coefficient, r.

$$r = \frac{N\Sigma XY - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2][N\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

r was determined to be .28, significant at the .10 level, using the Spearman Brown correction formula $r_{tt}=\frac{2r_{oe}}{1+r_{oe}}$ (Downie & Heath, 1965). The computer printout of the factor matrix is included in Appendix C.

Knowledge Regarding Public Law 94-142 Survey (KPLS)

Items selected for the KPLS were extracted directly from the official document itself. Twenty (20) items were selected that met the following criteria: (1) It was an item about which it could be expected educators would be knowledgable, (2) it was an item that reflected the controversial issues commonly discussed and (3) it was an item the answer to which could be unambiguously extrapolated from the written law itself. The items included on the KPLS were written as clearly and concisely as possible to reduce problems of interpretation by the respondents.

Because the items were taken directly from the law and verifiable by it, the KPLS was assumed to have content validity. The Pearson-Moment split half correlation r was determined using the results obtained by administering the KPLS to the nineteen (19) educators described above. r was found to equal .68, significant at the .05 level. It was therefore assumed that the KPLS was reliable.

In scoring the KPLS, each correct response was scored "1", and each blank or incorrect response was scored "0". The maximum score, representing the most knowledgable individual(s) concerning Public Law 94-142 was "20"; the minimum score, representing the least knowledgable individual(s) concerning Public Law 94-142 was "0". Appendix D contains the KPLS.

Statistical Design

In testing the hypotheses of this study that dealt with "differences", t-tests for independent groups were used. According to Sharp (1979) the following requirements must be met to utilize this test:

1. The two groups are independent
2. Measurement is at least at the interval level
3. The populations are normally distributed
4. The populations have the same variances
5. The samples are randomly drawn

Requirements 1, 2 and 5 were clearly met. Concerning requirement 3, Sharp states that ". . . you can

violate this assumption and not worry about it as long as your sample sizes are not extremely small." This the researcher did in view of the sizes of the samples involved. Concerning requirement 4, Sharp used Hays (1973) as a reference in a footnote, stating:

> Older statistics books and articles suggest that a test of homogeneity of variance be carried out before it is permissible to use a t-ratio. However, many modern statisticians feel such a test is not worth the time and effort. Where these tests for homogeneity of variance are most needed -- on small samples with unequal sizes -- they are the least effective (Sharp, 1973, p. 275).

Based on Sharp's above statement, this researcher assumed that requirement 4 was met -- that a test for homogeneity was not necessary.

In testing those hypotheses of this study that dealt with correlation, the Pearson-Moment correlation method, discussed above, was used.

The .05 level of significance was established for testing all of the hypotheses of this study.

Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from all of the school districts in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma except the Edmond and Jones Public School District and the Oklahoma City Public School District. The latter was initially excluded because of procedural difficulties and the socio-political climate related to union/management difficulties

of significance to this study. The former school districts did not choose to participate in the study.

The twelve (12) school districts that participated in the study represented diverse school settings ranging from rural to urban and from large to small. Additional data regarding the various schools was not sought.

This researcher met with the superintendents or their designees of all of the school districts that participated in the study. The purposes of the study, the instruments to be used and the general research procedures were shared with them. They were assured of system anonymity and of having the results of the study made available to them. They agreed to participate and made available to this researcher rosters of their school districts.

A sample was sought which would be numerically proportional on a district basis to that districts' proportion of the total number of teachers and administrators in the county. To offset the possibility of not having representation by very small districts, it was decided that each district should have at least one (1) school administrator, one (1) special education teacher, one (1) elementary teacher and one (1) secondary teacher. This goal was achieved by a stratified random sampling.

It was determined by counting the number of people listed on all the rosters that the school districts in the study had a total of 2,559 professional personnel,

excluding counselors and support personnel. It was decided that the commonly used 10% (Richer & Forcese, 1973) or 259 person sample size would be sought, with the expectation that not all would respond.

Each variable category of this study was stratified to insure that a sufficient and proportional sample of administrators and special education teachers, both elementary and secondary would be included. The proportion of each variable category needed was computed. Table A, indicates the number and percentage that each variable category constituted of the total population and final sample.

TABLE A

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIABLE CATEGORIES IN POPULATION AND FINAL SAMPLE

VARIABLE CATEGORIES OF EDUCATORS	TOTAL POPULATION		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Secondary Administrators	61	2	9	5
Elementary Administrators	57	2	14	8
Secondary Teachers	1211	47	65	36
Special Education	90	4	12	7
Non-Special Education	1121	44	53	29
Elementary Teachers	1230	48	94	52
Special Education	144	6	26	14
Non-Special Education	1086	42	68	37
TOTAL	2559	100	182	100

Table B indicates the number and percentage each district constituted of the population by variable category.

TABLE B

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSTITUTED OF THE TOTAL POPULATION BY VARIABLE CATEGORY

School Districts	ADMINISTRATORS				TEACHERS								TOTAL	
	SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY		ELEMENTARY				SECONDARY					
					Special Education		Non-Special Educ.		Special Education		Non-Special Educ.			
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
A	1	.04	2	.1	13	.5	15	.5	1	.04	20	1.3	52	2.48
B	6	.4	7	.3	10	.4	65	2.5	3	.1	83	3.2	174	6.9
C	3	.1	1	.04	7	.3	17	.7	6	.2	26	1.0	60	2.34
D	2	.1	1	.04	1	.04	13	.5	2	.1	21	.8	40	1.58
E	3	.1	1	.04	4	.2	25	1.0	9	.4	52	2.0	94	3.74
F	2	.1	1	.04	2	.1	7	.3	1	.1	12	.5	25	1.14
G	19	.7	19	.7	40	1.6	389	15.2	33	1.3	360	14.1	860	33.6
H	2	.1	2	.1	5	.3	25	1.0	3	.1	31	1.2	68	2.8
I	17	.7	16	.7	45	.2	422	16.5	23	.9	432	16.9	955	35.9
J	6	.4	5	.2	15	.5	81	3.2	9	.4	84	3.3	200	8.0
K	0	0	1	.04	1	.04	21	.8	0	0	0	0	23	.88
L	0	0	1	.04	1	.04	6	.2	0	0	0	0	8	.28
TOTAL	61	2.74	57	2.34	144	4.22	1086	42.4	90	3.64	1121	44.3	2559	99.64

The selections from the stratification, teachers--elementary and secondary, and elementary and secondary administrators, were made by assigning numbers to individual names, placing the numbers on cardboard slips, putting them in a box, shaking them vigorously and pulling successively from the box until the desired number from each stratification was achieved. To further insure that sufficient numbers from each variable category would be contained in the sample, one additional selection, where possible, was made from each category. The individuals selected were crossed off the rosters, from which the rest of the sample was drawn. The rest of the sample was taken by randomly selecting a person not already selected from the first ten (10) names on the alphabetical rosters. After this selection, each tenth person not already selected was selected until the names on all rosters were exhausted.

Table C indicates the number and percentage from each of the responding districts in the final sample by variable category.

TABLE C

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT CONSTITUTED OF THE FINAL SAMPLE BY VARIABLE CATEGORY

School Districts	ADMINISTRATORS				TEACHERS								TOTAL	
	SECONDARY		ELEMENTARY		ELEMENTARY				SECONDARY					
					Special Education		Non-Special Educ.		Special Education		Non-Special Educ.			
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
A	1	.5	0	0	2	1.1	1	.5	1	.5	0	0	5	2.6
B	1	.5	0	0	2	1.1	8	4.4	1	.5	7	3.8	19	10.3
C	2	1.1	1	.5	3	1.6	2	1.1	2	1.1	1	.5	11	5.9
D	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.1	2	1.1	1	.5	8	4.2
E	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.1	2	1.1	1	.5	3	1.6	10	5.3
F	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	6	3.0
G	0	0	2	1.1	3	1.6	19	10.4	2	1.1	14	7.7	40	21.9
H	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.1	3	1.6	0	0	3	1.6	10	5.3
I	0	0	4	2.2	5	2.7	22	12.1	2	1.1	19	10.4	52	28.5
J	1	.5	1	.5	3	1.6	6	3.3	0	0	4	2.2	15	8.1
K	0	0	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
L	0	0	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
TOTAL	9	4.6	14	7.3	26	13.9	68	37.1	12	6.4	53	28.2	182	98.1

Each person selected was sent through school mail a sealed, addressed envelope which contained a letter of explanation and thanks, a personal data sheet, forms ATPLS and KPLS and a self-addressed return envelope. The completed forms were sent by the respondents to a collection point in the district's central office where they were picked up. A few were stamped and returned individually to this researcher. Appendix E contains the correspondence sent to the sample selected.

The respondents were instructed not to sign or affix their names to the returned materials unless they desired the results of the study. They were assured anonymity, especially since it was necessary to affix a number to the personal data sheets and the forms ATPLS and KPLS to aid in accounting for the returns.

The materials for the study were collected from the central mailing sites of the school districts by this researcher. A few were mailed by the respondents directly to this researcher. The returned materials of twenty-nine (29) of the respondents were incomplete and discarded. Forty-eight (48) of those selected for the study did not return the materials, in some instances because they were no longer employed by the school district. The 70% acceptable return rate was considered sufficient to complete the study (Kerlinger, 1964).

Appendix F contains variable information and the scores of respondents on both the KPLS and the ATPLS.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the data obtained in study, analyzes them in terms of the tested hypotheses, and summarizes and discusses the findings.

This study sought to determine the attitudes and knowledge regarding Public Law 94-142 on the part of randomly selected elementary and secondary school teachers and elementary and secondary school administrators employed in public school districts in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. Specifically, the study purported to answer the following questions:

1. What is the status of selected public school educators relative to knowledge and attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142?
2. Are there significant differences in attitudes and knowledge levels concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of public school educators related to assignment level,

special or non-special teaching status and administrative or non-administrative status?

3. What are the relationships, if any, between attitudes and level of knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of selected public school educators related to assignment level, special or non-special teaching status, and administrative or non-administrative status?

The data are presented in three sections: attitudes, knowledge and correlation of attitudes and knowledge. The first two sections cover the hypotheses dealing with differences, the latter covers those dealing with relationships. Tables are presented as appropriate to aid in interpretation and analyses.

Hypotheses of differences were tested using the following formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\left[\Sigma X_1^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_1)^2}{N_1} + \left[\Sigma X_2^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_2)^2}{N_2}\right]}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \cdot \frac{(N_1 + N_2)}{N_1 \cdot N_2}\right.}}$$

Attitudes

HO_1: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary teachers and secondary teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

Table I provides the necessary data.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS REGARDING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Teachers	94	147.34	157	7.2 *
Secondary Teachers	65	143.56		S

* $t \geq 1.960$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_1 is rejected. There is a significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between elementary and secondary teachers.

HO_2: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between special education teachers and non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

Table II shows pertinent data.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS REGARDING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Special Education Teachers	38	154.00	157	15.6 *
Non-Special Education Teachers	121	144.38		S

* $t \geq 1.960$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_2 is rejected. There is a significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between special education teachers and non-special education teachers.

HO_3: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

Table III provides the necessary information.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	153.96	38	.37 * NS
Elementary School Administrators	14	148.86		

* $t \leq 2.021$, not significant.

HO_3 is <u>not</u> rejected. There is no evidence of a significant difference between elementary special education teachers and elementary school administrators related to attitudes toward Public Law 94-142.

HO_4: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

The pertinent statistics are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	154.08	19	1.80 * NS
Secondary School Administrators	9	150.22		

* $t \leq 2.093$, not significant.

HO_4 is not rejected. There is no evidence of a significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators.

HO_5: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

Relevant data is indicated in Table V.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	153.96	36	.008 * NS
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	154.08		

* $t \leq 2.021$, not significant.

HO_5 is not rejected. There is no evidence of a difference between elementary and secondary school special education teachers concerning Public Law 94-142.

HO_6: There is no significant difference in attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary school administrators and secondary school administrators, as measured by the ATPLS.

The necessary data is presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary School Administrators	14	148.86	21	.10 *
Secondary School Administrators	9	150.22		NS

* $t \leq 2.080$, not significant.

HO_6 is not rejected. There is no evidence of a significant difference between elementary and secondary school administrators regarding attitudes toward Public Law 94-142.

HO_7: There is no significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

Table VII provides the essential statistics.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION AND ELEMENTARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	153.96	92	8.32 * S
Elementary Non-Special Education Teachers	68	146.97		

* $t \geq 2.000$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_7 must be rejected. There is a significant difference between elementary special and elementary non-special education teachers concerning attitudes toward Public Law 94-142.

HO_8: There is no significant difference in attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers, as measured by the ATPLS.

Pertinent information is provided in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL AND SECONDARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING ATTITUDES

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	154.08	63	5.57 * S
Secondary Non-Special Education Teachers	53	141.05		

* $t \geq 2.000$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_8 must be rejected. There is a significant difference between secondary special and secondary non-special education teachers concerning attitudes toward Public Law 94-142.

Knowledge

HO_9: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary teachers and secondary teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

Table IX shows the pertinent statistics.

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Teachers	94	11.91	157	10.09* S
Secondary Teachers	65	10.80		

* $t \geq 1.980$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_9 is rejected. There is a significant difference between elementary and secondary teachers concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{10}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between special education teachers and non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

The related statistics are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Special Education Teachers	38	12.87	157	14.5 * S
Non-Special Education Teachers	121	11.02		

* $t \geq 1.960$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_{10} must be rejected. There is a significant difference between special education and non-special education teachers concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{11}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary school administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

Table XI shows the necessary information.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	12.50	38	5.81 * S
Elementary Administrators	14	14.36		

* $t \geq 2.021$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_{11} is rejected. There is a significant difference between elementary special education teachers and

elementary school administrators concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{12}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

Relevant data is provided by Table XII.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	13.67	19	2.34 * S
Secondary School Administrators	9	11.22		

* $t \geq 2.093$, significant at the .05 level.

HO_{12} must be rejected. There is a significant difference between secondary special education teachers and secondary school administrators concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{13}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

Table XIII reflects relevant statistics.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	12.50	36	2.44 * S
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	13.67		

* $t \geq 2.042$, significant at the .05 level.

HO_{13} must be rejected. There is a significant difference between elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{14}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary administrators and secondary administrators, as measured by the KPLS.

The necessary statistics are presented in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS AND SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Administrators	14	14.36	21	3.87 * S
Secondary Administrators	9	11.22		

* $t \geq 2.080$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_{14} is rejected. There is a significant difference between elementary and secondary administrators regarding knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{15}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between elementary special education teachers and elementary non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

Table XV provides the needed statistics.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SPECIAL AND ELEMENTARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	12.50	92	1.38 * NS
Elementary Non-Special Education Teachers	68	11.69		

* $t \leq 1.980$, not significant.

HO_{15} is not rejected. There is no evidence of a significant difference between elementary special education and elementary non-special education teachers concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

HO_{16}: There is no significant difference in knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 between secondary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers, as measured by the KPLS.

Table XVI reflects needed data.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION AND SECONDARY NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS REGARDING KNOWLEDGE

	No.	Mean	df	t-ratio
Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	13.67	63	7.04 * S
Secondary Non-Special Education Teachers	53	10.15		

* $t \geq 2.000$, significant at the .001 level.

HO_{16} was rejected. There is a significant difference between secondary special education and secondary non-special education teachers concerning knowledge of Public Law 94-142.

Correlation Between Knowledge and Attitudes

HO_{17}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142 as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of elementary administrators.

HO_{17} was not rejected. The correlation coefficient, r -.37, is not significant at the .05 level. Attitudes and knowledge are not found to be significantly related for elementary administrators.

HO_{18}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary administrators.

HO_{18} was not rejected. The r coefficient, .08, is not significant at the .05 level. Attitude and knowledge are not found to be related significantly for secondary administrators.

HO_{19}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS on the part of elementary special education teachers.

HO_{19} was rejected. The r coefficient, .46, is significant at the .05 level. For elementary special education teachers, knowledge and attitudes are significantly related.

HO_{20}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary special education teachers.

HO_{20} was not rejected. The r coefficient, -.39, is not significant at the .05 level. Attitude and knowledge are not found to be significantly related for secondary special education teachers.

HO_{21}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of secondary non-special education teachers.

HO_{21} is rejected. The r coefficient, .36, is significant at the .05 level, even though it is numerically smaller than some of the nonsignificant correlations, because of the larger number of people in this category. For secondary non-special education teachers, attitudes and knowledge are significantly related.

HO_{22}: There is no significant correlation between attitudes toward and knowledge of Public Law 94-142, as measured by the ATPLS and the KPLS, on the part of elementary non-special education teachers.

HO_{22} was not rejected. The r coefficient, .002, is not significant. Attitudes and knowledge are not found to be significantly related for elementary non-special education teachers.

Summary of Findings

Table XVII gives a comparative summary of some general findings of the different hypotheses concerning attitudes and knowledge.

TABLE XVII

MEANS OF VARIABLE GROUPS CONCERNING ATTITUDES TOWARD PUBLIC LAW 94-142

1.	Secondary Special Education Teachers	154.08
2.	Elementary Special Education Teachers	153.96
3.	Secondary Administrators	150.22

TABLE XVII (continued)

MEANS OF VARIABLE GROUPS CONCERNING ATTITUDES TOWARD PUBLIC LAW 94-142

4.	Elementary Administrators	148.86
5.	Elementary Non-Special Education Teachers	146.97
6.	Secondary Non-Special Education Teachers	141.05

Table XVII shows that secondary special education teachers have the most favorable attitudes toward the law; secondary non-special education teachers have the least positive attitudes toward the law.

Overall, it is clear that special education teachers are most positive towards the law; administrators next most positive and non-special education teachers are the least positive.

Related to knowledge of Public Law 94-142, Table XVIII depicts general finding.

TABLE XVIII

MEANS OF VARIABLE GROUPS CONCERNING KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

1.	Elementary Administrators	14.36
2.	Secondary Special Education Teachers	13.67
3.	Elementary Special Education Teachers	12.50
4.	Elementary Non-Special Education Teachers	11.69
5.	Secondary Administrators	11.22
6.	Secondary Non-Special Education Teachers	10.15

According to Table XVIII, elementary administrators are more knowledgable regarding the law than any of the variable groups and secondary non-special education teachers are the least knowledgable of all. At the elementary school level, the administrators are more knowledgable than their teachers. The reverse is so at the secondary level, except for secondary special education teachers who rank second in terms of knowledge concerning the law. At both levels, special education teachers are more knowledgable about the law than non-special education teachers.

Correlations between attitudes toward and knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 are summarized in Table XIX. They range from -.39 through zero to .46, showing no general pattern which would characterize all groups. The two correlations which are statistically significant are not appreciably larger than two others which were not significant by virtue of coming from small samples.

TABLE XIX

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD AND KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING PUBLIC LAW 94-142

		No.	r	P
1.	Elementary Administrators	14	-.37	NS
2.	Secondary Administrators	9	.08	NS
3.	Elementary Special Education Teachers	26	.46	<.05
4.	Secondary Special Education Teachers	12	-.39	NS
5.	Secondary Non-Special Education Teachers	53	.36	<.05
6.	Elementary Non-Special Education Teachers	68	.00	NS

With regard to the tested hypotheses of this study, the following findings are warranted concerning attitudes toward the Law:

There are significant differences in attitudes concerning the law between:

1. Elementary teachers and secondary teachers
2. Special education teachers and non-special education teachers
3. Elementary special education teachers and elementary non-special education teachers
4. Secondary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers

With regard to knowledge, significant differences were found between the following groups:

1. Elementary teachers and secondary teachers
2. Special education and non-special education teachers
3. Elementary special education teachers and elementary administrators
4. Secondary special education teachers and secondary administrators
5. Elementary special education teachers and secondary special education teachers
6. Elementary administrators and secondary administrators

7. Secondary special education and secondary non-special education teachers.

Knowledge and attitudes were significantly correlated for the following groups: elementary special education teachers and secondary non-special education teachers.

Discussion

The findings of this study warrant discussion since some were extremely interesting and since they may provide some insight into factors that may facilitate or hinder implementation of the law.

It was expected that special education teachers would have more positive attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 because of their teaching experience and perhaps because they, through their professional organizations, were in the forefront of the move to get the new law passed. It might have been assumed that non-special education teachers would have been more positive toward the law than school administrators since the law represented help for them possibly in dealing with slow-learners already in the regular classrooms. School administrators could have expected to be least positive since they, as leaders in their schools, would have to make difficult decisions during the implementation stage. Perhaps the findings suggest that resistance to Public Law 94-142 can be expected from non-special education teachers who have the least

positive attitudes toward the law. Ironically, the positioning of the administration between the special education and non-special education teachers may be reflective of the practical situation in which many administrators will find themselves as they attempt to implement the law.

This researcher is disappointed in the low scores on the ATPLS, given instrument validity; it was expected that a few scores might have exceeded 200 points, none did.

With respect to knowledge of the law, it is interesting that secondary administrators ranked so low in knowledge of the law. One could logically assume that, as implementers of the law, administrators would have more knowledge of the law. At a minimum, one might have expected them to be as knowledgable as the special education teachers. Especially one might have felt this way since the law is likely to be more traumatic for secondary schools than for elementary schools, given traditional practices. The finding that elementary principals were more knowledgable about the law than their teachers regardless of status possibly reflects the differences in administrative styles between elementary and secondary principals. The key factor could be that elementary principals generally intereact more with their teachers and were motivated by the concern of their special education teachers.

Equally surprising was the finding that secondary special education teachers were more knowledgable about the law than elementary special education teachers. Possibly, this difference reflects differential preparation for the new law at the various levels. Perhaps the difference arises from the reading habit differences of the two teacher groups, assuming the former group to be concerned about more general knowledge. Perhaps secondary special education teachers sense much more difficulty in implementing the law and much more effect, possibly negative, of the new law. More knowledge might be viewed as a way of protecting one's self from doing "what he/she doesn't really have to do."

Generally, special education teachers were found to be more knowledgable about the law than non-special education teachers. Educators at the elementary school level were found to be more knowledgable about the law than those at the secondary level. The case of the secondary special education teachers is the notable exception to this general pattern. It was surprising that no educator scored a perfect score of 20.

Concerning the relationship(s) between knowledge and attitudes, there does not appear to be strong relationships between knowledge and attitudes related to Public Law 94-142. Such a statistically significant relationship existed only for elementary special education

teachers and secondary non-special education teachers, and these correlations, though significant, were low.

It seems clear then that, generally, educators cannot be expected to possess strong positive attitudes toward the law by becoming more knowledgable about the law. Nor can it be said with justification that if educators possess more positive attitudes they can be expected to become more knowledgable about the law. If knowledge and attitudes are to be changed, programs specific to changing each must be developed.

These findings have implications for inservice training efforts by school systems. Particularly, it should be expected that educators become much more knowledgable about this important law than this study indicates they are. Particularly is this necessary, in view of the fact that the KPLS contained items which educators are expected to know and about which they are expected to be conversant. An item analysis on the data would have been valuable in determining what specific areas of the law might need to be stressed in a training effort conducted by a local school district.

It would appear that there might be a need for human relations training for educators to possibly modify some existing negative attitudes regarding the law.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter is designed to summarize the study, draw conclusions and make recommendations based on the study.

This study sought to determine the attitudes and knowledge regarding Public Law 94-142 on the part of 182 randomly selected special and non-special education teachers and administrators at the elementary and secondary school levels. More specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the status of selected public school educators relative to knowledge and attitudes concerning Public Law 94-142?
2. Are there significant differences in attitudes and knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of public school educators

related to assignment, level, special or non-special teaching status and administrative or non-administrative status?

3. What are the relationships, if any, between attitudes and levels of knowledge concerning Public Law 94-142 on the part of selected public school educators related to assignment level, special or non-special teaching status and administrative or non-administrative status?

Twenty-two (22) hypotheses were tested using data obtained through the administration of the KPLS and the ATPLS. These hypotheses were tested using t-tests and the Pearson Product-Moment correlation formula at the .05 level.

Of the hypotheses tested hypotheses 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19 and 21 were rejected. Hypotheses 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 22 were not rejected.

Secondary special education teachers were found to possess the most positive attitudes toward the law; secondary non-special educators the least positive. Elementary school administrators were the most knowledgable about the law. Secondary non-special education teachers were the least knowledgable.

There was no statistically significant correlation between attitude and knowledge of the law except for elementary special education teachers and secondary

non-special education teachers, and these correlations were below .50.

Conclusions

Based on this study, it was concluded that:

(1) Educators were not sufficiently knowledgable about Public Law 94-142;

(2) Educators' attitudes regarding Public Law 94-142 are not sufficiently positive to facilitate effective implementation of Public Law 94-142;

(3) Secondary non-special education teachers may be the major deterrents to effective implementation of Public Law 94-142;

(4) Special education teachers may be a valuable inservice training resource for schools at both the elementary and secondary levels;

(5) There is a need for inservice training related to both knowledge and attitude regarding Public Law 94-142.

Recommendations

The following recommendations appear justified. It is recommended that:

(1) School districts commence Public Law 94-142 related to inservice educational activities for its teachers immediately.

(2) Schools use special education teachers as resources in familiarizing non-special education teachers with Public Law 94-142.

(3) A similar study of greater geographical magnitude be completed to assess attitudes and knowledge.

(4) An item-analysis of both instruments be conducted to assess specific knowledge and attitude needs as they relate to inservice training.

REFERENCES

Abeson, A., & Zettel, J. The end of the quiet revolution The education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44 (2), 115 and 120.

Allport, G. W. Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), A Handbook of social psychology. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

American Psychological Association Committee. Technical recommendations for psychological tests and diagnostic techniques. Psychological Bulletin Supplement, 1954, 51 (2), 1-38, Part 2.

Annual Report National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, 1976. The unfinished revolution: Education for the handicapped. Report, Education of the handicapped today, Stock No. 017-080-01532-3, 1-7.

Ashley, J. G. Mainstreaming: One step forward, two steps back. American Educator, 1977, 1 (3), 3-7.

Badt, M. Attitudes of university students toward exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 1957, 23, 286-290.

Ballard, J., & Zettel, J. Public Law 94-142 and section 504: What they say about rights and protections. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44 (3), 183.

Barker, R. G.; Wright, B.; Meyerson, L.; & Ganick, M. Adjustment of physical handicap and illness: A survey of the social psychology of physique and disability. (Rev. ed.). New York: Social Science Research Council, 1953.

Brown, W. Some experimental results in the correlation of mental abilities. British Journal of Psychology, 1910, 3, 296-322.

Campbell, A.; Converse, P. E.; Miller, W. E.; & Stokes, D. E. The American voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Campbell, D. L. The indirect assessment of social attitudes. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 47, 15-38.

Campbell, N. R. et al. Final report. Advance Science, 1940, 2, 331-349.

Centers, L. & Centers, R. Peer group attitudes toward the amputee child. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 127-132.

Chisman, F. P. Attitude psychology and the study of public opinion. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.

Cohen, J. & Struening, E. L. Factors underlying opinions about mental illness in the personnel of a larger mental hospital. American Psychologist, 1959, 14, 339.

Cole, R. W. & Dunn, R. A new lease on life for education of the handicapped: Ohio copes with 94-142. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59 (1), 3-6.

Collings, G. D. & Singletary, E. E. Case law and education of the handicapped. Research Bulletin. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational and Development Council, 1973.

Costin, F. & Kerr, W. D. The effects of an abnormal psychology course on students' attitudes toward mental illness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 214-218.

Cronback, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.

Dixon, C. R. Courses in psychological and students' attitude toward mental illness. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 50.

Downie, N. M. & Heath, R. W. Basic statistical methods. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Education of handicapped law concerns administrators. Oklahoma City Times, October, 1977, p. 14.

Education of the handicapped today. American Education, June, 1976, 121 (5), 6-8.

Federal Register. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Office of Education, Education of Handicapped Children, Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Tuesday, August 23, 1977. Part II, 42 (163), p. 42497.

Ghiselli, E. E. Theory of psychological measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Gildston, P. Stutters' self-acceptance and perceived parental acceptance. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72 (1), 59-64.

Goodman, L. V. A bill of rights for the handicapped. American Education, 1976, 12 (6), 6-8.

Grebler, A. Parental attitude toward mentally retarded children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1975, 56, 475-483.

Green, B. F. Attitude measurement. In G. Lindsey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.

Guthrie, G. M.; Butler, A.; & Garlow, L. Personality differences between institutionalized and non-institutionalized retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 67, 543-548.

Hargin, N. G.; Stern, G. G. & Cruickshank, W. M. Attitudes of educators toward exceptional children. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1958.

Johnson, G. O. A study of the social position of mentally handicapped children in the regular grades. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1950, 55, 60-88.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Killackey, J. Handicapped youth head for school. Sunday Oklahoman, September 1977, p. 28.

Kuder, G. F. & Richardson, M. W. The theory of estimation of test reliability. Psychometrika, 1937, 2, 151-160.

Lippman, H. J. Attitudes toward the handicapped. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.

Lori Case vs. State of California, Civil No. 13127, Court of Appeals, Fourth District California, filed December 14, 1973.

Meisgeier, C. H. & King, J. D. The process of special education administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Meyerowitz, J. H. Self-derogations in young retardates and special class placements. Child Development, 1962, 33, 443-451.

Meyers, C. E. Realities in teacher recruitment. Mental Retardation, 1964, 2, 42-46.

Meyerson, L. Physical disability as a social psychological problem. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 4 (4), 21-25.

Mills vs. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D. D. C., 1972).

Murphy, G.; Murphy, L. B. & Newcomb, T. M. Experimental social psychology. New York: Harper, 1937.

Mussen, P. H. & Barker, R. G. Attitudes toward cripples. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1944, 39, 351-355.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education Incorporated. An analysis of P. L. 94-142, Washington, D. C., 1977.

National Information Center for the Handicapped. The new education law: What does it mean? A Project of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Washington, D. C., 1977.

Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, F. Supp. 279 (E. D. Pa. 1972, Order, Injunction and Consent Agreement).

Peterson, J. H. A disguised structured instrument for the assessment of attitudes toward the poor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1967.

Public Law 94-142, unverified copy, 1976. Compilation of EHA-B as amended by P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 94-142, 14.

Richardson, S. A. et al. Cultural uniformity in reaction to physical disabilities. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 241-247.

Richer, S. & Forcese, D. Social Research Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall & Co., 1973.

Saunders, F. F. Attitudes toward handicapped persons: A study of the differential effects of five variables. (Published doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1969).

Selltiz, C.; Wrightsman, L. S. & Cook, S. W. Research methods in social relations (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Sharp, Vicki F. Statistics for the Social Sciences. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979.

Shaw, M. E. & Wright, J. M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Sherer, E. R. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance and respect for others in ten counseling cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 169-175.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. An outline of social psychology. (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Spearman, C. Correlation calculated from faculty data. British Journal of Psychology, 1910, 3, 271-295.

Stevens, S. S. Mathematics, measurement, and psychophysics. In S. S. Stevens (Ed.), Handbook of experimental psychology. New York: Wiley, 1951.

Swanson, B. M. Parent-child relations: A child's acceptance by others, of others, and of self. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

Thornkide, E. L. The psychology of wants, interests, and attitudes. New York: Appleton-Century, 1935.

Tonn, M. The case for keeping mentally retarded children in your regular classroom. American School Board Journal, 1974, 161.

Thurstone, L. L. The measurement of attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Weintraub, F. J. The end of the quiet revolution: The education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Editorial Comment. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44 (2), 114.

Will it work. The Oklahoma Teacher, November 1977, p. 5.

Wolfgang, J. R. Personal space - An unobtrusive measure of attitudes toward the physically handicapped. Unpublished master thesis. University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Yuker, H. E. et al. The measurement of attitudes toward disabled persons. Albertson, N. Y.: Human Resources Center, 1966.

APPENDIX A

PUBLIC LAW 94-142

P. L. 94-142

THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT OF 1975

The federal Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P. L. 94-142) is the result of nearly 4 years of intensive legislative development, culminating when President Gerald Ford affixed his signature to this historic legislation on November 29, 1975. After extensive hearings conducted by both Chambers of the Congress, hearings held in Washington, D. C., and around the nation, the Senate version of P. L. 94-142 (S.6) was approved on June 18, 1975, by a vote of 83 to 10. Approximately one month later, on July 29, the House of Representatives followed suit, approving its version by a vote of 375 to 44.

Subsequently, the joint House-Senate compromise bill, usually referred to as the "conference agreement," was approved by even larger margins. The House affirmed the conference agreement by a lopsided 404 to 7, 29 more votes of approval than the bill enjoyed at first passage. The Senate followed with an equally overwhelming "aye" of 87 to 7.

The complete text of P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, follows.

COMPLETE TEXT OF THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT

That this Act may be cited as the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975".

Extension of Existing Law

Sec. 2.(a)(1)(A) Section 611(b)(2) of the Education of the Handicapped Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(b)(2) (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Act"), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended by striking out "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,".

(B) Section 611(c)(1) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 (c)(1)), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended by striking out "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,".

(2) Section 611(c)(2) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 (c)(2)), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended by striking out "year ending June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977", and by striking out "2 per centum" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1 per centum".

(3) Section 611(d) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(d)), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended

by striking out "year ending June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977".

(4) Section 612(a) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended --

(A) by striking out "year ending June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977"; and

(B) by striking out "fiscal year 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "preceding fiscal year".

(b) (1) Section 614 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380; 88 Stat. 580) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1975," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977,".

(2) Section 614 (b) of the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380; 88 Stat. 580) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977,".

(3) Section 614 (c) of the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public 93-380; 88 Stat. 580) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and 1976, for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977,".

(c) Section 612 (a) of the Act, as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, and as amended by subsection (a) (4), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or $300,000, whichever is greater".

(d) Section 612 of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1411), as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Commissioner shall, no later than one hundred twenty days after the date of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, prescribe and publish in the Federal Register such rules as he considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and secton 611.".

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 611 of the Act as in effect during the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1976, such sums as may be necessary for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September

30, 1976, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1977, to carry out the provisions of part B of the Act, as in effect during such fiscal years.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 3. (a) Section 601 of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1401) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "This title" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Congress finds that --

"(1) there are more than eight million handicapped children in the United States today;

"(2) the special educational needs of such children are not being fully met;

"(3) more than half of the handicapped children in the United States do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity;

"(4) one million of the handicapped children in the United States are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers;

"(5) there are many handicapped children throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose handicaps prevent them from having a successful educational experience because their handicaps are undetected;

"(6) because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside the public school system, often at great distance from their residence and at their own expense;

"(7) developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and methods have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, State and local educational agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of handicapped children;

"(8) State and local educational agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all handicapped children, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special educational needs of handicapped children; and

"(9) it is in the national interest that the Federal Government assist State and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of handicapped children in order to assure equal protection of the law.

"(c) It is the purpose of this Act to assure that all handicapped children have available to them, within the time periods specified in section 612 (2)(B), a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist

States and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children.".

(b) The heading for section 601 of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1401) is amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE: STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE"

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 4. (a) Section 602 of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1402) is amended --

(1) in paragraph (1) thereof, by striking out "crippled" and inserting in lieu thereof "orthopedically impaired", and by inserting immediately after "impaired children" the following: ", or children with specific learning disabilities,";

(2) in paragraph (5) thereof, by inserting immediately after "instructional materials." the following" "telecommunications, sensory, and other technological aids and devices,";

(3) in the last sentence of paragraph (15) thereof, by inserting immediately after "environmental" the following: ", cultural, or economic"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(16) The term 'special education' means 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.

"(17) The term 'related services' means transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services (including speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, and medical and counseling services, except that such medical services shall be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only) as may be required to assist a handicapped child to benefit from special education, and includes the early identification and assessment of handicapping conditions in children.

"(18) The term 'free appropriate public education' means special education and related services which (A) have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge, (B) meet the standards of the State educational agency, (C) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the State involved, and (D) are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under section 614 (a) (5).

"(19) The term 'individualized education program' means a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially

designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardians of such child, and, whenever appropriate, such child, which statement shall include (A) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, (C) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved.

"(20) The term 'excess costs' means 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 of secondary school student, as may be appropriate, and which shall be computed after deducting (A) amounts received under this part or under title I or title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and (B) any State or local funds expended for programs which would qualify for assistance under this part or under such titles.

"(21) The term 'native language' has the meaning given that term by section 703 (A) (2) of the Bilingual

Education Act (20 U.S.C. 880b-1 (a) (2)).

"(22) The term 'intermediate educational unit' means any public authority, other than a local educational agency, which is under the general supervision of a State educational agency, which is established by State law for the purpose of providing free public education on a regional basis, and which provides special education and related services to handicapped children within that State.".

(b) The heading for section 602 of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1402) is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS"

ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION OF ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Sec. 5 (a) Part B of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART B.--ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION OF ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"ENTITLEMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS

"Sec. 611. (a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (3) and in section 619, the maximum amount of the grant to which a State is entitled under this part for any fiscal year shall be equal to --

"(A) the number of handicapped children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, in such State who are receiving special education and related services;

multiplied by --

"(B) (i) 5 per centum, for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 1978, of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States;

"(ii) 10 per centum, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States;

"(iii) 20 per centum, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States;

"(iv) 30 per centum, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States; and

"(v) 40 per centum, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for each fiscal year thereafter, of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States;

except that no State shall receive an amount which is less than the amount which such State received under this part for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977.

"(2) For the purpose of this subsection and subsection (b) through subsection (e) the term 'State' does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(3) The number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services in any fiscal year shall be equal to the average of the number of such children receiving special education and related services on October 1 and February 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(4) For purposes of paragraph (1) (B), the term 'average per pupil expenditure', in the United States, means the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made (or, if satisfactory data for such year are not available at the time of computation, then during the most recent preceding fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available) of all local educational agencies in the United States (which, for purposes of this subsection, means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), as the case may be, plus any direct expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the source of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

"(5) (A) In determining the allotment of each State under paragraph (I), the Commissioner may not count --

"(i) handicapped children in such State under paragraph (1) (A) to the extent the number of children is greater

than 12 per centum of the number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such State;

"(ii) as part of such percentage, children with specific learning disabilities to the extent the number of such children is greater than one-sixth of such percentage; and

"(iii) handicapped children who are counted under section 121 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in any State shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(b) (1) Of the funds received under subsection (a) by any State for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978 --

"(A) 50 per centum of such funds may be used by such State in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2); and

"(B) 50 per centum of such funds shall be distributed by such State pursuant to the subsection (d) to local educational agencies and intermediate educational units in such State, for use in accordance with the priorities established under section 612(3).

"(2) Of the funds which any State may use under paragraph (1) (A) --

"(A) an amount which is equal to the greater of --

"(i) 5 per centum of the total amount of funds received under this part by such State; or

"(ii) $200,000;

may be used by such State for administrative costs related to carrying out sections 612 and 613; and

"(B) the remainder shall be used by such State to provide support services and direct services, in accordance with the priorities established under section 612 (3).

"(c) (1) Of the funds received under subsection (a) by any State for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for each fiscal year thereafter --

"(A) 25 per centum of such funds may be used by such State in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2); and

"(B) except as provided in paragraph (3), 75 per centum of such funds shall be distributed by such State pursuant to subsection (d) to local educational agencies and intermediate educational units in such State, for use in accordance with priorities established under section 612 (3).

"(2) (A) Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (B), of the funds which any State may use under paragraph (L) (A) --

"(i) an amount which is equal to the greater of --

"(I) 5 per centum of the total amount of funds received under this part by such State; or

"(II) $200,000;

may be used by such State for administrative costs related to carrying out the provisions of sections 612 and 613; and

"(ii) the remainder shall be used by such State to provide support services and direct services, in accordance with the priorities established under section 612 (3).

"(B) The amount expended by any State from the funds available to such State under paragraph (1) (A) in any fiscal year for the provision of support services or for the provision of direct services shall be matched on a program basis by such State, from funds other than Federal funds, for the provision of support services or for the provision of direct services for the fiscal year involved.

"(3) The provisions of section 613 (a) (9) shall not apply with respect to amounts available for use by any State under paragraph (2).

"(4) (A) No funds shall be distributed by any State under this subsection in any fiscal year to any local educational agency or intermediate educational unit in such State if --

"(i) such local educational agency or intermediate educational unit is entitled, under subsection (d) to less than $7,500 for such fiscal year; or

"(ii) such local educational agency or intermediate educational unit has not submitted an application for such

funds which meets the requirements of section 614.

"(B) Whenever the provisions of subparagraph (A) apply, the State involved shall use such funds to assure the provision of a free appropriate education to handicapped children residing in the area served by such local educational agency or such intermediate educational unit. The provisions of paragraph (2) (B) shall not apply to the use of such funds.

"(d) From the total amount of funds available to local educational agencies and intermediate educational units in any State under subsection (b) (1) (B) or subsection (c) (1) (B), as the case may be, each local educational agency or intermediate educational unit shall be entitled to an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount available under subection (b) (1) (B) or subsection (c) (1) (B), as the case may be, as the number of handicapped children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, receiving special education and related services in such local educational agency or intermediate educational unit bears to the aggregate number of handicapped children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, receiving special education and related services in all local educational agencies and intermediate educational units which apply to the State educational agency involved for funds under this part.

"(e) (1) The jurisdictions to which this subsection applies are Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and

the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) Each jurisdiction to which this subsection applies shall be entitled to a grant for the purposes set forth in section 601 (c) in an amount equal to an amount determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria based on respective needs, except that the aggregate of the amount to which such jurisdictions are also entitled for any fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 1 per centum of the aggregate of the amounts available to all States under this part for that fiscal year. If the aggregate of the amounts, determined by the Commissioner pursuant to the preceding sentence, to be so needed for any fiscal year exceeds an amount equal to such 1 per centum limitation, the entitlement of each such jurisdiction shall be reduced proportionately until such aggregate does not exceed such 1 per centum limitation.

"(3) The amount expended for administration by each jurisdiction under this subsection shall not exceed 5 per centum of the amount allotted to such jurisdiction for any fiscal year, or $35,000, whichever is greater.

"(f) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to make payments to the Secretary of the Interior according to the need for such assistance for the education of handicapped children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior. The amount of such payment for any fiscal

year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the aggregate amounts available to all States under this part for that fiscal year.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior may receive an allotment under this subsection only after submitting to the Commissioner an application which meets the applicable requirements of section 614 (a) and which is approved by the Commissioner. The provisions of section 614 shall apply to any such application.

"(g) (1) If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for making payments to States under this part are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all States are entitled to receive under this part for such fiscal year, the maximum amounts which all States are entitled to receive under this part for such fiscal year shall be ratably reduced. In case additional funds become available for making such payments for any fiscal year during which the preceding sentence is applicable, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced.

"(2) In the case of any fiscal year in which the maximum amounts for which States are eligible have been reduced under the first sentence of paragraph (1), and in which additional funds have not been made available to pay in full the total of such maximum amounts under the last sentence of such paragraph, the State educational agency shall fix dates before which each local educational agency

or intermediate educational unit shall report to the State educational agency on the amount of funds available to the local educational agency or intermediate education unit, under the provisions of this part. The amounts so available to any local educational agency or intermediate educational unit, or any amount which would be available to any other local educational agency or intermediate educational unit if it were to submit a program meeting the requirements of this part, which the State educational agency determines will not be used for the period of its availability, shall be available for allocation to those local educational agencies or intermediate educational units, in the manner provided by this section, which the State educational agency determines will need and be able to use additional funds to carry out approved program.

"ELIGIBILITY

"Sec. 612. In order to qualify for assistance under this part in any fiscal year, a State shall demonstrate to the Commissioner that the following conditions are met:

"(1) The State has in effect a policy that assures all handicapped children the right to a free appropriate public education.

"(2) The State has developed a plan pursuant to section 613 (b) in effect prior to the date of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and submitted not later than August 21, 1975, which will

be amended so as to comply with the provisions of this paragraph. Each such amended plan shall set forth in detail the policies and procedures which the State will undertake or has undertaken in order to assure that --

"(A) there is established (i) a goal of providing full educational opportunity to all handicapped children, (ii) a detailed timetable for accomplishing such a goal, and (iii) a description of the kind and number of facilities, personnel, and services necessary throughout the State to meet such a goal;

"(B) a free appropriate public education will be available for all handicapped children between the ages of three and eighteen within the State not later than September 1, 1978, and for all handicapped children between the ages of three and twenty-one within the State not later than September 1, 1980, except that, with respect to handicapped children aged three to five and aged eighteen to twenty-one, inclusive, the requirements of this clause shall not be applied in any State if the application of such requirements would be inconsistent with State law or practice, or the order of any court, respecting public education within such age groups in the State;

"(C) all children residing in the State who are handicapped, regardless of the severity of their handicap, and who are in need of special education and related services are identified, located, and evaluated, and that a practical

method is developed and implemented to determine which children are currently receiving needed special education and related services and which children are not currently receiving needed special education and related services;

"(D) policies and procedures are established in accordance with detailed criteria prescribed under section 617 (c); and

"(E) the amendment to the plan submitted by the State required by this section shall be available to parents, guardians, and other members of the general public at least thirty days prior to the date of submission of the amendment to the Commissioner.

"(3) The State has established priorities for providing a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children, which priorities shall meet the timetables set forth in clause (B) of paragraph (2) of this section, first with respect to handicapped children who are not receiving an education, and second with respect to handicapped children, within each disability, with the most severe handicaps who are receiving an inadequate education, and has made adequate progress in meeting the timetables set froth in clause (B) of paragraph (2) of this section.

"(4) Each local educational agency in the State will maintain records of the individualized education program for each handicapped child, and such program shall be established, reviewed, and revised as provided in section 614 (a) (5).

"(5) The State has established (A) procedural safeguards as required by section 615, (B) procedures to assure that, to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily, and (C) procedures to assure that testing and evaluation materials and procedures utilized for the purposes of evaluation and placement of handicapped children will be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory. Such materials or procedures shall be provided and administered in the child's native language or mode of communication, unless it clearly is not feasible to do so, and no single procedure shall be the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program for a child.

"(6) The State educational agency shall be responsible for assuring that the requirements of this part are carried out and that all educational programs for handicapped children within the State, including all such program administered by any other State or local agency, will be under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational

programs for handicapped children in the State educational agency and shall meet education standards of the State educational agency.

"(7) The State shall assure that (A) in carrying out the requirements of this section procedures are established for consultation with individuals involved in or concerned with the education of handicapped children, including handicapped individuals and parents or guardians or handicapped children, and (B) there are public hearings, adequate notice of such hearings, and an opportunity for comment available to the general public prior to adoption of the policies, programs, and procedures required pursuant to the provisions of this section and section 613.

"STATE PLANS

"Sec. 613. (a) Any State meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 612 and desiring to participate in the program under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as he deems necessary. Each such plan shall --

"(1) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that funds paid to the State under this part will be expended in accordance with the provisions of this part, with particular attention given to the provisions of sections 611 (b), 611 (c), 611 (d), 612 (2), and 612 (3);

"(2) provide that programs and procedures will be established to assure that funds received by the State or any of its political subdivisions under any other Federal program, including section 121 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 214c-2), section 305 (b) (B) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 844a (b) (B)) or its successor authority, and section 122 (a) (4) (B) of the Vocational Education ACt of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 1262 (a) (4) (B)), under which there is specific authority for the provision of assistance for the education of handicapped children, will be utilized by the State, or any of its political subdivisions, only in a manner consistent with the goal of providing a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children, except that nothing in this clause shall be construed to limit the specific requirements of the laws governing such Federal programs.

"(3) set forth, consistent with the purposes of this Act, a description of programs and procedures for (A) the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which shall include the inservice training of general and special educational instructional and support personnel, detailed procedures to assure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained, and effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped

children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and (B) adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials development through such projects;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures to assure --

"(A) that, to the extent consistent with the number and location of handicapped children in the State who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, provision is made for the participation of such children in the program assisted or carried out under this part by providing for such children special education and related services; and

"(B) that (i) handicapped children in private schools and facilities will be provided special education and related services (in conformance with an individualized educational program as required by this part) at no cost to their parents or guardian, if such children are placed in or referred to such schools or facilities by the State or appropriate local educational agency as the means of carrying out the requirements of this part or any other applicable law requiring the provision of special education and related services to all handicapped children within such State, and (ii) in all such instances the State educational agency shall determine whether such schools and facilities meet standards that apply to State and local educational agencies and that children so served have all the rights they would have if

served by such agencies;

"(5) set forth policies and procedures which assure that the State shall seek to recover any funds made available under this part for services to any child who is determined to be erroneously classified as eligible to be counted under section 611 (a) or section 611 (d);

"(6) provide satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this part, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this part, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

"(7) provide for (A) making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this part, and (B) keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports and proper disbursement of Federal funds under this part;

"(8) provide procedures to assure that final action with respect to any application submitted by a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit shall not be taken without first affording the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit involved reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing;

"(9) provide satisfactory assurance that Federal funds made available under this part (A) will not be comingled

with State funds, and (B) will be so used as to supplement and increase the level of State and local funds expended for the education of handicapped children and in no case to supplant such State and local funds, except that, where the State provides clear and convincing evidence that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education, the Commissioner may waive in part the requirement of this clause if he concurs with the evidence provided by the State;

"(10) provide, consistent with procedures prescribed pursuant to section 617 (a) (2), satisfactory assurance that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid under this part of the State, including any such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies and intermediate educational units;

"(11) provide for procedures for evaluation at least annually of the effectiveness of programs in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children (including evaluation of individualized education program), in accordance with such criteria that the Commissioner shall prescribe pursuant to section 612; and

"(12) provide that the State has an advisory panel, appointed by the Governor or any other official authorized under State law to make such appointments, composed of

individuals involved in or concerned with the education of handicapped children, including handicapped individuals, teachers, parents or guardians of handicapped children, State and local education officials, and administrators of programs for handicapped children, which (A) advises the State educational agency of unmet needs within the State in the education of handicapped children, (B) comments publicly on any rules or regulations proposed for issuance by the State regarding the education of handicapped children and the procedures for distribution of funds under this part, and (C) assists the State in developing and reporting such data and evaluations as may assist the Commissioner in the performance of his responsibilities under section 618.

"(b) Whenever a State educational agency provides free appropriate public education for handicapped children, or provides direct services to such children, such State educational agency shall include, as part of the State plan required by subsection (a) of this section, such additional assurances not specified in such subsection (a) as are contained in section 614 (a), except that funds available for the provision of such education or services may be expended without regard to the provisions relating to excess costs in section 614 (a).

"(c) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification there of which --

"(1) is submitted by a State eligible in accordance with section 612; and

"(2) meets the requirements of subsection (a) and subsection (b).

The Commissioner shall disapprove any State plan which does not meet the requirements of the preceding sentence, but shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State.

"APPLICATION

"Sec. 612 (a) A local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit which desires to receive payments under section 611 (d) for any fiscal year shall submit an application to the appropriate State educational agency. Such application shall --

"(1) provide satisfactory assurance that payments under this part will be used for excess costs directly attributable to programs which --

"(A) provide that all children residing within the jurisdiction of the local educational agency or the intermediate educational unit who are handicapped, regardless of the severity of their handicap, and are in need of special education and related services will be identified, located, and evaluated, and provide for the inclusion of a practical methods of determining which children are currently receiving needed special education and related services and which children are not currently receiving such education and services;

"(B) establish policies and procedures in accordance with detailed criteria prescribed under section 617 (c);

"(C) establish a goal of providing full educational opportunities to all handicapped children, including --

"(i) procedures for the implementation and use of the comprehensive system of personnel development established by the State educational agency under section 613 (a) (3);

"(ii) the provision of, and the establishment of priorities for providing, a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children, first with respect to handicapped children who are not receiving an education, and second with respect to handicapped children, within each disability, with the most severe handicaps who are receiving an inadequate education;

"(iii) the participation and consultation of the parents or guardians of such children; and

"(iv) to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the provisions of section 612 (5) (B), the provision of special services to enable such children to participate in regular educational programs;

"(D) establish a detailed timetable for accomplishing the goal described in subclause (C); and

"(E) provide a description of the kind and number of facilities, personnel, and services necessary to meet the goal described in subclause (C);

"(2) provide satisfactory assurance that (A) the

control of funds provided under this part, and title to property derived from such funds, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this part, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property, (B) Federal funds expended by local educational agencies and intermediate educational units for programs under this part (i) shall be used to pay only the excess costs directly attributable to the education of handicapped children, and (ii) shall be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State and local funds expended for the education of handicapped children, and in no case to supplant such State and local funds, and (C) State and local funds will be used in the jurisdiction of the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit to provide services in program areas which, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services being provided in areas of such jurisdiction which are not receiving funds under this part;

"(3) (A) provide for furnishing such information (which, in the case of reports relating to performance, is in accordance with specific performance criteria related to program objectives), as may be necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this part, including information relating to the educational achievement of handicapped children participating in programs carried out under this part; and

"(B) provide for keeping such records, and provide for affording such access to such records, as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such information furnished under subclause (A);

"(4) provide for making the application and all pertinent documents related to such application available to parents, guardians, and other members of the general public, and provide that all evaluations and reports required under clause (3) shall be public information;

"(5) provide assurances that the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit will establish, or revise, whichever is appropriate, an individualized education program of each handicapped child at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate revise, its provisions periodically, but not less than annually;

"(6) provide satisfactory assurance that policies and programs established and administered by the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit shall be consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1) through paragraph (7) of section 612 and section 613 (a); and

"(7) provide satisfactory assurance that the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit will establish and maintain procedural safeguards in accordance with the provisions of sections 612 (5) (B), 612 (5) (C) and 615.

"(b) (1) A State educational agency shall approve any application submitted by a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit under subsection (a) if the State educational agency determines that such application meets the requirements of subsection (a), except that no such application may be approved until the State plan submitted by such State educational agency under subsection (a) is approved by the Commissioner under section 613 (c). A State educational agency shall disapprove any application submitted by a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit under subsection (a) if the State educational agency determines that such application does not meet the requirements of subsection (a).

"(2) (A) Whenever a State educational agency, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, finds that a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit, in the administration of an application approved by the State educational agency under paragraph (1), has failed to comply with any requirements set forth in such application, the State educational agency, after giving appropriate notice to the local educational agency or the intermediate educational unit, shall --

"(i) make no further payments to such local educational agency or such intermediate educational unit under section 620 until the State educational agency is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply with the requirements involved; or

"(ii) take such finding into account in its review of any application made by such local educational agency or such intermediate educational unit under subsection (a).

"(B) The provisions of the last sentence of section 616 (a) shall apply to any local educational agency or any intermediate educational unit receiving any notification from a State educational agency under this paragraph.

"(3) In carrying out its functions under paragraph (1), each State educational agency shall consider any decision made pursuant to a hearing held under section 615 which is adverse to the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit involved in such decision.

"(c) (1) A State educational agency may, for purposes of the consideration and approval of applications under this section, require local educational agencies to submit a consolidated application for payments if such State educational agency determines that any individual application submitted by any such local educational agency will be disapproved because such local educational agency is ineligible to receive payments because of the application of section 611 (c) (4) (A) (i) or such local educational agency would be unable to establish and maintain programs of sufficient size and scope to effectively meet the educational needs of handicapped children.

"(2) (A) In any case in which a consolidated application of local educational agencies is approved by a State

educational agency under paragraph (1), the payments which such local educational agency may receive shall be equal to the sum of payments to which each such local educational agency would be entitled under section 611 (d) if an individual application of any such local educational agency had been approved.

"(B) The State educational agency shall prescribe rules and regulations with respect to consolidated applications submitted under this subsection which are consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1) through paragraph (7) of section 612 and section 613 (a) and which provide participating local educational agencies with joint responsibilities for implementing programs receiving payments under this part.

"(C) In any case in which an intermediate educational unit is required pursuant to State law to carry out the provisions of this part, the joint responsibilities given to local educational agencies under subparagraph (B) shall not apply to the administration and disbursement of any payments received by such intermediate educational unit. Such responsibilities shall be carried out exclusively by such intermediate educational unit.

"(d) Whenever a State educational agency determines that a local educational agency --

"(1) is unable or unwilling to establish and maintain programs of free appropriate public education which

meet the requirements established in subsection (a);

"(2) is unable or unwilling to be consolidated with other local educational agencies in order to establish and maintain such programs; or

"(3) has one or more handicapped children who can best be served by a regional or State center designed to meet the needs of such children;

the State educational agency shall use the payments which would have been available to such local educational agency to provide special education and related services directly to handicapped children residing in the area served by such local educational agency. The State educational agency may provide such education and services in such manner, and at such locations (including regional or State centers), as it considers appropriate, except that the manner in which such education and services are provided shall be consistent with the requirements of this part.

"(e) Whenever a State educational agency determines that a local educational agency is adequately providing a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children residing in the area served by such agency with State and local funds otherwise available to such agency, the State educational agency may reallocate funds (or such portion of those funds as may not be required to provide such education and services) made available to such agency, pursuant to section 611 (d), to such other local educational

agencies within the State as are not adequately providing special education and related services to all handicapped children residing in the areas served by such other local educational agencies.

"(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) (2) (B) (ii), any local educational agency which is required to carry out any program for the education of handicapped children pursuant to a State law shall be entitled to receive payments under section 611 (d) for use in carrying out such program, except that such payments may not be used to reduce the level of expenditures for such program made by such local educational agency from State or local funds below the level of such expenditures for the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which such local educational agency seeks such payments.

"PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

"Sec. 615. (a) Any State educational agency, any local educational agency, and any intermediate educational unit which receives assistance under this part shall establish and maintain procedures in accordance with subsection (b) through subsection (e) of this section to assure that handicapped children and their parents or guardians are guaranteed procedural safeguards with respect to the provision of free appropriate public education by such agencies and units.

"(b) (1) The procedures required by this section shall include, but shall not be limited to --

"(A) an opportunity for the parents or guardian of a handicapped child to examine all relevant records with respect to the identification, evaluate, and educational placement of a child, and the provision of a free appropriate public education to such child, and to obtain an independent educational evaluation of the child;

"(B) procedures to protect the rights of the child whenever the parents or guardian of the child are not known, unavailable, or the child is a ward of the State, including the assignment of an individual (who shall not be an employee of the State educational agency, local educational agency, or intermediate educational unit involved in the education or care of the child) to act as a surrogate for the parents or guardian;

"(C) written prior notice to the parents or guardian of the child whenever such agency or unit --

"(i) proposes to initiate or change, or

"(ii) refuses to initiate or change,

the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child;

"(D) procedures designed to assure that the notice required by clause (C) fully inform the parents or guardian in the parents' or guardian's native language, unless it

clearly is not feasible to do so, of all procedures available pursuant to this section; and

"(E) an opportunity to present complaints with respect to any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of free appropriate public education to such child.

"(2) whenever a complaint has been received under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the parents or guardian shall have an opportunity for an impartial due process hearing which shall be conducted by the State educational agency or by the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit, as determined by State law or by the State educational agency. No hearing conducted pursuant to the requirements of this paragraph shall be conducted by an employee of such agency or unit involved in the education or care of the child.

"(c) If the hearing required in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of this section is conducted by a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit, any party aggrieved by the findings and decision rendered in such a hearing may appeal to the State educational agency which shall conduct an impartial review of such hearing. The officer conducting such review shall make an independent decision upon completion of such review.

"(d) any party to any hearing conducted pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) shall be accorded (1) the right

to be accompanied and advised by counsel and by individuals with special knowledge or training with respect to the problems of handicapped children, (2) the right to present evidence and confront, cross-examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses, (3) the right to a written or electronic verbatim record of such hearings, and (4) the right to written findings of fact and decisions (which findings and decisions shall also be transmitted to the advisory panel established pursuant to section 613 (a) (12)).

"(e) (1) A decision made in a hearing conducted pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be final, except that any party involved in such hearing may appeal such decision under the provisions of subsection (c) and paragraph (2) of this subsection. A decision made under subsection (c) shall be final, except that any party may bring an action under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) Any party aggrieved by the findings and decision made under subsection (b) who does not have the right to an appeal under subsection (c), and any party aggrieved by the findings and decision under subsection (c) shall have the right to bring a civil action with respect to the complaint presented pursuant to this section, which action may be brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy. In any action brought under this paragraph, the court shall receive the records of the

administrative proceedings, shall hear additional evidence at the request of a party, and, basing its decision on the preponderance of the evidence, shall grant such relief as the court determines is appropriate.

"(3) During the pendency of any proceedings conducted pursuant to this section, unless the State or local educational agency and the parents or guardian otherwise agree, the child shall remain in the then current educational placement of such child, or, if applying for initial admission to a public school, shall, with the consent of the parents or guardian, be placed in the public school program until all such proceedings have been completed.

"(4) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this subsection without regard to the amount in controversy.

"WITHHOLDING AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

"Sec. 616. (a) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency involved (and to any local educational agency or intermediate educational unit affected by any failure described in clause (2)), finds --

"(1) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any provision of section 612 or section 613, or

"(2) that in the administration of the State plan there is a failure to comply with any provision of this part or with any requirements set forth in the application of a local educational agency or intermediate educational unit approved by the State educational agency pursuant to the State plan,

the Commissioner (A) shall, after notifying the State educational agency, withhold any further payments to the State under this part, and (B) may, after notifying the State educational agency, withold further payments to the State under the Federal programs specified in section 613 (a) (2) within his jurisdiction, to the extent that funds under such programs are available for the provision of assistance for the education of handicapped children. If the Commissioner withholds further payments under clause (A) or clause (B) he may determine that such withholding will be limited to programs or projects under the State plan, or portions thereof, affected by the failure, or that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this part to specified local educational agencies or intermediate educational units affected by the failure. Until the Commissioner is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply with the provisions of this part, as specified in clause (1) or clause (2), no further payments shall be made to the State under this part or under the federal programs specified in section 613 (a) (2) within his jurisdiction

to the extent that funds under such program are available for the provision of assistance for the education of handicapped children, or payments by the State educational agency under this part shall be limited to local education agencies and intermediate educational units whose actions did not cause or were not involved in that failure, as the case may be. Any State educational agency, local educational agency, or intermediate educational unit in receipt of a notice pursuant to the first sentence of this subsection shall, by means of a public notice, take such measures as may be necessary to bring the pendency of an action pursuant to this subsection to the attention of the public within the jurisdiction of such agency or unit.

"(b) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to its State plan submitted under section 613, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner hereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive;

but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(3) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 617. (a) (1) In carrying out his duties under this part, the Commissioner shall --

"(A) cooperate with, and furnish all technical assistance necessary, directly or by grant or contract, to the States in matters relating to the education of handicapped children and the execution of the provisions of this part;

"(B) provide such short-term training programs and institutes as are necessary;

"(C) disseminate information, and otherwise promote the education of all handicapped children within the States; and

"(D) assure that each State shall, within one year after the date of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, provide certification of the actual number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services in such State.

"(2) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, the Commissioner shall, by regulation, prescribe a uniform financial report to be utilized by State educational agencies in submitting State plans under this part in order to assure equity among the States.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Commissioner (and the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of subsection (c)) shall issue, not later than January 1, 1977, amend, and revoke such rules and regulations as may be necessary. No other less formal method of implementing such provisions is authorized.

"(c) The Secretary shall take appropriate action, in accordance with the provisions of section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act, to assure the protection of the confidentiality of any personally identifiable data, information, and records collected or maintained by the Commissioner and by State and local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of this part.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to hire qualified personnel necessary to conduct data collection and evaluation

activities required by subsections (b), (c) and (d) of section 618 and to carry out his duties under subsection (a) (1) of this subsection without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to appointments in the competitive services and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates except that no more than twenty such personnel shall be employed at any time.

"EVALUATION

"Sec. 618. (a) The Commissioner shall measure and evaluate the impact of the program authorized under this part and the effectiveness of State efforts to assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children.

"(b) The Commissioner shall conduct, directly or by grant or contract, such studies, investigations, and evaluations as are necessary to assure effective implementation of this part. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section, the Commissioner shall --

"(1) through the National Center for Education Statistics, provide to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress and to the general public at least annually, and shall update at least annually, programmatic information concerning programs and projects assisted under this part and other Federal programs supporting the education of

handicapped children, and such information from State and local educational agencies and other appropriate sources necessary for the implementation of this part including --

"(A) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, who require special education and related servics;

"(B) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, receiving a free appropriate public education and the number of handicapped children who need and are not receiving a free appropriate public education in each such State;

"(C) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, who are participating in regular educational programs, consistent with the requirements of section 612 (5) (B) and section 614 (a) (1) (C) (iv), and the number of handicapped children who have been placed in separate classes or separate school facilities, or who have been otherwise removed from the regular education environment;

"(D) the number of handicapped children who are enrolled in public or private institutions in each State and who are receiving a free appropriate public education, and the number of handicapped children who are in such institutions and who are not receiving a free appropriate public education;

"(E) the amount of Federal, State and local expenditures in each State specifically available for special education and related services; and

"(F) the number of personnel, by disability category, employed in the education of handicapped children, and the estimated number of additional personnel needed to adequately carry out the policy established by this Act; and

"(2) provide for the evaluation of programs and projects assisted under this part through --

"(A) the development of effective methods and procedures for evaluation;

"(B) the testing and validation of such evaluation methods and procedures; and

"(C) conducting actual evaluation studies designed to test the effectiveness of such programs and projects.

"(c) In developing and furnishing information under subclause (E) of clause (1) of subsection (b), the Commissioner may base such information upon a sampling of data available from State agencies, including the State educational agencies, and local educational agencies.

"(d) (1) Not later than one hundred twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall transmit to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress a report on the progress being made toward the provision of free appropriate public education to all handicapped children, including a detailed description of all evaluation

activities conducted under subsection (b).

"(2) The Commissioner shall include in each such report --

"(A) an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures undertaken by each State educational agency, local educational agency, and intermediate educational unit to assure that handicapped children receive special education and related services in the least restrictive environment commensurate with their needs and to improve programs of instruction for handicapped children in day or residential facilities;

"(B) any recommendations for change in the provisions of this part, or any other Federal law providing support for the education of handicapped children; and

"(C) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the procedures undertaken by each such agency or unit to prevent erroneous classification of children as eligible to be counted under section 611, including actions undertaken by the Commissioner to carry out provisions of this Act relating to such erroneous classification.

In order to carry out such analyses and evaluations, the Commissioner shall conduct a statistically valid survey for assessing the effectiveness of individualized education programs.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"INCENTIVE GRANTS

"Sec. 619. (a) The Commissioner shall make a grant to any State which --

"(1) has met the eligibility requirements of section 612;

"(2) has a State plan approved under section 613; and

"(3) provides special education and related services to handicapped children aged three to five, inclusive, who are counted for the purposes of section 611 (a) (1) (A). The maximum amount of the grant for each fiscal year which a State may receive under this section shall be $300 for each such child in that State.

"(b) Each State which --

"(1) has met the eligibility requirements of section 612,

"(2) has a State plan approved under section 613, and

"(3) desires to receive a grant under this section, shall make an application to the Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay to each State having an application approved under subsection (b) of this section the amount to which the State is entitled under this section, which amount shall be used for the purpose of providing

the services specified in clause (3) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for making payments to States under this section are not sufficient to pay in full the maximum amounts which all States may receive under this part for such fiscal year, the maximum amounts which all States may receive under this part of such fiscal year shall be ratably reduced. In case additional funds become available for making such payments for any fiscal year during which the preceding sentence is applicable, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced.

"(e) In addition to the sums necessary to pay the entitlements under section 611, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"PAYMENTS

"Sec. 62. (a) The Commissioner shall make payments to each State in amounts which the State educational agency of such State is eligible to receive under this part. Any State educational agency receiving payments to the local educational agencies and intermediate educational units of such State in amounts which such agencies and units are eligible to receive under this part after the State educational agency has approved applications of such agencies

or units for payments in accordance with section 614 (b).

"(b) Payments under this part may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine necessary.".

(b) (1) The Commissioner of Education shall, no later than one year after the effective date of this subsection, prescribe --

(A) regulations which establish specific criteria for determining whether a particular disorder or condition may be considered a specific learning disability for purposes of designating children with specific learning disabilities;

(B) regulations which establish and describe diagnostic procedures which shall be used in determining whether a particular child has a disorder or condition which places such child in the category of children with specific learning disabilities; and

(C) regulations which establish monitoring procedures which will be used to determine if State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and intermediate educational units are complying with the criteria established under clause (A) and clause (B).

(2) The Commissioner shall submit any proposed regulation written under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, for review

and comment by each such committee, at least fifteen days before such regulation is published in the Federal Register.

(3) If the Commission determines, as a result of the promulgation of regulations under paragraph (1), that changes are necessary in the definition of the term "children with specific learning disabilities," as such term is defined by section 602 (15) of the Act, he shall submit recommendations for legislation with respect to such changes to each House of the Congress.

(4) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) The term "children with specific learning disabilities" means those children who have a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. Such disorders include such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Such term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

(B) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(c) Effective on the date upon which final regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Education under subsection

(b) take effect, the amendment made by subsection (a) is amended, in subparagraph (A) of section 611 (a) (5) (as such subparagraph would take effect on the effective date of subsection (a)), by adding "and" at the end of clause (i), by striking out clause (ii), and by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS, REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTUAL BARRIERS, AND MEDIA CENTERS

Sec. 6. (a) Part A of the Act is amended by inserting after section 605 thereof the following new sections:

"EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

"Sec. 606. The Secretary shall assure that each recipient of assistance under this Act shall make positive efforts to employ and advance in employment qualified handicapped individuals in programs assisted under this Act.

"GRANTS FOR THE REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

"Sec. 607. (a) Upon application by any State or local educational agency or intermediate educational unit the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to pay part or all of the cost of altering existing buildings and equipment in the same manner and to the same extent as authorized by the Act approved August 12, 1968 (Public Law 94-180), relating to architectural barriers.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.".

(b) Section 653 of the Act (20 U. S. C. 1453) is amended to read as follows:

"CENTERS ON EDUCATIONAL MEDIA AND MATERIALS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

"Sec. 653. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, or other appropriate nonprofit agencies, for the establishment and operation of centers on educational media and materials for the handicapped, which together will provide a comprehensive program of activities to facilitate the use of new educational technology in education programs for handicapped persons, including designing, developing, and adapting instructional materials, and such other activities consistent with the purposes of this part as the Secretary may prescribe in such agreements. Any such agreement shall --

"(1) provide that Federal funds paid to a center will be used solely for such purposes as are set forth in the agreement; and

"(2) authorize the center involved, subject to prior approval by the Secretary, to contract with public and private agencies and organizations for demonstration projects.

"(b) In considering proposals to enter into agreements under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to institutions and agencies --

"(1) which have demonstrated the capabilities necessary for the development and evaluation of educational media for the handicapped; and

"(2) which can serve the educational technology needs of the Model High School for the Deaf (established under Public Law 89-694).

"(c) The Secretary shall make an annual report on activities carried out under this section which shall be transmitted to the Congress.".

CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF REGULATIONS

Sec. 7 (a) (1) Section 431 (d) (1) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U. S. C. 1232 (d) (1)) is amended by inserting "final" immediately before "standard" each place it appears therein.

(2) The third sentence of section 413 (d) (2) of such Act (20 U. S. C. 1232 (d) (2)) is amended by striking out "proposed" and inserting in lieu thereof "final".

(3) The fourth and last sentences of section 431 (d) (2) of such Act (20 U. S. C. 1232 (d) (2)) each are amended by inserting "final" immediately before "standard".

(b) Section 431 (d) (1) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U. S. C. 1232 (d) (1)) is amended by

adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Failure of the Congress to adopt such a concurrent resolution with respect to any such final standard, rule, regulation, or requirement prescribed under any such Act, shall not represent, with respect to such final standard, rule, regulation, or requirement, an approval or finding of consistency with the Act from which it derives its authority for any purpose, nor shall such failure to adopt a concurrent resolution be construed as evidence of an approval or finding of consistency necessary to establish a prima facie case, or an inference or presumption, in any judicial proceeding.".

EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 8. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amendments made by sections 2 (a), 2 (b), and 2 (c) shall take effect on July 1, 1975.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 (d), 2 (e), 3, 6, and 7 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) The amendments made by sections 4 and 5 (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1977, except that the provisions of clauses (A), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (2) of section 612 of the Act as amended by this Act, section 617 (a) (1) (D) of the Act, as amended by this Act, section 617 (b) of the Act, as amended by this Act, and section 618 (a) of the Act, as amended by this Act, shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) The provisions of section 5 (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

APPENDIX B

FINAL DRAFT OF ATPLS

ATPL Scale

The following questions are designed to determine information regarding Public Law (P.L. 94-142) The Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

Read each statement and put the appropriate number on the answer sheet. Please do not write on the question sheet.

Please Answer Every Question

1. Educators will work hard to implement Public Law 94-142 effectively.

2. We should obey Public Law 94-142 even though we criticize it.

3. Information gained in school changes so rapidly that it soon loses its value.

4. The purpose of law is to protect each citizen from the possible misdeeds of others.

5. Minority groups deserve equal opportunity and equal treatment.

6. Public Law 94-142 will result in an overburden of new and unnecessary paperwork.

7. Handicapped people are more emotional than other people.

8. Minority groups in this country have a difficult time.

9. Teachers must discard their envious attitudes if they are to assist the mainstreaming of handicapped students.

10. Public Law 94-142 should not have been enacted unless Congress had intended to provide the necessary financing.

11. Some laws command our respect, while others are mere regulations.

12. If boys and girls are to do an adequate job of learning in school, their needs for love must be met.

13. Education has failed unless it has helped boys and girls understand and express their own feelings and experiences.

14. The purpose of all laws is simply to guide individuals in their relations with others.

15. Public Law 94-142 is the true embodiment of justice and freedom.

16. The goals of education should be dictated by children's interest.

17. Most handicapped persons have chips on their shoulder.

18. The State Department of Education should see to it that school districts conform to the requirements of Public Law 94-142.

19. Special education teachers will do a better job of working with handicapped students than regular teachers.

20. A person should obey only those laws that seem reasonable.

21. Public Law 94-142 was passed in response to the pressure of lobbies in Washington.

22. Money should not be a very important factor in implementing Public Law 94-142.

23. Students should play a very active part in formulating rules for the classroom and the school.

24. Minority groups should be subject to the will of the majority.

25. Teachers have not been generally involved in planning for the implementation of Public Law 94-142.

26. It is more important for students to learn to work together cooperatively than it is for them to learn how to compete.

27. Teachers should follow the leadership of others.

28. The classroom experiences that are most helpful to boys and girls are the ones wherein they can express themselves creatively.

29. Most handicapped persons have different personalities than normal persons.

30. Activities in the school curriculum are useful mainly to facilitate the learning of subject matter.

31. Public Law 94-142 is not going to work unless the State Department of Education takes a strong leadership role.

32. Handicapped people show less enthusiasm than non-handicapped people.

33. A teacher should accept the deficiencies and shortcomings of a student as well as his/her good points.

34. Most handicapped people expect special treatment.

35. A primary drawback in implementing Public Law 94-142 is that teachers don't know very much about the law.

36. Boys and girls in the elementary school should be promoted regardless of whether they have completed the work for their grade or not.

37. All children should be encouraged to aim for the highest academic goals.

38. Handicapped people are often less aggressive than normal people.

39. Minority groups sometimes deserve special treatment.

40. People in Washington have imposed this new law (Public Law 94-142) on school people.

ATPL Scale
Instructions

Use this answer sheet to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements. Write in the appropriate number from +3 to -3 depending on how you feel on each one.

+3:	I agree very much	-1:	I disagree a little
+2:	I agree pretty much	-2:	I disagree pretty much
+1:	I agree a little	-3:	I disagree very much

Please Answer Every Item

1.	_____	21.	_____
2.	_____	22.	_____
3.	_____	23.	_____
4.	_____	24.	_____
5.	_____	25.	_____
6.	_____	26.	_____
7.	_____	27.	_____
8.	_____	28.	_____
9.	_____	29.	_____
10.	_____	30.	_____
11.	_____	31.	_____
12.	_____	32.	_____
13.	_____	33.	_____
14.	_____	34.	_____
15.	_____	35.	_____
16.	_____	36.	_____
17.	_____	37.	_____
18.	_____	38.	_____
19.	_____	39.	_____
20.	_____	40.	_____

APPENDIX C

COMPUTER PRINTOUT OF FACTOR MATRIX

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

VARIABLE	FACTOR 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	0.40078	0.02289	0.03948	0.15792	-0.05245	0.34038	-0.19004
2	0.23358	0.25634	0.01235	0.00809	-0.09445	0.51376	-0.21071
3	-0.13509	0.04809	-0.04228	-0.14214	0.43972	-0.16534	0.23428
4	-0.29334	-0.09405	0.20254	0.07942	0.15825	-0.38883	0.09492
5	-0.27433	-0.32442	0.37170	0.09029	0.07907	-0.16894	0.37896
6	0.31545	-0.01760	-0.31104	-0.07905	-0.08260	0.12662	-0.41892
7	0.00452	-0.01835	0.06275	-0.05857	0.69626	-0.12455	-0.12124
8	0.07265	-0.46535	-0.00523	0.17933	-0.24167	-0.04078	-0.25015
9	0.28282	-0.03333	0.01174	0.37047	0.05711	0.38373	-0.20124
10	-0.38881	-0.12765	-0.08186	-0.11096	-0.05101	-0.13193	0.38065
11	0.10377	0.03705	-0.02552	0.23130	0.07488	0.10291	-0.60388
12	0.20074	-0.00444	0.41214	0.06783	-0.19074	0.38326	0.03767
13	-0.01926	-0.10995	-0.46254	0.05983	0.05870	0.09955	-0.10618
14	0.15700	-0.37702	-0.20608	0.06697	0.05182	0.15369	0.30406
15	0.31044	-0.37693	0.23754	0.18911	-0.38980	0.23934	-0.05734
16	0.61002	0.21140	0.09414	-0.00598	-0.29605	0.15330	-0.06006
17	0.58377	-0.01960	0.06045	0.06578	-0.26135	0.10827	-0.02138
18	0.27246	0.01910	-0.05208	0.17407	-0.05265	0.56362	-0.05030
19	0.02957	-0.07747	0.21960	0.16394	0.00669	0.62149	-0.16438
20	0.42538	-0.28639	0.20728	0.12744	0.10977	0.34735	-0.05732
21	0.07701	0.48432	0.14193	0.06001	0.16236	-0.19805	-0.11235
22	0.25238	0.16129	-0.04913	0.28367	-0.17262	0.5 ,05	-0.01628
23	0.14812	0.29285	0.53739	0.05579	0.07128	0.09741	0.01397
24	0.05239	-0.57819	0.17188	-0.00850	0.01971	-0.12790	0.07988
25	0.04465	0.38080	-0.08410	0.13892	-0.07889	0.10209	-0.00988
26	-0.03978	0.05666	0.11762	0.12222	0.40682	-0.44940	0.05488
27	0.01976	-0,29600	0.38859	0.17552	-0.23624	0.43958	-0.00979
28	-0.00200	-0.27331	-0.23468	0.27071	-0.28434	-0.07640	-0.18894
29	0.61876	0.01236	0.04859	0.22309	0.16584	0.09170	-0.05089
30	0.16450	0.30154	-0.45799	0.27996	0.24110	-0.04826	0.16012
31	-0.07838	-0.01323	-0.07355	-0.08495	0.59263	-0.03775	-0.05931
32	0.17393	0.08978	0.13774	0.42377	-0.14783	-0.18523	-0.02537

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX (Continued)

VARIABLE	FACTOR 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	-0.33102	-0.26182	-0.04649	0.12697	-0.10528	0.42593	0.06369
34	0.33535	0.26961	0.04479	0.46863	0.11331	0.08034	-0.01663
35	0.07212	0.45531	0.21216	0.35546	0.18974	0.04835	0.12998
36	0.04880	-0.07838	0.05002	0.33379	0.13542	0.31135	-0.17703
37	-0.09030	0.05711	-0.01227	0.07422	0.10875	-0.10138	0.66006
38	0.10206	0.00997	-0.07122	0.42062	-0.44135	0.40348	-0.08983
39	0.15411	0.34960	-0.27179	0.27195	0.13325	-0.29524	0.31659
40	-0.21961	-0.06710	-0.36287	0.07114	-0.02672	0.09620	0.07434
41	-0.14536	-0.67772	0.00878	0.06616	0.11500	0.05530	0.03806
42	0.48278	0.22552	-0.20k74	0.39465	-0.07972	0.13592	-0.15975
43	0.07481	0.56368	0.17891	0.42333	0.09851	-0.02291	0.14597
44	-0.01266	0.04912	-0.07201	0.67249	-0.28492	0.23768	-0.13158
45	-0.00495	-0.15377	0.56656	0.12988	0.04792	0.14567	-0.03611
46	-0.08346	-0.07281	-0.05212	0.17603	0.33511	-0.38406	-0.14784
47	-0.07087	-0.07790	-0.00245	0.38723	0.01719	0.02498	-0.13403
48	0.14915	0.12313	-0.06606	0.60726	-0.11098	-0.00420	-0.09754
49	0.00633	0.47903	0.24479	0.36270	0.23859	-0.01835	-0.00530
50	-0.41423	0.17179	-0.31712	0.11094	0.16018	-0.16172	0.07004
51	0.00696	0.23905	-0.07366	0.10321	0.63548	0.00200	0.26431

APPENDIX D

KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 SURVEY (KPLS)

KPLS

Please complete the following survey by placing a T (True) or F (False) as appropriate for each item. Please respond to every item if possible.

1. ___ The provisions of Public Law 94-142 require the state educational agency to distribute the federal monies that support the law.

2. ___ Public Law 94-142 requires that first priority go to the most severely handicapped children whose education is inadequate.

3. ___ Public Law 94-142 requires each state to implement the provisions of the law for handicapped children from ages 3-18 by September 1978.

4. ___ States must implement the provisions of P.L. 94-142 even if they receive no federal support money.

5. ___ The provisions of P.L. 94-142 require that handicapped children be "mainstreamed."

6. ___ Individualized educational programs for each handicapped child are not required by Public Law 94-142.

7. ___ In the development of individualized educational programs, P.L. 94-142 requires the involvement of the parents and the handicapped child, when appropriate.

8. ___ Methods for testing and evaluating for purposes of placing handicapped students must be done in the primary mode of communication of the handicapped child.

9. ___ Individualized educational programs for handicapped children must be evaluated every 2 years.

10. ___ Providing a free and appropriate education for handicapped children must be done without cost to the parents.

11. ___ Local public school systems, according to provisions of P.L. 94-142, may not place handicapped children in private schools to achieve the purposes of the law.

12. ___ Local school districts are required to use more than one test or procedure in reaching a decision about an individualized educational program for each handicapped child.

13. ___ If a local school district desires to receive federal monies to assist in educating handicapped children as required by law, it must submit a plan to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

14. ___ An acceptable state plan, according to P.L. 94-142, must include the establishment of an advisory board composed of handicapped individuals, teachers and parents of handicapped children.

15. ___ The state educational agency must hold public hearings concerning the state plan before it is adopted, and publicize the plan after it is approved by HEW.

16. ___ Individualized educational programs for handicapped children are not required to include both long term and short term goals.

17. ___ Under the provisions of P.L. 94-142, HEW may not make grants to state educational agencies to initiate, expand and improve programs for the education of handicapped children at the preschool level.

18. ___ Handicapped students attending Indian Reservation Schools are excluded from the provision of the law, unless they attend regular public schools for a portion of the day.

19. ___ If a parent contests the replacement of her handicapped child from one learning environment to another, the schools decision shall stand until a final judicial decision is rendered.

20. ___ The amount of federal support available to support P.L. 94-142 increases yearly until 1985.

APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE SENT TO SAMPLE

Dear Educator,

You have been randomly selected to participate in a doctoral study concerning Public Law 94-142 that I am conducting under the direction of my chairman, Dr. Robert Ragland at the University of Oklahoma. I would be most appreciative if you would complete the three (3) enclosed forms as soon as possible, hopefully not later than April 1, 1979.

The enclosed forms are: (1) a personal data form, (2) Form KPLS, and (3) Form ATPL and (4) a self-addressed return envelope. I hope you will complete the forms as best you can. It is not necessary, nor particularly desirable that you "prepare" for your responses, especially on the Form KPLS.

It is not necessary for you to identify yourself, so please do not include your name unless you are interested in receiving a summary of the findings of the study. You will notice a number on the forms, this number is intended only to assist in accounting for the outstanding forms. Should you desire a copy of the findings, indicate by signing your name. You may rest assured that your name will not be revealed unless you agree to such revelation.

Your return envelope should include the three forms, sealed within the envelope and returned to the school's central mailing site. I will pick them up there.

If you have any questions regarding the forms or any aspect of the study, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone at (405) 321-2604, or by mail at 1207 Lakecrest Drive, Norman, Oklahoma 73071.

Sincerely,

Bonita Davis

BD/rac

Enclosures

APPENDIX F

VARIABLE INFORMATION AND SCORES ON ATPLS AND KPLS

IDENTIFICATION AND SCORES OF RESPONDENTS ON

THE ATPLS AND THE KPLS

E = Elementary S = Secondary

SPECIAL EDUCATION

IDENTIFICATION NO.	SCORE ON ATPLS	SCORE ON KPLS
266 E.	160	16
267 E.	149	12
268 E.	125	2
274 S.	153	12
132 E.	175	11
203 S.	158	16
259 S.	152	15
206 S.	143	15
073 E.	156	11
106 S.	163	0
262 S.	172	13
126 S.	152	16
161 E.	166	11
289 E.	136	0
074 E.	153	15
062 E.	139	15
250 E.	149	13
290 S.	154	16
298 E.	174	15
107 S.	159	14
004 E.	152	16
008 E.	148	11
060 E.	122	16
201 S.	160	16
302 E.	148	14
077 E.	154	11
049 E.	136	14
239 S.	141	15
175 E.	153	13
011 E.	172	14
016 E.	174	17
002 E.	163	13
244 E.	163	15
301 E.	152	10
130 E.	162	13
300 E.	136	14
303 S.	142	16
277 E.	166	12

NON SPECIAL EDUCATION

IDENTIFICATION NO.	SCORE ON ATPLS	SCORE ON KPLS
070 E.	157	14
036 E.	151	17
143 S.	150	15
071 E.	153	13
069 E.	101	12
136 E.	132	12
272 S.	108	3
090 S.	164	12
278 E.	164	12
118 S.	142	13
094 S.	145	13
017 E.	141	13
271 S.	159	17
013 E.	135	11
284 E.	149	15
021 S.	120	7
150 E.	163	12
187 E.	174	1
192 E.	64	11
219 S.	132	10
240 S.	140	13
184 E.	130	14
189 E.	161	13
235 S.	136	0
188 E.	150	12
023 S.	158	2
220 S.	119	14
114 S.	159	16
087 S.	142	13
291 S.	115	10
075 E.	153	11
041 E.	144	14
068 E.	150	15
120 S.	162	10
108 S.	138	16
039 E.	159	11
249 S.	140	11
253 S.	158	15
233 S.	155	11
053 E.	136	9
144 S.	149	0
299 E.	154	13
237 E.	152	12
236 E.	140	13
258 E.	134	12
109 S.	154	12
151 E.	157	12
207 S.	145	10

IDENTIFICATION NO.	SCORE ON ATPLS	SCORE ON KPLS
152 E.	164	11
137 E.	155	7
056 E.	142	13
098 S.	154	14
148 E.	159	12
065 E.	144	14
005 E.	85	11
012 E.	161	12
174 E.	125	0
028 S.	136	0
081 E.	153	2
009 E.	150	16
195 S.	128	2
125 S.	141	11
076 E.	155	11
135 E.	151	12
067 E.	154	13
260 S.	144	12
257 E.	172	13
129 S.	139	10
044 E.	143	13
124 S.	139	0
187 S.	136	13
197 S.	116	7
297 S.	153	9
246 E.	135	14
251 S.	120	13
248 S.	143	13
242 E.	166	15
245 E.	162	12
282 S.	121	12
171 E.	148	9
019 S.	154	14
229 S.	163	0
063 E.	143	16
051 E.	129	10
281 S.	0	0
055 E.	178	16
097 S.	173	12
033 E.	153	12
093 S.	158	9
296 S.	163	12
095 S.	111	4
269 E.	167	13
292 S.	134	13
280 E.	150	10
295 S.	149	16
294 S.	127	17
287 E.	127	11
285 E.	145	2

IDENTIFICATION NO.	SCORE ON ATPLS	SCORE ON KPLS
080 E.	135	15
059 E.	158	13
052 E.	175	14
265 E.	142	6
003 E.	150	14
196 S.	145	12
173 E.	149	9
172 E.	138	12
164 E.	155	15
163 E.	138	0
181 E.	144	12
198 S.	167	14
191 E.	134	11
102 S.	151	13
264 E.	163	15
243 E.	163	15
047 E.	156	17
999 S.	183	15
225 S.	145	13
142 S.	162	7
007 S.	163	15
180 E.	137	10
241 S.	131	8

ADMINISTRATORS

IDENTIFICATION NO.	SCORE ON ATPLS	SCORE ON KPLS
078 E.	151	13
015 E.	154	15
018 S.	145	0
183 E.	132	13
099 S.	166	18
001 E.	146	14
999 S.	155	13
140 S.	158	0
270 E.	129	17
273 S.	129	13
006 E.	155	13
304 S.	162	15
066 E.	143	10
131 E.	166	17
263 S.	128	14
037 E.	153	13
286 E.	136	15
293 S.	155	16
014 E.	180	12
256 E.	126	19
190 E.	158	15
238 S.	154	12
046 E.	155	15

APPENDIX G

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Personal Data Sheet

Please complete the personal data items as appropriate.

A. Current Teaching Status (check one)

1. _____ Special Education Teacher
2. _____ Non-Special Education Teacher
3. _____ Administrator

B. Grade Level for Current Teaching Status (check one)

1. _____ Elementary School (K-5 or 6)
2. _____ Jr. High/Middle School (6-7, 8 or 9)
3. _____ High School (9 or 10-12)

C. Sex (check one)

1. _____ Male 2. _____ Female

D. How long have you (fill in as appropriate)

1. _____ been an administrator?
2. _____ been a Special Education teacher?
3. _____ been a Non-Special Education teacher?
4. _____ been in education?
5. _____ been familiar with Public Law 94-142?

E. Have you (fill in "yes" or "no" as appropriate)

1. _____ taken courses in Special Education?
2. _____ taught special education students (administrators and non-special education teachers only)?