

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY: TEACHER TRAINING AND  
DIAGNOSTIC TESTS USED

2148  
3608N

by

BARBARA ANN CAVE

B. A., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1973

-

---

A MASTERS REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

LD

2668

R4

1974

C387

C 2

Document

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to the following people: Dr. Larry Martin, for his guidance and direction in conducting the survey; Dr. Howard Kittleson and Dr. Michael Holen, for their assistance in understanding and correctly organizing the technical aspects of a survey; Dr. John DeMand and Dr. Fred Bradley, for their patience, help, and understanding during the trying times of writing this report; Mrs. Lois Brunmeier, the very gracious and congenial secretary who gave direction and encouragement during the many months of involvement with the survey; Mrs. Karen Crosslin, Mrs. Ira Wolfe, and Mrs. Ellen McQuade, for the cooperation, assistance and moral support needed to accomplish the feat of organizing the survey and writing the report; David Zanders for his understanding and patient friendship. and especially to the writer's loving family.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. PROCEDURES .....	2
3. FINDINGS.....	5
Part III .....	5
Part V.....	28
4. CONCLUSIONS .....	56
5. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	58
APPENDIXES .....	60
A. Final Survey .....	61
B. Cover Letter .....	68
C. Follow-Up Letter .....	70
D. Comments .....	72



# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total Group Response to Each Item Part III.....	6
2. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 1 .....	9
3. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 2 .....	10
4. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 3 .....	12
5. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 5 .....	13
6. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 6 .....	15
7. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 7 .....	16
8. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 8 .....	18
9. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 9 .....	19
10. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 10 .....	20
11. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 11 .....	22
12. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 12 .....	23
13. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 13 .....	25
14. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 14 .....	26
15. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 15 .....	27

16.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 4 .....	29
17.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part III, Item 16 .....	30
18.	Total Group Response to Each Item, Part V .....	7
19.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 1 .....	32
20.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 3 .....	33
21.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 5 .....	35
22.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 7 .....	36
23.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 9 .....	38
24.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 11 .....	39
25.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 13 .....	41
26.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 15 .....	42
27.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 17 .....	43
28.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 2 .....	45
29.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 8 .....	46
30.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 16 .....	48
31.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 4 .....	49
32.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 6 .....	51

33. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 10 .....	52
34. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 12 .....	54
35. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Part V, Item 14 .....	55

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

Learning disabilities is a relatively new field in special education. A teacher training program in the area of learning disabilities was recently established at Kansas State University in an effort to help supply the state of Kansas with well qualified teachers in that field. The learning disability survey utilized in this study was devised to gather opinions from Kansas administrators, learning disability teachers, school psychologists and students currently enrolled in the present learning disability program. This was done in order to determine what competencies these people, already dealing with the field of learning disabilities, felt were crucial to a learning disability teacher education program. The results of the survey will be utilized in helping to modify the learning disability program at Kansas State University to meet the identified needs in the state of Kansas.

The survey consists of 102 questions which were grouped into the five sections of: 1. staffing, 2. public relations, 3. teacher training, 4. affective behavior and 5. diagnostic tests. The scope of this report will deal only with sections III and V, which concern those questions dealing with what specific course work and diagnostic testing skills are needed by a learning disability teacher. The six specific groups of people surveyed in this study are the following: principals, school psychologists, learning disability teachers, college students in the learning disability program at Kansas State University, superintendents, and directors of special education.

## Chapter II

### PROCEDURES

A series of group discussions concerning possible ways to obtain the opinions and needs of the educators of Kansas about the field of learning disabilities was begun in February, 1974. Several different means of obtaining these opinions were considered. Among those were a telephone survey and a written survey sent through the mail. It was agreed that a written survey would be more beneficial. The major areas of opinions to be sampled at this time were considered to be what tests should be used to identify and diagnose learning disabled children, the learning disability teachers' preparatory curriculum, and the types of learning disability programs needed in public schools.

The first set of written questions that were worked out were short answer questions such as "Do you feel a learning disability teacher should be able to give and interpret diagnostic tests? If so, which ones?" Upon consultation with Kansas State University staff members, it was decided that these types of questions were too general for the stated purposes and therefore the survey was rewritten utilizing more specific questions. An example of an item from this draft of questions is "In the hiring of a learning disability teacher, is prior teaching experience essential, desired, or doesn't it matter?" This set of questions also included a general question asking simple for the survey recipients' conception of learning disabilities. These questions were then reworded so that each seemed to be addressed to each specific group mentioned above. At the top of each questionnaire was a short paragraph stating that our goal was to improve the learning disability teacher education program at Kansas State University. These questionnaires were again reviewed by the staff at Kansas State

University. It was concluded that the questions should be rewritten so as to lend themselves to a rating scale. By this method, it was felt that possible responses would be more limited and therefore improve the usability of the data received from the survey. The survey utilized the number 1 to indicate strong agreement with the statement, number 2 to indicate agreement, number 3 to indicate a neutral response, number 4 to indicate disagreement, and number 5 to show a strong disagreement.

All of the similar questions were then grouped into content areas. The following five areas resulted: (I.) staffing of a learning disability teacher's affective behavior, (II.) a learning disability teacher's need for public relations, (III.) preparatory college curriculum needed for a learning disability teacher, (IV.) a learning disability teacher's affective behavior and (V.) diagnostic tests that could be used and the definition of a learning disabled child. The last page was reserved for information on the person's educational background, teaching experience, job position and gender. A copy of the complete final survey appears in Appendix A.

In April, each of the surveys was given a code number and was sent out through bulk mail with a cover letter and a postage paid return envelope. The State Department computer furnished the survey team with pre-addressed, gummed labels of every principal, superintendent, director of special education, school psychologist, and learning disability teacher in Kansas. Each person mentioned above received the survey by mail. The cover letter was similar to the original introductory paragraph that was written earlier. It was revised and each letter was hand signed to add a personal touch, trying to urge the educators of Kansas to help us accumulate the teaching competencies they felt were needed by every learning disability teacher. A copy of this cover letter appears in Appendix B.

A follow-up letter was sent to those people who had not responded to the first mailing by the end of two weeks. The reminder also included a survey and return postage paid envelope. A copy of the follow-up letter appears in Appendix C.

Upon return of the surveys, the code numbers were removed and the information was recorded on Computer Fortran Data sheets. In June, the coded Fortran sheets were key punched at the Kansas State University Computer Center and sent through the computer.

Each of the five major sections of the survey was assigned to a specific investigator for analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. The scope of this report is limited to the preparatory college curriculum needed for a learning disability teacher (Section III), the diagnostic tests that could be used, and the definition of a learning disabled child (Section V).

## Chapter III

### Findings

After the computer cards were keypunched, the computer was programmed to yield several different values. These values were the mode, mean, and the standard deviation for every question in each part of the survey. Also recorded was the total number of people responding to each item. (See Table 1 for Part III figures and Table 18 for Part V figures.)

The total group was divided into the subgroups of the job position held, gender, level of educational degree and years of experience. The job position subgroup was categorized into the psychologist, learning disability teacher, principal, superintendent, director of special education and learning disability college student divisions. The gender subgroup was divided into male and female divisions and the degree subgroup was divided into the bachelor, master, masters plus and doctorate levels. The experience subgroup was categorized into the divisions of 1 to 3 years, 4 to 6, 7 to 9, and 10 years or more of experience. Tables were written that recorded the percentage of responses for each of these subgroups and their divisions according to each section of the 1 to 5 rating scale. The chi square value of each subgroup was indicated by placing an asterisk by those values at the .05 level of significance. Also recorded in the tables were the number of persons responding and the number of people who chose not to answer the question. In the total group response, the principals returned 707 surveys of the 1652 that were sent (43 percent response); the superintendents returned 206 of the 328 sent (63 percent response); learning disability teachers returned 226 of 274 sent out (82 percent response); directors of special education returned 46 of 52 sent (88 percent response); school psychologists returned 119 of 158 sent (75 percent response); and the Kansas



Table 1

Total Group Response to Each Item  
Part III  
Teacher Training

Question Number	Mode	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number Responding
1	1.00	1.34	0.55	1349
2	3.00	2.53	1.15	1346
3	1.00	1.52	0.57	1351
4	3.00	2.74	1.16	1339
5	2.00	1.87	0.71	1348
6	2.00	1.87	0.76	1347
7	2.00	1.71	0.70	1355
8	2.00	1.62	0.62	1352
9	2.00	1.64	0.63	1354
10	1.00	1.79	0.88	1355
11	1.00	1.49	0.60	1351
12	2.00	2.22	0.87	1342
13	2.00	1.71	0.67	1349
14	2.00	1.92	0.81	1348
15	2.00	1.94	0.89	1347
16	3.00	3.06	1.05	1343

**Table 18**

**Total Group Response to Each Item**  
**Part V**  
**Diagnostic Tests Used**

Question Number	Mode	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number Responding
1	3.00	2.61	0.83	1281
2	2.00	2.84	1.13	1317
3	2.00	2.31	0.86	1237
4	5.00	4.22	0.96	1313
5	3.00	2.41	0.73	1263
6	2.00	1.96	0.83	1309
7	2.00	2.52	0.84	1266
8	2.00	2.74	1.16	1303
9	3.00	2.42	0.71	1254
10	4.00	3.53	0.87	1308
11	3.00	2.36	0.80	1256
12	2.00	2.70	0.83	1294
13	2.00	2.40	0.82	1266
14	4.00	3.51	1.00	1296
15	3.00	2.43	0.76	1255
16	5.00	4.17	0.91	1303
17	3.00	2.85	0.69	1241

State University learning disability students returned 56 of the 56 surveys given (100 percent response).

The questions in Part III of the Learning Disability Survey deal with the training of the learning disability teacher. This section may be further broken down into the area of specific course work needed by the learning disability teacher (see questions 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11, 12,13,14, 15) and whether the learning disability training received at the elementary level may be used with children at the secondary level and vice versa (see questions 4,16).

Of the total group response to item 1, Part III, of the survey, 97.1% strongly agreed or agreed that the training in the characteristics of the learning disabled child is in the preparation of a learning disability teacher. (See table 2) This yielded a mean score of 1.34 (See table 1). No significant discrepancies in ratings were found within any of the subgroup areas.

In question 2 of Part III, 47.1% of the total group strongly agreed or agreed that a masters degree should be one of the qualifications for a learning disability teacher, 29% were undecided while 21.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed (see Table 3). This yielded a mean score of 2.53 (see Table 1). No significant discrepancies in ratings were found within the educational degree category. However, significant discrepancies were found within the job position, gender and experience subgroups. While the total subgroup of positions held answered in a positive way, the superintendents and principals tended to respond more negatively than the others, especially in comparison with the psychologist and learning disability teacher subgroups. When considering the gender subgroup, the females appeared to respond more positively while the males tended to be slightly more undecided. Looking at the experience subgroup, people with less

Table 2

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III  
Item 1

Training in the characteristics of the L.D. child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	68.6	28.5	1.5	0.3	0.2	349/13
0.0935	Psychologist	66.4	30.3	2.5	0.0	0.8	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	69.5	28.3	1.3	0.4	0.4	226/0
	Principals	69.3	29.2	1.4	0.1	0.0	696/11
	Superintendents	64.4	32.7	1.5	1.0	0.5	205/1
	Directors	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	92.9	5.4	1.8	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.3836	Male	67.9	29.9	1.6	0.4	0.2	950/11
	Female	72.4	26.1	1.3	0.0	0.3	399/2
0.6437	Bachelors	72.9	24.8	1.5	0.8	0.0	133/0
	Masters	68.6	29.2	1.7	0.1	0.4	832/5
	Masters Plus	67.6	31.2	0.8	0.4	0.0	253/7
	Doctorate	71.1	27.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.5026	1-3 Years	73.8	23.8	1.6	0.8	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	70.8	27.4	1.8	0.0	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	67.4	27.9	3.5	1.2	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	68.1	30.4	1.0	0.2	0.3	928/11

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 3

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III  
Item 2

A master's degree should be  
one of the qualifications for  
a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	23.6	24.3	29.0	18.4	3.5	1346/16
0.0000*	Psychologist	34.5	34.5	19.3	10.9	0.8	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	35.4	22.1	23.0	14.2	5.3	226/0
	Principals	21.9	25.1	32.3	18.7	2.0	694/13
	Superintendents	11.3	19.1	32.4	29.4	7.8	204/2
	Directors	22.2	37.8	22.2	13.3	4.4	45/1
	Students	28.6	17.9	33.9	16.1	3.6	56/0
0.0001*	Male	20.7	24.7	31.0	20.5	3.2	949/12
	Female	31.7	24.4	25.4	14.1	4.3	397/4
0.1142	Bachelors	23.3	20.3	33.8	15.8	6.8	133/0
	Masters	23.3	27.3	27.7	18.8	2.9	829/8
	Masters Plus	25.3	19.4	33.2	17.8	4.3	253/7
	Doctorate	24.4	27.8	25.6	21.1	1.1	90/0
0.0075*	1-3 Years	36.1	22.1	20.5	16.4	4.9	122/0
	4-6 Years	29.2	29.2	23.9	12.4	5.3	113/0
	7-9 Years	28.2	28.2	25.9	15.3	2.4	85/2
	10 Plus Years	20.6	25.1	31.1	19.9	3.3	926/13

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

experience seemed to answer more positively than each succeeding experience grouping.

For total group response to item 3 of the third section of the survey, 97.2% strongly agreed or agreed that training in the guidance of learning disabled children and their parents is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher (see Table 4). A mean score of 1.52 was yielded for this question (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies in ratings were found within all the subgroups although all of the subgroups answered in an overwhelmingly positive manner to the question. Within the position held subgroup, it appears that learning disability teachers and students responded much more in strong agreement with this question than the other categories of positions held. In the gender subgroup, the females were in more strong agreement than the males. In the degree subgroup, the doctorates agreed with the statement but not as strongly as the other divisions within the subgroup. The experience subgroup showed people in the 1 to 3 year range more strongly agreed with the statement than those with more experience.

For total group response to item 5 of Part III, when asked if training in language and speech development is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher, 85% of the total group strongly agreed or agreed while 11.9% were undecided (see Table 5). This yielded a mean score of 1.87 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were found in all subgroup areas. Within the position subgroup, the principals and superintendents did not appear to agree as strongly as the others with the question. In the gender subgroup, more males were undecided and females tended to answer in stronger agreement than the males. Within the experience subgroup, the ten years and over division less strongly agreed and was more undecided than those of less experience.

Table 4

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 3

Training in the guidance of  
L.D. children and parents is  
important in the preparation  
of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	50.0	47.2	1.4	0.4	0.2	1351/11
0.0002*	Psychologist	49.6	49.6	0.0	0.0	0.8	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	63.7	34.5	1.3	0.4	0.0	226/0
	Principals	47.9	50.6	1.0	0.3	0.3	698/9
	Superintendents	42.0	54.6	2.4	1.0	0.0	205/1
	Directors	37.8	57.8	4.4	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	69.6	26.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.0005*	Male	46.6	51.3	1.4	0.4	0.3	951/10
	Female	59.5	38.8	1.5	0.3	0.0	400/1
0.0012*	Bachelors	54.9	39.1	4.5	1.5	0.0	133/0
	Masters	49.2	49.6	0.7	0.1	0.4	832/5
	Masters Plus	53.3	43.5	2.7	0.4	0.0	255/5
	Doctorate	42.2	56.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.0111*	1-3 Years	63.9	34.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	59.3	38.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	57.0	43.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	45.8	51.9	1.5	0.4	0.3	930/9

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 5

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part III

Item 5

Training in language and  
speech development is im-  
portant in the preparation  
of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	29.4	55.6	11.9	1.8	0.4	1348/14
0.0000*	Psychologist	37.0	56.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	40.0	44.0	11.1	3.6	1.3	225/1
	Principals	24.1	61.3	13.3	1.3	0.0	697/10
	Superintendents	25.0	57.4	13.7	3.4	0.5	204/2
	Directors	40.0	48.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	50.0	42.9	5.4	0.0	1.8	56/0
0.0000*	Male	25.4	59.5	13.5	1.6	0.1	950/11
	Female	39.9	48.2	8.5	2.3	1.0	398/3
0.0252*	Bachelors	41.4	44.4	9.0	3.8	1.5	133/0
	Masters	27.9	57.8	12.3	1.7	0.4	829/8
	Masters Plus	29.8	55.3	13.7	1.2	0.0	255/5
	Doctorate	27.8	62.2	8.9	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.0021*	1-3 Years	36.9	50.8	8.2	2.5	1.6	122/0
	4-6 Years	38.9	48.7	8.8	2.7	0.9	113/0
	7-9 Years	40.0	54.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	85/2
	10 Plus Years	26.1	58.3	13.6	1.8	0.2	928/11

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



For the total group response to item 6 of Part III, 84.7% was in strong agreement or agreement with the statement that the learning disability teacher should be able to interpret and make educational prescriptions from the test results she receives from the psychologist while 10.4% remained undecided (see Table 6). This yielded a mean score of 1.87 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were notes within the subgroup of job position, gender and years of experience categories but not in the educational background area. The position subgroup showed that the superintendents and principals less strongly agreed and appeared more undecided than all the other divisions except the students. Directors appeared the least undecided of all. Within the gender subgroup, the females appeared to be in stronger agreement than the males did. Within the experience subgroup, those with 1 to 3 years of experience tended to be in stronger agreement with the question than the others did.

Response of the total group for item 7 of Part III showed 90.2% in strong agreement or agreement while 1.9% was in disagreement with the statement that training in remedial reading is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher (see Table 7). A mean score of 1.71 was yielded (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies in ratings were found in the areas of job position, gender, and years of experience. Within the position subgroup, learning disability teachers and students seemed to be in stronger agreement with the statement than did the other professions. Within the gender subgroup, the females seemed to be in stronger agreement than the males did. Within the experience subgroup, the 10 years and over division was in less agreement within the statement than the other divisions.

In question 8 of Part III, 94.6% of the total group response was in strong agreement or agreement that training in the psychology of

Table 6

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part III  
Item 6

The L.D. teacher should be able to interpret and make educational prescriptions from the test results she receives from the psychologist.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	31.2	53.5	10.4	3.4	0.4	1347/15
0.0000*	Psychologist	39.5	45.4	9.2	5.0	0.8	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	43.4	43.8	7.1	4.9	0.9	226/0
	Principals	26.9	59.7	10.6	2.6	0.1	695/12
	Superintendents	27.9	54.9	15.2	2.0	0.0	204/2
	Directors	33.3	55.6	2.2	6.7	2.2	45/1
	Students	35.7	39.3	16.1	7.1	1.8	56/0
0.0000*	Male	28.6	57.6	11.1	2.5	0.2	949/12
	Female	38.7	45.5	9.3	5.5	1.0	398/3
0.0627*	Bachelors	37.6	43.8	13.5	5.3	0.0	133/0
	Masters	29.8	57.5	9.0	3.3	0.4	829/8
	Masters Plus	35.4	48.0	13.4	2.4	0.8	254/6
	Doctorate	28.9	60.0	7.8	3.3	0.0	90/0
0.0006*	1-3 Years	46.3	39.7	8.3	5.0	0.8	121/1
	4-6 Years	29.2	52.2	9.7	7.1	1.8	113/0
	7-9 Years	39.5	45.3	11.6	2.3	1.2	86/1
	10 Plus Years	29.6	56.7	10.7	2.9	0.1	927/12

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 7

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part III

Item 7

Training in remedial  
reading is important in  
the preparation of a L.D.  
teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	40.7	49.5	7.4	1.6	0.3	1355/7
0.0000*	Psychologist	41.2	47.1	8.4	3.4	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	62.8	32.3	4.0	0.9	0.0	226/0
	Principals	36.2	55.4	7.1	1.1	0.1	702/5
	Superintendents	30.7	52.7	11.7	3.4	1.5	205/1
	Directors	31.1	62.2	6.7	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	55.4	33.9	8.9	1.8	0.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	36.0	53.8	8.3	1.5	0.4	955/6
	Female	52.5	40.0	5.5	2.0	0.0	400/1
0.0385	Bachelors	48.1	40.6	9.0	2.3	0.0	133/0
	Masters	40.4	50.8	7.4	1.4	0.0	835/2
	Masters Plus	38.3	53.1	5.5	2.0	1.2	256/4
	Doctorate	38.9	50.0	7.8	2.2	1.1	90/0
0.0177*	1-3 Years	53.3	41.0	4.9	0.8	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	53.1	41.6	4.4	0.9	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	46.5	46.5	4.7	2.3	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	36.9	53.0	7.8	1.8	0.4	934/5

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

exceptional children is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher. Only 1.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed (see Table 8). The score of 1.62 was the mean for this item (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were found in the subgroup of job position only.

The 9th item in Part III found 93.5% of the total group response in strong agreement or agreement with the statement that training in the characteristics of the emotionally disturbed child is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher. Only 1.1% disagreed (see Table 9). The mean score for this item was 1.64 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were noted within all subgroup categories. Within the position subgroup, the students were in strong agreement and more undecided than the other divisions. Within the gender subgroup, the males were less undecided and more in agreement than the females. Within the degree subgroup, the doctorate level less strongly agreed with questions than the others did. Within the 7 to 9 and the 10 and over divisions of the experience subgroup, more agreement was found with the statement than in the other age ranges.

The total response group to item 10 showed 82.2% in strong agreement and agreement that the learning disability teacher should have regular classroom teaching experience before she teaches in a learning disability program. There was 5.4% in disagreement but 11.8% remained undecided about the question (see Table 10). A mean score of 1.79% was yielded (see Table 1). The category of educational degrees held showed no significant discrepancies. Discrepancies were found in the subgroups of job position, gender and years of experience. Within the position subgroup, the learning disability students more strongly agreed, the directors were undecided and the psychologists were in less strong agreement than the other

Table 8

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 8

Training in the psychology  
of exceptional children is  
important in the prepara-  
tion of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	44.0	50.6	3.6	1.0	0.1	1352/10
0.0426*	Psychologist	44.5	52.1	1.7	1.7	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	50.2	43.1	4.4	1.8	0.4	225/1
	Principals	41.9	54.0	3.3	0.7	0.1	700/7
	Superintendents	38.0	56.1	5.4	0.5	0.0	205/1
	Directors	53.3	44.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	66.1	28.6	3.6	1.8	0.0	56/0
0.1030	Male	42.4	53.1	3.7	0.7	0.1	953/8
	Female	48.9	45.9	3.5	1.5	0.3	399/2
0.2738	Bachelors	45.9	45.9	7.5	0.0	0.8	133/0
	Masters	43.2	52.2	3.2	1.2	0.1	833/4
	Masters Plus	44.7	51.8	3.1	0.4	0.0	255/5
	Doctorate	46.7	50.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.1543	1-3 Years	48.4	44.3	4.1	2.5	0.8	122/0
	4-6 Years	47.8	48.7	3.5	0.0	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	54.7	40.7	4.7	0.0	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	42.2	53.4	3.3	1.0	0.1	931/8

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 9

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 9

Training in the characteristics of the emotionally disturbed child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
.	Total Group	43.0	50.5	4.8	1.0	0.1	1354/8
0.0017*	Psychologist	40.3	51.3	5.9	2.5	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	47.8	42.9	8.0	0.9	0.4	226/0
	Principals	43.1	53.2	3.0	0.6	0.1	701/6
	Superintendents	39.5	55.1	4.9	0.5	0.0	205/1
	Directors	33.3	57.8	4.4	4.4	0.0	45/1
	Students	55.4	30.4	12.5	1.8	0.0	56/0
0.0010*	Male	42.1	53.5	3.7	0.6	0.1	955/6
	Female	46.1	44.4	7.5	1.8	0.3	399/2
0.0255*	Bachelors	48.1	39.8	9.8	2.3	0.0	133/0
	Masters	42.8	52.0	4.0	1.2	0.1	853/6
	Masters Plus	43.1	53.3	3.1	0.0	0.4	255/5
	Doctorate	37.8	55.6	6.7	0.0	0.0	90/0
0.0139*	1-3 Years	45.1	46.7	6.6	1.6	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	46.0	42.5	8.8	2.7	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	46.5	48.8	2.3	1.2	1.2	86/1
	10 Plus Years	42.2	53.4	3.9	0.4	0.1	933/6

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 10

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 10

The L.D. teacher should  
have regular classroom  
teaching experience be-  
fore she teaches in a  
L.D. program.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	44.1	38.1	11.8	4.7	0.7	1355/7
0.0000*	Psychologist	33.6	42.0	10.9	13.4	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	52.2	28.3	11.1	5.8	2.7	226/0
	Principals	43.2	41.5	11.5	3.4	0.4	702/5
	Superintendents	42.0	43.9	11.2	2.4	0.5	205/1
	Directors	40.0	28.9	24.4	6.7	0.0	45/1
	Students	62.5	17.9	14.3	5.4	0.0	56/0
0.0232*	Male	41.7	40.8	12.0	4.8	0.6	955/6
	Female	50.8	32.3	11.5	4.5	1.0	400/1
0.3190	Bachelors	45.9	30.1	17.3	4.5	2.3	133/0
	Masters	44.7	38.7	11.3	4.9	0.5	835/2
	Masters Plus	41.0	41.8	12.1	4.3	0.8	256/4
	Doctorate	42.2	43.3	10.0	3.3	1.1	90/0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	30.3	37.7	18.0	10.7	3.3	122/0
	4-6 Years	48.7	29.2	14.2	7.1	0.9	113/0
	7-9 Years	46.5	33.7	15.1	4.7	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	45.3	40.5	10.6	3.2	0.4	934/5

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



divisions. Within the gender subgroup, the females more strongly agreed with the question than the males. Within the experience subgroup, the 1 to 3 years division was in less strong agreement with the question and more undecided. Also more people in this category disagreed with the question than in the other categories.

For the total group response to item 11, when asked if training in the remediation of the learning disabled child is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher, 96.3% strongly agreed or agreed while only 0.8% disagreed (see Table 11). This yielded a 1.49 mean score (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were found in the subgroups of gender and years of experience. Within the gender subgroup, the females appeared to be much more in strong agreement with the question than the males. Within the experience subgroup, the 10 or more years of experience group was in less strong agreement with the question than the other groups were.

For the total group response to item 12, 64.5% were in strong agreement or agreement while 27.0% remained neutral. Only 7.0% were in strong disagreement or disagreement that it is important to have a theory of learning disabilities and to organize one's work around that theory (see Table 12.) The mean score yielded 2.22 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were found in the areas of job position, gender and years of experience while the area of educational degrees showed no significant discrepancies. Within the position subgroup, the teachers, directors and students appeared in more stronger agreement with the question than the others. Within the gender subgroup, the females appeared to be more in stronger agreement with the question than the males were. Within the experience subgroup, the 1 to 3 year division appeared to be in less strong



Table 11

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part III

Item 11

Training in the remediation of the L.D. child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	54.2	42.1	2.2	0.4	0.4	1351/11
0.0	Psychologist	68.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	2.5	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	71.1	27.6	0.9	0.0	0.4	225/1
	Principals	47.2	49.9	2.4	0.3	0.1	699/8
	Superintendents	42.4	50.7	5.4	1.5	0.0	205/1
	Directors	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	45/1
	Students	91.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	48.1	48.5	2.6	0.5	0.2	952/9
	Female	70.2	27.8	1.3	0.0	0.8	399/2
0.0525	Bachelors	68.2	28.8	2.3	0.0	0.8	132/1
	Masters	52.2	44.5	2.5	0.5	0.2	833/4
	Masters Plus	54.5	43.5	1.6	0.0	0.4	255/5
	Doctorate	44.4	51.1	2.2	1.1	1.1	90/0
0.0002*	1-3 Years	68.9	31.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	68.1	28.3	1.8	0.9	0.9	113/0
	7-9 Years	62.4	35.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	85/1
	10 Plus Years	48.8	47.7	2.8	0.3	0.3	932/7

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 12

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part III  
Item 12

It is important to have a  
theory of learning dis-  
abilities and to organize  
your work around that  
theory.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	20.4	44.1	27.0	6.2	0.8	1342/20
0.0005*	Psychologist	17.9	43.6	23.9	12.0	2.6	117/2
	L.D. Teacher	27.4	43.5	20.6	6.7	1.8	223/3
	Principals	19.5	45.8	30.1	4.2	0.4	694/13
	Superintendents	15.6	44.9	30.7	8.8	0.0	205/1
	Directors	24.4	44.4	24.4	6.7	0.0	45/1
	Students	32.1	35.7	19.6	10.7	1.8	56/0
0.0105*	Male	19.1	45.3	28.9	6.2	0.4	947/4
	Female	24.6	43.3	23.8	6.6	1.8	395/6
0.8864	Bachelors	21.4	42.0	28.2	6.1	2.3	131/2
	Masters	19.6	45.5	28.0	6.2	0.7	826/11
	Masters Plus	22.4	44.1	26.4	6.3	0.8	254/6
	Doctorate	23.3	46.7	23.3	6.7	0.0	90/0
0.0454*	1-3 Years	16.5	42.1	28.9	10.7	1.7	121/1
	4-6 Years	23.4	47.7	20.7	4.5	3.6	111/2
	7-9 Years	22.6	42.9	27.4	7.1	0.0	84/2
	10 Plus Years	20.8	45.4	27.7	5.6	0.5	928/11

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

agreement and more undecided about the question.

In question 13, the total group responded with 90.2% strong agreement or agreement to the statement training in the education of exceptional children is important in the preparation of a learning disability teacher. Disagreeing or strongly disagreeing answers came to 1.2% (see Table 13). The mean score yielded 1.71 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies were found within the experience subgroup. Highly positive responses occurred within the position subgroup. It appeared that the superintendent were slightly more undecided than the other divisions. Within the gender subgroup, although responses were overwhelmingly positive, the males were more conservative with their responses. Although highly positive responses were given by all divisions of the degree subgroup, it appeared that the doctorate level division tended to be more undecided.

For the total group response for item 14, 78.4% strongly agreed and agreed that a field experience in learning disabilities is important preparation for a learning disability teacher while 17.3% were undecided as to its importance. The remaining 3.3% disagreed with the statement (see Table 14). A mean score of 1.92 was yielded (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies occurred within the subgroups of gender, degree and years of experience while no significant discrepancies occurred within the job position subgroup. Within the gender subgroup, females appeared to respond more strongly while the males were more conservative with their agreement and more males were undecided. All the divisions within the degree subgroup appeared to generally agree with the statement, the bachelors degree level appeared to be in stronger agreement than the other three levels who tended to be more conservative. Within the experience subgroup, the 1-3 year division agreed more strongly than the other three which became succeeding more conservative in response as the number of years of

Table 13

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 13

Training in education of exceptional children is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	38.5	51.7	7.6	1.1	0.1	1349/13
0.0004*	Psychologist	42.0	48.7	7.6	1.7	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	48.4	43.0	7.6	0.4	0.4	233/3
	Principals	34.6	56.7	7.1	1.4	0.1	700/7
	Superintendents	33.2	54.6	11.2	1.0	0.0	205/1
	Directors	38.6	56.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	44/2
	Students	69.6	26.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.0001*	Male	35.3	56.2	7.0	1.4	0.1	952/9
	Female	47.6	42.6	9.1	0.5	0.3	397/4
0.0016*	Bachelors	48.9	42.0	7.6	0.8	0.8	131/2
	Masters	36.3	55.2	7.1	1.2	0.1	831/6
	Masters Plus	40.8	50.6	7.5	1.2	0.0	255/5
	Doctorate	35.6	48.9	14.4	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.0833	1-3 Years	54.5	41.3	4.1	0.0	0.0	121/1
	4-6 Years	47.8	46.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	113/0
	7-9 Years	47.1	40.0	11.8	1.2	0.0	85/7
	10 Plus Years	34.6	55.6	8.4	1.3	0.1	930/9

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 14

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 14

A field experience (teacher  
aide to a L.D. teacher) in  
L.D. is important in the pre-  
paration of a L.D. teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	32.9	45.5	17.3	2.7	0.6	1348/14
0.0	Psychologist	51.3	42.0	5.9	0.8	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	43.5	36.3	16.1	2.2	1.8	223/3
	Principals	26.1	50.4	20.0	3.3	0.1	700/7
	Superintendents	21.7	52.7	21.2	3.4	1.0	203/3
	Directors	46.7	40.0	8.9	2.2	2.2	45/1
	Students	73.2	17.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	28.9	48.9	18.5	3.2	0.4	950/11
	Female	43.5	38.9	14.8	1.8	1.0	398/3
0.0214*	Bachelors	48.1	33.6	16.8	0.8	0.8	131/2
	Masters	30.7	48.0	17.3	3.4	0.6	831/6
	Masters Plus	31.5	46.5	19.3	2.8	0.0	254/6
	Doctorate	27.8	53.3	17.8	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	52.1	34.7	11.6	0.8	0.8	121/1
	4-6 Years	42.5	37.2	18.6	0.9	0.9	113/0
	7-9 Years	41.9	40.7	14.0	3.5	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	26.9	50.2	19.2	3.1	0.5	928/11

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 15

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III  
Item 15

A practicum in L.D.  
(graduate level student  
teaching) is important in  
the preparation of a L.D.  
teacher.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	36.1	38.5	19.5	4.0	0.8	1347/15
0.0	Psychologist	59.7	33.6	5.9	0.8	0.0	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	52.5	31.8	12.6	1.8	1.3	223/3
	Principals	26.1	42.6	26.1	4.7	0.6	698/9
	Superintendents	23.0	45.1	23.0	6.9	2.0	204/2
	Directors	68.9	26.7	2.2	2.2	0.0	45/1
	Students	76.8	19.6	1.8	1.8	0.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	29.8	42.2	22.4	4.5	1.1	950/11
	Female	52.6	31.0	13.4	2.8	0.3	397/4
0.1440	Bachelors	50.0	30.3	15.2	3.8	0.8	132/1
	Masters	33.9	40.3	20.3	4.6	0.8	828/9
	Masters Plus	34.5	39.6	21.2	3.5	1.2	255/5
	Doctorate	37.8	38.9	22.2	1.1	0.0	90/0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	56.6	32.8	9.0	1.6	0.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	51.8	33.0	12.5	2.7	0.0	112/1
	7-9 Years	50.0	33.7	12.8	3.5	0.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	30.0	41.1	23.4	4.3	1.2	927/12

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

experience increased.

The second section of Part III dealt with the interchangeability of elementary and secondary certifications. The total group response for item 4 revealed a 43.4% agreement with the statement that a learning disability teacher trained at the secondary level should be able to teach learning disabilities at the elementary level. However, 27.2% responded in disagreement (see Table 16). The mean score was 2.74 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies in answers occurred within the subgroups of job position and gender while no significant discrepancies occurred within the degree held and the years of experience subgroup. Within the degree subgroup, it appeared that the learning disability teacher agreed more positively with the statement than the psychologists and both tended to have less undecidedness than the other divisions within this subgroup. Within the gender subgroup, it appeared that the males were slightly more undecided on the answer to this questions while females tended to answer more positively to it.

In answer to the statement 16, that a learning disability teacher trained at the elementary level should be able to teach learning disabilities at the secondary level, there was a wide range of responses. In the disagreement and strong disagreement level 35.4% were recorded, and 29.2% agreed or strongly agreed while 34.0% remained undecided (see Table 17). This yielded a mean score of 3.06 (see Table 1). The job position and gender subgroups showed significant discrepancies but the degree held and years of experience subgroups did not. Within the position held subgroup, students tended to be much more undecided on the answer to this question than did the other professions. Males seemed to answer this question more positively than the females.

Part V of the Learning Disability Survey deals with diagnostic



Table 16

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III  
Item 4

A L.D. teacher trained at the  
secondary level should be  
able to teach learning dis-  
abilities at the elementary  
level.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	16.2	27.2	27.2	21.7	6.1	1339/23
0.0047*	Psychologist	16.0	27.7	19.3	30.3	6.7	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	25.6.	25.1	21.5	21.1	6.7	223/3
	Principals	13.6	27.0	30.3	22.7	6.4	692/15
	Superintendents	14.7	34.3	28.9	17.6	4.4	204/2
	Directors	15.9	29.5	29.5	22.7	2.3	44/2
	Students	21.8	20.0	30.9	16.4	10.9	55/1
0.0002*	Male	13.4	29.0	28.8	22.8	6.0	946/15
	Female	23.7	24.4	24.9	20.4	6.6	393/8
0.6214	Bachelors	19.1	26.7	25.2	20.6	8.4	131/2
	Masters	15.3	27.9	29.4	21.8	5.6	824/13
	Masters Plus	17.8	28.1	26.1	20.9	7.1	253/7
	Doctorate	15.6	31.1	21.1	28.9	3.3	90/0
0.1876	1-3 Years	18.3	24.2	33.3	21.7	2.5	120/2
	4-6 Years	13.4	25.9	25.9	30.4	4.5	112/1
	7-9 Years	21.2	20.0	31.8	22.4	4.7	85/2
	10 Plus Years	15.6	29.9	27.1	20.8	6.5	922/17

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



Table 17

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part III

Item 16

A L.D. teacher trained at  
the elementary level  
should be able to teach  
learning disabilities at  
the secondary level.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	7.6	21.6	34.0	28.4	7.0	1343/19
0.0016*	Psychologist	6.7	19.3	29.4	37.0	7.6	119/0
	L.D. Teacher	10.8	17.5	30.0	31.4	10.3	223/3
	Principals	5.8	21.9	36.4	29.9	6.0	695/12
	Superintendents	10.3	28.9	34.3	21.1	5.4	204/2
	Directors	11.1	31.1	28.9	22.2	6.7	45/1
	Students	10.9	12.7	45.5	18.2	12.7	55/1
0.0264*	Male	7.5	23.7	35.0	27.7	6.1	949/12
	Female	8.4	17.5	33.2	31.5	9.4	394/7
0.2275	Bachelors	8.4	14.5	35.9	29.0	12.2	131/2
	Masters	7.0	21.8	35.3	29.4	6.4	824/13
	Masters Plus	8.2	26.6	31.6	27.7	5.9	256/4
	Doctorate	10.0	25.6	30.0	28.9	5.6	90/0
0.1495	1-3 Years	10.7	11.5	37.7	31.1	9.0	122/0
	4-6 Years	9.0	18.0	32.4	32.4	8.1	111/2
	7-9 Years	9.3	19.8	37.2	30.2	3.5	86/1
	10 Plus Years	6.8	24.5	34.4	27.6	6.7	925/14

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

tests. However this part will be broken down into three more specific groups for greater clarity. The groups are (1) diagnostic tests used in a learning disability program (2) a learning disability teacher's case load, and (3) the definition of learning disabilities.

For the diagnostic testing section of Part V, question 1 received a widespread total response. In agreement or strong agreement with the statement concerning the usefulness of the Wide Range Achievement Test in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems, 43.7% was found. Undecided responses came to 38.7% and 11.6% were in disagreement or strong disagreement (see Table 19). The mean score yielded a 2.61 score (see Table 18). No significant discrepancies were noted for the job position area nor the educational degree area. But significant discrepancies were found in the gender and years of experience categories. Within the gender subgroup, males tended to answer the question more positively than the females did. In considering the divisions of the experience subgroup, the percentages of undecidedness increased as the number of years increased ranging from 19.8% to 45.5% respectively even though, as a group, the response was generally positive in nature.

The total group response to item 3 had 57.3% in agreement or strong agreement with the statement. To the statement concerning the usefulness of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems 30.8% were undecided and 6.5% disagreed (see Table 20). The mean score yielded 2.31 for this item (see Table 1). No significant discrepancies were noted for the job position or degree areas but were noted in the gender and experience categories. As a whole, the responses in the gender subgroup were positive, however the females tended to respond more strongly than the males while the males tended to be more undecided. The experience subgroup also showed generally positive

Table 19

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 1

The Wide Range Achievement Test  
is useful in identifying  
and/or diagnosing learning  
problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	7.9	35.8	38.7	8.7	2.9	1281/81
0.0	Psychologist	17.4	52.2	7.8	19.1	3.5	115/4
	L.D. Teacher	7.7	34.5	29.1	19.1	9.5	220/6
	Principals	7.3	37.7	48.3	5.3	1.4	660/47
	Superintendents	7.6	33.7	52.7	6.0	0.0	184/22
	Directors	13.3	51.1	17.8	13.3	4.4	45/1
	Students	5.5	29.1	52.7	5.5	7.3	55/1
0.0000*	Male	8.5	39.3	44.1	6.5	1.7	896/75
	Female	8.3	35.1	34.3	15.8	6.5	385/16
0.3158	Bachelors	10.0	37.7	35.4	13.1	3.8	130/3
	Masters	7.1	38.0	42.7	9.1	3.2	790/47
	Masters Plus	12.3	40.3	38.6	6.4	2.5	236/24
	Doctorate	9.2	37.9	37.9	11.5	3.4	87/3
0.0000*	1-3 Years	9.9	47.1	19.8	15.7	7.4	121/1
	4-6 Years	10.1	37.6	28.4	16.5	7.3	109/4
	7-9 Years	9.6	28.9	43.4	16.9	1.2	83/4
	10 Plus Years	7.9	37.8	45.5	6.7	2.1	870/69

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 20

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V  
Item 3

The Wechsler Intelligence  
Scale for Children is useful  
in identifying and/or diag-  
nosing learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.8	41.5	30.8	5.4	1.1	1287/75
	Psychologist	42.2	56.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	24.5	39.8	24.5	8.8	2.3	216/10
	Principals	11.0	46.4	36.3	5.6	0.8	666/41
	Superintendents	8.6	33.9	50.5	5.9	1.1	186/20
	Directors	21.7	52.2	15.2	6.5	4.3	46/0
	Students	25.5	29.1	40.0	3.6	1.8	55/1
	Male	13.0	43.9	36.4	5.8	1.0	903/58
	Female	25.5	44.0	23.4	5.5	1.6	384/17
	Bachelors	20.2	42.6	27.9	7.8	1.6	129/4
	Masters	16.1	43.8	33.7	5.4	1.0	793/44
	Masters Plus	17.1	47.5	30.0	4.2	1.3	240/20
	Doctorate	14.9	41.4	31.0	10.3	2.3	87/3
	1-3 Years	27.5	39.2	20.8	8.3	4.2	120/2
	4-6 Years	19.3	50.5	23.9	5.5	0.9	109/4
	7-9 Years	21.7	49.4	25.3	3.6	0.0	83/4
	10 Plus Years	13.5	43.9	35.9	6.0	0.7	877/62

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

opinions but the percent of indeciveness grew as the number of years of experience grew ranging from 20.8% in the 1-3 year bracket to 35.9% undecided in the 10 years plus bracket.

When question 5 concerning whether the Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems was asked, 49.1% of the total group agreed with it. Only 3.0% disagreed and 41.0% were neutral to it (see Table 21). This yielded a mean score of 2.41. (see Table 18). The gender, degree and experience subgroups showed significant discrepancies but the job position subgroup did not. The subgroup of gender, although yielding generally positive responses showed the females answering more positively while the males were more undecided. Again, in the educational degree category, responses were generally positive. However, people in the bachelors degree division agreed in larger percentages than those with higher degrees tended to be more undecided. Likewise the experience subgroup also answered positively but indecisiveness grew from 30.6% in the 1 to 3 year division to 50.1% in the 10 years and over division.

Upon answering question 7 concerning whether or not they felt the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems, the total group responded with 48.9% in agreement or strong agreement, 35.4% were undecided and 10.1% disagreed (see Table 22). The mean score yielded a 2.74 response (see Table 18). No significant discrepancies occurred in the job position group but were present in the gender, degree and experience groups. Within the gender subgroup, the opinions of both divisions were generally positive. However, the males had a large number of undecided opinions while the females's opinions were more diverse. The experience subgroup showed an increasingly

Table 21

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 5

The Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	9.3	39.8	41.0	2.4	0.6	1268/94
0.0	Psychologist	14.8	62.6	16.5	5.2	0.9	115/4
	L.D. Teacher	13.3	51.4	28.4	5.5	1.4	218/8
	Principals	7.1	36.8	54.1	1.5	0.5	649/58
	Superintendents	7.1	30.6	60.1	2.2	0.0	183/23
	Directors	8.7	67.4	21.7	2.2	0.0	46/0
	Students	29.1	56.4	12.7	0.0	1.8	55/1
0.0000*	Male	8.6	39.0	50.2	1.8	0.3	884/77
	Female	13.0	51.3	29.9	4.4	1.3	384/17
0.0037*	Bachelors	16.3	53.5	27.1	2.3	0.8	129/4
	Masters	9.1	40.4	47.7	2.2	0.6	782/49
	Masters Plus	9.5	46.6	40.9	2.6	0.4	232/28
	Doctorate	8.0	35.6	50.6	5.7	0.0	87/3
0.0000*	1-3 Years	14.0	48.8	30.6	4.1	2.5	121/1
	4-6 Years	13.8	55.0	30.3	0.9	0.0	109/4
	7-9 Years	14.6	45.1	36.6	3.7	0.0	82/5
	10 Plus Years	7.6	39.3	50.1	2.6	0.5	858/91

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 22

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V

Item 7

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	8.2	40.7	35.4	8.6	1.5	1286/76
0.0	Psychologist	8.6	37.9	20.7	28.4	4.3	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	7.8	43.6	31.2	14.7	2.8	218/8
	Principals	7.8	45.0	40.8	5.3	1.2	665/12
	Superintendents	8.2	33.7	54.9	2.7	0.5	184/22
	Directors	6.5	60.9	10.9	21.7	0.0	46/0
	Students	25.5	47.3	23.6	3.6	0.0	55/1
0.0000*	Male	8.7	41.6	41.3	6.8	1.6	898/63
	Female	8.8	46.4	28.6	14.4	1.8	388/13
0.4388	Bachelors	9.2	50.8	30.0	9.2	0.8	130/3
	Masters	7.4	42.4	39.5	8.7	1.9	792/44
	Masters Plus	9.6	45.6	32.6	10.5	1.7	239/21
	Doctorate	11.5	35.6	41.4	10.3	1.1	87/3
0.0102*	1-3 Years	10.9	38.7	28.6	16.8	5.0	119/3
	4-6 Years	3.6	48.2	31.8	14.5	1.8	110/3
	7-9 Years	7.3	45.1	36.6	8.5	2.4	82/5
	10 Plus Years	8.3	43.0	40.6	7.0	1.1	877/62

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



larger percentage of indecision with an increased number of years of experience.

A slight majority of the total group responded with 46.7% agreement on item 9. But 43.1% were undecided as to whether or not the Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems. Only 2.3% actually disagreed (see Table 23). The mean score showed a 2.42 response. (see Table 18). Discrepancies that are significant occurred in the gender and experience subgroups, but not in the degree and job position subgroups. The gender subgroup as a whole responded positively. However, the females gave more positive responses than the males and the males were more undecided than the females. The experience subgroup showed generally positive opinions but indecisiveness grew as years of experience grew.

The total group response for item 11 dealing with diagnostic tests showed a large percentage (43.5%) of undecided responses. The group was asked if they felt the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems. Of the total group 46.5% were in strong agreement or agreement with the question, leaving 2.2% in disagreement (see Table 24). The mean score yielded a 2.36 response (see Table 18). The gender, degree and experience subgroups showed significant discrepancies although the job position subgroup did not. In the gender subgroup the opinions of both divisions were generally positive. However the males tended to be more undecided while females answered with more positiveness. Opinions in the degree subgroup were also positive in nature but the bachelors and masters plus divisions answered more positively than the masters and doctorate divisions which tended to be more undecisive in nature. The experience subgroup showed generally positive opinions but the percentage of indecisiveness increased as the



Table 23

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V

Item 9

The Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	9.0	37.7	43.1	1.9	0.4	1254/108
0.0	Psychologist	12.4	61.1	20.4	5.3	0.9	113/6
	L.D. Teacher	10.8	46.9	38.0	3.3	0.9	213/13
	Principals	6.6	38.6	53.6	0.9	0.2	647/60
	Superintendents	9.4	30.6	59.4	0.6	0.0	180/26
	Directors	11.4	54.5	22.7	11.4	0.0	44/2
	Students	34.5	27.3	34.5	1.8	1.8	55/1
0.0000*	Male	8.1	38.0	52.1	1.6	0.2	879/82
	Female	13.6	48.0	34.4	3.2	0.8	375/26
0.1106	Bachelors	14.7	41.1	41.1	1.6	1.6	129/4
	Masters	8.4	40.3	48.8	2.2	0.3	770/67
	Masters Plus	11.3	45.7	41.3	1.7	0.0	230/30
	Doctorate	8.0	39.1	49.4	3.4	0.0	87/3
0.0291*	1-3 Years	11.1	45.3	36.8	6.0	0.9	117/5
	4-6 Years	6.6	44.3	46.2	2.8	0.0	106/7
	7-9 Years	12.3	37.0	46.9	3.7	0.0	81/6
	10 Plus Years	9.3	40.0	49.3	1.3	0.1	852/87

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 24

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 11

The Illinois Test of Psycho-  
linguistic Abilities is use-  
ful in identifying and/or  
diagnosing learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.3	31.2	43.5	1.6	0.6	1256/106
0.0	Psychologist	40.5	52.6	4.3	0.9	1.7	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	28.4	40.0	27.0	2.8	1.9	215/11
	Principals	7.9	29.7	60.8	1.2	0.3	646/61
	Superintendents	7.4	23.3	67.6	1.7	0.0	176/30
	Directors	30.4	47.8	13.0	8.7	0.0	46/0
	Students	40.0	38.2	21.8	0.0	0.0	55/1
0.0000*	Male	11.3	31.1	55.5	1.6	0.5	874/87
	Female	28.5	40.1	28.3	2.1	1.0	382/19
0.0002*	Bachelors	25.8	45.3	28.1	0.0	0.8	128/5
	Masters	16.2	30.5	50.6	1.9	0.6	770/67
	Masters Plus	13.8	40.1	43.1	2.6	0.4	232/38
	Doctorate	10.2	34.1	53.4	1.1	1.1	88/2
0.0000*	1-3 Years	28.3	45.8	21.7	0.8	3.3	120/2
	4-6 Years	23.6	40.9	32.7	2.7	0.0	110/3
	7-9 Years	18.3	36.6	41.5	2.4	1.2	82/5
	10 Plus Years	12.2	31.3	54.4	1.8	0.4	847/57

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

years of experience increased.

The total group response for item 13 showed 51.0% in agreement and strong agreement with the statement. However 36.4% were undecided as to whether or not the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems (Table 25). This yielded a mean score of 2.40 (see Table 18). Within the gender and experience subgroups, significant discrepancies occurred whereas in the position and degree groups, no significant discrepancies occurred. Within the gender subgroup, the opinions of both divisions were generally positive. However the males were more undecided whereas the females held more definitely positive opinions. Opinions in the experience subgroup also were positive in nature but as the years of experience increased, the undecided response was more frequently used.

In item 15, the statement that the Bender Gestalt Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems was given. Of the total group, 44.9% were undecided about the statement and 43.3% strongly agreed or agreed with it (see Table 26). A mean score of 2.48 was yielded (see Table 18). Significant discrepancies appeared in the gender and experience subgroup but no significant discrepancies appeared in the job position or degree subgroups. Within the gender subgroup, the opinions of both divisions were generally positive. However the males tended to be more firmly positive. The total experience subgroup answered in a positive way but the 7 to 9 year division of the experience group tended to answer more negatively than undecidedly as the other three divisions did.

Within the total response group for item 17, 60.4% of the total group were undecided as to whether or not the Vineland Social Maturity Scale was useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems. Of the total group, 21.4% agreed that the test was useful (see Table 27). The

Table 25

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V  
Item 13

The Frostig Developmental  
Test of Visual Perception  
is useful in identifying  
and/or diagnosing learning  
problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	11.7	39.3	36.4	4.0	1.5	1266/96
0.0	Psychologist	13.8	47.4	19.8	12.1	6.9	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	11.2	45.1	30.2	9.3	4.2	215/11
	Principals	10.7	41.9	44.6	2.1	0.6	652/55
	Superintendents	10.0	31.7	57.8	0.6	0.0	180/25
	Directors	19.6	54.3	15.2	10.9	0.0	46/0
	Students	40.0	47.3	10.9	1.8	0.0	55/1
0.0000*	Male	10.7	40.3	45.0	2.8	1.1	885/76
	Female	16.8	46.7	25.7	7.9	2.9	381/20
0.1684	Bachelors	17.3	51.2	27.6	1.6	2.4	127/6
	Masters	11.6	41.1	41.5	4.6	1.3	779/58
	Masters Plus	11.5	42.6	38.3	5.1	2.6	235/25
	Doctorate	12.6	40.2	41.4	3.4	2.3	87/3
0.0000*	1-3 Years	12.6	41.2	31.1	10.1	5.0	119/3
	4-6 Years	6.4	45.9	33.0	9.2	5.5	109/4
	7-9 Years	12.0	43.4	36.1	7.2	1.2	83/4
	10 Plus Years	12.4	41.6	42.7	2.6	0.8	858/81

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 26

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 15

The Bender Gestalt Test is  
useful in identifying and/or  
diagnosing learning  
problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	9.3	34.0	44.9	2.9	1.0	1255/107
0.0	Psychologist	25.9	61.2	6.9	6.0	0.0	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	12.1	43.5	36.0	5.1	3.3	214/12
	Principals	6.7	34.0	56.6	2.0	0.8	645/62
	Superintendents	7.3	20.2	72.5	0.0	0.0	178/28
	Directors	13.0	52.2	21.7	13.0	0.0	46/0
	Students	16.7	33.3	42.6	5.6	1.9	54/2
0.0000*	Male	8.3	34.1	54.6	2.5	0.5	879/82
	Female	14.4	43.4	35.1	4.8	2.4	376/23
0.5394	Bachelors	11.8	41.7	42.5	2.4	1.6	127/6
	Masters	9.7	36.5	49.2/	3.5	1.0	770/67
	Masters Plus	12.0	38.2	47.6	1.7	0.4	233/27
	Doctorate	6.9	31.0	55.2	4.6	2.3	87/3
0.0001*	1-3 Years	12.7	44.1	37.3	4.2	1.7	118/4
	4-6 Years	7.3	45.0	42.2	3.7	1.8	109/4
	7-9 Years	15.9	36.6	37.8	4.9	4.9	82/5
	10 Plus Years	9.1	34.6	53.5	2.5	0.4	848/41

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 27

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V

Item 17

The Vineland Social Maturity  
Scale is useful in identify-  
ing and/or diagnosing  
learning problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.9	18.5	60.4	7.4	1.8	1241/121
0.0	Psychologist	4.3	20.7	39.7	30.2	5.2	116/3
	L.D. Teacher	2.8	25.5	56.6	11.8	3.3	212/14
	Principals	2.4	19.0	74.2	3.5	0.9	633/74
	Superintendents	3.4	15.7	77.0	3.4	0.6	178/28
	Directors	2.2	28.9	46.7	20.0	2.2	45/1
	Students	12.7	23.6	50.9	5.5	7.3	55/1
0.0001*	Male	2.8	18.8	70.8	6.2	1.4	865/96
	Female	4.3	23.7	56.1	12.5	3.5	376/25
0.2454	Bachelors	4.8	24.6	60.3	7.1	3.2	126/7
	Masters	2.8	19.4	67.4	8.7	1.8	763/74
	Masters Plus	3.9	23.2	63.6	8.3	0.9	228/32
	Doctorate	1.1	13.8	73.6	6.9	4.6	87/3
0.0001*	1-3 Years	3.3	21.7	52.5	18.3	4.2	120/2
	4-6 Years	3.7	21.1	61.5	11.9	1.8	109/4
	7-9 Years	3.7	23.5	59.3	8.6	4.9	81/6
	10 Plus Years	2.6	19.3	70.9	5.9	1.3	835/104

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

mean score yielded a 2.85 (see Table 18). Significant discrepancies were found in the gender and experience categories and no discrepancies were found in the position and degree categories. The gender subgroup answered in a positive fashion. However the majority of opinions occurred in the undecided response section. The experience subgroup for this question were of diverse opinions with over 50% of the opinions for the whole subgroup falling in the undecided response column. The second section of Part V dealt with the case load of a learning disability teacher. Question 2 of Part V asked with the case load of a learning disability teacher should be 11-20 pupils. In the total group response, 43.4% agreed or strongly agreed while 31.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed leaving 22.2% undecided (see Table 28.) The mean score yielded was 2.84 (see Table 18). Significant discrepancies were not present in the degree grouping but were present in the groupings of position, gender and experience. The job position subgroup reveals generally positive attitudes from all divisions toward the question. However there were a higher number of people responding negatively among the superintendents while directors leaned more toward the undecided response. The gender subgroup gave a varied response but the females tended to be more decided in their agreement whereas the males tended to choose the undecided response. The experience subgroup revealed that people in the 1 to 3 year experience division answered with a greater percentage of positive responses than the more experienced groups did while the latter became increasingly more indecisive.

The responses for item 8 of Part V were varied widely. In agreement were 43.7% of the total group but 22.3% were undecided and 29.7% disagreed (see Table 29). The item stated that the case load of a learning disability teacher should be 5 to 10 pupils. The mean score yielded was 2.74 (see Table 18). The job position subgroup yielded mixed



Table 28

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V  
Item 2

The case load of a L.D. teacher  
should be 11-20 pupils.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	10.4	33.0	22.2	24.4	6.7	1317/45
0.0000*	Psychologist	17.5	40.4	16.7	21.9	3.5	114/5
	L.D. Teacher	12.3	32.7	18.2	23.2	13.6	220/6
	Principals	8.2	32.3	23.8	29.8	6.0	685/22
	Superintendents	8.8	38.7	33.0	16.5	3.1	194/12
	Directors	17.4	39.1	23.9	19.6	0.0	46/0
	Students	21.4	30.4	8.9	21.4	17.9	56/0
0.0000*	Male	9.0	35.5	25.4	24.9	5.2	924/37
	Female	14.8	31.0	17.0	26.2	10.9	393/8
0.1795	Bachelors	16.8	37.4	13.0	25.2	7.6	131/2
	Masters	10.2	34.0	23.2	26.5	6.0	810/27
	Masters Plus	10.0	35.7	26.1	21.7	6.4	249/11
	Doctorate	6.9	32.2	25.3	28.7	6.9	87/3
0.0024*	1-3 Years	14.2	44.2	16.7	19.2	5.8	120/2
	4-6 Years	17.6	28.7	15.7	26.9	11.1	108/5
	7-9 Years	11.9	27.4	25.0	33.3	2.4	84/3
	10 Plus Years	9.1	33.9	25.1	25.7	6.2	905/34

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



Table 29

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V  
Item 8

The case load of a L.D. teacher should be 5-10 pupils.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.9	27.8	22.3	24.7	5.0	1303/59
0.0000*	Psychologist	11.5	29.2	21.2	30.1	8.0	113/6
	L.D. Teacher	27.9	26.5	17.4	24.2	4.1	219/7
	Principals	16.9	32.6	24.8	21.6	4.1	681/26
	Superintendents	4.8	17.7	28.0	41.4	8.1	186/26
	Directors	2.2	34.8	23.9	34.8	4.3	46/0
	Students	30.4	26.8	17.9	16.1	8.9	56/0
0.0000*	Male	13.6	27.7	25.7	27.5	5.5	913/48
	Female	23.6	32.1	17.7	22.1	4.6	390/11
0.1552	Bachelors	22.1	28.2	17.6	26.0	6.1	131/2
	Masters	15.5	29.2	25.3	24.2	5.7	801/36
	Masters Plus	13.9	30.2	22.9	30.2	2.9	245/15
	Doctorate	19.8	24.4	19.8	32.6	3.5	86/4
0.0703	1-3 Years	16.9	24.6	22.0	28.8	7.6	118/4
	4-6 Years	25.7	26.6	20.2	24.8	2.8	109/4
	7-9 Years	20.9	34.9	19.8	17.4	7.0	86/1
	10 Plus Years	14.2	29.3	24.5	27.2	4.8	390/49

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

responses. The psychologists, learning disability teachers, principals, and student divisions showed a more positive opinion on the question while the superintendents and directors of special education divisions tended to be more negative. The gender subgroup also showed mixed responses. However the females were more decided than the males and tended to be a little more positive toward the item.

Item 16 of Part V yielded a large percentage (75.2) of disagreeing and strongly disagreeing opinions. The statement concerning whether the case load of a learning disability teacher should be 21 to 30 pupils found 15.3% undecided and only 5.0% agreeing with it (see Table 30). The mean score yielded 4.17 (see Table 18). The position and degree categories showed no significant discrepancies but the gender and experience categories did. The gender category revealed negative responses to the item with the females in strong disagreement whereas the males tended to answer more conservatively. The experience category also showed negative responses. The less experienced divisions were in strong disagreement while the more experienced divisions were more conservative with their disagreement.

It was found that 78.3% of the total group surveyed strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that the learning disabled child is mentally retarded (50-80 I.Q.), while 10.9% were undecided (see Table 31). This yielded a mean score of 4.22 (see Table 18). There were significant discrepancies in the 3 subgroups of gender, degree and experience while in the job position subgroup there were no significant discrepancies. The gender subgroup's responses were primarily negative in nature. However the females had stronger disagreeing opinions than the males since the males answered more conservatively. The degree subgroup responses also were primarily negative. But the bachelors degree division was more strongly opinioned than the other divisions. Negative reactions were seen in the

Table 30

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V  
Item 16

The case load of an L.D.  
teacher should be 21-30  
pupils.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	0.9	4.1	15.3	33.3	41.9	1303/59
0.0	Psychologist	0.0	7.9	7.0	32.5	51.8	114/5
	L.D. Teacher	2.3	3.6	12.3	25.5	56.4	220/6
	Principals	0.7	3.2	15.5	37.2	43.4	678/29
	Superintendents	1.1	7.5	29.9	42.2	19.3	187/19
	Directors	0.0	6.5	21.7	39.1	32.6	46/0
	Students	0.0	0.0	5.4	19.6	75.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	0.8	4.4	18.7	37.3	38.8	910/51
	Female	1.3	4.1	9.9	29.3	55.5	393/8
0.2823	Bachelors	1.5	6.1	11.5	29.8	51.1	131/2
	Masters	0.5	3.8	16.0	36.4	43.4	800/37
	Masters Plus	1.6	5.3	17.6	34.7	40.4	245/15
	Doctorate	2.3	4.6	18.4	34.5	40.2	87/3
0.0009*	1-3 Years	1.7	6.7	11.7	24.2	55.8	120/2
	4-6 Years	2.7	3.6	12.7	23.6	57.3	110/3
	7-9 Years	0.0	8.2	10.6	36.5	44.7	85/2
	10 Plus Years	0.8	4.0	17.9	37.8	39.4	890/49

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 31

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 4

The L.D. child is mentally re-  
tarded (50-80 I.Q.).

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	1.4	5.7	10.9	30.8	47.5	1313/49
0.0	Psychologist	2.6	0.9	2.6	15.4	78.6	117/2
	L.D. Teacher	1.8	4.9	6.7	18.4	68.2	223/3
	Principals	1.2	7.7	15.8	38.0	37.4	679/28
	Superintendents	1.6	5.3	11.6	42.6	38.9	190/16
	Directors	0.0	2.2	4.3	30.4	63.0	46/0
	Students	1.8	5.4	0.0	14.3	78.6	56/0
0.0000*	Male	1.7	6.4	13.1	35.8	42.9	918/43
	Female	0.8	4.8	7.3	23.0	64.1	895/6
0.0220*	Bachelors	1.5	9.9	9.2	20.6	58.8	131/2
	Masters	1.6	5.9	11.7	34.9	45.9	812/25
	Masters Plus	1.2	5.7	13.5	28.2	51.4	245/15
	Doctorate	1.2	1.2	7.1	36.5	54.1	85/5
0.0000*	1-3 Years	0.8	1.7	5.8	15.0	76.7	120/2
	4-6 Years	0.0	2.7	6.3	19.6	71.4	112/1
	7-9 Years	1.2	3.5	5.8	27.9	61.6	86/1
	10 Plus Years	1.7	7.3	13.7	36.9	40.4	896/43

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

experience subgroup. An increasingly more conservative disagreement was given by the people with increasingly more experience.

The total response for item 6 of Part V revealed that 77.9% agreed that the learning disabled child has average or above average intelligence, but does not work up to his potential and 10.9% were undecided (see Table 32). The mean score of 1.96 was determined (see Table 18). The job position category showed no significant discrepancies but the gender, degree and experience categories did show significant discrepancies. Upon considering the responses of the gender subgroup, positive responses were found. Females were strongly positive in response while males were found to be slightly more undecided. The degree subgroup showed that the people with a bachelors degree were not as conservative with their agreement as people with higher degrees. Looking at the experience subgroup, it is again seen that the more experience the persons in the division had had, the more conservative their agreement to this item was.

The statement that the learning disabled child is emotionally (item 10) was disagreed or strongly disagreed upon by 51.5% of the total group surveyed, with 33.2% of the group undecided (see Table 33). A mean score of 3.53 was obtained (see Table 18). There were significant discrepancies in the 3 subgroups of position, gender and experience, but not discrepancies in the degree subgroup. Although the general response to this item was negative, a large percentage of responses was undecided especially in the divisions of principals, superintendents and directors of special education. In the gender subgroup, the males were generally more conservative in their answers than the females. A fairly large percent of each division agree with the statement, although the response was generally negative. In the experience subgroup the more experienced divisions had a higher percentage of agreement with the statement than the less experienced divisions had,

Table 32

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V

Item 6

The L.D. child has average or  
above intelligence, but  
does not work up to his  
potential.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	30.5.	47.4	10.9	6.4	0.9	1309/58
0.0	Psychologist	50.4	40.2	6.0	3.4	0.0	117/2
	L.D. Teacher	49.5	42.8	4.1	2.7	0.9	222/4
	Principals	22.3	51.2	15.5	9.8	1.2	676/31
	Superintendents	22.6	60.5	12.1	3.7	1.1	190/16
	Directors	34.8	47.8	8.7	8.7	0.0	46/0
	Students	64.3	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	56/0
0.0000*	Male	25.0	52.8	13.3	8.0	1.0	917/44
	Female	47.7	41.3	6.6	3.6	0.8	392/9
0.0014*	Bachelors	47.7	43.8	3.8	3.8	0.8	130/3
	Masters	29.2	48.4	13.3	8.0	1.1	805/32
	Masters Plus	31.3	52.4	9.8	6.1	0.4	246/14
	Doctorate	28.4	58.0	10.2	2.3	1.1	88/2
0.0000†	1-3 Years	51.7	39.2	3.3	5.0	0.8	120/2
	4-6 Years	44.6	44.6	8.0	1.8	0.9	112/1
	7-9 Years	36.5	52.9	8.2	2.4	0.0	85/2
	10 Plus Years	25.8	51.9	13.5	7.8	1.0	892/47

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 33

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup

Part V  
Item 10

The L.D. child is emotionally  
disturbed.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	0.8	10.6	33.2	39.9	11.6	1308/54
0.0000*	Psychologist	0.0	6.1	28.7	50.4	14.8	115/4
	L.D. Teacher	0.5	10.9	26.2	43.9	18.6	221/5
	Principals	1.3	13.2	38.0	39.5	7.9	681/26
	Superintendents	0.0	7.0	39.6	40.1	13.4	187/19
	Directors	0.0	6.5	37.0	45.7	10.9	46/0
	Students	1.8.	12.5	17.9	41.1	26.8.	56/0
0.0066*	Male	1.1	11.2	36.9	40.2	10.6	916/45
	Female	0.3	10.5	29.1	44.6	15.6	392/9
0.3949	Bachelors	0.8	10.9	29.5	41.9	17.1	129/4
	Masters	0.7	10.7	36.2	41.8	10.5	806/31
	Masters Plus	1.2	14.2	34.6	39.4	10.6	246/14
	Doctorate	1.1	6.8	35.2	39.8	17.0	88/2
0.0062*	1-3 Years	0.0	5.0	30.3	46.2	18.5	119/3
	4-6 Years	0.0	9.9	35.1	35.1	19.8	111/2
	7-9 Years	2.3	14.0	32.6	38.4	12.8	86/1
	10 Plus Years	1.0	11.4	37.0	41.2	9.4	893/46

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value



even though the response in general was negative.

A 43.2% of the total group response to item 12 of Part V agreed or strongly agreed that the learning disabled child has emotional problems while 34.4% of those surveyed were undecided (see Table 34). This yielded a mean score of 2.70 (see Table 18). There were significant discrepancies in all 4 subgroups. The responses by the job position subgroup were mixed but generally more positively than negatively oriented. Within the gender subgroup, the females agreed more strongly while the males were positive but more undecided. Within the degree subgroup, the responses were generally positive with the masters and masters plus divisions giving more undecided responses. Within the experience subgroup, the divisions seemed to agree less and become more undecided as the years of experience increased.

The total group response for item 14 of Part V revealed that 53.3% disagreed and strongly disagreed that the learning disabled child is a slow learner. However 24.7% were undecided about the statement (see Table 35). This yielded a mean score of 3.51 (see Table 18). Significant discrepancies occur within the gender, degree and experience subgroups but did not occur in the job position subgroup. Within the job position held subgroup, it appeared that the school psychologist and directors of special education divisions responded more negatively than the other 4 divisions. Within the gender subgroup, although the responses in general were negative, the female division appeared to respond more strongly than the males.



Table 34

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V  
Item 12

The L.D. child has emotional  
problems.

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	5.2	38.0	34.4	15.1	2.2	1294/68
0.0000*	Psychologist	4.4	57.9	24.6	10.5	2.6	114/5
	L.D. Teacher	12.2	45.0	25.2	15.3	2.3	222/4
	Principals	4.0	37.6	40.3	16.2	1.9	673/34
	Superintendents	1.1	29.3	46.2	19.0	4.3	184/22
	Directors	2.3	50.0	27.3	20.5	0.0	44/2
	Students	16.4	40.0	29.1	12.7	1.8	55/1
0.0000*	Male	3.3	38.3	39.4	16.3	2.6	908/53
	Female	10.6	44.0	28.8	15.0	1.6	386/15
0.0093*	Bachelors	12.4	45.7	24.0	17.1	0.8	129/4
	Masters	4.5	38.8	38.3	16.0	2.5	800/37
	Masters Plus	5.0	41.3	36.7	15.4	1.7	240/20
	Doctorate	3.4	43.7	31.0	17.2	4.6	87/3
0.0000*	1-3 Years	10.9	55.5	20.2	12.6	0.8	119/3
	4-6 Years	11.7	45.0	28.8	12.6	1.8	111/2
	7-9 Years	8.3	39.3	39.3	13.1	0.0	84/3
	10 Plus Years	3.5	37.8	39.1	17.1	2.5	882/57

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

Table 35

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by  
Total and Each Subgroup  
Part V  
Item 14

The L.D. child is a slow  
learner (80-90 I.Q.).

$\chi^2$		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.0	15.1	24.7	38.8	14.5	1296/66
0.0000*	Psychologist	1.7	7.8	19.1	44.3	27.0	115/4
	L.D. Teacher	2.7	16.1	22.0	39.9	19.3	223/3
	Principals	2.0	17.4	30.2	40.2	10.2	666/41
	Superintendents	1.1	16.0	26.6	39.9	16.5	188/18
	Directors	2.2	6.5	19.6	54.3	17.4	46/0
	Students	5.4	21.4	10.7	33.9	28.6	56/0
0.0035*	Male	2.1	15.6	27.7	41.7	12.8	903/58
	Female	2.0	16.5	22.1	38.4	20.9	393/8
0.6513	Bachelors	1.5	19.8	22.9	38.9	16.8	131/2
	Masters	2.3	15.6	27.0	41.3	13.8	796/41
	Masters Plus	2.0	16.5	22.1	38.4	20.9	393/8
	Doctorate	0.0	10.6	23.5	44.7	21.2	85/5
0.0837	1-3 Years	4.2	11.7	20.0	42.5	21.7	120/2
	4-6 Years	1.8	17.1	23.4	36.9	20.7	111/2
	7-9 Years	1.2	12.0	33.7	38.6	14.5	83/4
	10 Plus Years	1.9	16.6	26.7	41.9	12.8	883/56

\* Indicates a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance

\*\* Number of people responding to this question over number of people who did not respond

$\chi^2$  = chi square value

## Chapter IV

## CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this survey was to determine what public school educators in the state of Kansas considered necessary competencies of a learning disability teacher. Conclusions drawn from the teacher training part of the survey (Part III) were generally positive in nature. In the first subtopic, the total group responded favorably with a range from 64.5% to 97.2% in agreement with all the preparatory training areas mentioned in the survey with only a relatively small percentage of undecidedness. It appeared that the following training competencies for a learning disability teacher were generally agreed desirable by most public educators: (1) training in the characteristics of a learning disabled child, (2) training in the guidance of learning disabled children and their parents, (3) training in language and speech development, (4) training in remedial reading, (5) training in the psychology of exceptional children, (6) training in the characteristics of the emotionally disturbed, (7) training in remediation of learning disabled children, (8) training in education of exceptional children, (9) a field experience with a learning disability teacher, (10) a practicum in learning disabilities and (11) training in interpreting and prescribing from diagnostic tests. Therefore it seems that these training areas should be incorporated into the learning disability program at Kansas State University.

A masters degree did not appear to be an essential competency since a mixed response occurred when it was mentioned. Also there seemed to be less agreement that a specific learning disability theory is needed to organize a learning program around.

In the second subtopic, there were only two questions, both of which received diverse answers. It was generally felt (43.4% agreement)

that a learning disability teacher trained at the secondary level, should be able to teach learning disabilities at an elementary level. When asked if an elementary trained learning disability teacher should be able to teach at the secondary level, a very mixed response was given. A high percentage of people were undecided and more disagreed with the statement than agreed.

Part V of the learning disability survey was divided into three subtopics: (1) diagnostic tests used, (2) case load of a learning disability teacher, and (3) the definition of a learning disabled child.

In the diagnostic test subtopic, the total group response was in positive agreement toward use of the following tests: (1) Wide Range Achievement Test; (2) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, (3) Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test, (4) Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey, (5) Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, (6) Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, and the (7) Bender Gestalt. However, many people appeared to be undecided as to the usefulness of the tests. The majority of the total group gave an undecided response in regard to the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was the only test on which a large amount of disagreement appeared.

In the case load subtopic of Part V, the total group was of mixed opinion but agreed that the case load of a learning disability teacher should be lower than twenty-one students as seen by the 75.2% disagreement with the question 16 which dealt with a caseload of twenty-one to thirty.

When asked the definition of learning disabilities, a 43.2% to 77.9% range of people said that a learning disabled child as average or above average intelligence, but does not work up to his potential. He may have emotional problems but is not emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded. However, many held an undecided view on a definition.

## Chapter V

### SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Significant patterns that occur throughout Part III appear to exhibit a tendency for females to respond more decidedly than males, and for people with more experience to respond less decisively than people with less experience. This might indicate that people recently graduated from college have had more contact with the learning disabilities field than those people who have been out in the field. Also the females questioned in this survey tended to be teachers and learning disability college students who are personally involved in the field and should know more about it. A suggestion to help alleviate this problem would be to encourage learning disability teachers and students to hold more in-service workshops, give more speeches and publicize their existence to a greater degree.

In Part V the conservative number of positive responses coupled with an almost equally number of undecided responses seems to imply that many people are either somewhat unsure of the usefulness of the tests or they are unfamiliar with them. This thought is supported by hand written comments found on the surveys indicating that many principals and superintendents were not familiar with the tests mentioned. This trend within Part V is also noted by looking at the higher percentage of indecision among the administrators as compared with the other job position divisions. A possible suggestion in view of this trend might be to encourage future learning disability teachers to make their definitions, jobs and diagnostic tools known to their administrators. This suggestion might also decrease the trend for the male division to be more indecisive than the females in the area of testing since the male population surveyed was primarily

administrative in nature while most of the female population consisted of teachers and learning disability students.

Many comments requested results from the survey and more information concerning the learning disability field. A recommendation for further contact with public educators would be to send out a short news letter informing them about basic concepts of learning disabilities.

**APPENDIX A. Final Survey**

Code Number

## LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY

**DIRECTIONS:** Please read each statement carefully and use the code numbers to indicate how you feel about the statement. Please mail the questionnaire to me in the enclosed envelope.

[illegible]

Use the following code numbers to show your responses:

- Write 1 if you strongly agree  
Write 2 if you agree  
Write 3 if you are undecided  
Write 4 if you disagree  
Write 5 if you strongly disagree

**Please note that L.D. is used as an abbreviation of the term Learning Disabilities.**

□□□□□  
PART I

1. \_\_\_ Every child in the school should be screened for learning disability problems.
2. \_\_\_ The principal should participate in the decision to place a child in the L.D. program.
3. \_\_\_ At the junior high level (7-8) the total school emphasis for the L.D. child should be upon remediation with some presentation of vocational information and training.
4. \_\_\_ The school nurse should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
5. \_\_\_ Placement in the L.D. program should be initiated by classroom teacher referrals.
6. \_\_\_ The school psychologist should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.
7. \_\_\_ At the elementary school level (K-6) the total school emphasis for the L.D. child should be upon doing away with the underlying causes of the disabilities and bringing the child up to grade level.
8. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
9. \_\_\_ A L.D. teacher should concentrate on the underlying causes of the learning disability.
10. \_\_\_ The director of special education should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.
11. \_\_\_ A self-contained L.D. class teacher (one who works with learning disabled children in her room for all or most of the day) is desirable to have in the school system.
12. \_\_\_ The superintendent should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.
13. \_\_\_ The director of special education should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
14. \_\_\_ The regular classroom teacher should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.



## PART I—continued

15. \_\_\_ An itinerant teacher (one who commutes from school to school and works with regular classroom teachers and children) is desirable to have in the school system.
16. \_\_\_ The psychologist should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
17. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher's main concern is bringing the child up to grade level in academic subjects.
18. \_\_\_ The superintendent should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
19. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.
20. \_\_\_ A resource teacher (one who works with individuals or small groups of children for a specified amount of time every week in a resource room) is desirable to have in a school system.
21. \_\_\_ The parents should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
22. \_\_\_ A L.D. teacher should have access to extra money for specialized supplies.
23. \_\_\_ The principal should participate in the setting up of the L.D. program.
24. \_\_\_ At the senior high level (9-12) low emphasis should be on remediation and major emphasis on vocational information and preparation.
25. \_\_\_ The regular classroom teacher should participate in the decision to place a child in a L.D. program.
26. \_\_\_ If your school system could support only one type of program, which program would you advocate?  
       \_\_\_itinerant   \_\_\_resource  
       \_\_\_self-contained

□□□□□  
PART II

1. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should be responsible for administering and interpreting diagnostic tests not required to be given by the school psychologist.
2. \_\_\_ A L.D. teacher should organize in-service training programs and workshops.
3. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should help parents understand their child's difficulties.
4. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should live in the community where she teaches.
5. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should express feelings openly to administrators.
6. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should inform parents of their progress or lack of progress.
7. \_\_\_ A physical education teacher and not the L.D. teacher should be responsible for working on motor coordination and muscle control problems in L.D. children.
8. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should handle most L.D. matters without administrative consultation.
9. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should become involved in community affairs.

## PART II—continued

10. \_\_\_ The only school involvement expected of the L.D. teacher should be teaching the child.
11. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should help sponsor youth activities.
12. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should suggest ways for the parents to help the child.
13. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should work relatively independent of other teachers.
14. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should sponsor adult activities.
15. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should encourage parents to become involved in school and/or class activities.
16. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should regularly consult with the regular classroom teacher regarding L.D. matters pertaining to one of the children in their room.
17. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should speak at community functions.
18. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should have no duties directly involved with tests or testing procedures.
19. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should visit with the parents in their home.
20. \_\_\_ It is important for the L.D. teacher to belong to professional teacher organizations.

□ □ □ □ □

## PART III

1. \_\_\_ Training in the characteristics of the L.D. child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
2. \_\_\_ A master's degree should be one of the qualifications for a L.D. teacher.
3. \_\_\_ Training in the guidance of L.D. children and parents is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
4. \_\_\_ A L.D. teacher trained at the secondary level should be able to teach learning disabilities at the elementary level.
5. \_\_\_ Training in language and speech development is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
6. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should be able to interpret and make educational prescriptions from the test results she receives from the psychologist.
7. \_\_\_ Training in remedial reading is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
8. \_\_\_ Training in the psychology of exceptional children is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
9. \_\_\_ Training in the characteristics of the emotionally disturbed child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
10. \_\_\_ The L.D. teacher should have regular classroom teaching experience before she teaches in a L.D. program.
11. \_\_\_ Training in the remediation of the L.D. child is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.
12. \_\_\_ It is important to have a theory of learning disabilities and to organize your work around that theory.

## PART III—continued

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>13. Training in education of exceptional children is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.</p> <p>14. A field experience (teacher aide to a L.D. teacher) in L.D. is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.</p> | <p>15. A practicum in L.D. (graduate level student teaching) is important in the preparation of a L.D. teacher.</p> <p>16. A L.D. teacher trained at the elementary level should be able to teach learning disabilities at the secondary level.</p> |
|---|---|

□□□□□  
PART IV

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should be a friend to the children.</p> <p>2. Appearance does play an important part in the effectiveness of a teacher. (i.e. men - length of hair; women - length of skirt, skirt vs pants)</p> <p>3. The L.D. teacher should be allowed to use early dismissals from school for controlling behavior.</p> <p>4. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should encourage students to discuss and confide their problems in him/her.</p> <p>5. Experimentation with new ideas and techniques is desirable.</p> <p>6. A school building which is designed for openness and movement within is an effective educational arrangement.</p> <p>7. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should exercise firm discipline at all times.</p> <p>8. Competition with others should be stressed in learning.</p> <p>9. The L.D. teacher should be allowed to use extra privileges for controlling behavior.</p> | <p>10. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should provide immediate feedback to students about their progress.</p> <p>11. The student should learn to rely more on himself than on the teacher for help with directions.</p> <p>12. The L.D. teacher should be allowed to use material rewards such as inexpensive prizes for controlling behavior.</p> <p>13. In the classroom "noise" is acceptable.</p> <p>14. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should become emotionally involved with the students.</p> <p>15. A classroom in which there are several learning centers is an effective classroom arrangement.</p> <p>16. The teacher should strive to involve students in decision-making activities which relate to their learning.</p> <p>17. The L.D. teacher should be allowed to use positive verbal reinforcement for controlling behavior.</p> |
|--|---|

## PART IV—continued

18. \_\_\_ In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should allow students to work at their own rate of speed.
19. \_\_\_ One of the major goals of instruction should be to facilitate achievement as well as to help students cope with failure.
20. \_\_\_ In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should make objectives known to students prior to instruction.
21. \_\_\_ The school should encourage group instruction rather than individualized instruction.
22. \_\_\_ A classroom which utilizes a structured arrangement of desks in rows is an effective classroom arrangement.
23. \_\_\_ In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should allow students to help make decisions in the instructional process.

□ □ □ □ □  
PART V

1. \_\_\_ The Wide Range Achievement Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
2. \_\_\_ The case load of a L.D. teacher should be 11-20 pupils.
3. \_\_\_ The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
4. \_\_\_ The L.D. child is mentally retarded (50-80 I.Q.).
5. \_\_\_ The Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
6. \_\_\_ The L.D. child has average or above intelligence, but does not work up to his potential.
7. \_\_\_ The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
8. \_\_\_ The case load of a L.D. teacher should be 5-10 pupils.
9. \_\_\_ The Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
10. \_\_\_ The L.D. child is emotionally disturbed.
11. \_\_\_ The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
12. \_\_\_ The L.D. child has emotional problems.
13. \_\_\_ The Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
14. \_\_\_ The L.D. child is a slow learner (80-90 I.Q.).
15. \_\_\_ The Bender Gestalt Test is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.
16. \_\_\_ The case load of an L.D. teacher should be 21-30 pupils.
17. \_\_\_ The Vineland Social Maturity Scale is useful in identifying and/or diagnosing learning problems.

## PART VI

Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Years of Teaching Experience \_\_\_\_\_

College Attended	Degree
------------------	--------

_____	_____
-------	-------

_____	_____
-------	-------

_____	_____
-------	-------

Present Position \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX B. Cover Letter**

Department of Administration and Foundations of Education  
College of Education  
Holton Hall  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

April, 1974

Dear Public School Personnel:

**IT'S TIME TO MAKE YOUR WISHES KNOWN.** The Special Education Component of the Department of Administration and Foundations is asking for input from the people on the "FIRING LINE". The input information supplied by you will be utilized in the establishment of a more comprehensive teacher education program in the area of learning disabilities.

As you will notice, your survey form contains a code number on the upper right hand corner of the first page. This number is only for the purpose of follow-up of non-returned forms. Upon receipt of your survey form, the code number will be clipped off thus making the form completely anonymous.

Please fill out the survey at your earliest convenience and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. I sincerely hope that you will take advantage of this opportunity to have **INPUT** into the establishment of a more comprehensive teacher education program in the area of learning disabilities.

Sincerely,

Larry L. Martin, Ph.D.  
Coordinator of Special Education  
Component

LLM:lab

Enclosure

**APPENDIX C. Follow-Up Letter**



WE REALLY NEED YOUR !HELP!!

OOPS! Did you forget to send in your survey on Learning Disabilities? you did, please complete it and return it as soon as possible. We trying to compile the results so that we can work on our courses better prepare teachers in the Learning Disabilities field before y get into the field. Please help us help the children of the future better preparing our Learning Disabilities teachers of today!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Larry L. Martin".

Larry L. Martin  
Coordinator of Special Education

**APPENDIX D. Comments**

**Superintendents:**

"I started in on the survey and decided it was too repetitious. In a superintendent meeting recently, several commented the same."

"Do not feel qualified to answer Part V."

"Several problems with the survey 1. Didn't stick with learning disabilities 2. Most people have had little experience with learning disability programs 3. Seriously doubt if so-called experts in the LD field could agree on items in Part V."

**Principals:**

"There is no way that I can answer this Questionnaire!"

"Many of the questions that I was undecided about were marked that way because of a lack of knowledge about that particular question. I also marked some as undecided because it would depend on the circumstances as to whether or not I would agree or disagree."

"I am not familiar with this."

**Teachers:**

"Principals with LD or EMR or ED classes should be required to KNOW about the program and its goals. They need to take Intro. to LD or Psychology of Exceptional Children or at least a workshop!!!"

"I would like to have a report of this survey."

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY:  
TEACHER TRAINING AND DIAGNOSTIC TESTS USED

by

BARBARA ANN CAVE

B.A., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1973

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

The Kansas State University teacher training program in the field of learning disabilities was recently established. In hopes of modifying the program to better prepare new learning disability teachers for current needs in Kansas education, a survey was designed to determine what competencies were considered necessary by the public educators.

The survey questions covered staffing of the learning disability program, public relations and the affective behavior of the learning disability teacher, college curriculum for teacher training, and the diagnostic tests used in the learning disability program. After a number of attempts, a questionnaire format using a one to five rating scale was agreed on. Each superintendent, principal, school psychologist, director of special education and learning disability teacher received a survey, cover letter and a postage-paid return envelope. Two weeks later, a reminder was sent to those people who had not yet responded. The answers on each returned survey were recorded on Fortran sheets, key punched and run through the computer. This paper will deal only with the competencies concerning learning disability teacher training (Part III) and the tests used for screening and/or diagnosing learning disabilities in children (Part V).

Part III, (training of a learning disability teacher) of the Learning Disability Survey was divided into two subtopics for greater clarity. Those subtopics were: (1) specific courses needed in a learning disability teacher's training and (2) the interchangeability of elementary and secondary certification.

In the first subtopic, the total group responded favorably with a range from 64.5% to 97.2% in agreement with all the preparatory training areas listed with only a relatively small percentage of undecidedness.

In the second subtopic, there were only two questions, both of which had diverse opinions. It was generally felt (43.4% agreement) that a learning disability teacher trained at the secondary level should be able to teach learning disabilities at an elementary level. When asked if an elementary trained learning disability teacher should be able to teach at the secondary level, a very mixed response was given. A high percentage of people were undecided and more disagreed with the statement than agreed.

Part V of the learning disability survey was divided into three subtopics: (1) diagnostic tests used, (2) case load of a learning disability teacher, and (3) the definition of a learning disabled child.

In the diagnostic test subtopic, the total group response was in positive agreement toward use of the tests mentioned for screening and diagnostic purposes. There was a range from 43.3% to 57.3% of people positively in favor of the tests with the exception of the Vineland Social Maturity Scale where the majority of the total group were undecided as to its usefulness. However there was almost an equally large percentage of the group that were undecided about all the other tests except for the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in which a large percentage were negative towards it.

In the case load subtopic of Part V, the total group was of mixed opinion but agreed that the case load of a learning disability teacher should be lower than twenty-one students as seen by the 75.2% disagreement with the question 16 which dealt with a caseload of twenty-one to thirty.

When asked the definition of learning disabilities, a 43.2% to 77.9% range of people said that a learning disabled child has average or above average intelligence, but does not work up to his potential. He may have emotional problems but is not emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded.

However many held an undecided view on a definition.