

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY: THE AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

2148-5608A

by

ELLEN JANE HILL MCQUADE

B. S., Saint Bonaventure University, 1972

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
M33
C.2
Document

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to many individuals for their direct and indirect assistance, particularly Dr. Larry L. Martin, Dr. John W. DeMand, and Lois Brunmeier, for the considerable time and advice offered to this report. The author also wishes to express gratitude to three graduate students, Barbara Cave, Karen Crosslin, and Ira Wolfe, for their suggestions and support.

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH THE ORIGINAL
PRINTING BEING
SKEWED
DIFFERANTLY FROM
THE TOP OF THE
PAGE TO THE
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED
FROM THE
CUSTOMER.**

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH DIAGRAMS
THAT ARE CROOKED
COMPARED TO THE
REST OF THE
INFORMATION ON
THE PAGE.**

**THIS IS AS
RECEIVED FROM
CUSTOMER.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. PROCEDURES.	3
III. FINDINGS.	5
BUILDING AND CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE.	7
CONTROL OF BEHAVIOR	11
TEACHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE STUDENTS.	19
TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS	23
IV. CONCLUSIONS	38
BUILDING AND CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE.	38
CONTROL OF BEHAVIOR	38
TEACHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE STUDENTS.	39
TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS	39
V. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	41
APPENDIXES	43
A. Original Open-Ended Learning Disability Survey.	44
B. Final Learning Disability Survey.	46
C. Cover Letter.	52
D. Follow-Up Cover Letter.	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total Group Response to Each Item Part IV.	6
2. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 6.	8
3. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 15	9
4. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 22	10
5. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 3.	12
6. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 7.	13
7. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 9.	14
8. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 12	16
9. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 13	17
10. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 17	18
11. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 1.	20
12. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 2.	21
13. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 4.	22
14. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 11	24
15. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 14	25

Table	Page
16. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 5.	26
17. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 8.	28
18. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 10	29
19. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 16	30
20. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 18	32
21. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 19	33
22. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 20	34
23. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 21	35
24. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup, Question 23	37

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The Learning Disability Survey utilized in this report was distributed throughout the state of Kansas in order to obtain the opinions of various people in the field of education about the area of learning disabilities. The information gained from this survey will be utilized to modify and improve the learning disability teacher education program at Kansas State University.

Since learning disabilities is a new area in education, it was felt that input from the field of education was necessary in order to better prepare teachers to meet the needs of the students and the communities. The ideas from the people surveyed will be valuable in helping decide what areas should be stressed in the formal training of special education students at Kansas State University. Surveys were sent to all superintendents, directors of special education, principals, and learning disability teachers in Kansas. Students in the learning disability program at Kansas State University also completed the questionnaire.

It was considered important to find out what professional, personal, and material skills a teacher should have in order to do an effective job as a learning disabilities teacher. The reactions of the people surveyed will directly influence the educational program for learning disabilities at Kansas State University.

The Learning Disability Survey was divided into five major parts. Part I was concerned with the staffing and organizing a learning disability program and the type of teacher needed to head such a program. Part II involved questions about the job of a learning disability teacher in relation to school and

the community. Part III included the training needed to prepare a teacher for the learning disability program. Part IV was concerned with affective behavior. It included the school personnel attitudes toward the learning disability teacher and factors affecting school and classroom environment. Part V asked questions concerning testing procedures, case loads of a learning disability teacher and definitions.

The scope of this report is limited to dealing with Part IV, The Affective Domain.

Chapter II

PROCEDURES

The first meeting dealing with the survey took place in February. Plans were made to start formulating the questions and form of the survey. Subsequent meetings were scheduled to discuss various ideas among the investigators. After several meetings, it was decided that the survey would be done by mail.

It was decided that five categories of people in the education field would be included in the survey: superintendents, directors of special education, principals, learning disability teachers, and college students in the area of learning disabilities at Kansas State University. Open-ended questions were designed to cover all facets of the field of learning disabilities. Appendix A shows the first open-ended survey that was designed.

In March, revisions were made, and the open-ended survey was changed to a questionnaire with a 1-5 rating scale for each question. The questions were made more specific, and the questionnaire was made longer. It was felt that more information could be gleaned from this revised survey. A copy of the final survey is shown on Appendix B; the cover letter that was sent with the survey is shown on Appendix C.

The surveys, cover letters, and postage-paid return envelopes were printed. When they were ready, the coding process began. Since lists of superintendents, directors of special education, principals, and special education teachers being surveyed were available, a code number starting from 0001 was assigned to each person for the purpose of knowing who returned the surveys. The code number written on the top of the survey itself and also next to the individual's

name on the sheet. In April the cover letters, surveys, and postage-paid return envelopes were mailed from Kansas State University. Surveys were also distributed to those students at Kansas State University enrolled in learning disability classes.

As the surveys began to come in, the code numbers on the sheets were circled. In May, follow-up letters were sent to those people who had not returned the surveys. A copy of the follow-up letter is presented on Appendix D. The data on the returned surveys were then entered on key punch data sheets. The code numbers on the surveys were then removed.

The data was transcribed to eighty-column IBM cards and run through the computer. Each of the five major parts of the survey was assigned to a separate investigator for analysis, conclusions and recommendations. It is with Part IV of the Learning Disability Survey, The Affective Domain, that this report is concerned.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

The computer was programmed to provide the mode, the mean, the standard deviation, and the total number of responders to each question (See Table 1). The chi square value was used, indicating a significant difference at the .05 level. The responders were categorized by position held in the education field (psychologists, learning disability teachers, principals, superintendents, directors of special education, and students), sex (male and female), amount of training in terms of degrees held (Bachelors, Masters, Masters plus more graduate credit hours, and Doctorate), and the number of years of teaching experience (1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10 and over). The comparisons of these subgroups as well as the total group response are presented in Tables 2-24.

The Learning Disability Survey was given to people working in six educational positions. The following shows the percentage of responders from the six positions: principals returned 707 surveys out of a possible 1652, yielding a 43% response; superintendents returned 206 out of 328, 63%; psychologists, 119 out of 158, 75%; learning disability teachers returned 226 out of 274, 82%; directors of special education, 46 out of 52, 88%; and students, 56 out of 56, 100%.

Questions on the survey dealing with the affective domain were divided into the following four major headings: building and classroom arrangement and structure (questions 6, 15, 22); control of behavior (questions 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 17); teacher's attitude toward the students (questions 1, 2, 4, 11, 14); and techniques of teaching learning disabled students (questions 5, 8, 10, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23).

Table 1

Total Group Response to Each Item

Item	Mode	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number Responding
1	2.00	1.74	.78	1344
2	2.00	2.34	1.11	1343
3	3.00	3.07	1.08	1345
4	2.00	2.03	.73	1346
5	2.00	1.81	.63	1350
6	2.00	2.38	.91	1332
7	2.00	2.40	.95	1334
8	4.00	3.69	.97	1348
9	2.00	2.40	.95	1338
10	2.00	1.83	.77	1347
11	2.00	1.88	.70	1349
12	2.00	2.49	1.02	1351
13	2.00	2.24	.82	1334
14	4.00	3.47	1.02	1337
15	2.00	2.00	.75	1346
16	2.00	1.70	.58	1352
17	2.00	1.59	.60	1348
18	2.00	1.70	.70	1350
19	2.00	1.60	.61	1352
20	2.00	1.80	.72	1348
21	4.00	3.70	.82	1326
22	3.00	3.33	.93	1319
23	2.00	2.18	.79	1338

BUILDING AND CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE

Of the total group surveyed on question 6, it was found that 56.2% tended to agree or strongly agree that the school building should be designed for openness and movement (See Table 2). A considerable amount, 32.2%, was undecided. The mean response was 2.38 (See Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the subgroups of training, sex, or experience. Psychologists and students agreed more strongly with the question than the others in the position subgroup.

A big majority of the total response (80.5%), appeared to agree or strongly agree to question 15 that a classroom should have several learning centers for an effective arrangement (See Table 3). However, 15% was undecided. The mean response was 2.00 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the training subgroup. Directors of special education tended to show the strongest agreement with 95.6% feeling that learning centers were effective arrangements. Even though the principals and superintendents agreed with the question the least, their percentages were still over 75%. The females tended to agree more strongly with the question than the males. Those with less teaching experience seemed to agree more strongly with this question.

Of the total group surveyed on question 22, 42.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed that a structured arrangement of rows of desks in a classroom could be effective (See Table 4). A large segment of the people questioned (36%) was undecided. The mean response was 3.33 (See Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the position or experience subgroups. More males than females seemed to think that structured rows of desks could be effective in the classroom. Those with a master's degree plus more graduate credit hours

Table 2

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

Item 6

6. A school building which is designed for openness and movement within is an effective educational arrangement.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.5	40.7	32.2	7.5	1.9	1332/30
0.0104*	Psychologist	25.6	36.8	26.5	9.4	1.7	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	15.4	37.6	32.1	10.9	4.1	221/ 5
	Principals	14.4	44.5	33.9	6.0	1.3	688/19
	Superintendents	11.8	41.4	36.0	8.4	2.5	203/ 3
	Directors	17.8	35.6	33.3	11.1	2.2	45/ 1
	Students	28.6	39.3	25.0	7.1	0.0	56/ 0
0.3869	Male	15.5	42.6	33.2	6.8	1.9	942/19
	Female	16.7	39.5	32.1	9.7	2.1	390/11
0.4503	Bachelors	17.4	39.4	30.3	8.3	4.5	132/ 1
	Masters	14.6	41.2	33.9	8.3	2.0	817/30
	Masters Plus	18.3	44.2	29.1	7.2	1.2	251/ 9
	Doctorate	17.8	45.6	31.1	4.4	1.1	90/ 0
0.0954	1-3 Years	24.0	39.7	27.3	6.6	2.5	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	14.3	42.9	26.8	13.4	2.7	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	22.4	40.0	28.2	8.2	1.2	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	14.2	41.6	34.8	7.6	1.8	913/26

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 3

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

Item 15

15. A classroom in which
there are several learning
centers is an effective
classroom arrangement.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	22.5	58.0	15.0	2.4	0.9	1346/16
0.0007*	Psychologist	29.1	58.1	10.3	2.6	0.0	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	29.8	55.6	11.6	1.8	1.3	225/ 1
	Principals	18.6	60.8	17.2	2.6	0.9	699/ 8
	Superintendents	18.3	58.9	19.3	2.5	1.0	202/ 4
	Directors	40.0	55.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	37.5	46.4	8.9	5.4	1.8	56/ 0
0.0051*	Male	20.4	59.7	16.7	2.4	0.7	950/11
	Female	28.5	56.3	11.4	2.5	1.3	396/ 5
0.5275	Bachelors	27.1	56.4	13.5	1.5	1.5	133/ 0
	Masters	20.4	60.1	15.9	3.0	0.6	829/ 8
	Masters Plus	24.9	57.7	14.6	1.6	1.2	253/ 7
	Doctorate	24.4	60.0	14.4	0.0	1.1	90/ 0
0.0160*	1-3 Years	32.2	58.7	7.4	1.7	0.0	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	28.3	56.6	15.0	0.0	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	27.9	51.2	17.4	2.3	1.2	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	19.5	59.8	17.0	2.7	1.0	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 4

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

Item 22

22. A classroom which utilizes
a structured arrangement
of desks in rows is an
effective classroom
arrangement.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.0	16.2	36.0	33.3	9.3	1319/43
0.0922	Psychologist	2.5	19.5	31.4	33.9	12.7	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	4.2	13.9	31.0	38.0	13.0	216/10
	Principals	1.9	16.8	39.3	33.7	8.3	685/22
	Superintendents	0.5	20.7	39.9	31.8	7.1	198/ 8
	Directors	0.0	11.4	43.2	36.4	9.1	44/ 2
	Students	1.8	10.7	33.9	37.5	16.1	56/ 0
0.0006*	Male	2.0	19.0	38.0	32.8	8.2	931/30
	Female	2.1	11.3	35.3	38.1	13.1	388/13
0.0123*	Bachelors	4.6	17.6	28.2	40.5	9.2	131/ 2
	Masters	1.6	19.1	37.6	32.9	8.9	812/25
	Masters Plus	1.2	11.7	41.3	35.2	10.5	247/13
	Doctorate	5.7	11.4	36.4	37.5	9.1	88/ 2
0.2591	1-3 Years	3.3	19.8	32.2	37.2	7.4	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	3.6	13.4	40.2	33.0	9.8	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	4.7	16.5	47.1	27.1	4.7	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	1.6	17.1	37.0	34.9	9.4	900/39

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

least agreed that rows of desks were effective and this division seemed to be the most undecided of the subgroup.

CONTROL OF BEHAVIOR

There seemed to be a mixed reaction from the total group surveyed on question 3 as to whether or not a learning disability teacher should use early dismissals from school for controlling behavior. Only 31.1% agreed or strongly agreed to the question, and 31% was undecided (See Table 5). The mean response was 3.07 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the training subgroup. The principals and superintendents seemed to differ from the rest of the subgroup in that they did not advocate early dismissals from school as much as the others. More females than males tended to accept this way of controlling behavior. Those surveyed with the least amount of experience appeared to be in favor of this means of controlling behavior much more so than those with more experience.

It was found in question 7 that 59.5% of the total number of people surveyed seemed to feel that the learning disability teacher should exercise firm discipline at all times, and 24.2% were undecided (See Table 6). The mean response was 2.40 (See Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies within the sex and training subgroups. The learning disability teachers and principals seemed to believe more in firm discipline than did the others in the position subgroup. Those surveyed with 1-3 years of experience disagreed the most with this question.

Of the total group surveyed on question 9, 61.5% agreed or strongly agreed to use extra privileges for controlling behavior (See Table 7). However, 23.3% was undecided. The mean response was 2.40 (See Table 1). There were no

Table 5

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

Item 3

3. The L.D. teacher should be
allowed to use early dis-
missals from school for con-
trolling behavior.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	7.1	24.0	31.0	28.1	8.5	1345/17
0.0000*	Psychologist	14.4	44.1	19.5	17.8	4.2	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	12.4	26.2	28.4	23.6	9.3	225/ 1
	Principals	5.6	22.3	32.9	30.5	8.6	695/12
	Superintendents	1.5	12.7	36.8	37.3	11.8	204/ 2
	Directors	6.7	51.1	20.0	20.0	2.2	45/ 1
	Students	12.5	19.6	39.3	19.6	8.9	56/ 0
0.0003*	Male	6.1	22.0	32.1	31.2	8.5	949/12
	Female	9.8	29.8	29.5	22.0	8.8	396/ 5
0.1316	Bachelors	10.6	20.5	35.6	27.3	6.1	132/ 1
	Masters	6.2	25.0	30.4	29.7	8.7	828/ 9
	Masters Plus	9.9	24.9	33.2	25.3	6.7	253/ 7
	Doctorate	4.4	27.8	25.6	27.8	14.4	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	17.2	36.9	22.1	19.7	4.1	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	15.9	26.5	31.9	19.5	6.2	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	11.8	27.1	22.4	30.6	8.2	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	4.2	22.5	33.2	30.8	9.2	924/15

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 6

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

Item 7

7. In regard to his/her students,
the L.D. teacher should exercise
firm discipline at all times.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.1	44.4	24.2	12.6	1.6	334/28
0.0000*	Psychologist	7.8	45.7	19.0	22.4	5.2	116/ 3
	L.D. Teacher	24.9	43.0	19.5	10.9	1.8	221/ 5
	Principals	13.9	47.5	26.6	11.1	0.9	691/16
	Superintendents	15.8	41.9	30.5	10.8	1.0	203/ 3
	Directors	13.3	44.4	20.0	22.2	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	14.3	39.3	17.9	21.4	7.1	56/ 0
0.0588	Male	14.7	45.1	26.6	12.3	1.3	944/17
	Female	17.2	45.9	20.3	14.1	2.6	390/11
0.0833	Bachelors	24.2	39.4	21.2	15.2	0.0	132/ 1
	Masters	14.5	47.1	24.4	11.9	2.1	821/16
	Masters Plus	15.3	45.0	25.7	13.7	0.4	249/11
	Doctorate	13.3	42.2	32.2	11.1	1.1	90/ 0
0.0119*	1-3 Years	20.8	38.3	16.7	22.5	1.7	120/ 2
	4-6 Years	19.6	39.3	25.9	14.3	0.9	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	12.9	44.7	29.4	9.4	3.5	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	14.8	47.3	25.2	11.6	1.1	916/23

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 7

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

Item 9

9. The L.D. teacher should be
allowed to use extra privileges
for controlling behavior.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	14.0	47.5	23.3	10.9	2.5	1338/24
0.0	Psychologist	23.7	61.9	11.0	2.5	0.8	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	29.3	45.5	14.4	9.9	0.9	222/ 4
	Principals	9.2	48.1	26.7	12.6	3.3	692/15
	Superintendents	6.9	42.9	32.0	14.8	3.4	203/ 3
	Directors	11.1	68.9	13.3	6.7	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	23.2	37.5	30.4	7.1	1.8	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	10.7	48.0	25.7	12.3	3.3	943/18
	Female	22.5	49.1	19.2	8.4	0.8	395/ 6
0.1454	Bachelors	23.3	41.9	20.2	14.0	0.8	129/ 4
	Masters	12.8	48.6	24.8	11.2	2.7	823/14
	Masters Plus	14.2	50.8	22.4	9.8	2.8	254/ 6
	Doctorate	12.2	53.3	18.9	11.1	4.4	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	28.3	47.5	15.0	9.2	0.0	120/ 2
	4-6 Years	27.0	38.7	19.8	12.6	1.8	111/ 2
	7-9 Years	15.1	47.7	23.3	12.8	1.2	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	10.3	49.1	25.7	11.7	3.2	920/19

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

significant discrepancies within the training or position subgroups. More females than males tended to agree that extra privileges should be used for controlling behavior. Those with the least amount of experience seemed to agree more to this question than those with more experience.

On question 12 dealing with the use of material rewards for controlling behavior, 56.9% of the total group response tended to agree or strongly agree with this system while 25.8% was undecided (See Table 8). The mean response was 2.49 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy among the positions. More females than males seemed to advocate the use of material rewards for controlling behavior. The people with bachelor's degrees appeared to agree most to this question; the higher the degree, the less agreement. It seemed that the more teaching experience a person had the less he agreed with this question.

It was found in question 13 that 70.2% of the total number of people surveyed would tend to accept "noise" in the classroom while 19.2% was undecided (See Table 9). The mean response was 2.24 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the training subgroup. The directors of special education tended to agree the most to this question. More males than females seemed to be able to accept "noise" in the classroom. Those with 7-10 years of experience appeared to accept more "noise" than the others in this subgroup.

In question 17, an overwhelming 95% of the total response appeared to believe that a learning disability teacher should use positive verbal reinforcement for controlling behavior (See Table 10). The mean response was 1.59 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy among positions. More females than males seemed to believe in positive verbal reinforcement. Those surveyed with doctorate degrees tended to agree the most to this

Table 8

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

Item 12

12. The L.D. teacher should be
allowed to use material
rewards such as inexpen-
sive prizes for controlling
behavior.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	14.2	42.7	25.8	12.2	4.3	1351/11
0.0	Psychologist	24.8	59.8	12.0	3.4	0.0	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	31.4	47.3	14.2	4.9	2.2	226/ 0
	Principals	8.7	40.1	32.0	14.1	5.0	700/ 7
	Superintendents	3.4	33.7	32.7	22.4	7.8	205/ 1
	Directors	22.2	64.4	6.7	6.7	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	26.8	42.9	19.6	5.4	5.4	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	10.3	40.8	28.4	15.2	5.3	954/ 7
	Female	23.9	48.6	20.2	5.3	2.0	397/ 4
0.0037*	Bachelors	27.1	44.4	16.5	8.3	3.8	133/ 0
	Masters	12.7	43.6	27.2	12.6	3.8	832/ 5
	Masters Plus	12.2	42.1	27.6	13.8	4.3	254/ 6
	Doctorate	13.3	37.8	26.7	14.4	7.8	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	31.1	50.8	13.1	4.1	0.8	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	25.7	46.9	19.5	5.3	2.7	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	16.3	44.2	25.6	14.0	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	10.1	40.8	29.3	14.5	5.3	929/10

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 9

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

Item 13

13. In the classroom "noise"
is acceptable.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	13.7	56.5	19.2	7.4	1.0	1334/28
0.0000*	Psychologist	20.5	54.7	17.1	7.7	0.0	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	21.8	45.9	18.6	12.7	0.9	220/ 6
	Principals	11.9	60.7	20.3	6.2	0.9	690/17
	Superintendents	6.4	62.7	22.5	6.9	1.5	204/ 2
	Directors	20.0	66.7	8.9	4.4	0.0	45/ 0
	Students	19.6	48.2	19.6	7.1	5.4	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	11.9	61.9	19.4	6.0	0.9	939/22
	Female	19.0	47.8	20.3	11.4	1.5	395/ 6
0.0599	Bachelors	19.5	46.6	19.5	12.8	1.5	133/ 0
	Masters	13.3	57.5	20.4	8.1	0.7	819/18
	Masters Plus	14.3	63.3	16.7	4.8	0.8	251/ 9
	Doctorate	11.2	64.0	20.2	3.4	1.1	89/ 1
0.0000*	1-3 Years	22.1	50.8	11.5	13.9	1.6	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	21.2	51.3	15.0	12.4	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	23.5	54.1	16.5	5.9	0.0	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	10.8	60.2	21.9	6.2	0.9	915/24

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 10

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

Item 17

17. The L.D. teacher should be
allowed to use positive
verbal reinforcement for
controlling behavior.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	45.4	49.6	3.2	0.7	0.1	1348/14
0.0	Psychologist	69.2	29.1	0.0	1.7	0.0	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	66.2	32.0	1.3	0.4	0.0	225/ 1
	Principals	37.9	57.7	4.0	0.4	0.0	699/ 8
	Superintendents	27.5	64.7	6.4	1.0	0.5	204/ 2
	Directors	64.4	35.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	66.1	32.1	0.0	1.8	0.0	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	39.9	55.7	3.6	0.7	0.1	952/ 9
	Female	60.1	36.9	2.5	0.5	0.0	396/ 5
0.0040*	Bachelors	60.2	34.6	3.0	2.3	0.0	133/ 0
	Masters	42.8	53.6	3.3	0.4	0.0	830/ 7
	Masters Plus	45.7	48.4	4.3	1.2	0.4	254/ 6
	Doctorate	46.7	51.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	68.9	30.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	66.4	33.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	58.1	40.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	38.6	56.0	4.5	0.8	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

χ^2 = chi square value

question. The people with 4-6 years of experience agreed 100% with this question while those with 10 or more years experience tended to agree the least.

TEACHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE STUDENTS

It was found in question 1 that 86.3% of the total group responding agreed or strongly agreed and 9% was undecided about whether the learning disability teacher should be a friend to the children (See Table 11). The mean response was 1.74 (See Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies among the subgroups.

When asked to respond to question 2, whether or not appearance played an important part in the effectiveness of a teacher, 65.8% of the total group surveyed appeared to agree or strongly agree that it did. However, 14.9% was undecided (See Table 12). The mean response was 2.34 (See Table 1). It appeared that the principals and superintendents agreed more strongly than the other people surveyed. It also appeared that the males surveyed placed more emphasis on appearance than did the females. From the results of the survey, it seemed that those persons with at least a master's degree were more concerned about appearance than those with only a bachelor's degree. Also, as years of experience progressed, so did the percentage of people who felt that appearance played an important part in the effectiveness of the teacher.

It was found in question 4 that 78.4% of the total number of people surveyed thought that the learning disability teacher should encourage students to discuss and confide problems (See Table 13). But 17.3% was undecided. The mean response was 2.03 (See Table 1). There was no significant difference in the experience, sex, and training subgroups. Principals and students appeared to agree more strongly to this question than the others.

Table 11

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

Item 1

1. In regard to his/her students,
the L.D. teacher should be a
friend to the children.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	41.3	45.0	9.0	2.9	0.5	1344/18
0.5734	Psychologist	40.7	47.5	3.5	3.4	0.0	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	41.2	44.2	10.2	4.0	0.4	226/ 0
	Principals	42.4	45.1	9.5	2.3	0.7	694/13
	Superintendents	42.9	48.3	6.4	2.0	0.5	203/ 3
	Directors	26.7	48.9	17.8	6.7	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	48.2	41.1	5.4	5.4	0.0	56/ 0
0.9199	Male	41.8	45.8	9.0	2.9	0.6	946/15
	Female	42.0	45.2	9.5	3.0	0.3	398/ 3
0.8743	Bachelors	40.9	47.7	9.1	2.3	0.0	132/ 1
	Masters	42.5	45.0	9.3	2.7	0.6	829/ 8
	Masters Plus	40.7	45.1	9.9	4.0	0.4	253/ 7
	Doctorate	36.4	54.5	5.7	2.3	1.1	88/ 2
0.1241	1-3 Years	42.6	43.4	9.0	4.9	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	35.4	43.4	15.9	5.3	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	39.5	45.3	11.6	3.5	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	42.1	47.1	7.9	2.2	0.7	923/16

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 12

Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by

Total and Each Subgroup 2. Appearance does play an im-Item 2

portant part in the effec-
tiveness of a teacher. (i.e.
men - length of hair; women -
length of skirt, skirt vs
pants)

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	22.5	43.3	14.9	13.1	4.8	1343/19
0.0000*	Psychologist	12.7	44.1	16.1	23.7	3.4	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	14.7	36.2	21.4	18.8	8.9	224/ 2
	Principals	25.8	45.0	14.3	11.2	3.7	694/13
	Superintendents	29.4	52.0	9.3	5.9	3.4	204/ 2
	Directors	17.8	35.6	22.2	17.8	6.7	45/ 1
	Students	17.9	39.3	14.3	19.6	8.9	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	25.2	45.7	13.5	11.9	3.6	947/14
	Female	16.9	39.6	18.9	16.7	7.8	396/ 5
0.0279*	Bachelors	15.3	38.2	24.4	13.7	8.4	131/ 2
	Masters	22.9	45.6	14.5	13.3	3.7	827/10
	Masters Plus	26.1	41.5	14.6	11.9	5.9	253/ 7
	Doctorate	21.1	50.0	10.0	13.3	5.6	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	15.7	34.7	24.0	16.5	9.1	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	10.8	41.4	17.1	20.7	9.9	111/ 2
	7-9 Years	25.6	44.2	10.5	15.1	4.7	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	25.5	46.6	13.6	10.6	3.6	924/15

* 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

 χ^2 = chi square value

Table 13

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

Item 4

4. In regard to his/her students,
the L.D. teacher should en-
courage students to discuss
and confide their problems in
him/her.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	20.9	57.5	17.3	2.8	0.4	1346/16
0.0034*	Psychologist	17.6	55.5	21.8	5.0	0.0	119/ 0
	L.D. Teacher	25.6	52.0	19.3	3.1	0.0	223/ 3
	Principals	21.0	61.8	14.1	2.6	0.6	696/ 9
	Superintendents	14.6	60.5	23.4	1.0	0.5	205/ 1
	Directors	22.2	44.4	26.7	6.7	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	35.7	46.4	14.3	3.6	0.0	56/ 0
0.0960	Male	20.0	60.5	16.3	2.8	0.4	951/10
	Female	23.8	52.7	20.5	2.8	0.3	395/ 6
0.0603	Bachelors	29.0	54.2	14.5	2.3	0.0	131/ 2
	Masters	20.0	58.8	17.7	3.0	0.5	830/ 7
	Masters Plus	22.9	56.5	18.6	2.0	0.0	253/ 7
	Doctorate	7.8	71.1	16.7	4.4	0.0	90/ 0
0.2829	1-3 Years	24.8	50.4	19.8	5.0	0.0	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	25.7	54.9	15.0	4.4	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	27.1	51.8	16.5	3.5	1.2	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	19.5	60.2	17.6	2.3	0.4	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Of the total group responding to question 11, 87% seemed to agree or strongly agree that the student should learn to rely more on himself rather than the teacher for help with directions (See Table 14). There was 8.9% that was undecided. The mean response was 1.88 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the training subgroup. Even though the majority of students tended to agree to this question, the percentage was not as high as the other people surveyed; students also had the highest percentage of undecided answers. The females surveyed tended to agree more strongly than the males. Those people with less years of experience seemed to agree more strongly than did those with more teaching experience.

On question 14, of all those surveyed, 54.6% appeared to believe that a learning disability teacher should not become emotionally involved with the students (See Table 15). There was 24.7% that was undecided. The mean response was 3.47 (See Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies among position, sex, or training subgroups. The people with 4-6 years of experience and 10 and over years of experience tended to disagree more strongly to this question.

TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS

A large majority of the total group responding to question 5 (90.1%) seemed to think it was desirable to experiment with new ideas and techniques (See Table 16). The mean response was 1.81 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the training subgroup. The students surveyed seemed to think the least about experimenting with new ideas and they answered this question the most undecidedly. More females than males tended to agree with this question. Those with 7-10 years of experience seemed to disagree more with this question.

Table 14

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

Item 11

11. The student should learn
to rely more on himself
than on the teacher for
help with directions.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	27.2	59.8	8.9	2.9	0.2	1349/13
0.0000*	Psychologist	31.9	62.1	5.2	0.0	0.9	116/ 3
	L.D. Teacher	42.9	49.1	7.1	0.9	0.0	226/ 0
	Principals	22.6	63.9	9.4	4.0	0.0	699/ 8
	Superintendents	21.0	63.4	10.7	4.4	0.5	205/ 1
	Directors	35.6	60.0	2.2	2.2	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	32.1	48.2	17.9	0.0	1.8	56/ 0
0.0003*	Male	24.1	63.3	8.8	3.6	0.2	953/ 8
	Female	35.4	53.5	9.3	1.5	0.3	396/ 5
0.0815	Bachelors	37.6	50.4	11.3	0.8	0.0	133/ 0
	Masters	26.3	61.6	8.9	3.3	0.0	830/ 7
	Masters Plus	24.8	64.2	7.9	2.8	0.4	254/ 6
	Doctorate	26.7	56.7	11.1	5.6	0.0	90/ 0
0.0026*	1-3 Years	42.1	51.2	5.0	1.7	0.0	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	36.6	54.5	7.1	1.8	0.0	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	35.3	51.8	10.6	2.4	0.0	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	23.5	63.5	9.5	3.3	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 15

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

Item 14

14. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should become emotionally involved with the students.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	3.2	15.6	24.7	41.3	13.3	1337/25
0.0764	Psychologist	4.4	26.5	24.8	37.2	7.1	113/ 6
	L.D. Teacher	5.0	17.7	24.5	39.5	13.2	220/ 6
	Principals	3.4	14.3	25.7	43.5	13.1	697/10
	Superintendents	1.0	14.1	22.4	44.9	17.6	205/ 1
	Directors	2.3	13.6	36.4	29.5	18.2	44/ 2
	Students	1.8	16.1	23.2	44.6	14.3	56/ 0
0.5710	Male	3.6	16.6	24.3	41.9	13.7	948/13
	Female	2.6	14.4	27.5	42.4	13.1	389/12
0.3796	Bachelors	4.6	19.8	29.0	34.4	12.2	131/ 2
	Masters	2.9	16.4	26.1	42.7	12.0	825/12
	Masters Plus	3.6	14.1	22.1	42.6	17.7	249/11
	Doctorate	3.3	14.4	21.1	46.7	14.4	90/ 0
0.0001*	1-3 Years	5.9	23.7	34.7	29.7	5.9	118/ 4
	4-6 Years	4.5	14.4	26.1	41.4	13.5	111/ 2
	7-9 Years	7.0	23.3	29.1	30.2	10.5	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	2.6	14.3	23.3	44.8	14.9	921/18

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 16

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

Item 5

5. Experimentation with new ideas
and techniques is desirable.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	29.5	60.6	7.7	1.0	0.2	1350/12
0.0008*	Psychologist	35.3	62.2	0.8	1.7	0.0	119/ 0
	L.D. Teacher	40.6	52.7	5.8	0.4	0.4	224/ 2
	Principals	24.9	64.4	9.4	1.1	0.1	699/ 8
	Superintendents	26.8	63.9	7.8	1.0	0.5	205/ 1
	Directors	40.0	57.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	39.3	44.6	14.3	1.8	0.0	56/ 0
0.0254*	Male	27.4	63.3	8.0	1.2	0.1	952/ 9
	Female	35.4	56.0	7.3	0.8	0.5	398/ 3
0.1458	Bachelors	42.4	48.5	8.3	0.8	0.0	132/ 1
	Masters	28.0	62.9	7.6	1.1	0.4	831/ 6
	Masters Plus	30.2	61.2	7.5	1.2	0.0	255/ 5
	Doctorate	23.3	66.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	90/ 0
0.0002*	1-3 Years	47.5	46.7	4.9	0.8	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	38.1	57.5	4.4	0.0	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	31.4	57.0	8.1	3.5	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	25.9	64.1	8.7	1.0	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

χ^2 = chi square value

In question 8, the majority of the total number of people surveyed, (63.9%), appeared to disagree or strongly disagree that competition should be stressed, and 22.8% was undecided (See Table 17). The mean response to this question was 3.69 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy among positions. More males than females tended to agree that competition should be stressed in learning. Those surveyed with a master's or doctorate degree seemed to agree more than the others in the subgroup. The people with 10 or more years experience seemed to agree more that competition should be stressed.

It was found in question 10 that 83.3% of the total number of people surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that the learning disability teacher should provide immediate feedback to students about their progress (See Table 18). However, 12.8% was undecided. The mean response was 1.83 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy among positions. More females than males tended to agree with this question. Those people with masters plus more graduate credit hours tended to agree less than the other people in the subgroup; those with 10 or more years of experience agreed less than the others in that subgroup.

In question 16, an overwhelming majority of the total group responding (94.6%) thought the teacher should strive to involve students in decision-making activities related to their learning (See Table 19). Respondants tended to show agreement as the mean response was 1.70 (See Table 1). No significant discrepancy was reported in the training subgroup. Directors of special education appeared to agree or strongly agree with this question 100%. Of the total number of people in this subgroup, the students tended to agree the least. The females exhibited stronger agreement to the question. Those with 1-3 years of experience and 7-9 years of experience tended to show the strongest agreement.

Table 17

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

Item 8

8. Competition with others should
be stressed in learning.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.0	10.3	22.8	45.4	18.5	348/14
0.0	Psychologist	0.0	4.2	6.8	51.7	37.3	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	1.3	6.7	14.7	45.8	31.6	225/ 1
	Principals	2.3	11.3	26.8	46.8	12.8	697/10
	Superintendents	2.9	16.6	31.7	37.1	11.7	205/ 1
	Directors	2.2	4.4	17.8	66.7	8.9	45/ 1
	Students	1.8	8.9	14.3	37.5	35.7	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	2.4	11.7	26.5	44.9	14.5	948/13
	Female	1.0	7.3	14.8	48.0	28.8	400/ 1
0.0154*	Bachelors	0.8	9.1	18.2	40.9	31.1	132/ 1
	Masters	2.2	11.5	23.4	47.3	15.6	829/ 8
	Masters Plus	1.6	7.5	24.7	48.2	18.0	255/ 5
	Doctorate	4.4	10.0	23.3	37.8	24.4	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	0.8	5.8	18.2	45.5	29.8	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	1.8	3.5	22.1	45.1	27.4	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	3.5	4.7	18.6	51.2	20.9	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	2.2	12.0	25.1	46.0	14.8	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 18

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

Item 10

10. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should provide immediate feedback to students about their progress.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	35.9	47.4	12.8	2.3	0.4	1347/15
0.0	Psychologist	59.3	38.1	2.5	0.0	0.0	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	57.1	35.3	6.7	0.9	0.0	224/ 2
	Principals	27.1	54.0	16.2	2.4	0.3	698/ 9
	Superintendents	24.0	51.0	18.1	5.4	1.5	204/ 2
	Directors	48.9	48.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	55.4	30.4	10.7	3.6	0.0	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	30.6	51.6	14.8	2.4	0.5	953/ 8
	Female	50.0	39.1	8.6	2.3	0.0	394/ 7
0.0060*	Bachelors	53.4	35.3	9.0	2.3	0.0	133/ 0
	Masters	32.6	51.3	13.4	2.3	0.5	829/ 8
	Masters Plus	35.0	45.3	16.1	3.1	0.4	254/ 6
	Doctorate	41.1	47.8	10.0	1.1	0.0	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	64.8	30.3	4.9	0.0	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	54.9	35.4	8.8	0.9	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	43.5	47.1	7.1	2.4	0.0	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	29.1	52.1	15.4	2.8	0.5	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 19

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

Item 16

16. The teacher should strive to involve students in decision-making activities which relate to their learning.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	35.0	59.6	3.9	0.6	0.1	1352/10
0.0002*	Psychologist	46.2	53.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	44.7	51.8	2.2	1.3	0.0	226/ 0
	Principals	31.1	63.8	4.3	0.7	0.1	701/ 6
	Superintendents	26.8	66.3	6.3	0.0	0.5	205/ 1
	Directors	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	45/ 1
	Students	51.8	41.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	56/ 0
0.0005*	Male	31.9	63.6	3.9	0.4	0.2	954/ 7
	Female	43.5	51.5	4.0	1.0	0.0	398/ 3
0.3277	Bachelors	36.8	57.1	4.5	1.5	0.0	133/ 0
	Masters	34.0	62.0	3.1	0.7	0.1	832/ 5
	Masters Plus	34.9	58.4	6.3	0.0	0.4	255/ 5
	Doctorate	35.6	63.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	90/ 0
0.0007*	1-3 Years	48.4	50.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	45.1	50.4	2.7	1.8	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	46.5	51.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	30.4	64.7	4.2	0.5	0.2	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Of the total group response to question 18 there was much agreement, (90.6%), in allowing the students to work at their own rate of speed, and the mean response was 1.70 (See Tables 20 and 1). Directors of special education seemed to agree or strongly agree 100%. Of the total number of people in this subgroup, the superintendents agreed the least. More females than males tended to agree with this question. Those surveyed with 1-3 years of experience and 7-9 years of experience tended to show the strongest agreement.

In question 19, it was found that 95.4% of the total group responding appeared to agree or strongly agree that one of the major goals of instruction should be to facilitate achievement as well as to help students cope with failure (See Table 21). The mean response was 1.60 (See Table 1). All of the divisions within each of the subgroups agreed or strongly agreed with this question (The range was 92.3-99.2). It was felt that this indicated subgroup congruence.

In question 20, 86% of the total group response tended to believe that the learning disability teacher should make objectives known to students prior to instruction, while 10.9% was undecided (See Table 22). The mean response was 1.80 (See Table 1). All of the divisions within the subgroups agreed or strongly agreed with this question (The range was 80.7-93.3). It was felt that this indicated subgroup congruence.

The majority of the total group responding to question 21 (64.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the school should encourage group instruction rather than individualized instruction (See Table 23). However 25.3% was undecided. The mean response was 3.70 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the experience subgroup. More females than males tended to disagree with this question, but all the divisions within the subgroups appeared to disagree or strongly disagree.

Table 20

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

Item 18 18. In regard to his/her students,
the L.D. teacher should allow
students to work at their own
rate of speed.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	41.0	49.6	5.8	2.6	0.1	1350/12
0.0000*	Psychologist	49.2	47.5	1.7	1.7	0.0	118/ 1
	L.D. Teacher	58.9	33.5	4.9	2.7	0.0	224/ 2
	Principals	36.5	55.1	5.6	2.8	0.0	702/ 5
	Superintendents	29.7	54.5	11.9	3.5	0.5	202/ 4
	Directors	41.3	58.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	46/ 0
	Students	57.1	35.7	5.4	1.8	0.0	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	36.4	54.0	6.9	2.5	0.1	951/10
	Female	53.1	40.6	3.3	3.0	0.0	399/ 2
0.0085*	Bachelors	58.6	34.6	4.5	2.3	0.0	133/ 0
	Masters	38.1	53.0	6.0	2.9	0.0	830/ 7
	Masters Plus	41.6	51.0	5.1	2.0	0.4	255/ 5
	Doctorate	41.1	47.8	8.9	2.2	0.0	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	66.1	29.8	1.7	2.5	0.0	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	55.8	33.6	7.1	3.5	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	48.3	48.3	2.3	1.1	0.0	87/ 0
	10 Plus Years	35.0	55.6	6.5	2.8	0.1	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 21

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

Item 19 19. One of the major goals of instruction should be to facilitate achievement as well as to help students cope with failure.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	45.2	50.2	2.7	1.1	0.1	1352/10
0.0001*	Psychologist	51.3	47.9	0.8	0.0	0.0	119/ 0
	L.D. Teacher	60.1	36.3	2.7	0.9	0.0	223/ 3
	Principals	40.7	54.9	3.3	1.0	0.1	703/ 4
	Superintendents	36.0	58.6	3.0	2.5	0.0	203/ 3
	Directors	50.0	47.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	46/ 0
	Students	66.1	32.1	0.0	1.8	0.0	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	40.8	55.3	2.7	1.0	0.1	953/ 8
	Female	56.6	39.3	2.8	1.3	0.0	399/ 2
0.0057*	Bachelors	57.6	38.6	3.0	0.8	0.0	132/ 1
	Masters	42.7	53.6	2.5	1.2	0.0	832/ 5
	Masters Plus	46.5	50.0	2.7	0.8	0.0	256/ 4
	Doctorate	45.6	46.7	5.6	1.1	1.1	90/ 0
0.0000*	1-3 Years	63.1	36.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	59.8	36.6	2.7	0.0	0.9	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	49.4	47.1	2.3	1.1	0.0	87/ 0
	10 Plus Years	40.6	54.6	3.3	1.4	0.0	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 22

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

Item 20

20. In regard to his/her students,
the L.D. teacher should make
objectives known to students
prior to instruction.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	35.2	50.8	10.9	1.8	0.3	1348/14
0.0017*	Psychologist	42.0	50.4	7.6	0.0	0.0	119/ 0
	L.D. Teacher	44.0	47.1	7.1	1.3	0.4	225/ 1
	Principals	31.8	55.2	10.7	2.0	0.3	698/ 9
	Superintendents	29.2	51.5	16.3	2.5	0.5	202/ 4
	Directors	52.2	39.1	8.7	0.0	0.0	46/ 0
	Students	44.6	32.1	19.6	3.6	0.0	56/ 0
0.0134*	Male	32.6	53.5	11.7	1.9	0.3	950/11
	Female	42.7	46.2	9.3	1.5	0.3	398/ 3
0.4310	Bachelors	36.6	51.9	9.2	2.3	0.0	131/ 2
	Masters	34.7	52.2	11.4	1.4	0.2	831/ 6
	Masters Plus	38.4	47.1	11.8	2.4	0.4	255/ 5
	Doctorate	34.4	58.9	3.3	2.2	1.1	90/ 0
0.0311*	1-3 Years	43.4	45.1	9.0	2.5	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	46.0	44.2	8.8	0.9	0.0	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	48.8	44.2	7.0	0.0	0.0	86/ 1
	10 Plus Years	32.3	54.0	11.3	2.0	0.3	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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 23

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

Item 21

21. The school should encourage group instruction rather than individualized instruction.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	0.7	7.1	25.3	51.4	12.8	1326/36
0.0000*	Psychologist	0.9	6.0	23.9	54.7	14.5	117/ 2
	L.D. Teacher	0.0	5.5	16.0	49.8	28.8	219/ 7
	Principals	0.9	8.5	29.2	51.5	9.9	685/22
	Superintendents	1.5	7.9	27.2	56.4	6.9	202/ 4
	Directors	0.0	0.0	24.4	62.2	13.3	45/ 1
	Students	0.0	7.1	26.8	53.6	12.5	56/ 0
0.0000*	Male	1.1	7.5	28.0	53.4	10.0	936/25
	Female	0.0	6.9	21.0	51.3	20.8	390/11
0.0004*	Bachelors	0.0	7.7	22.3	47.7	22.3	130/ 3
	Masters	0.5	8.1	27.3	52.1	12.0	816/21
	Masters Plus	2.4	5.6	25.3	57.8	8.8	249/11
	Doctorate	0.0	4.5	20.2	53.9	21.3	89/ 1
0.0601	1-3 Years	0.0	5.0	20.7	53.7	20.7	121/ 1
	4-6 Years	0.0	7.1	22.1	52.2	18.6	113/ 0
	7-9 Years	0.0	8.3	32.1	45.2	14.3	84/ 3
	10 Plus Years	1.0	8.0	26.8	53.3	10.9	907/32

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

It was found in question 23 that 73.5% of the total number surveyed agreed that the students should be allowed to help make decisions in the instructional process, and 17.8% was undecided (See Table 24). The mean response was 2.18 (See Table 1). There was no significant discrepancy in the sex subgroup. It appeared that the psychologists agreed more strongly to this question than did the others in the position subgroup. Those with doctorate degrees seemed to show stronger agreement; the people with 10 or more years of experience seemed to show the least agreement.

Table 24

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

Item 23

23. In regard to his/her students, the L.D. teacher should allow students to help make decisions in the instructional process.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.2	58.3	17.8	6.2	0.7	1338/24
0.0000*	Psychologist	23.5	68.1	7.6	0.8	0.0	119/ 0
	L.D. Teacher	18.6	55.9	18.6	6.8	0.0	220/ 6
	Principals	11.5	60.5	19.6	7.4	1.0	693/14
	Superintendents	13.9	56.4	21.8	6.9	1.0	202/ 4
	Directors	26.1	60.9	8.7	4.3	0.0	46/ 0
	Students	32.1	48.2	14.3	3.6	1.8	56/ 0
0.0818	Male	13.8	60.7	18.2	6.3	1.0	946/15
	Female	19.4	56.1	17.9	6.4	0.3	392/ 9
0.0223*	Bachelors	18.3	51.9	20.6	8.4	0.8	131/ 2
	Masters	12.2	62.8	18.0	6.4	0.6	823/14
	Masters Plus	20.9	53.0	18.6	6.3	1.2	253/ 7
	Doctorate	22.5	59.6	13.5	3.4	1.1	89/ 1
0.0000*	1-3 Years	23.8	60.7	12.3	3.3	0.0	122/ 0
	4-6 Years	23.2	58.0	11.6	7.1	0.0	112/ 1
	7-9 Years	27.1	60.0	9.4	3.5	0.0	85/ 2
	10 Plus Years	12.1	59.6	20.2	7.1	1.1	918/21

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

From the findings it was possible to draw some conclusions about the affective domain in the Learning Disability Survey. In order to do this more effectively, the questions in the survey were again considered under the four major headings.

BUILDING AND CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE

Of the total response from questions concerning the building and classroom arrangement and structure, it seemed that the majority of the people surveyed agreed that the school building should be designed for openness and movement and that the classroom should have several learning centers for an effective arrangement. There seemed to be a combination of undecidedness and slight disagreement about whether a structured arrangement of rows of desks in a classroom could be effective.

CONTROL OF BEHAVIOR

Of the total response from questions dealing with the control of behavior, the majority of the people appeared to agree that the learning disability teacher should exercise firm discipline at all times. It was felt that the learning disability teacher should be allowed to use extra privileges, material rewards, and positive verbal reinforcement for controlling behavior; however, those with the most amount of teaching experience tended to agree less strongly than the others in the subgroup. The total group seemed to agree that "noise" was acceptable in the classroom. There was a mixed reaction as to whether or

not a learning disability teacher should use early dismissals from school for controlling behavior with the principals and superintendents being the least in favor of this method.

TEACHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE STUDENTS

Concerning the teacher's attitude toward the students, the people surveyed seemed to agree that appearance played an important part in the effectiveness of a teacher, with principals and superintendents expressing the strongest agreement. Males tended to be more in agreement, also. It seemed to be agreed that the learning disability teacher should be a friend to the students, should encourage students to discuss and confide problems, and should teach the student to rely more on himself rather than on the teacher for directions. There seemed to be a combination of undecidedness and slight disagreement as to whether a learning disability teacher should become emotionally involved with the students.

TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS

Of the total response from questions concerned with teaching techniques, it appeared that most people agreed that experimentation with new ideas and techniques was desirable. The students surveyed tended to show the least agreement and the most undecidedness of the subgroup. It is felt by the author that this might be due to the inexperience of the students; they might feel obligated to remain with the older techniques that have had success with learning disabled students. It appeared that the total group agreed that one of the major goals of instruction should be to facilitate achievement as well as to help students cope with failure, that the learning disability teacher should make objectives known to students prior to instruction and provide

immediate feedback to the students about their progress. The total group seemed to agree that the teacher should strive to involve students in decision-making activities related to their learning and the instructional process, and that students should be allowed to work at their own rate of speed. It was found that the majority of the total number surveyed seemed to disagree that the school should encourage group instruction rather than individualized instruction, and that competition with others should not be stressed.

Chapter V

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Many people included their comments along with the completed survey. Because their remarks explained some of their answers and suggested further studies, a few will be included in this report.

A superintendent stated, "Each child in L. S. program must be dealt with as an individual. Situations vary and there seems to be no pat answers." A psychologist said, "L. D. is not a field of absolutes and cannot be adequately surveyed. As such I was forced to give the most noncommittal responses in areas where I have definite opinions because of the misinterpretations that would result from the choices available." A teacher stated, "Some answers depend upon the type of program in effect."

Concerning the teaching techniques, one superintendent said, "There are methods that seem to be a help to some teachers that are a hindrance to others." Another superintendent seemed to have difficulty answering questions about building and classroom arrangement and structure, as he stated, "...openness in a school building can aid in an effective educational arrangement, but just because the openness is there, it does not assure effective educational program."

While it is true that every situation is unique, it appeared to the author that the majority of the questions allowed the responder to choose that which he felt was true in most instances. Since every school system is different, it would perhaps be better if each school system developed a survey to find out what the people felt was needed in a learning disability program. After such a program had been initiated, it would then be recommended that the

program be evaluated to see if it met the needs of that school system and the people involved.

It also seemed to the author that there was confusion on the part of many as to what "learning disability" actually meant. As one principal asked, "What is a L. D.? I have not yet found a satisfactory definition. This may appear to be sarcastic, a gay question. However, this concerns me greatly." A suggestion was presented by a learning disability teacher who said, "Please, give help, do research in the area of classroom teachers in accepting L. D. Too many it seems are dead set against it and it hinders much progress with students. Every opportunity in educational classes to explain about L. D. would be a step. You might catch teachers going back to school. (I'm an older teacher.)"

At Kansas State University, the teacher education learning disability program can be modified to include and expound upon such areas as different classroom arrangements and various teaching techniques. University classes should require that students have sufficient knowledge of controlling behavior through extra priveleges and rewards. Kansas State University students might also benefit from more child psychology-overted classes that include role-playing situations. Students in the teacher education program also need to learn how to budget their time as teachers, to be able to allow their students to work at their own rate of speed, to allow them to make their own decisions, and to provide immediate feedback to the students. .

Until more people become aware of what this subject involves, it is difficult to set up a competant program. The public needs to be informed so that when schools improve their learning disability programs, the programs will be accepted by all involved.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL OPEN-ENDED LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY

1. Since the field of learning disabilities is so new, there are various theories as to what learning disabilities include. What is your concept of learning disabilities?
2. What are the advantages, disadvantages, and special training needed for an itinerant, resource room, and self contained classroom teacher? Which program would you advocate?
3. In the hiring of a learning disabilities teacher, is prior teaching experience desired, essential, or doesn't it matter? Is a masters degree desired, essential, or doesn't it matter? Is membership in professional organizations desired, essential, or doesn't it matter? If it is desired or essential, which organizations are important?
4. Which diagnostic tests are used in your school? Who administers them to the students?
5. Who is involved in your system of referrals? Who participates in the staffing of children into the learning disabilities program?
6. Who will actually set up the learning disabilities program?
7. What instructional materials would a learning disabilities teacher have at her disposal? Who would provide these materials?
8. What type of special education courses should a learning disabilities teacher be expected to have taken? Is an audio-visual aids course recommended?
9. Could a learning disabilities teacher with a secondary education background teach in an elementary learning disability program and vice versa?

10. What is the difference between a learning disabilities teacher and a regular classroom teacher in regard to delivery of knowledge and classroom arrangement? What do you consider to be the ideal classroom arrangement? Traditional rows? Open Classroom? Learning Centers? Engineered Classroom? What is the ideal number of children that should be enrolled in this arrangement?

11. Is the learning disabilities teacher allowed exceptional methods of controlling behavior? Physical punishment? Behavior modification? Special priveleges?

12. What personal qualities should a learning disabilities teacher exhibit?

13. What standards of appearance do you set for your teachers? Length of hair? Skirt length? Pants vs. Skirts?

14. To what extent would you expect your teachers to participate in community functions? Do you expect him/her to speak at school functions?

15. What role does the parent play in the education of his child? How important is parent-teacher interaction?

16. What areas in learning disabilities need improvement? Why?

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

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

□ □ □ □ □
PART IV

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

PART IV—continued

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

□ □ □ □ □

PART V

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

PART VI

Sex _____

Years of Teaching Experience _____

College Attended _____ Degree _____

Present Position _____

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

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 D

FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER

WE REALLY NEED YOUR HELP!!

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

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY: THE AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

by

ELLEN JANE HILL MCQUADE

B. S., Saint Bonaventure University, 1972

AN ABSTRACT OF 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

The Learning Disability Survey was distributed to superintendents, directors of special education, principals, and learning disability teachers throughout the state of Kansas. Students in the learning disability program at Kansas State University also completed the questionnaire. The information gained from the survey will be utilized to modify and improve the learning disability teacher education program at Kansas State University.

The survey was developed over a series of meetings, and it was decided that a 1-5 rating scale, with 1 indicating strong agreement and 5, strong disagreement, would be used for each question. In April, surveys, cover letters, and postage-paid return envelopes were mailed. Since the surveys were given code numbers, it was possible to send follow-up letters to those who had not returned the surveys. The data on the returned surveys was recorded and code numbers were removed. After the information was run through the computer, the survey was divided and each investigator was assigned a part for analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. It is with Part IV of the Learning Disability Survey, The Affective Domain, that this report is concerned.

Questions on the survey dealing with the affective domain were divided into the following four major headings: building and classroom arrangement and structure, control of behavior, teacher's attitude toward the students, and techniques of teaching learning disabled students.

Of the total response from questions concerning the building and classroom arrangement and structure, it seemed that the majority of the people surveyed agreed that the school building should be designed for openness and movement and that the classroom should have several learning centers for an effective arrangement. There seemed to be a slight disagreement that a structured arrangement of rows of desks in a classroom could be effective.

Of the total response from questions dealing with the control of behavior, the majority of the people appeared to agree that the learning disability teacher should exercise firm discipline at all times and should be allowed to use extra privileges, material rewards, and positive verbal reinforcement for controlling behavior. The total group seemed to agree that "noise" is acceptable in the classroom. There was a mixed reaction and no consensus was given as to whether or not a learning disability teacher should use early dismissals from school for controlling behavior.

Concerning the teacher's attitude toward the students, the people surveyed seemed to agree that appearance played an important part in the effectiveness of a teacher and that the learning disability teacher should be a friend to the children, should encourage students to discuss and confide problems, and should teach the student to rely more on himself rather than on the teacher. It was found that slightly more people seemed to believe that a learning disability teacher should not become emotionally involved with the students.

Of the total response from questions concerned with teaching techniques, it appeared that most people agreed that experimentation with new ideas and techniques was desirable, that one of the major goals of instruction should be to facilitate achievement as well as to help students cope with failure, that the learning disability teacher should make objectives known to students prior to instruction and provide immediate feedback to the students about their progress, that the teacher should strive to involve students in decision-making activities relating to their learning and the instructional process, and that students should be allowed to work at their own rate of speed. It was found that the majority of the total number surveyed seemed to disagree that competition with others should be stressed.