

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY: THE JOB OF A LEARNING
DISABILITY TEACHER, IN THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

by

KAREN SUE MUSTOE CROSSLIN

B. S., Kansas State 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
C76
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; Miss Barbara Cave, 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; and the writer's loving husband, Gary Crosslin, who, without his patience, help and understanding would have had a difficult time working on and completing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction	1
2. Procedures	3
3. Findings	6
The Job of the Learning Disability Teacher in the School	8
Desired Amount of Community Involvement of the Learning Disability Teacher	30
4. Conclusions	39
5. Suggestions and Recommendations	42
APPENDIXES	44
A. Final Form of Survey	45
B. Original Open-Ended Questions for the Survey	52
C. First Cover Letter	56
D. Second Cover Letter	58
E. Comments	60
ABSTRACT	62

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Total Group Response to Each Item, Part II: The Job of a Learning Disability Teacher in the School and Community	7
2. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 1	9
3. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 2	11
4. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 3	12
5. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 5	14
6. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 6	15
7. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 7	17
8. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 8	18
9. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 10	19
10. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 12	21
11. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 13	22
12. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 15	23
13. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 16	25
14. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 18	26
15. Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 19	28

16.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 20	29
17.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 4	31
18.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 9	33
19.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 11	34
20.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 14	36
21.	Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by Total and Each Subgroup - Item 17	37

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Learning disabilities is a relatively new field in education. The importance of effectively educating children with learning disabilities has reached the attention of the Kansas State Legislature. As a result of discussion and careful study, the legislature passed a law mandating that every school district in Kansas must provide adequate education for every child with learning disabilities starting July 1, 1974.

In an effort to receive public school input for adding to or modifying the present learning disability program at Kansas State University, it was decided to prepare and conduct a survey in the state of Kansas. The purpose of the survey was to obtain opinions about learning disabilities from each superintendent, director of special education, principal, psychologist, and learning disability teacher in the state of Kansas. University students in the learning disability program at Kansas State University were also sampled. All of the above were asked via a questionnaire what they felt was important in the preparation of teachers in the field of learning disabilities.

The survey was divided in five parts (see Appendix A for copy). Part I dealt with what the emphasis should be in setting up a learning disabilities program, the staffing procedures for placement of a learning disabled child, and the type of learning disability teacher each school would prefer. Part II was concerned with the job of a learning disability teacher in the school and community. Part III dealt with what

kind of training a learning disability teacher needs to do a satisfactory job. Part IV was interested in gaining information about the affective domain - school personnel's attitudes toward the manner in which the learning disability teacher conducts herself and factors that affect the school and classroom environment. Part V of the survey questioned the desirability and effectiveness of various tests associated with learning disabilities, the acceptable case load of the teacher, and the definition of learning disabilities.

The scope of this report is limited to Part II of the survey, in regard to the opinions of the specified school personnel questioned about the job of a learning disability teacher in the school and the community.

Chapter II

PROCEDURES

Work on the survey started in February and required several months of preparation. Information was being sought pertaining to teacher preparation, the type of teacher the school wanted, tests used to identify the learning disabled child, the part appearance played in the hiring of a teacher and other affective behaviors, the importance of instructional materials training, the amount of experience needed for teaching and their knowledge, staffing of a learning disabled child, comparisons of regular teachers and learning disability teachers in certain areas, behavior control, community participation, importance of parent involvement and suggestions for improvement in the field of learning disabilities.

Several kinds of surveys were considered for use. At first it was thought that the most effective way to receive valid input would be by a telephone and/or a written survey. Feedback was sought from superintendents, directors of special education, principals, learning disability teachers, and Kansas State University students enrolled in the learning disability program.

Because of the magnitude of the population to be surveyed, a written survey was decided upon. The final survey was a result of several revisions. The following statements summarize these revisions; The first form of the survey was comprised of sixteen open-ended questions (see Appendix B). It was felt that this would allow the professional personnel to tell the survey team exactly how they felt about the area of learning

disabilities.

After careful examination, the first form of the survey was found to be too general in nature and the results would be very difficult to quantify. The final form of the survey was made more specific. A 1-5 rating scale was utilized, number 1 indicating strong agreement, number 2 indicating agreement, number 3 indicating an undecided response, number 4 indicating disagreement, and number 5 indicating strong disagreement. Statistics concerning each question, how it was answered, and by whom could be easily obtained in this way. The survey was also divided into five parts, each part dealing with a general area, but asking specific questions. On the back of the survey information about the sex of the person, years of teaching experience, colleges attended, degrees received, and present position was obtained.

The next step was to obtain a computer printout from the State Department with the necessary names of the school personnel needed for the survey. Utilizing this printout, each individual survey was coded for the purpose of follow-up letters. A cover letter was printed and hand signed (see Appendix C). In April each person on the computer printout list was sent a survey, cover letter, and a postage paid return envelope. Several classes in learning disabilities, both graduate and undergraduate, were also surveyed.

As the surveys were returned, each name was checked off the list utilizing the code numbers. After two weeks, those people who didn't respond were sent another survey, a new cover letter (see Appendix D), and another postage paid return envelope.

The data received on each returned survey was entered on Fortran key punch data sheets. The code numbers on the original surveys were destroyed, and the data sheets were run through the Kansas State University computer.

Each of the five major parts of the survey was assigned to a specific investigator for data analysis, drawing conclusions, and making recommendations. The scope of this report is limited to the section of the survey dealing with the job of a learning disability teacher in the school and community (Part II).

Chapter III

FINDINGS

The computer was programmed to yield the mode, mean, standard deviation, and total number of respondents to each item of Part II (see Table 1). In the remainder of the tables, the total group was divided into subgroups, which in turn were divided into divisions. They were: the positional subgroup, including psychologists, learning disability teachers, principals, superintendents, directors of special education, and Kansas State University students in the curriculum of learning disabilities; the sex subgroup, including males and females; the educational subgroup, including people holding bachelor, master, master plus, and doctorate level degrees; and the years of experience subgroup, including people with 1 to 3, 4 to 6, 7 to 9, and more than 10 years of experience in the field of education. The information being sought was total group and divisions of the subgroups responses to each question. There was a breakdown of the percentage of responses concerning each rating in the 1 to 5 rating scale utilized in the survey. The chi square value of each subgroup was indicated, with an asterisk placed by those values indicating a significant chi square value at the .05 level of significance. The number of people who answered and did not answer each individual question was recorded.

The percentage of each division in the positional subgroup was found by comparing the number of surveys received to the number of surveys sent. They are as follows: principals - 707 received out of 1652 sent, indicating a 43 percent response; superintendents - 206 received out of 328 sent, indicating a 63 percent response; learning disability teachers - 226 received

Table 1

Total Group Response to Each Item

Part II: The Job of a Learning Disability
Teacher in the School and Community

Item	Mode	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number Responding
1	2.00	2.06	.92	1332
2	2.00	2.32	.96	1333
3	1.00	1.43	.55	1338
4	3.00	2.75	1.13	1330
5	2.00	1.68	.70	1331
6	1.00	1.56	.61	1347
7	4.00	3.11	1.02	1339
8	4.00	3.17	1.13	1351
9	2.00	2.27	.84	1348
10	4.00	3.96	.90	1350
11	3.00	2.76	.91	1341
12	2.00	1.55	.56	1351
13	4.00	3.99	.94	1350
14	3.00	3.28	.89	1340
15	2.00	1.90	.73	1347
16	1.00	1.49	.61	1346
17	2.00	2.12	.79	1342
18	4.00	3.93	.76	1346
19	2.00	2.18	.81	1343
20	2.00	2.44	1.05	1338

out of 274 sent, indicating an 82 percent response; directors of special education - 46 received out of 52 sent, indicating an 88 percent response; school psychologists - 119 received out of 158 sent, indicating a 75 percent response; and the Kansas State University students in the curriculum of learning disabilities - 56 received out of 56 sent, indicating a 100 percent response.

Questions on the survey dealing with school and community involvement of the learning disability teachers were broken into the two major sub-headings of the job of the learning disability teacher in the school (items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20) and the desired amount of involvement the learning disability teacher has in the community (items 4, 9, 11, 14, 17). In this section of the report, numbers 1 and 2 indicate degrees of positive responses, number 3 indicates an undecided response, and numbers 4 and 5 indicate extent of disagreement with the question.

THE JOB OF THE LEARNING DISABILITY TEACHER IN THE SCHOOL

Of the total group response to item 1 of the survey, 75.1% were in strong agreement or agreement that the learning disability teacher should be responsible for administering and interpreting diagnostic tests not required to be given by the school psychologist. A 13.9% response was undecided how to answer (see Table 2). This yielded a mean score of 2.06 (see Table 1). Significant discrepancies in ratings were found within all of the subgroups of positions held, sex of respondent, University degrees held, and years of experience. However, a large percentage

Table 2

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

Item 1

The L.D. teacher should be responsible for administering and interpreting diagnostic tests not required to be given by the school psychologist.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	26.9	48.2	13.9	7.1	1.6	<u>1332</u> 30
0.0000*	Psychologist	39.5	43.7	10.1	5.0	1.7	<u>119</u> 0
	L.D. Teacher	43.7	41.0	7.7	5.9	1.8	<u>222</u> 4
	Principals	21.0	52.3	16.3	9.3	1.2	<u>687</u> 20
	Superintendents	22.3	52.5	16.8	5.4	3.0	<u>202</u> 4
	Directors	30.4	52.2	13.0	4.3	0.0	<u>46</u> 0
	Students	36.4	43.6	14.5	1.8	3.6	<u>55</u> 1
0.0000*	Male	23.4	50.7	16.0	8.5	1.4	<u>939</u> 22
	Female	37.4	46.1	9.9	4.3	2.3	<u>393</u> 8
0.0009*	Bachelors	34.8	49.2	10.6	4.5	0.8	<u>132</u> 1
	Masters	26.7	51.7	12.5	7.6	1.6	<u>817</u> 20
	Masters Plus	29.4	39.2	21.6	7.8	2.0	<u>255</u> 5
	Doctorate	18.2	63.6	10.2	8.0	0.0	<u>88</u> 2
0.0075*	1-3 Years	39.3	41.8	9.8	5.7	3.3	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	36.6	45.5	8.0	8.9	0.9	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	24.4	50.0	17.4	8.1	0.0	<u>86</u> 1
	10 Plus Years	24.3	51.7	15.2	7.3	1.4	<u>913</u> 22

* 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

(68.6% to 84.7%) of all of the divisions within each subgroup agreed or strongly agreed with this question. It is felt that this indicates subgroup positive congruence.

A 61.6% total group response to item 2 was in strong agreement or agreement that a learning disability teacher should organize in-service training programs and workshops and 23.9% (almost one-fourth) were undecided (see Table 3). The mean score of this response was 2.32 (see Table 1). The different subgroups seemed to respond to the question in the same manner as the total group did (ranging in agreement from 59.5% to 72.7%). The only subgroup that seemed to show discrepancies concerned the years of experience, and that appeared to be caused by the fact that the people with the most experience were more undecided in their responses than were the others.

The total group gave a 96.9% response of strong agreement and agreement to item 3 that the learning disability teacher should help parents understand their child's difficulties (see Table 4). This yielded a mean score of 1.43 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the sex and educational subgroups. The positional and years of experience subgroups showed significant discrepancies. A large percentage (96.4% to 99.0%) of all of the divisions within the subgroups agreed or strongly agreed with this question. The main significant discrepancy in the positional subgroup seemed to be that the students more strongly agreed than any other division. In the years of experience subgroup, the range of 1 to 3 years was more strongly in agreement with the question than were the other age ranges.

The statement in item 5 that the learning disability teacher should

Table 3

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

Item 2

A L.D. teacher should organize
in-service training programs
and workshops.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	19.1	42.5	23.9	10.8	1.5	$\frac{1333}{29}$
0.0518	Psychologist	22.0	41.5	17.8	16.1	2.5	$\frac{118}{1}$
	L.D. Teacher	25.3	44.8	19.9	8.1	1.8	$\frac{227}{5}$
	Principals	16.9	42.9	28.5	10.6	1.2	$\frac{688}{19}$
	Superintendents	18.1	44.1	22.5	12.3	2.9	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	19.6	45.7	19.6	15.2	0.0	$\frac{46}{0}$
	Students	29.1	43.6	18.2	9.1	0.0	$\frac{55}{1}$
0.2940	Male	18.1	43.7	25.5	11.2	1.6	$\frac{941}{20}$
	Female	23.0	42.9	21.9	10.7	1.5	$\frac{392}{9}$
0.4007	Bachelors	24.2	43.9	22.0	9.1	0.8	$\frac{132}{1}$
	Masters	18.3	44.7	25.0	10.3	1.7	$\frac{819}{18}$
	Masters Plus	21.3	38.7	26.9	11.9	1.2	$\frac{253}{7}$
	Doctorate	15.7	43.8	20.2	18.0	2.2	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.0157*	1-3 Years	26.2	45.1	18.9	7.4	2.5	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	26.8	42.0	17.0	11.6	2.7	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	24.4	47.7	19.8	8.1	0.0	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	16.5	43.4	27.0	11.7	1.3	$\frac{914}{25}$

* 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 3

The L.D. teacher should help
parents understand their
child's difficulties.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	57.9	39.0	1.0	0.2	0.1	<u>1338</u> 74
0.0084*	Psychologist	63.9	34.5	0.8	0.8	0.0	<u>119</u> 0
	L.D. Teacher	67.1	31.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	<u>222</u> 4
	Principals	55.9	43.0	1.0	0.0	0.1	<u>691</u> 16
	Superintendents	53.9	44.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	<u>204</u> 7
	Directors	52.2	45.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	<u>46</u> 0
	Students	78.2	18.2	1.8	1.8	0.0	<u>55</u> 1
0.3901	Male	57.3	41.4	1.1	0.2	0.1	<u>943</u> 18
	Female	62.8	35.7	1.0	0.3	0.3	<u>395</u> 6
0.2975	Bachelors	66.7	31.1	1.5	0.0	0.8	<u>132</u> 1
	Masters	57.5	41.4	0.7	0.2	0.1	<u>822</u> 15
	Masters Plus	60.8	37.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	<u>255</u> 5
	Doctorate	53.9	44.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	<u>89</u> 1
0.0005*	1-3 Years	73.8	23.8	1.6	0.0	0.8	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	65.2	31.3	2.7	0.9	0.0	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	67.4	31.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	<u>86</u> 1
	10 Plus Years	55.1	43.9	0.9	0.1	0.1	<u>919</u> 20

* 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

express feelings openly to administrators was strongly agreed and agreed upon by 88.8% of the total group (see Table 5). A mean score of 1.68 was obtained from this response (see Table 1). The different divisions within the subgroups seemed to respond in the same manner as the total group did (ranging from 82.6% to 95.5%). A significant discrepancy seemed to show that a higher percentage of directors didn't agree as strongly as the rest of the divisions. Those with the doctorate level of education had a higher percentage of agreement than did any of the other divisions.

Of the total group response to item 6, 94.7% strongly agreed or agreed that the learning disability teacher should inform parents of their progress or lack of progress (see Table 6). The mean score for this question was 1.56 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the sex and educational subgroups, but the positional and years of experience subgroups showed significant discrepancies. A large percentage (93.2% to 98.2%) of all the divisions within the subgroups agreed or strongly agreed with this question. A greater percentage of learning disability teachers gave a stronger response than did any of the other divisions, while the superintendents didn't seem to be inclined to give the strongest response, but did agree. The doctorate level didn't appear to advocate the question as much as the others, but still tended to highly agree. The more years of experience a person had, the more he was inclined to agree rather than strongly agree.

A 38.9% total group response to item 7 disagreed or strongly disagreed that a physical education teacher and not the learning disability teacher should be responsible for working on motor coordination and muscle control problems in learning disabled children, while 26.2% strongly agreed

Table 5

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

Item 5

The L.D. teacher should express feelings openly to administrators.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	42.2	46.6	7.0	1.7	0.1	<u>1331</u> 31
0.0053	Psychologist	35.6	48.3	13.6	2.5	0.0	<u>118</u> 1
	L.D. Teacher	38.2	45.5	12.3	4.1	0.0	<u>220</u> 6
	Principals	45.8	47.1	5.7	1.2	0.3	<u>690</u> 17
	Superintendents	46.0	49.5	3.5	1.0	0.0	<u>202</u> 4
	Directors	33.3	57.8	6.7	2.2	0.0	<u>45</u> 1
	Students	45.5	47.3	7.3	0.0	0.0	<u>55</u> 1
0.0000*	Male	45.5	48.6	4.8	1.1	0.1	<u>939</u> 22
	Female	37.8	45.7	13.0	3.3	0.3	<u>392</u> 9
0.0080*	Bachelors	36.4	46.2	11.4	6.1	0.0	<u>132</u> 1
	Masters	44.7	48.0	6.3	1.0	0.1	<u>815</u> 22
	Masters Plus	43.0	45.3	9.0	2.3	0.4	<u>256</u> 4
	Doctorate	40.4	52.8	5.6	1.1	0.0	<u>89</u> 1
0.0126*	1-3 Years	39.3	47.5	9.0	4.1	0.0	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	43.6	39.1	16.4	0.9	0.0	<u>110</u> 3
	7-9 Years	41.9	50.0	4.7	3.5	0.0	<u>86</u> 1
	10 Plus Years	43.6	48.7	6.0	1.4	0.2	<u>915</u> 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 6

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

Item 6

The L.D. teacher should
inform parents of their
progress or lack of pro-
gress.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	48.9	45.8	3.5	0.4	0.3	<u>1347</u> 15
0.0225*	Psychologist	55.9	37.3	5.9	0.8	0.0	<u>118</u> 1
	L.D. Teacher	60.4	36.4	2.2	0.0	0.9	<u>225</u> 1
	Principals	46.6	48.9	3.9	0.4	0.3	<u>698</u> 9
	Superintendents	44.6	52.5	2.9	0.0	0.0	<u>204</u> 2
	Directors	45.5	47.7	6.8	0.0	0.0	<u>44</u> 2
	Students	48.2	50.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	<u>56</u> 0
0.2100	Male	47.7	48.3	3.5	0.3	0.2	<u>948</u> 13
	Female	53.6	41.6	3.8	0.5	0.5	<u>399</u> 2
0.7976	Bachelors	48.9	47.4	2.3	0.8	0.8	<u>133</u> 0
	Masters	49.2	46.5	3.5	0.5	0.4	<u>830</u> 7
	Masters Plus	51.8	43.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	<u>255</u> 5
	Doctorate	45.5	51.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	<u>88</u> 2
0.0022*	1-3 Years	62.3	32.8	2.5	1.6	0.8	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	58.9	35.7	5.1	0.0	0.0	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	53.6	40.5	4.8	0.0	1.2	<u>84</u> 3
	10 Plus Years	45.9	50.1	3.6	0.3	0.2	<u>929</u> 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

or agreed. An undecided response of 33.3% was given (see Table 7). This yielded a mean score of 3.11 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the subgroups concerning education attained, sex or years of experience, but there were significant discrepancies in the positional subgroups. The divisions within each subgroup yielded responses that were consistent with the total group findings. There were significant discrepancies concerning the learning disability teachers as there was a higher percentage in agreement with the question than disagreement. A higher percentage of superintendents were undecided than held disagreements. Students had the highest percentage of disagreement (51.7%) than any of the other positions.

A 48% total group response to item 8 strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that the learning disability teacher should handle most learning disability matters without administrative consultation, 35% agreed, and 16.2% responding undecided (see Table 8). This yielded a mean score of 3.17 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the educational, sex, and years of experience subgroups, but there were significant discrepancies within the positional subgroup. Learning disability teachers had a higher percentage of agreement with the question (44.2%) than they did disagreement (38.8%). The bachelor degree division also agreed more with the question (44.0%) than disagreed (38.7%).

The statement in item 10 concerning the only school involvement expected of the learning disability teacher should be teaching the child was strongly disagreed and disagreed by 79.5% of the total group and 11.7% were undecided (see Table 9). A mean score of 3.96 was obtained from these responses (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies

Table 7Percentage of Responses for 1-5 by
Total and Each SubgroupItem 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.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	7.5	18.7	33.3	33.5	5.4	<u>1339</u> 23
0.0142*	Psychologist	7.8	22.1	28.8	31.1	4.1	<u>115</u> 4
	L.D. Teacher	14.0	22.1	28.8	31.1	4.1	<u>222</u> 4
	Principals	6.2	18.2	35.7	33.6	6.3	<u>694</u> 13
	Superintendents	5.9	20.5	38.5	32.7	2.4	<u>205</u> 1
	Directors	6.7	11.1	35.6	35.6	11.1	<u>45</u> 1
	Students	7.1	16.1	25.0	44.6	7.1	<u>56</u> 0
0.0990	Male	6.8	18.8	35.8	33.0	5.6	<u>945</u> 16
	Female	9.6	19.5	29.2	36.5	5.1	<u>394</u> 7
0.1164	Bachelors	10.6	20.5	25.8	39.4	3.8	<u>132</u> 1
	Masters	6.4	19.1	35.7	33.0	5.8	<u>827</u> 10
	Masters Plus	9.1	22.9	32.8	31.6	3.6	<u>253</u> 7
	Doctorate	6.8	11.4	35.2	38.6	8.0	<u>88</u> 2
0.3097	1-3 Years	10.0	23.3	29.2	32.5	5.0	<u>120</u> 2
	4-6 Years	8.2	20.9	27.3	35.5	8.2	<u>110</u> 3
	7-9 Years	4.6	14.9	33.3	37.9	9.2	<u>87</u> 0
	10 Plus Years	7.4	19.0	36.4	32.7	4.6	<u>923</u> 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 8

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

Item 8

The L.D. teacher should
handle most L.D. matters
without administrative
consultation.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	5.6	29.4	16.2	38.2	9.8	<u>1351</u> 11
0.0321*	Psychologist	4.2	31.9	12.6	39.5	11.8	<u>119</u> 0
	L.D. Teacher	10.3	33.9	17.0	33.0	5.8	<u>224</u> 2
	Principals	4.9	29.1	16.1	40.6	9.3	<u>700</u> 7
	Superintendents	3.9	26.0	16.7	38.2	15.2	<u>204</u> 2
	Directors	4.3	28.3	28.3	28.3	10.9	<u>46</u> 0
	Students	5.4	30.4	14.3	41.1	8.9	<u>56</u> 0
0.0957	Male	4.8	28.4	17.1	39.7	10.0	<u>954</u> 7
	Female	7.6	32.7	14.6	35.5	9.6	<u>397</u> 4
0.6318	Bachelors	7.6	36.4	17.4	32.6	6.1	<u>132</u> 1
	Masters	5.4	29.7	16.1	39.2	9.5	<u>831</u> 6
	Masters Plus	6.2	27.1	15.5	39.5	11.6	<u>258</u> 2
	Doctorate	3.4	32.6	19.1	37.1	7.9	<u>89</u> 1
0.1162	1-3 Years	9.1	31.4	15.7	36.4	7.4	<u>121</u> 1
	4-6 Years	6.3	33.0	16.1	37.5	7.1	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	0.0	41.4	20.7	29.9	8.0	<u>87</u> 0
	10 Plus Years	5.8	28.0	16.4	39.2	10.5	<u>931</u> 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

Table 9

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

Item 10

The only school involvement
expected of the L.D. teacher
should be teaching the
child.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.3	5.4	11.7	54.4	25.1	<u>1350</u> 12
0.0699	Psychologist	1.7	8.5	9.4	59.0	21.4	<u>117</u> 7
	L.D. Teacher	5.8	4.9	12.4	53.1	23.9	<u>226</u> 0
	Principals	1.3	5.6	11.6	55.9	25.6	<u>700</u> 7
	Superintendents	2.9	3.9	9.3	56.4	27.5	<u>204</u> 2
	Directors	2.2	6.7	13.3	51.1	26.7	<u>45</u> 1
	Students	1.8	5.4	26.8	39.3	26.8	<u>56</u> 0
0.0504	Male	2.0	4.8	10.6	56.5	25.9	<u>952</u> 9
	Female	3.3	7.0	14.8	51.0	23.9	<u>398</u> 3
0.3060	Bachelors	5.3	9.0	14.3	52.6	18.8	<u>133</u> 0
	Masters	1.6	5.0	11.3	56.0	26.0	<u>832</u> 5
	Masters Plus	3.5	5.1	12.2	52.9	26.3	<u>255</u> 5
	Doctorate	2.2	4.5	9.0	58.4	25.8	<u>89</u> 1
0.0635	1-3 Years	3.3	5.7	13.9	54.9	22.1	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	5.4	8.9	6.3	53.6	25.0	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	2.3	3.5	16.3	54.7	23.3	<u>86</u> 1
	10 Plus Years	2.0	5.1	11.7	55.2	26.0	<u>930</u> 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

in the 4 subgroups.

Of the total group surveyed, 97.3% strongly agreed or agreed to item 12 that the learning disability teacher should suggest ways for the parents to help the child (see Table 10). These results produced a mean score of 1.55 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the positional, sex, or educational subgroups, but there were significant discrepancies concerning the years of experience. People with less experience and less degree levels tended to agree more strongly than did people with more experience and higher level degrees.

An 80.9% total group response strongly disagreed or disagreed in item 13 that the learning disability teacher should work relatively independent of other teachers (see Table 11). A mean score of 3.99 was yielded from this (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the educational subgroup but there were significant discrepancies in the positional, sex, and years of experience subgroups. A greater percentage of principals agreed (13.2%) with this question than the other people in this division, but there was still a greater percentage that disagreed. Students tended to disagree more strongly than did the other people in the division. The range of experience of 4 to 6 years had a higher percentage of strong disagreement than did the other divisions.

It was found that 84.4% of the total group strongly agreed or agreed in item 15 that the learning disability teacher should encourage parents to become involved in school and/or class activities while 11.8% were undecided (see Table 12). These resulted in a mean score of 1.90 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the sex, educational or years of experience subgroups, but there were significant discrepancies

Table 10

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

Item 12

The L.D. teacher should
suggest ways for the parents
to help the child.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	46.8	50.5	1.5	0.1	0.2	<u>1351</u> 11
0.2064	Psychologist	55.1	42.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	<u>118</u> 1
	L.D. Teacher	53.5	43.4	2.7	0.4	0.0	<u>226</u> 0
	Principals	44.0	54.1	1.3	0.1	0.4	<u>700</u> 7
	Superintendents	43.1	56.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	<u>204</u> 2
	Directors	46.7	51.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	<u>45</u> 1
	Students	58.9	39.3	1.8	0.0	0.0	<u>56</u> 0
0.3468	Male	45.8	52.4	1.5	0.1	0.3	<u>953</u> 8
	Female	50.5	47.5	1.8	0.3	0.0	<u>398</u> 3
0.8385	Bachelors	51.9	45.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	<u>133</u> 0
	Masters	47.1	51.0	1.4	0.1	0.4	<u>831</u> 6
	Masters Plus	44.9	53.1	1.6	0.4	0.0	<u>256</u> 4
	Doctorate	40.0	57.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	<u>90</u> 0
0.0076*	1-3 Years	59.0	39.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	<u>122</u> 0
	4-6 Years	54.5	41.1	3.6	0.9	0.0	<u>112</u> 1
	7-9 Years	54.7	43.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	<u>86</u> 1
	10 Plus Years	43.3	55.0	1.3	0.1	0.3	<u>931</u> 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

Table 11

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

Item 13

The L.D. teacher should work
relatively independent of
other teachers.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	1.8	8.7	7.7	51.7	29.2	$\frac{1350}{17}$
0.0003*	Psychologist	1.7	6.7	3.4	52.9	35.3	$\frac{119}{0}$
	L.D. Teacher	1.3	8.0	7.6	44.4	38.7	$\frac{225}{1}$
	Principals	2.1	11.1	9.1	53.2	24.4	$\frac{701}{6}$
	Superintendents	1.5	5.9	6.4	58.4	27.7	$\frac{202}{4}$
	Directors	0.0	2.2	2.2	60.0	35.6	$\frac{45}{1}$
	Students	3.6	1.8	8.9	39.3	46.4	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0375*	Male	1.8	8.6	7.5	54.8	27.3	$\frac{952}{8}$
	Female	2.0	9.0	8.5	45.7	34.7	$\frac{398}{3}$
0.2302	Bachelors	0.8	9.1	12.9	46.2	31.1	$\frac{132}{1}$
	Masters	1.4	9.4	8.1	52.6	28.5	$\frac{831}{6}$
	Masters Plus	3.1	7.8	4.7	53.9	30.5	$\frac{256}{4}$
	Doctorate	2.2	5.6	6.7	54.4	31.1	$\frac{90}{0}$
0.0006*	1-3 Years	3.3	3.3	6.6	48.4	38.5	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	3.6	8.9	8.9	38.4	40.2	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	2.3	2.3	14.0	53.5	27.9	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	1.5	10.3	7.3	54.1	26.8	$\frac{930}{9}$

* 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 12

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

Item 15

The L.D. teacher should encourage parents to become involved in school and/or class activities.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	28.3	56.1	11.8	2.1	0.6	$\frac{1347}{15}$
0.0303*	Psychologist	29.9	58.1	11.1	0.9	0.0	$\frac{117}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	30.7	48.4	16.4	2.7	1.8	$\frac{225}{1}$
	Principals	29.3	57.7	10.7	1.9	0.4	$\frac{700}{7}$
	Superintendents	24.6	62.6	10.8	2.0	0.0	$\frac{203}{3}$
	Directors	15.9	68.2	9.1	6.8	0.0	$\frac{44}{2}$
	Students	32.1	44.6	17.9	3.6	1.8	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0641	Male	28.8	58.0	10.8	2.0	0.3	$\frac{950}{11}$
	Female	28.0	53.7	14.6	2.5	1.3	$\frac{397}{4}$
0.5644	Bachelors	26.3	55.6	14.3	2.3	1.5	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	29.6	55.3	12.3	2.2	0.6	$\frac{830}{7}$
	Masters Plus	25.7	62.8	9.5	2.0	0.0	$\frac{253}{7}$
	Doctorate	26.7	60.0	10.0	3.3	0.0	$\frac{90}{0}$
0.4135	1-3 Years	35.2	48.4	14.8	1.6	0.0	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	28.2	52.7	16.4	1.8	0.9	$\frac{110}{3}$
	7-9 Years	32.6	53.5	9.3	3.5	1.2	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	26.9	59.2	11.3	2.2	0.4	$\frac{929}{10}$

* 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

in the positional subgroup. The students more strongly agreed with the question than did the other people in the subgroup. They also had a higher percentage of indecisiveness than did the others.

Of the total group surveyed in item 16, 95.8% responded in agreement or strong agreement that the learning disability teacher should regularly consult with the regular classroom teacher regarding learning disability matters pertaining to one of the children in her room (see Table 13). This yielded a mean score of 1.49 (see Table 1). The sex and educational subgroups showed no significant discrepancies but there were significant discrepancies in the positional and years of experience subgroups. The differences of percentages in the principals agreement and strong agreement with the question was the smallest of any in that division (4.3%), while the students responded with the widest difference (50%). The smaller number of years experience, the stronger they agreed, and the larger number of years experience, the more they agreed with a number 2 rating.

A 78.7% strong disagreement or disagreement response to item 18 was made concerning the learning disability teacher having no duties directly involved with tests or testing procedures, while 14.9% were undecided (see Table 14). A mean score of 3.93 was obtained (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the years of experience subgroup, but the positional, sex and educational subgroups did show significant discrepancies. The principals had a smaller percent of disagreement (74.8%) than did the others in that division and they also had the highest percentage of indecisiveness (18.5%). The males and females were practically equal in their percentage of disagreement with the

Table 13

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

Item 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.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	54.6	41.2	2.1	0.7	0.3	$\frac{1346}{16}$
0.0086*	Psychologist	61.2	36.2	0.9	1.7	0.0	$\frac{116}{3}$
	L.D. Teacher	65.8	32.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	$\frac{225}{1}$
	Principals	50.2	45.9	2.9	0.6	0.4	$\frac{699}{8}$
	Superintendents	51.5	46.6	2.0	0.0	0.0	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	59.1	38.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	$\frac{44}{2}$
	Students	73.2	23.2	1.8	1.8	0.0	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0511	Male	53.4	43.6	2.2	0.4	0.4	$\frac{950}{11}$
	Female	59.6	37.1	2.0	1.3	0.0	$\frac{396}{5}$
0.5969	Bachelors	60.9	36.1	1.5	0.8	0.8	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	53.7	43.5	1.9	0.6	0.4	$\frac{833}{4}$
	Masters Plus	57.6	39.2	2.4	0.8	0.0	$\frac{250}{10}$
	Doctorate	48.3	47.2	4.5	0.0	0.0	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.0003*	1-3 Years	75.4	23.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	64.9	32.4	1.8	0.0	0.9	$\frac{111}{2}$
	7-9 Years	59.3	37.2	2.3	1.2	0.0	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	51.1	45.7	2.4	0.5	0.2	$\frac{927}{12}$

* 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 14

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

Item 18

The L.D. teacher should
have no duties directly
involved with tests or
testing procedures.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	0.6	4.6	14.9	60.1	18.6	$\frac{1346}{16}$
0.0001*	Psychologist	0.0	6.0	8.5	64.1	21.4	$\frac{117}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	0.4	2.7	11.1	54.7	31.1	$\frac{225}{1}$
	Principals	1.0	5.6	18.5	60.6	14.2	$\frac{698}{9}$
	Superintendents	0.0	3.4	13.2	68.6	14.7	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	0.0	4.5	9.1	52.3	34.1	$\frac{44}{2}$
	Students	0.0	1.8	14.3	58.9	25.0	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0002*	Male	0.6	5.2	15.0	63.5	15.6	$\frac{949}{11}$
	Female	0.5	3.3	15.4	54.4	26.4	$\frac{397}{4}$
0.0438	Bachelors	0.0	3.0	12.8	54.9	29.3	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	0.5	4.9	15.7	60.3	18.4	$\frac{832}{5}$
	Masters Plus	1.6	5.2	15.5	62.2	15.5	$\frac{251}{9}$
	Doctorate	0.0	2.2	6.7	73.0	18.0	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.1606	1-3 Years	0.0	3.3	9.0	57.4	30.3	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	0.9	3.6	13.4	58.9	23.2	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	0.0	7.0	16.3	64.0	12.8	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	0.8	4.5	15.9	61.3	17.4	$\frac{926}{13}$

* 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

question, but they were also practically equal in percentage of indecisiveness, which was fairly high (15% and 15.4%). The doctorate degrees had a very high percentage of disagreement with the question (91.0%) and the lowest percentage of the other three ratings.

The statement in item 19 that the learning disability teacher should visit with the parents in their home was agreed or strongly agreed upon by 68.4% of the responses, with 25.2% (one-fourth) of all the responses undecided (see Table 15). This yielded a mean score of 2.18 (see Table 1). There were significant discrepancies in all 4 subgroups of the survey. A greater percentage of directors and superintendents agreed with this question than did the other people in the division. Learning disability teachers were more indecisive than any others. Males had a greater percentage of agreement (73.7%) than did females (59.0%), while females tended to be more indecisive. Bachelor degrees responded with a smaller percentage of agreement to the question than the other divisions did, but had a higher percentage of indecisiveness. People with less years of teaching experience agreed less and were more indecisive than were the other divisions. Those with more than 10 years experience responded with a higher percentage of agreement to the question and a lesser percentage of indecisiveness.

Of the total group surveyed, 56.8% agreed or strongly agreed to item 20 that it was important for the learning disability teacher to belong to professional teacher organizations. A 28.0% response was undecided (see Table 16). A mean score of 2.44 was yielded (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the educational or years of experience subgroups, but there were significant discrepancies in the positional and sex subgroups. There was a small difference in the percent of agreement

Table 15

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

Item 19

The L.D. teacher should
visit with the parents in
their home.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	18.6	49.8	25.2	4.1	0.9	$\frac{1343}{19}$
0.0000*	Psychologist	12.0	43.6	35.0	6.8	2.6	$\frac{117}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	12.5	41.5	38.8	6.3	0.9	$\frac{224}{2}$
	Principals	21.1	53.1	22.8	2.4	0.6	$\frac{697}{10}$
	Superintendents	19.6	57.4	16.7	5.9	0.5	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	16.3	58.1	18.6	7.0	0.0	$\frac{43}{3}$
	Students	30.4	37.5	25.0	3.6	3.6	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0000*	Male	21.1	52.6	21.8	3.7	0.7	$\frac{948}{13}$
	Female	13.7	45.3	34.4	5.3	1.3	$\frac{395}{6}$
0.0423*	Bachelors	16.5	41.4	36.1	4.5	1.5	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	18.9	52.4	23.2	4.7	0.8	$\frac{832}{5}$
	Masters Plus	19.7	45.8	30.1	3.6	0.8	$\frac{249}{11}$
	Doctorate	14.8	63.6	18.2	2.3	1.1	$\frac{88}{2}$
0.0000*	1-3 Years	15.6	34.4	40.2	8.2	1.6	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	15.0	44.2	34.2	5.3	0.9	$\frac{113}{0}$
	7-9 Years	25.6	40.7	29.1	4.7	0.0	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	18.9	54.8	22.0	3.5	0.9	$\frac{922}{17}$

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

Table 16

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

Item 20

It is important for the
L.D. teacher to belong to
professional teacher
organizations.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	18.2	37.6	28.0	9.8	4.6	$\frac{1338}{24}$
0.0000*	Psychologist	14.7	45.7	29.3	10.3	0.0	$\frac{116}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	26.8	38.4	21.9	9.4	3.6	$\frac{224}{2}$
	Principals	17.7	39.4	29.1	10.0	3.8	$\frac{693}{14}$
	Superintendents	8.8	28.9	35.8	13.2	13.2	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	20.9	41.9	27.9	4.7	4.7	$\frac{43}{3}$
	Students	35.7	39.3	21.4	3.6	0.0	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0000*	Male	16.0	35.7	31.3	11.1	5.8	$\frac{943}{18}$
	Female	24.6	44.3	22.0	7.1	2.0	$\frac{395}{6}$
0.6918	Bachelors	18.9	38.6	29.5	7.6	5.3	$\frac{132}{1}$
	Masters	17.3	39.2	27.6	11.5	4.4	$\frac{826}{11}$
	Masters Plus	20.0	34.8	30.8	8.0	6.4	$\frac{250}{10}$
	Doctorate	16.9	42.7	29.2	7.9	3.4	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.2306	1-3 Years	15.6	36.9	29.5	14.8	3.3	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	17.0	33.0	35.7	7.1	7.1	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	24.4	29.1	31.4	12.8	2.3	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	18.0	39.3	27.5	9.9	5.2	$\frac{920}{19}$

* 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

and indecisiveness to the question in the superintendent's responses, while students had the largest percentage in agreement and the smallest in indecisiveness. A greater percentage of females (68.9%) than males (51.7%) agreed upon the question, but the males were more indecisive than the females.

DESIRED AMOUNT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT OF THE LEARNING DISABILITY TEACHER

Of the total group surveyed in item 4, 40% agreed or strongly agreed that the learning disability teacher should live in the community where she teaches. There was a 32.7% undecided response concerning that statement (see Table 17). This yielded a mean score of 2.75 (see Table 1).

There were no significant discrepancies in the educational subgroup, but there were significant discrepancies in the positional, sex, and years of experience subgroups. The psychologists had a higher percentage of disagreement with the question than any other position. The learning disability teachers had practically equal percentages on all 3 ratings. The superintendents had the highest percentage of agreement (54.9%) and the lowest percentage of disagreement (15.4%). The highest percentage of directors felt undecided about the question. A higher percentage of males agreed with the question than females, but the females had a higher percentage of indecisiveness and disagreement. Those with the fewest number years of experience had a higher percentage of disagreement and lowest percentage of agreement with the question than did the other divisions, while the 7 to 9 years had the highest percentage of agreement and smallest percentage of disagreement.

Table 17

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

Item 4

The L.D. teacher should live
in the community where she
teaches.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	15.2	24.8	32.7	18.7	6.2	$\frac{1330}{32}$
0.0000*	Psychologist	2.6	21.4	35.9	29.9	10.3	$\frac{117}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	10.5	22.3	34.1	24.1	9.1	$\frac{220}{6}$
	Principals	18.3	25.0	32.8	17.9	6.1	$\frac{689}{18}$
	Superintendents	18.3	36.6	29.7	13.9	1.5	$\frac{202}{4}$
	Directors	10.9	13.0	43.5	17.4	15.2	$\frac{46}{0}$
	Students	23.6	20.0	40.0	14.5	1.8	$\frac{55}{1}$
0.0000*	Male	17.7	28.1	31.7	16.6	5.9	$\frac{938}{23}$
	Female	10.5	18.9	37.8	25.3	7.7	$\frac{392}{9}$
0.7208	Bachelors	11.5	29.0	33.6	19.8	6.1	$\frac{131}{7}$
	Masters	15.7	24.5	33.7	19.6	6.4	$\frac{815}{22}$
	Masters Plus	18.4	24.7	31.8	18.0	7.1	$\frac{255}{5}$
	Doctorate	7.9	27.0	38.2	21.3	5.6	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.0000*	1-3 Years	5.8	19.0	33.1	30.6	11.6	$\frac{121}{1}$
	4-6 Years	13.6	20.0	28.2	25.5	12.7	$\frac{110}{3}$
	7-9 Years	20.9	26.7	33.7	14.0	4.7	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	16.5	27.4	33.5	17.6	5.0	$\frac{914}{25}$

* 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

The statement in item 9 that the learning disability teacher should become involved in community affairs was agreed or strongly agreed upon by 64.4% of the total group surveyed. A 27.5% response was undecided about the question (see Table 18). A mean score of 2.27 was obtained (see Table 1). There were significant discrepancies in all the subgroups with a range of responses from 51.8% to 75% in agreement with the question. The superintendents responded with the highest percentage of agreement with the question and by far the lowest percentage of indecisiveness. The learning disability teachers had the lowest percentage of responses in this subgroup and the highest percentage of disagreement with the question. The psychologist seemed to be the most indecisive in the subgroup. Males had a much higher percentage of positive response to the question than females, while females were more indecisive in their responses. The two extremes of degree levels appear to be more indecisive than the middle levels and the doctorate level expressed the highest percentage of agreement in that subgroup.

Of the total group surveyed, 40.5% agreed or strongly agreed with item 11 that the learning disability teacher should help sponsor youth activities, but there was also a 39.3% undecided response concerning that question (see Table 19). This yielded a mean score of 2.76 (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies in the educational and years of experience subgroups but there were significant discrepancies in the positional and sex subgroups. This question, after a look at the total percentages in each subgroup, had a high percentage of undecided responses. The psychologists, learning disability teachers, directors and students responded undecidedly with a higher percentage than was their agreement

Table 18

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

Item 9

The L.D. teacher should be-
come involved in community
affairs.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	16.2	48.2	27.5	6.2	1.0	$\frac{1348}{14}$
0.0001*	Psychologist	11.2	44.0	35.3	8.6	0.9	$\frac{116}{3}$
	L.D. Teacher	10.8	42.6	31.8	12.6	2.2	$\frac{223}{3}$
	Principals	18.1	49.4	27.7	4.3	0.6	$\frac{701}{6}$
	Superintendents	19.6	55.4	17.6	6.4	1.0	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	8.7	50.0	34.8	6.5	0.0	$\frac{46}{0}$
	Students	19.6	48.2	28.6	1.8	1.8	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0000*	Male	18.1	52.1	24.4	4.5	0.9	$\frac{951}{10}$
	Female	12.1	40.6	35.8	10.6	1.0	$\frac{397}{4}$
0.0103*	Bachelors	12.0	39.8	34.6	10.5	3.0	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	15.9	51.9	25.7	5.6	0.8	$\frac{828}{9}$
	Masters Plus	19.4	43.4	29.5	7.4	0.4	$\frac{258}{2}$
	Doctorate	12.5	47.7	34.1	4.5	1.1	$\frac{88}{2}$
0.0049*	1-3 Years	9.9	44.6	30.6	12.4	2.5	$\frac{121}{1}$
	4-6 Years	10.9	43.6	32.7	10.9	1.8	$\frac{110}{3}$
	7-9 Years	21.8	43.7	27.6	5.7	1.1	$\frac{87}{0}$
	10 Plus Years	17.4	49.9	27.0	5.1	0.6	$\frac{930}{9}$

* 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 19

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

Item 11

The L.D. teacher should help
sponsor youth activities.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	5.6	34.9	39.3	14.8	3.9	$\frac{1341}{21}$
0.0000*	Psychologist	1.7	31.6	41.0	21.4	4.3	$\frac{117}{7}$
	L.D. Teacher	2.2	23.7	46.0	19.6	8.5	$\frac{224}{7}$
	Principals	7.2	36.4	39.9	14.0	2.6	$\frac{695}{17}$
	Superintendents	6.4	48.5	31.2	9.9	4.0	$\frac{202}{4}$
	Directors	6.7	33.3	42.2	17.8	0.0	$\frac{45}{1}$
	Students	5.4	33.9	41.1	14.3	5.4	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0000*	Male	6.6	39.0	38.6	13.2	2.6	$\frac{949}{17}$
	Female	3.3	26.8	43.1	19.6	7.1	$\frac{392}{9}$
0.4499	Bachelors	3.0	32.6	43.2	16.7	4.5	$\frac{132}{1}$
	Masters	6.3	36.5	38.8	15.2	3.2	$\frac{824}{13}$
	Masters Plus	5.5	31.8	42.0	16.1	4.7	$\frac{255}{5}$
	Doctorate	4.5	42.7	36.0	10.1	6.7	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.0591	1-3 Years	3.3	30.6	45.5	17.4	3.3	$\frac{121}{1}$
	4-6 Years	1.8	31.3	46.4	15.2	5.4	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	5.9	22.4	47.1	20.0	4.7	$\frac{85}{2}$
	10 Plus Years	6.6	38.0	37.5	14.2	3.7	$\frac{923}{16}$

* 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

or disagreement percentage. Learning disability teachers disagreed more than agreed with the question. Males had a higher percentage of agreement with the question than females, but the females were more undecided and disagreed with a higher percentage. People holding bachelor degrees were more undecided than any of the other divisions within the educational subgroup. Only the more advanced years of experience (10 plus) agreed more than they were undecided with the question, while all of the other divisions within that subgroup had a higher percentage of indecisiveness.

It was agreed or strongly agreed by 35% of the total group surveyed in item 14 that the learning disability teacher should sponsor adult activities, but 48.7% were undecided upon how to respond (see Table 20). A mean score of 3.28 was obtained (see Table 1). There were no significant discrepancies among the divisions in the 4 subgroups of this part.

Of the total group surveyed in item 17, 70.9% agreed or strongly agreed that the learning disability teacher should speak at community functions and 24.5% were undecided how to respond (see Table 21). This yielded a mean score of 2.12 (see Table 1). There were significant discrepancies in all 4 subgroups, with a range of percentages in agreement with the question from 57.2% to 84.3%. The directors had 0% of disagreement with the question while the superintendents had the highest percentage of agreement and the lowest percentage of indecisiveness in this subgroup. The students appeared to agree less and be more undecided about that question than the other divisions. Males were in greater agreement than females, while the females tended to respond with more indecisiveness. People with bachelor degrees seem to feel less agreement and more indecisiveness about the question than did the others in that subgroup.

Table 20

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

Item 14

The L.D. teacher should sponsor adult activities.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	2.4	12.3	48.7	25.8	9.2	$\frac{1340}{22}$
0.0518	Psychologist	2.5	13.6	44.1	29.7	10.2	$\frac{118}{1}$
	L.D. Teacher	2.2	10.3	51.6	24.7	11.2	$\frac{223}{3}$
	Principals	2.6	13.7	48.6	27.3	7.8	$\frac{695}{12}$
	Superintendents	2.0	8.9	55.7	22.7	10.8	$\frac{203}{3}$
	Directors	2.3	15.9	36.4	34.1	11.4	$\frac{44}{2}$
	Students	3.6	12.7	50.9	20.0	12.7	$\frac{55}{1}$
0.0705	Male	2.0	13.5	50.1	26.0	8.4	$\frac{949}{12}$
	Female	3.6	10.0	48.1	26.9	11.5	$\frac{391}{10}$
0.2938	Bachelors	4.6	8.4	56.5	23.7	6.9	$\frac{131}{2}$
	Masters	1.8	13.5	47.5	28.0	9.2	$\frac{824}{13}$
	Masters Plus	3.5	10.2	51.6	24.8	9.8	$\frac{254}{6}$
	Doctorate	2.2	12.2	50.0	23.3	12.2	$\frac{90}{0}$
0.4310	1-3 Years	2.5	15.1	47.1	27.7	7.6	$\frac{119}{3}$
	4-6 Years	3.6	5.4	55.4	26.8	8.9	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	5.9	14.1	44.7	24.7	10.6	$\frac{85}{2}$
	10 Plus Years	2.2	12.0	49.4	26.9	9.5	$\frac{924}{15}$

* 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 21

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

Item 17

The L.D. teacher should
speak at community
functions.

χ^2		1	2	3	4	5	**
	Total Group	20.0	50.9	24.5	2.1	1.1	$\frac{1342}{20}$
0.0064	Psychologist	21.4	51.3	26.5	0.9	0.0	$\frac{117}{2}$
	L.D. Teacher	15.2	49.6	30.8	2.2	2.2	$\frac{224}{2}$
	Principals	20.3	50.8	25.6	2.4	0.9	$\frac{695}{12}$
	Superintendents	25.0	59.3	13.2	1.5	1.0	$\frac{204}{2}$
	Directors	25.0	56.8	18.2	0.0	0.0	$\frac{44}{2}$
	Students	16.1	41.1	35.7	3.6	3.6	$\frac{56}{0}$
0.0000*	Male	22.3	54.0	21.0	2.1	0.6	$\frac{948}{13}$
	Female	15.5	45.9	34.3	2.0	2.3	$\frac{394}{7}$
0.0128*	Bachelors	12.0	45.9	39.1	1.5	1.5	$\frac{133}{0}$
	Masters	20.0	52.8	23.5	2.5	1.2	$\frac{830}{7}$
	Masters Plus	23.3	53.4	20.5	2.0	0.8	$\frac{249}{11}$
	Doctorate	24.7	51.7	23.6	0.0	0.0	$\frac{89}{1}$
0.0004*	1-3 Years	20.5	43.4	32.8	0.8	2.5	$\frac{122}{0}$
	4-6 Years	19.6	48.2	24.1	3.6	4.5	$\frac{112}{1}$
	7-9 Years	23.3	41.9	34.9	0.0	0.0	$\frac{86}{1}$
	10 Plus Years	20.6	54.1	22.6	2.2	0.5	$\frac{922}{17}$

* 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

χ^2 = chi square value

The greater the years of experience, the higher the percentages of agreement and the lower the percentage of indecisiveness and the reverse is true for the fewest number of years experience (lowest percentage of agreement and highest percentage of indecisiveness within the subgroup).

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

It was found that of the total group response to the job of the learning disability teacher in the school, the following statements received agreement or strong agreement: the learning disability teacher should be responsible for administering and interpreting diagnostic tests not required to be given by the school psychologist, organizing inservice training programs and workshops, informing parents of their child's difficulties, progress, and lack of progress, showing ways parents can help their child and become involved in school and/or class activities, expressing feelings openly to administrators, consulting regularly with the regular classroom teacher regarding learning disability matters pertaining to one of the children in their room, visiting with the parents in their home, and belonging to professional teacher organizations.

The total group disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the learning disability teacher should only be involved at school by teaching the child, work relatively independent of other teachers, and have no duties directly involved with tests or testing procedures.

Mixed results were received from the total group regarding the question of whether the learning disability teacher or the P.E. teacher should be responsible for working on motor control and coordination problems in learning disabled children. Mixed results were also received on whether a learning disability teacher should handle problems without administrative consultation.

Of the total group response to the amount of community involvement desired of the learning disability teacher, it was found that there was agreement or strong agreement that the learning disability teacher should be involved in community affairs and speak at community functions.

The total group gave a 40 percent response in agreement or strong agreement that the learning disability teacher should live in the community where she teaches and help sponsor youth activities, but 32.7 percent and 39.3 percent of the responses concerning these two areas were undecided.

About one third of the people responded in agreement that the learning disability teacher should sponsor adult activities; however, about one half of the respondents were undecided.

The competencies derived from this survey that may add to or modify the present learning disability program at Kansas State University appear to be that: learning disability teachers need to have training in college preparatory classes in administering and interpreting diagnostic tests that the psychologist isn't required to give; a section of the advanced learning disabilities classes should involve education of the learning disability teacher in organizing in-service training programs and workshops and should provide a field experience in doing the actual work in the organization of such program; and teachers should be acquainted with the different professional organizations and urged to become involved with them.

It seemed to be extremely important for the learning disability teacher to understand the methods of counseling about their student's problems, progress or lack of progress, ways of helping their student,

and the importance of involvement with school and/or class activities. As part of the course curriculum, the future teachers should learn the proper techniques for guidance and counseling of parents and have actual experiences in applying the techniques learned.

Another competency that the learning disability teacher should obtain is the ability to express one's self (which would help in consulting with the regular teacher about one of the children in her classroom) and have good public relations with the people she is working with. This would be helpful in speaking at community functions and being involved in community activities. This could be included in a guidance course, or even a course only concerned with public relations would be very useful and helpful.

On several of the other questions there were large percentages of undecided responses, either almost equal to or larger than the agreement or disagreement ratings. Therefore no concrete competencies appeared.

Chapter V

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In comparing questions concerning the specific areas in community involvement of the learning disability teacher, in general it appeared that the superintendents agreed more strongly about these questions and the learning disability teachers disagreed more. This might imply that further study would be useful in establishing better rapport between the two groups and understanding the roles of the learning disability teacher in the community. The males also had a greater percentage of agreement and the females were more undecided and disagreeing. This was probably because most of the superintendents were male and the learning disability teachers were females.

As a general overview concerning the area of the learning disability teacher working with the parents, the higher educated, more experienced teachers tended to agree more with the questions than did the others. In some cases, the students agreed more strongly than the other divisions in the positional subgroup did. This might imply that it is necessary to advise and help the people who are out in the field directly working with the parents of learning disability children of methods they can use to establish better and more constructive relations with them.

The questions dealing with the learning disability teacher's job in working with other teachers and with youth and adult activities tended to show the students with the highest percentage of responses at either the agreement or disagreement end of the scale, depending on the type of question asked (items 7 or 13, or 16). This might imply the people who

have been out in the field longer are not as acquainted with this area, so they could use some informational workshops and educational classes pertaining to the area. The same type of information could be drawn from the results of the years of experience - the lesser experience, the higher percentage of agreement or disagreement.

In studying the question about the learning disability teacher belonging to professional organizations, it was found that the students, people with doctorate level degrees and the longest years of experience had the highest percentage of agreement with the question. But this causes a problem in suggestions for further study or recommendations because the students weren't considered in the years of experience or degree levels. However, it does show that students should be acquainted with the different organizations and should learn about the types of services they perform and the benefits that are received by members.

There were many areas in the survey that received an undecided response. Comments received from the respondents (see Appendix E) on the returned survey indicate the following possible causes for the undecided response: many of the positions weren't familiar with the area of learning disabilities and felt they weren't qualified to give a more definite answer; they felt the questions were unclear; they felt the response would depend on the circumstances involved whether they would agree or disagree.

If a further study were to be done to try to better understand the reason for the responses made, some of the questions should possibly be worded for better clarification. Also, a follow-up letter to inform the school of the results of the survey would be useful to help the public gain more awareness and insight into the field of learning disabilities.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A**FINAL FORM OF 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.

000

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

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

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**ORIGINAL OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FOR THE 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, and self-contained classroom teacher?

Which program would you advocate?

3. In the hiring of a L.D. teacher, is prior teaching experience

Essential _____

Desired _____

Unimportant _____

Is a Master's Degree

Essential _____

Desired _____

Unimportant _____

Is being a member of a professional organization

Essential _____

Desired _____

Unimportant _____

4. Which diagnostic tests are used in your school system?

Who administers them to the students?

5. Who is involved in your system of referrals?

Who participates in the staffing of the children into the L.D. program?

6. Who will actually set up the L.D. program?
7. What instructional materials would a L.D. teacher have at her disposal?
Who would provide these materials?
8. What type of special educational courses should a L.D. teacher be expected to have taken?
Is an audio-visual aides course recommended?
9. Could a L.D. teacher with secondary education background teach in an elementary L.D. program and vice versa?
10. What is the difference between a L.D. teacher and a regular classroom teacher in regard to

delivery of knowledge? _____

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 enrolled in this arrangement?

11. Is the L.D. teacher allowed exceptional methods of controlling behavior?

early dismissal _____

physical punishment _____

behavior modification _____

extra privileges _____

12. What personal qualities should a L.D. teacher exhibit?

13. What standards of appearance do you set for your teachers?

hair _____

skirt length _____

pantsuit vs. skirt _____

14. To what extent would you expect your teachers to participate in community functions?

Do you expect her to speak at school functions?

15. What role does the parent play in the education of his child?

How important is the parent - teacher interaction?

16. What areas in L.D. need improvement and why?

APPENDIX C**FIRST 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 D**SECOND COVER 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 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

APPENDIX E**COMMENTS**

Principals

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

There is no way that I can answer this questionnaire!

We do not have a LD program at the present time; therefore your questions are very difficult to answer.

Your questions are not well phrased. You ask questions that cannot really be answered. It sounds like you are trying to get me to agree with you on some questions.

Some of the questions are hard to answer without the knowledge of the student, teacher, and situation involved.

Many of the items cannot be answered realistically without further classification, etc.

I am not that familiar with all these tests.

Teachers

Principals with LD, EMR or ED classes should be required to know about the program and its goals. They need to take Intro. to L.D. or Psych. of Exceptional Children or at least a workshop!

LEARNING DISABILITY SURVEY: THE JOB OF A LEARNING
DISABILITY TEACHER IN THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

by

KAREN SUE MUSTOE CROSSLIN

B. S., Kansas State 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

A survey concerned with the area of learning disabilities was conducted in the state of Kansas. Input via the survey was sought from every superintendent, director of special education, principal, psychologist, and learning disability teacher in the state of Kansas. Students involved in the learning disability program at Kansas State University were also surveyed. The purpose of the survey was to gain information that could be used to improve Kansas State University's program in the area of learning disabilities. The survey dealt with the organizing and staffing of a learning disability program (Part I), the job of a learning disability teacher in the school and community (Part II), college preparation for teacher training (Part III), the affective domain and school personnel's attitudes toward the learning disability teacher (Part IV), and the desirability and effectiveness of diagnostic tests in the learning disability program (Part V). A one to five rating scale was utilized with one indicating strong agreement and five indicating strong disagreement. The scope of this report was concerned with the job of a learning disability teacher in the school and community.

The names of each person to be sent a survey were coded on a printout sheet for purpose of follow-up letters. The surveys, a cover letter, and a postage-paid return envelope were sent in April. When the surveys were returned, they were checked off of the list. After two weeks, those who hadn't returned their surveys were sent another survey, a new cover letter, and another postage-paid return envelope. The data from each survey form was entered on Fortran key punch data sheets, the code numbers removed from the surveys, and the information run through the computer.

Part II of the survey was broken down into two subtopics - the job of the learning disability teacher in the school and the amount of

community involvement desired of the learning disability teacher.

It was found that of the total group response to the job of the learning disability teacher in the school, the following areas received agreement or strong agreement: the learning disability teacher should be responsible for administering and interpreting diagnostic tests not required to be given by the school psychologist, organizing in-service training programs and workshops, informing parents of their child's difficulties, progress, and lack of progress, showing ways parents can help their child and become involved in school and/or class activities, expressing feelings openly to administrators, consulting regularly with the regular classroom teacher regarding learning disability matters pertaining to one of the children in their room, visiting with the parents in their home, and belonging to professional teacher organizations.

The total group disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the learning disability teacher should only be involved at school by teaching the child, work relatively independent of other teachers, and have no duties directly involved with tests or testing procedures.

Mixed results were received from the total group regarding the question of whether the learning disability teacher or the P.E. teacher should be responsible for working on motor control and coordination problems in learning disabled children. Mixed results were also received on whether a learning disability teacher should handle problems without administrative consultation.

Of the total group response to the amount of community involvement desired of the learning disability teacher, it was found that there was agreement or strong agreement that the learning disability teacher should

be involved in community affairs and speak at community functions.

The total group gave a 40 percent response in agreement or strong agreement that the learning disability teacher should live in the community where she teaches and help sponsor youth activities, but 32.7 percent and 39.3 percent of the responses concerning these two areas were undecided.

About one-third of the people responded in agreement that the learning disability teacher should sponsor adult activities; however, about one-half of the respondents were undecided.