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This study was designed to investigate the relationship of teachers' attitudes toward students' race, sex, socio-economic status, and classroom behavior as it relates to the referral process of an educable mentally retarded program in Alachua County, Florida.

The population of the study consisted of three hundred and fifty-nine (N=359) elementary school teachers from the Alachua County Schools. The sample consisted of 85 Black teachers (24%) and 274 White teachers (76%). The ratio of Black to White teachers in the sample is approximately equal to the ratio of Black to White teachers employed in the county.

Four basic bogus profiles of potential educable mentally retarded students were developed: 1) a high socio-economic, uncooperative student; 2) a high socio-economic, cooperative student; 3) a low socio-economic, uncooperative student; and 4) a low socio-economic, cooperative student. The intelligence test score (IQ), achievement test score, grade level, and age were held constant across all profiles. Race and sex were varied for each of the four profiles, that is, the same profile was presented to
one teacher as a Black male, then to another teacher as a Black female, to another as a White male, and to another as a White female. Thus, race and sex were manipulated making a total of 16 profiles. Each teacher was randomly assigned a profile by counselors within the respective school, with instructions to rate each of the following statements on a continuum of 1 to 5, with 1 being least likely and 5 being most likely to: 1) refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class; 2) request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior; 3) refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior; 4) make no referral and let the child continue as is. The profiles devised for use in this study were based on representative information taken from students' cumulative guidance records and comments made by teachers.

Basic questions of the study were as follows: Would the race of the teacher and/or the socio-economic status, sex, race, or classroom behavior of students relate to the teacher's judgment concerning 1) referral to an educable mentally retarded program; 2) referral to the school counselor; 3) making no referral, thus leaving the student as is; or 4) requesting a parent/teacher conference?

Four major null hypotheses with 6 sub-hypotheses were generated and tested. All hypotheses were tested by the analysis of variance using the general linear model at an alpha (α) level of .05. Significant F-ratios associated with interaction effects were further analyzed by examining simple interactions and simple main effects at an alpha (α) level of .01.
The following major findings emerged from the investigation:

1) The race of the students described in the bogus profiles was significant in the referral to an educable mentally retarded program. Teachers in the study referred Black students more often than they did Whites.

2) The race of the teacher in the study was not an important factor in the referral of the described students to an educable mentally retarded class. Black teachers referred Black bogus students as often as did White teachers.

3) Teachers were more likely to request a parent/teacher conference with the parents of the White student than with Blacks. However, parents of White, cooperative students, regardless of socio-economic status, were more likely to be requested for a conference.

4) Uncooperative students as described in the bogus profiles, were more likely to be referred for individual or group counseling regardless of race or sex.

5) Overall, teachers preferred to take some recourse (as compared to doing nothing) with all students as described in the profiles. However, teachers were least likely to suggest that nothing be done with the low socio-economic status student and more likely to suggest doing nothing with the high socio-economic status student regardless of sex or race.

From these results it was clearly illustrated that Black children as described in the bogus profiles are treated differently from White children by teachers (Black and White) in Alachua County. This could imply that teachers do not understand Black children, and, therefore, cannot generate alternative methods of teaching them. Teachers may be biased against Black children, or they do not know what to do with them. These are some possible reasons for an overrepresentation of Black students in the educable mentally retarded program in this county and throughout the United States. There is a definite need for new teaching techniques and methods when working with Black children, and a more equitable system of referral of students to educable mentally retarded classes and other special programs.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

While the program for educable mentally retarded has increased in the number of students, the percentages of Black and White students have remained at approximately 83% Black and 17% White. The county student population, however, is composed of 70% White and 30% Black. Therefore, it seems necessary to review the criteria being used by Alachua County in identifying educable mentally retarded students. (Handbook - Alachua County Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, 1974-75, p. 13)

It is obvious from the above statement that Blacks are in the minority in the Alachua County Schools (30%) but in a definite majority in educable mentally retarded (EMR) classes (83%). This ratio of Blacks to Whites in the special education classes appears highly disproportionate. Why are so many Blacks placed in these special classes? Does a student's race play a part in whether or not a teacher refers him to the Educable Mentally Retarded Program? And further, does a student's sex, socio-economic status, and classroom behavior influence a teacher's referral? The focus on this study was to determine teachers' attitudes and its relationship to race, socio-economic status, sex and classroom behavior in the referral process to an EMR program.

The above described malady is not peculiar to the Alachua County School System. Much anxiety over this perplexing situation has been expressed by concerned educators throughout the United States (Brockopp, 1958; Johnson, 1969; and Samuda, 1975).
Dunn (1968) confirms that the number of special day classes for the retarded has been increasing very rapidly. The most recent statistics compiled by the U. S. Office of Education now indicates that there are approximately 32,000 teachers of the retarded employed by local school systems—over one-third of all special educators in the nation. Dunn further indicates that, in his best judgement, about 60-80% of the pupils taught by these teachers are children from low status backgrounds—including Blacks, Indians, Chicanos, and Puerto Rican Americans; those from non-standard English-speaking, broken, disorganized, and inadequate homes; and children from other non-middle class environments.

It appears that self-contained special schools, special classes, resource classes and the tracking system are current methods being used by school systems to transfer misfits and behavioral problems, especially Black misfits out of the regular type classrooms (Williams, 1970).

Because of the preponderance of Blacks to Whites being referred to the educable mentally retarded classes, there is a definite need for a better and more equitable referral system, especially since it appears that many students have been labeled educable mentally retarded as a result of mild learning problems, for example, short attention span. This study was an attempt to investigate the factors involved in the referral process as perceived by elementary school teachers in one Florida county.

If, indeed, biases toward race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior affect a teacher's referral to special classes, then school counselors need to be aware of this. Counselors should be consultants, helping teachers become aware of their own biases and assisting
them in dealing with "problem" students in the regular classrooms.

The school counselor should assist teachers and others in solving their own problems in reference to racial "hang-ups." Thus, it seems imperative to know if a child's race or socio-economic level affects a teacher's referral to Educable Mentally Retarded Programs. And, if counselors have knowledge of where these biases occur, they can develop strategies for helping teachers deal with them. This type of counselor intervention may reduce the number of non-eligible Blacks and other minorities being referred to the educable mentally retarded programs. Further, the use of counselor consultation may help make the student referral process to special classes more consistent and more fair—to Whites and Blacks alike.

**Rationale**

Modern day American society is confronted with a very complex problem involving Black and White races. The problem is labeled as either "the Black problem" or "the White problem," depending upon the race of the person talking about the problem. The problem is centered around the coexistence and relationships of the two races and seems to arise and touch upon every phase of the Black/White relationship from youth in elementary school to adults in politics or any phase of life.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder (1968) concluded, in a summary report, that in America there is a move toward two societies—-one Black and one White—-which are separate and unequal. This has been the cause of much disgruntlement and unrest in Black communities and schools alike. Discrimination and segregation are very
much a part of the American way of life. These racial prejudices, if continued, threaten the very foundation of our "democratic society." According to many accounts, a major cause of the racial disturbances has been the attitude of some White Americans toward Blacks (Myrdal, 1964; Green, 1968; National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder, 1968). For example, it is a well-known fact that White landlords have for years nourished and perpetuated the growth and maintenance of the Black ghettos.

Banks (1972) states that following a chronicle of racial disorders, abuse, violence, destruction, and prejudices, decent citizens of the United States have finally realized that their American society is stricken by a severe and painful sickness—White racism.

If a negative Black/White communication is inherent throughout our society, racial prejudice has a definite bearing on counselor/teacher/student relationships in the schools.

Research in the past indicates that many White adults hold negative racial attitudes toward Blacks and other minority races. This was clearly illustrated as early as 1925 with a classical research study conducted by Bogardus (1925), a pioneer in the field of studying the racial attitudes of adults. Bogardus developed a scale to measure racial distances and conducted a study using his scale with college students. The results indicated that White college students ranked Black and Turks below all other racial and ethnic groups. A similar study was done in 1950 concerning teachers' attitudes toward children. The results revealed that the Black child was rated lowest in all rankings of groups on a Bogardus-type social-distance scale (Grambs, 1950).
Thirteen years later, teachers in training gave the same responses (Grambs, 1964).

Until recently separate schools for Black and White students have been the accepted practice in the United States. This was due to the fact that the American educational system was established and developed on the basis of racial separation. In other words, Black and White students lived and attended schools in different sections of the town, "on opposite sides of the track." This was the dominant attitude, especially of the White race, until the Supreme Court ruled (1954) against the "separate but equal" concept. The court's ruling held that even if educational opportunities for Blacks and Whites were equal, segregation of the schools would have a detrimental effect on Black children. In 1955 the lower courts were instructed to render decisions which would fulfill the 1954 decision with "all deliberate speed." As a direct result of the 1954 court ruling, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, under the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, was passed to end segregation of public schools and public facilities. However, as some of the above research has documented, many White teachers brought to the newly integrated schools the same negative racial attitudes of the White majority and minority students continue to suffer today as a result.

Several studies indicate that teachers' racial attitudes are similar to those of most White Americans (Becker, 1962; Clark, 1964). Research also indicates that White classroom teachers have low expectations of, and negative attitudes toward, Black students. Many of these teachers do not expect the culturally different students to perform
adequately in the classroom because they come from a home in which there is little or no stimulation for educational achievement. In a study concerning Black students, Becker (1962) interviewed sixty teachers in an urban school system. He found that slum children were perceived by these teachers as difficult to teach, boisterous, uncontrollable, and violent in the sphere of discipline. The teachers studied also felt that slum children were morally unacceptable on all scores from physical cleanliness to the spheres of sex and ambition to get ahead.

Clark (1964) had White students from his class interview teachers and administrators in the New York City Public School System. The general consensus of the group interviewed supports the belief that Black students are slow learners, and therefore cannot be expected to achieve academically. In the same study teachers indicated that Black children were inherently inferior in intelligence and therefore could not be expected to learn as much or as readily as White children; and, further, all the teacher would do if he/she tried to teach them as if they could learn, would be to develop in them serious emotional disturbances—frustrations and anxieties. The teachers concluded that the humanitarian thing to do, therefore, was to provide schools for these children essentially as custodial institutions rather than as educational institutions.

Research indicates that the reaction of many minority groups to the values and attitudes of Whites has been that of assimilation, the taking on of traits and characteristics normally associated with the White culture. In one study, conducted by Sarnoff (1951), it was found that Jews have some of the same prejudices and discriminations against
people of their own race as are found in the White ruling class. Other evidence is presented by Frazier (1957) that indicated the prevailing White American attitudes of Black inferiority have been accepted extensively by Black Americans.

It is then highly probable that Black teachers accept the racist ideology of White teachers in regard to many Black students being slow learners and slow poor academic achievers. The belief of many teachers—Black and White—as supported by Banks and Grambs (1972) is that White students can attain a higher level of achievement than Blacks and the two cannot be expected to make comparable progress.

Goldschmld (1970) also endorses the idea that many Blacks adopt the middle class White standards, specifically the "upwardly mobile Negroes." Black teachers are working in schools whose cause for existence is founded and based on the White valuing system. They are teaching students daily from books written according to White middle class standards; using techniques developed by and for the White middle class and constantly teaching and drilling into the students and themselves that this is the accepted and proper way to be. That these negative attitudes about Blacks are embodied by Black teachers is then not so astonishing.

Purpose of the Study

Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors, School Counselors, Teachers, School Psychologists, special educators, and others are concerned about the overrepresentation of Blacks and other minority children in special classes for the educable mentally retarded. Therefore, the major purpose
of this investigation was to determine teacher's attitudes toward students' race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior on the referral of elementary school children to an educable mentally retarded program in Alachua County. The study also provides counselors with additional information and recommendations when counseling with Black students in the referral process and/or counseling following placement in the special class.

In general, this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. Would the race of the teacher and/or the race, socio-economic status, sex, or classroom behavior of students (or possible interaction of these factors) relate to the teacher's judgment concerning referral to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program?

2. Would the race of the teacher and/or the race, socio-economic status, sex, or classroom behavior of students (or possible interaction of these factors) relate to the teacher's judgment concerning referral to the School Counselor?

3. Would the race of the teacher and/or the race, socio-economic status, sex, or classroom behavior of students (or possible interaction of these factors) relate to the teacher's judgment in regard to requesting parent/teacher conference?

4. Would the race of the teacher and/or the race, socio-economic status, sex, or classroom behavior of students (or possible interaction of these factors) relate to the teacher's judgment concerning taking no recourse with students?
Three hundred and fifty-nine (359) elementary school teachers in Alachua County, Florida, were utilized as subjects in this study. Bogus profiles of potential educable mentally retarded students varying only race, sex, classroom behavior and socio-economic status were given to the teachers for their referral or non-referral to the Educable Mentally Retarded program. A more detailed description of the subjects, methodology, and specific null hypotheses is given in Chapter III.

Criteria for Eligibility to EMR in Alachua County, Florida

The educable mentally retarded child is one who is impaired in intellectual and adaptive behavior and whose rate of learning is one-half to three-fourths that of a student of normal intelligence and whose developmental status reflects his rate of learning. The measured intelligence of an educable mentally retarded student generally falls between the range of two to three standard deviations below the mean (IQ = 100; SD = 15-16) and the assessed adaptive behavior falls below age and cultural expectancies. Therefore, a student is eligible for the EMR program if he meets the following criteria:

1. Psychological assessment: a score of 50-75 IQ points on the standardized instruments, the Stanford-Binet Form LM or the appropriate Wechsler; two to three standard deviations from the mean would be approximately 52-68 on the Stanford-Binet or 55-70 on the Wechsler.

2. Educational history: should indicate a persistence of low intellectual ability and impaired adaptive behavior in the school setting. Evidence of this should include:
a. all previous group and individual intelligence and achievement tests;
b. grades and comments from cumulative folder;
c. specific statements about the student's behavior from school personnel—specifically, the student's relationship with peers and adults, nature of classroom assignments and the student's reaction to those assignments;
d. reports of attempted program alterations to meet the student's needs within the regular program; quantitative and qualitative data on the student's reactions and abilities to deal with program alterations;
e. achievement determined by individual educational assessment; achievement expectations should be consistent with IQ, exposure to academic skills and experiential background.

3. Social and developmental history: should indicate delayed mental development and impaired adaptive behavior. Evidence could include information about the following:
   a. delays in walking, talking;
   b. relationships with peers and siblings;
   c. activities outside the home that the child is involved in;
   d. responsibilities of the child in the home; assumed at what ages;
   e. respect for parental authority;
f. language spoken in the home;
g. occupation and employment status of parents;
h. history of moving frequently: within county, within state, out of state;
i. evidence of books, magazines, toys, playground items, etc., in and around the home;
j. parent's awareness of any problem in behavior or development.

4. Health history: excludes medical, visual, and hearing problems as causes for intellectual disability; of after all medical attention and treatment, the intellectual disability is expected to persist.

5. Other considerations:
   a. Since retardation is a phenomenon pervading all facets of an individual's life, it is not enough to assess just one or two dimensions of behavioral functioning. Thus, every effort must be made to assess adaptive behavior (the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of his age and cultural group) (AAMD, 1973)
      -- in a variety of settings,
      -- in relation to chronological age,
      -- in relation to cultural expectations.
   b. Students being considered for placement in a program for educable mentally retarded should be identified during the primary grades and at the latest before they
leave the elementary school, except
--- when new or returning to the school system,
--- when the intellectual disability is due to a
recent accident or illness.
c. Placement of identified students into programs for
educable mentally retarded should occur no later than
March 1 of the school year with subsequently identified
students placed the following school year, except when
new or returning to the school system.

Provisions for Screening, Referral, Identification, Placement and
Dismissal of Exceptional Students in Alachua County, Florida

The first step in the process of identifying a student for
placement in a class for educable mentally retarded often involves
an observation by an elementary classroom teacher that the student is
not making adequate progress toward instructional goals which seem
appropriate for his age and cultural and experiential background. The
teacher then arranges for a Slosson Intelligence Test to be administered
to the child. The child's cumulative folder provides a history of his
school performance through report cards, anecdotal records, standardized
testing results, reading records, and reports from special teachers such
as the speech clinician or reading resource teacher. In addition to
this significant educational data, teachers should provide evidence of
the child's achievement level in basic skill areas as well as apparent
strengths or weaknesses in language process and visual-perceptual de-
velopment. Frequently the child's former teachers are contacted for
input, especially if there appears to be a discrepancy between past
and present achievement patterns.

The school psychologist, counselor, or principal may also observe the child in the classroom setting, both during academic instruction and during other activities such as music and physical education.

The Metropolitan Achievement Tests and Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Tests are administered to all students in grades one to seven each year in addition to other tests and inventories used by classroom teachers.

Poor performance on standardized tests may alert school personnel to check on other data on the student.

All students entering school are required to have a medical examination. Regular hearing and vision screening of school children is part of Alachua County's school health program. Additional health problems may be referred to the school public health nurse for consultation with parents and/or for referral to appropriate health agencies. Notes on the student's health status are to be recorded on the health record form in his cumulative folder at least twice each school year. Screening of elementary students for speech problems is scheduled each fall by the speech clinicians in the county.

The county school system's referral and case study forms are used to record pertinent data obtained through the screening process. Parents are notified by school personnel that their child is being referred for psychological evaluation. The referral form is then signed by the referring teacher, the school counselor and the principal and is sent to Pupil Personnel Services Department of psychological evaluation of the student's intellectual ability, social-emotional adjustment and academic potential. Referral may also be initiated by the parent or guardian, physician, or community agencies.
Psychological Services personnel process the referral and perform the following activities in making their identification and recommendations:

1. Assess Intellectual ability using Stanford-Binet Form LM or an appropriate level of the Wechsler;
2. Assess academic ability using the WRAT or the PIAT;
3. Assess perceptual development using the Bender-Gestalt or a similar instrument;
4. Evaluate educational data provided in case study and referral by school personnel (evidence of persistent learning and functioning difficulties substantiated by observational data and cumulative records);
5. Evaluate social and development data provided by school personnel and parents;
6. Evaluate health data from the student's health folder, provided by school personnel, with attention to recent hearing, speech, and vision screening results;
7. Request medical report when necessary;
8. Request additional social information when necessary;
9. Submit a written report with diagnosis and recommendations to the Director of Exceptional Student Education Programs for the Mentally Retarded and to appropriate local school personnel.

Recommendation for replacement in a program for the educable mentally retarded must be made to the Director of Exceptional Student Education Programs for the Mentally Retarded by a committee which is composed of, or includes input from Exceptional Student Education representative, school psychologist, principal, classroom teachers, guidance
counselor, Exceptional Student Education teacher, and other personnel as necessary.

Parents are notified by school personnel that their child is recommended for placement in the program for educable mentally retarded and of the parent's right to review the placement recommendation. Evidence of parent notification is kept in the student's cumulative record (Appendix A).

Copies of the referral, case study form, psychological report, and parent notification letter are stapled together and are permanently filed in the student's cumulative record (Appendix B).

Placements may be reconsidered at a subsequent staffing as new data is presented.

Referral and case study information should be updated and considered at a staffing when a student is to move from one level of the program to another (i.e., elementary to middle to secondary).

Termination from the EMR program is upon completion of secondary program for educable mentally retarded and receipt of high school diploma, transfer out of county, as a result of reevaluation of eligibility criteria, as a result of excessive absences without medical excuse after referral and report from attendance officer (for those sixteen years of age and over), transfer to regular program is recommended by staffing committee, or transfer to more appropriate special program is recommended by staffing committee.

Programs for the educable mentally retarded are provided in all schools in Alachua County by twenty-one full-time and one-half time elementary teachers, ten full-time and one half-time middle school teachers, and eleven full-time secondary teachers. Eighteen of the
elementary classes serve both primary and intermediate students (Handbook--Alachua County Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, 1974-1975).

Definitions of Specific Terminology

Terms used in this dissertation are operationally defined. These definitions are designed for the primary purpose of this study and do not necessarily apply to any other situations or circumstances.

**Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR).** A child who is impaired in intellectual and adaptive behavior and the rate of learning is one-half to three-fourths that of students with normal intelligence and whose developmental status reflects his rate of learning.

**Cooperative Behavior (non-aggressive or non-disruptive).** Works along with teachers and others in the school setting and does not challenge authority.

**Uncooperative Behavior (aggressive and/or disruptive).** Will challenge authority. In response to an anger-producing situation, he/she engages in some form of physical or verbal manner that is aggressive in nature.

**Black (Negro, Colored and Black are used interchangeably).** Denotes the minority race of dark-skinned Americans of African descent regardless of cultural background or biological ancestry.

**White.** is used in the general sense of the term as used in the United States to designate people of the majority race regardless of cultural background or biological ancestry.

**Disadvantaged.** Those people, particularly Blacks, who are regarded as having less than what is basic for decent living such as money and social position.
**Attitude.** An organization of several beliefs focused on a specific object or situation, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner.

**Value.** The intrinsic worth of a belief to the individual. A value is a single belief.

**Socio-economic Status.** The social, educational, occupational, and residential level of a family as measured by the Index of Status Characteristics (Warner, Meeker, and Eells, 1960).

**Intelligence.** The level of intellectual functioning of a child as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Slosson Intelligence Test, or Stanford-Binet, Form LM.

**Achievement.** The level of academic attainment as measured by the Wide Range Achievement Test, other standardized achievement tests, and grades in academic subjects.

**Desegregation.** The process by which a school or school system which is separated by race or color becomes one school program for all ethnic groups.

**Segregated School.** Those schools which assign or force students to attend based on the students' race or color—a conscious effort to prevent students from mixing racially.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation**

The remainder of this study is organized into four additional chapters and the appendices. Chapter II contains a review of research related to the present study. This review is divided into nine parts: 1) The segregation and desegregation movement; 2) Racial attitudes of Whites; 3) Placement in EMR: The effects of sex and race; 4) The
EMR: Definitions; 5) The efficacy of special classes; 6) The effects of socio-economic status on student intelligence and achievement; 7) The myths of the IQ test; 8) The effects of teachers' expectations on student performance; and 9) The counselor as a consultant to teachers. Chapter III outlines methods and procedures for the study and lists the hypotheses, a description of the measures to be used, the sample used in the study, and procedures for collection and analysis of the data. Chapter IV contains the limitations of the study, results of the investigation, and discussions of the findings. Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II
RELATED LITERATURE

In an examination of the previous research concerned with certain aspects of the educable mentally retarded, results and conclusions of several studies which are of relevance to this dissertation were selected and are discussed herein. Further, this chapter is divided into the following subheadings: 1) segregation and desegregation movement; 2) racial attitudes of Whites; 3) placement in EMR: the effects of race and sex; 4) the EMR: definitions; 5) the efficacy of special classes; 6) socio-economic status—intelligence and achievement; 7) the myth of the IQ test; 8) teachers' expectations; and 9) the counselor as a consultant to teachers.

**Segregation and Desegregation Movement**

In 1849 Blacks were considered "free and equal" even though the law upheld segregation. This doctrine of "free and equal" when tested in court provided the groundwork for keeping Blacks and Whites separated on public transportation, in schools, and in other areas—a condition which persisted for over 90 years. Desegregation of the schools with "all deliberate speed" was called for in 1954, but the "speed" was such that the courts had to inevitably set down guidelines and deadline dates for the Integration of schools in 1969.

Throughout American history, the public school systems have often been segregated in many ways, whether by religion, sex, wealth, social class or race. Separation by race is the major focus in this section.
The "separate but equal" doctrine justifying Black segregation in education and in public facilities originated not in the South, but in the North several years before the Civil War. The separate but equal doctrine was only prevalent in sections of the country where Blacks were theoretically free but in reality were forced to live as second-class citizens. The first authoritative judicial statement of the doctrine appeared in a decision by Justice Lemuel Shaw in the case of Sarah C. Roberts vs. The City of Boston (1849).

The case of Roberts vs. The City of Boston (1849) was tried in Massachusetts Judicial Court. Sarah Roberts was a five-year-old Black girl who had been denied admission to an all-White public school and therefore had to walk a half mile to an all Black school. Charles Sumner argued her case before the Massachusetts Supreme Court and attempted to convince the Court that the "free and equal" declaration of the Massachusetts Constitution made it unlawful to force Blacks to attend separate schools (Blaustein and Ferguson, 1957).

This case is historical in that it gave the American jurisprudence a new concept, "equality before the law," and is also credited as being the first formulation of the "equal protection of the laws" concept for Blacks in the United States. Sumner's argument was praised by the Court; however, the Court ruled that his case (argument) was invalid, and the decision went in favor of the city's policy of discrimination. In other words, it was lawful for Blacks to be required to attend separate schools in Massachusetts.

Brown and Harlan (1968) stated that in 1890 the General Assembly of the state of Louisiana passed a law that required all railroads to provide separate coaches for Black and White passengers. The law also gave officers of the passenger trains the authority to assign
each passenger to the coach or compartment used for his race. By 1896 segregation of railway cars was in effect in all the southern states. It was a criminal offense for Blacks to ride in coaches reserved for whites. It was against the law for a member of one race to ride in a coach which was reserved for members of the other race (Cushman and Cushman, 1963). The doctrine of "separate but equal" did not appear in the court until 1896 in the case of Plessy vs. Ferguson. In an effort to test the constitutionality of Louisiana's segregation laws, Homer A. Plessy, who had a great-grandparent of African descent, sat in a car which was reserved for white passengers after having made it known that he was Black. Plessy was only one-eighth Black and could easily pass for White. When he was asked (ordered) by the conductors to move to a coach reserved for Black passengers, Plessy refused. He appealed his conviction to the Louisiana Supreme Court. In the Supreme Court case of Plessy vs. Ferguson, 1896, Plessy argued that the Thirteenth Amendment provided that enforced racial segregation was a "badge of slavery." The Supreme Court rejected this argument on the grounds that it had ruled previously that the amendment applied only to involuntary servitude. Plessy argued further that legally enforced separation of the races was in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Fourteenth Amendment (1868) states that it is against the law to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws.

The Court upheld the Louisiana statute and, in a landmark decision, ruled that "separate but equal accommodations" were constitutional.

Brown and Harlan (1968) write as stated by the Court:

The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social as distinguished from political equality, or a co-mingling
of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the state legislatures in the exercise of their police power. (p. 93)

In the same case the Court saw the need to bring into focus the accepted practice of separate schools for Blacks and Whites to further justify their decision. The Court stated that separation of the races was a matter of common practice, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of states where the political rights of the Black race have been in existence the longest. This case didn't deal directly with equal education of the Black race, but it did indeed touch upon the fact that our American educational system was established and developed on the basis of racial separation; it demonstrated the attitudes of the White majority of that time and the ways in which the courts protected their idea of a democratic society with the law books.

By all odds, the most spectacular and controversial application of the equal protection clause came in 1936. This year marked the beginning of several important cases which confronted the pattern of segregation in higher education (post undergraduate level). These cases were the forerunners for pertinent shifts in court decisions and probably had great bearing on the 1954 Supreme Court ruling against the "separate but equal" concept.

One of the first cases concerning segregation which ruled in favor of a Black man was Murray vs. Maryland, 1936. Clift et al. (1965) writes that the Supreme Court upheld Murray, a Black, and ordered his admission to an all-White school. Murray applied for entrance to the
University of Maryland in Baltimore, School of Law, but was refused admission because he was a Black American. Murray took his case to court and argued that the "separate but equal" doctrine resulting from the Plessy vs. Ferguson case had been violated; that instruction at the Black campus was not equal to that of Whites; that the University of Maryland was a publicly financed institution; and that out-of-state scholarships for Blacks were not sufficient. The University of Maryland contended that he was entitled to equal instruction at the University's Negro (Black) branch located in Princess Anne; that the University was not technically a state agency since it was previously under private control; and that out-of-state scholarships provided for higher education of Blacks. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Murray since failure of the University to admit him to the all-White school was an infringement of his rights as a citizen.

Alexander et al. (1969) write that in Gaines vs. Missouri, 1938, the trustees of the University of Missouri offered Gaines, a Black citizen of Missouri, tuition from state funds to study law in another state after being denied admission to the Law School of the University. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it was unlawful for the University to deny a citizen of the state the educational opportunities afforded by that state.

In McLaurin vs. Oklahoma, 1950, the University of Oklahoma admitted McLaurin, a Black, to a course of studies leading to a doctorate in education. McLaurin challenged the University's practice of admitting Blacks but segregating them within the school. He was assigned a classroom seat in a section reserved for Black students and assigned to a special table in the cafeteria. The U.S. Supreme Court
ruled that segregation of Black students admitted to a state school was not permissible by the law (Alexander et al., 1969).

The case of *Sweatt vs. Painter*, 1950 (Alexander et al., 1969) states that the University of Texas Law School refused the admission of Sweatt to its school but later admitted him to a newly formed Black law school at the institution. Sweatt refused admission to the newly formed law school for Blacks and took his case to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court held that the petitioner was deprived of equal protection of the laws and ruled that he be admitted to the regular Law School at the University of Texas.

The outset of Black or civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s could be said to have started in 1954 when the Court ruled that states practicing racial segregation in the public schools violated the U.S. Constitution in the case of *Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka*. Schwartz (1957) and Alexander et al. (1972) stated that in this case plaintiffs were Black children of elementary school age residing in the states of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. The cases varied in facts and different local conditions; however, a common legal question justified their consideration to appear in court for a consolidated opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court. These elementary school children, with legal representatives, sought the aid of the court to integrate schools in their community. They had been denied admission to the White school because the laws in the respected states only permitted students to attend segregated schools according to race. Their attorneys argued that separate schools were substantially equal but charged that segregation was psychologically and socially damaging to Blacks and that segregation deprived the
children of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. The major issue of the case was that even with all things being equal, tangible factors such as physical facilities, does separation of Black and White students deprive Black children of equal educational opportunities? The decision, written by Chief Justice Earl Warren, reversed the famous ruling in Plessy vs. Ferguson (1896). The 1954 ruling held that even if educational opportunities for Blacks were equal to those for Whites, separate educational facilities created feelings of inferiority and are inherently unequal.

In a second judgment rendered May 31, 1955, the U. S. Supreme Court ordered the lower courts to integrate the schools with "all deliberate speed." Twelve years after the U. S. Supreme Court handed down their order for school systems to desegregate, some communities maintained segregation in public education. There was still a massive resistance to integrating the schools by White America during the middle 60s. This is evidence of the attitudes of many White Americans toward Blacks and other minorities. One would assume that if Whites did not possess racial and negative attitudes toward the Black race, schools would have been integrated without the forceful orders of the courts.

The Coleman Report (1966) and Racial Isolation In the Public Schools (Wilson, 1967) revealed that 90% of the Black students in eleven southern states still attended all Black or predominantly Black schools. The dissemination of this information prompted the Supreme Court in October of 1969 to order a Mississippi School Board of Education to integrate all of their schools at once, thus rejecting the doctrine from the 1950s that integration should proceed "with all deliberate speed."
Johnson (1967), Christopolis and Renz (1969) still contend that ability grouping in schools, i.e., segregated classes for retardates, prevents equal opportunity and can be damaging to the personality development of "slow" children.

As indicated in Chapter I, there is much to document the fact that many White teachers brought to the integrated schools negative attitudes toward Blacks which still cause minority students to suffer today. Prime examples are the overabundance of Blacks currently enrolled in special educational classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded, tracking, grouping and other devious innovations to separate Blacks from Whites in public schools.

The Racial Attitudes of Whites

Many researchers have stated that racial prejudice, negative attitudes and stereotypes are held by White Americans toward Blacks and other minority races (Bogardus, 1925; Becker, 1962; Clark, 1964; and Banks, 1972). If Whites in America did not harbor negative attitudes toward Blacks and other minority groups, one would assume that schools and other facilities would have been desegregated or integrated voluntarily rather than by court degree.

Studies of prejudice against Blacks have yielded rather consistent results. It is generally agreed from numerous investigations that this group experiences more overt hostility and prejudice than any other minority group in America. This is supported by Essian-Udom (1964) who stated that there are many cultural groups in the United States, but the group needing and demanding attention most dramatically is the 19 million Black Americans. He further indicated that Black Americans are robbed of their traditions and pride in the past and are
still seeking the acceptance by the White majority; but at almost every turn they are rebuffed and assigned a secondary status.

Several studies reveal an emerging, if not fragmented, picture of racial attitudes held by White children in America. An early study by Milnard (1931) suggested that the racial attitudes of children develop early in life. Radke, Trager, and Davis (1949) did a study in social perception and attitudes of children. The study revealed that a negative racial attitude intensified as the White child grew older.

Goodman (1946) found that most of the young children she studied were able to correctly identify race. She noted in this study that White children made more correct racial identifications than did Black children. Morland (1958) confirmed Goodman's findings that southern White children were more aware of racial differences at an earlier age than Blacks and that they were also more aware of racial exclusions than were Black children.

Trager and Yarrow (1952) found that children in kindergarten, first and second grades are adequately aware of race differences and the stigmas that are attached to them. They also found that over two-thirds of the White children in the study overtly attested to their prejudices towards Blacks. They concluded their study stating that the White children were formulating their prejudices from the values and judgments of the parents in the home. These values and judgments were mirrored by the children's reactions to racial differences.

In a more recent study, Morland (1963) found that the attitudes of the White children had not undergone any major changes since the earlier research studies of Trager, Yarrow and Goodman.
Banks (1972) writes that in the American society identity is acquired from other human beings, "significant others," and then, after careful evaluation, is incorporated into the self. Parents, teachers, and "significant others" in the environment of children shape their racial attitudes. Brookover and Erickson (1969) suggest that teachers, next to parents, are the "significant others" in the lives of children and play a major role in the early formation of attitudes which profoundly affect their lives and destinies.

It is apparent from these studies that young White children acquire negative racial attitudes toward Blacks early in life. Children are not born with these preconceived prejudices. They learn them from parents and significant others in their environment.

George W. Cable (1946) declared what he believed were the southern attitudes toward Blacks and school desegregation. He wrote that the "hard core" southern White would like Blacks to believe and say:

All we want is education. All we want it for is to make ourselves better laborers and servants. Give us ample free schools and we will waive all civil and political equality rights and consent to be not Americans but only Africans in America. (p. 37)

There is a tendency among White people to attribute to all Blacks those characteristics of the Blacks with whom they habitually come into contact. Since those contacts are, for the most part, with Blacks in menial or subordinate positions, there is little awareness among Whites that there are Blacks whose capacities and conduct are such as to warrant better treatment from their White neighbors (Myrdal, 1964).

In a classical research study, Bogardus (1925, 1927) measured racial attitudes and found that Blacks and Turks were ranked below all other racial and ethnic groups. His questionnaire offered a list
of races and nationalities and a list of seven degrees of social
intimacy (e.g. proximity of residence, marriage). Individuals (college
students) taking the questionnaires were asked to check off the degree
of social intimacy to which they would be willing to admit a member
of each race or nationality. With the information from students and/or
adults, Bogardus presented a rank order of races and nationalities
according to the degree of preference for them by a given group of
Americans.

Rosenblum (1959) indicates that prejudice is definitely related
to social class identification, i.e., the higher one's social class
identification, the more likely one is to be prejudiced toward ethnic
minorities.

Bolton (1935) conducted a race-related study with a group of
southern college students in which he assessed White attitudes toward
the separation of the races. Over 90 percent of these subjects
opposed integration although they had never studied about the Black
race. The social problems of Blacks were then explored by the group.
However, no significant change of the group toward the social problems
of Blacks were noted. Bolton concluded that the cultural pattern of
southern social organizations had strong influence on the group's
attitude. This was supported by Black and Atkins (1950) when they
wrote that determinants of prejudices against Blacks in the South are
not individual personality factors, but a built-in part of the culture
that has become institutionalized and is, therefore, a socially
acceptable behavior.

Another study by Bogardus (1958) suggested the persistency of
negative racial attitudes of the White majority. He took a longitudinal
approach as he was interested in attitudinal changes. Subjects in these studies were White university students. Bogardus compared the responses of the national sample of students on his social distance scale in the years of 1926, 1946 and 1956. The research covered a thirty-year span. On the basis of the comparison, it was concluded that racial attitudes remain through time. Bogardus reported that the 1926 study showed most resentment of the Black race. Some respondents showed resentment against Black militance in 1946. By 1956 many White students accepted the idea of gradual integration. He noted some changes, however. In each of the studies the White race was more highly valued than other races.

Emphasizing the dominant attitudes of southern Whites, Matthews and Prothro (1963) assessed that staunch segregationists of the southern states still held on to their idyllic images of the past, reminiscing about how it used to be. These same strict segregationists had a strong sense of doom for the future of the South. According to these writers, ignorance has been one of the major factors hampering the desegregation of the South. Because of the divergent values of the two groups on segregation, each have made some unfounded assumptions regarding the preferences of the other in relation to integration.

Vontress (1970) holds that the Black man is caught up in the web of a White system. He acquires the same negative attitudes and prejudices that Whites acquire. Many Blacks, like Whites, are prejudiced against Jews as a result of the assimilation of various negative attitudes and stereotypes. Much the same as Vontress, Bayton et al. (1965) remarked that there have been several studies of the attitudes and stereotypes which minority group members hold with respect to their own race. These studies tend to indicate the fact that many
minority group members carry the same negative attitudes and stereotypes concerning themselves as are harbored by the White majority.

Because the Black man has taken on the larger American culture, the average Black has also taken on something of the Americans' attitude toward Blacks. The Black man's negative attitudes toward the White man may better be described as hatred or fear rather than prejudice. It is hatred or fear toward those who humiliate him and deprive him of many of the good things of life. If the deprivation or humiliation were to cease, the hatred and fear would cease also.

The prejudice of Blacks toward other Blacks is described by DuBois (1940):

Blacks, particularly the better class Blacks, are brought up like other Americans despite the various separations and segregations. They share, therefore, average American culture and current American prejudices. It is almost impossible for a Black boy trained in a White northern high school and a White college to come out with any high ideas of his own people or any abiding faith in what they can do; or for a Black trained in the segregated schools of the South wholly to escape the deadening environment of insult and caste even if he happens to have the good teachers and teaching facilities, which poverty almost invariably denies him. He may rationalize his own individual status as exceptional. He...cannot ordinarily believe that the mass of Black people have possibilities equal to the Whites. (p. 191)

It was concluded by Roberts (1950) in a study of Black college students concerning prejudice that many college students assigned the same negative stereotypes to other Blacks as White college students did. He further purported that on the whole, Blacks have taken over the values and attitudes of their White contemporaries, that in their upward movement, Blacks lead uncomfortable and insecure lives. They are cut off from the White world and avoid Blacks with lower economic status than themselves; they live and behave in the way they think the White majority wants them to; on many occasions they out do Whites, whom they imitate. In other words, it is not uncommon for
Black professionals such as teachers and other educators to be less accepting of lower-class Blacks than are many White professionals.

**Teacher Attitudes**

Grambs (1950, 1964) administered the Bogardus-type social-distance scale to teachers to measure social distance. The results were similar to those found by Bogardus in 1925. She affirms the fact that teachers, like the general White population, entertain many negative attitudes and stereotypes about Blacks. She said that studies concerning teacher attitudes toward students show that the Black child is rated lowest in all rankings of groups on a Bogardus-type social-distance scale (Grambs, 1950). The original study was completed 13 years ago; teachers in training in 1963 gave the same responses. Attempts to change teachers' attitudes through human-relations workshops and special courses have reached very few (Grambs, 1964).

The general area of teacher attitudes and their relationship to achievement has been considered in other research. Faunce (1969) studied elementary teachers in the Minneapolis Public School System and found a "marked discrepancy" between attitudes of successful and non-successful teachers of lower-class Black students. Analysis of his questionnaire (186 items) showed that the effective teacher displayed acceptance, genuineness, empathy, and commitment to teach Black students. They were generally more experienced in teaching.

Porter (1969) found that Black students who had teachers who were "pupil-centered" and "positive" in their attitudes toward them clearly outperformed students from classes where the teachers were not pupil-centered and were less positive in their attitudes.
A study by Silberman (1969) indicated that teachers' attitudes toward their students are reflected in their behavior toward these students. Davidson and Lang (1960) found that students' perceptions of their teacher's feeling toward them correlated positively with self-perception, academic achievement, and desirable classroom behavior.

Current literature indicates that teachers' attitudes may have a great influence on children's behavior and achievement in school. Rosenthal (1968) stated that teachers' expectation causes the performance of many students to change and that expectations are communicated to students in ways in which the teachers are totally unaware.

Grady (1971), president-elect, Cajon Valley Teachers Association, El Cajon, California, assessed teachers' attitudes in that school district. The purpose of her study was to survey teacher attitudes toward the disadvantaged students. Her basic hypothesis that teachers' attitudes would be in significant disagreement with desirable attitudes was rejected. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents' attitudes in general coincided with authorities in the field of the disadvantaged. The study also revealed that teachers entering the profession (less than six years of teaching experience) have more favorable attitudes than teachers with six years or more of teaching experience. Grady also compared the responses of teachers working in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I Schools with teachers working in schools not designated as (ESEA) Title I Schools. The results indicated that teachers in the ESEA Title I School seemed less positive toward the disadvantaged students than those from the other schools. The ESEA Title I school-teacher tended to accept stereotyped characterization of minority
races and felt that these students should be dealt with in a more authoritarian way.

Similarly, Wiles (1971) conducted a study to assess the racial attitudes of Inner-City Teachers. The results indicated that these teachers exhibit contradictory attitudes about the concept of racial integration. They were unbiased and accepted the concept that integration was a means of creating better relations and academic achievement. In other words, they favored integration when the subject was approached as an abstract topic but gave biased responses when specific plans to implement integration were introduced.

In another study, Wiles (1970) assessed the attitudinal characteristic of teachers in a metropolitan school system. The study revealed that the attitudes about students became less favorable as the student school population became more non-White and disadvantaged. He stated that a possible inference of the study was that teachers of Blacks and other minority students were racially biased and, therefore, had negative attitudes toward non-White students.

The Coleman Report (1966) charged that a high proportion of teachers in schools serving disadvantaged areas were dissatisfied with teaching and students than teachers in other schools.

Sex and the Educationally Mentally Retarded

Two characteristics which researchers have indicated as highly relevant to intelligence and schooling are race and sex. There have been several studies which indicated that girls usually are better adjusted to school than boys and that White children usually do better in school than Black children. All of these factors are directly related to the type of environment children are from and the type of
schools they attend. Horton and Leslie (1970) emphasized that the environment dictates behavior, personality and achievement differences in children.

It is well known that boys are referred to psychoeducational clinics from three to five times as often as girls (Phillips, 1956; Gilbert, 1957). Boys are more aggressive and are thereby more likely to display exaggerated aggressive tendencies—hyperactivity, tendencies to challenge and fight authority, etc.

Gilbert (1957) examined 2,500 cases taken from the 1954 files of the principal child guidance center in four of the nation's five largest cities. He tabulated the reasons for referral based on age, sex and type of complaints. It was found that the most frequent reason for referral (45%) was that of "academic difficulties" and that boys were referred more often than girls in all age groups by an overall ratio of 2½ to 1.

Phillips (1956) studied 635 guidance records of children being referred for services. These records were those of children being referred to his private practice and public guidance center. They were examined as to sex and ordinal position. First-born occurred in the clinical population more so than the general population, and boys were referred more often than girls.

Nicholson (1967) investigated the referral aspect of the school psychologist's case-study work in 59 Ohio school districts. An analysis was made of the referral process and specific questions were asked pertaining to the children referred for case studies. Two of the questions raised in his study were as follows: (1) What kinds of problems are referred for case study, and (2) What are the relative proportions
of boys and girls referred for case study? Results indicated that academic difficulties constitute the most stated reason for referral. Forty-six percent of all children referred were in this category. Boys were referred with greater frequency than girls. Sixty-nine percent of the children referred to the psychologist included in the study were males. This is an overall ratio of slightly more than 2 to 1 in favor of males. The second most stated reason for referral was class placement such as special education and gifted classes. Twenty-six percent of all children referred fitted this category. Almost six percent of these children were referred for placement in a gifted class and twenty percent for placement in slow-learning classes.

Robbins, Mercer and Meyers (1967) studied the type of referrals of students by teachers to the central office of the Unified School District of Riverside, California, for one school year. Types of referrals were classified as outstanding qualities, acting out behavior, academic difficulty, special education, withdrawal, out of school problems and medical. The results indicated that the rate of referral for problem behavior was higher than referrals for any other reason. Boys outnumbered girls three to one (152 to 58). In the area of referral for special education, boys outnumbered the girls two to one (33 to 19). As can be seen, 52 students were referred to the special education program, and boys were referred at a higher rate than girls.

In a similar type study, Rice (1963) investigated the types of problems referred to a child guidance agency in Sacramento, California. He classified the referred problems into six broad problem categories which included emotional reactions, intellectual disabilities, motivational inadequacies, moral defects, physical ailments, and social
maladjustments. The analysis of the referred problems indicated that intellectual disabilities and social maladjustment were the most common problems at all grade levels. Boys outnumbered the girls in referrals.

Gilbert (1957) made a survey of referral problems in several metropolitan child guidance centers and found he could classify problems into ten broad problem categories. The top three referral problem categories are more pertinent to this study. They are: (1) academic difficulties; (2) mental retardation; and (3) aggressive and anti-social behavior. Academic difficulties constituted the most frequently stated reason for children being referred to the child guidance clinics. This represented almost half (45%) of all cases in the sample. Aggressive and anti-social behavior and mental retardation came in second and third position with 30 percent and 27 percent, respectively. The breakdown indicated that boys were referred at a far greater frequency than girls, the overall ratio being approximately 2½ to 1.

Smith (1971) states that studies on the prevalence of mental retardation report that more males than females are retarded. He further emphasized that this could be because our society is more aware of inadequacies among males than among females because of difference in role expectations.

It appears from the research that social and emotional adjustments are made more difficult for boys because aggressive tendencies have negative social value beyond an optimum level. Boys are expected to display just so much aggression and no more. This struggle to maintain just the right balance of aggression to satisfy the natural activity
drive and to win approval among both peer and authority groups generates sufficient insecurity to account for the preponderance of males referred for special services. In many instances below average school performance may be the criteria for acceptance in the peer group (Cohen, 1962). At the same time this below average school performance could be one of the reasons for referral to an EMR class.

**Race and Educable Mentally Retarded**

Just as the influence of sex on intelligence typically tends to favor one sex over the other, race as an influence on intelligence typically tends to favor one race over another. In the United States Whites are usually favored over Blacks on intelligence tests, etc.

Numerous research studies indicate that Blacks score lower on standardized achievement tests and aptitude tests than Whites (Dullick, 1950). Many educators, in attempting to cope with this program, group youngsters on the basis of their measured achievement level on nationally standardized tests. When this is done, one finds within such schools a "special class" for "slow learners" which in many cases is simply an all-Black class. These youngsters are labeled as "slow learners," "retardates," or youngsters unable to benefit from regular classroom instruction.

Grouping children according to supposed ability (known as tracking) has been a widely accepted educational practice in the United States (Green, 1974). Ability grouping discriminates against the child from a low socio-economic level and also discriminates against children having low intelligence.

Mental retardation is not equally distributed among all segments of our society (Lapouse and Weitzner, 1970). There are certain groups that seem to have a higher incidence of mental subnormality than other groups.
Many principals, teachers and other school administrators have for years felt that they were doing the disruptive, uncooperative, loud and slow learning student a favor by removing him from the regular classroom. Too often, however, Black children are removed and placed in special classes because they are rejected by regular teachers in regular classrooms and because they are troublemakers. By removing them, teachers feel that the students would benefit by getting the special help they need to improve in their academics and behavior. This was supported by Dunn (1968) when he stated that regular teachers and administrators have sincerely felt they were doing these pupils a favor by removing them from the pressures of an unrealistic and inappropriate program of studies. He went on to say that homogenous groupings tend to work to the disadvantage of the children who are underprivileged and slow learners. These children learn much from being in the same class with children from White middle class homes.

It has been hypothesized that individuals who are shunted into a particular group as a result of being negatively labeled tend to engage in role behaviors that are designed to reflect the characteristics of that group and so solidify their position in the group. For example, Guskin (1963) argued that mentally retarded children might manifest nonachievement, lack of control and helplessness behaviors because they are behaviors expected of mentally retarded individuals. Thus, the theoretical argument is advanced that the assignment of a child to a deviant group results in his behaving in conformity with his newly ascribed status.

There have been many field surveys, educational surveys and studies which have consistently shown a disproportionately large number of
persons from ethnic minorities such as Blacks, Mexican and Puerto Rican among those being labeled as retarded by clinical measures (Jastak, MacPhee, and Whitteman, 1963; Brockopp, 1958; Mullen and Nee, 1952; Lemkau, Tietze and Cooper, 1941). Samuda (1975) stated that the over-representation of minority students in the low-ability classes of elementary and secondary schools is an observable and easily documented fact.

Coleman et al. (1966) did a study which indicated that school authorities, in elementary and secondary schools attended by Blacks, would enroll a significantly greater proportion of Black children in lower tracks and classes for the educable mentally retarded. Dunn (1968) noted that at the national level, Blacks and minority groups comprised over 50 percent of students in EMR programs.

Mercer (1971) stated that the California State Department of Education, since 1966, has conducted annually an ethnic survey of students in special programs. The survey consistently shows that the rates of placement for Black and minority students in special education classes are two to three times higher per 1,000 than rates for children from English-speaking, Caucasian homes.

Robert Williams (1970) writes about the composition of special education classes in St. Louis. During the academic year 1968-1969, Blacks comprised approximately 63.6 percent of the St. Louis school population, Whites, 36.4 percent. Of 4,020 children in special education, 2,975 (76 percent) were Black, only 1,045 (24 percent) were White. Black students were placed approximately 3 to 1 in the special EMR classes.

Williams (1970) also reported that, in San Francisco, a group of Black psychologists presented a document on testing abuses to the San Francisco Unified School District School Board. The document clearly
pointed out that Blacks comprised 27.8 percent of the total student population but 53 percent of all in EMR programs. The Black psychologists stated that the consultants to psychologists and psychometricians are not familiar enough with Black experience to serve as competent evaluators of Black children.

Mercer (1971) writes that she investigated the characteristics of 1,234 children referred to the pupil personnel department of the Riverside Unified School District during a single school year. Approximately 31 percent were referred for the gifted program, 30 percent for behavior and disciplinary problems, 20 percent for academic difficulty with no mention of special classes and 8 percent were referred specifically for evaluation and possible placement in special education programs for the mentally retarded. Approximately 81 percent of the children of the school district were Anglo, 11 percent Mexican-American and 8 percent Black. Students being referred to pupil personnel departments were almost identical to the distribution in the school as far as social status and by ethnic groups. The school psychologists tested 865 of the 1,234 referred and, of the 865, 135 had IQ scores of 79 or below and were eligible for placement in a special education class on the basis of their test performance. Of the students failing the test, 47.4 percent were Anglo, 32.7, Mexican, and 19.8 percent were Blacks. The school psychologists recommended that 81 be placed in EMR classes. Of these, 37.9 percent were Anglo, while 40.9 percent were Mexican, and 21.2 percent were Black. There were disproportionately more of the eligible Mexican and Black children recommended for placement by the school psychologists and fewer of the eligible Anglo children. Seventy-one children were actually placed after the recommendation; of these, 45.3 percent were Mexican, 22.6 percent were Black.
Samuda (1975), quoting figures issued by the Bureau of Intergroup Relations of the State Department of Education for the State of California, Fall 1970, reports that Blacks comprise 9.1 percent of the total school population of that state but account for 27.5 percent of the EMR and constitute only 2.5 percent of those classified as gifted. Mercer (1971) also found more minorities being labeled retardates by community organizations than Whites.

Jenkins and Brown (1935) used data collected from the Institute of Juvenile Research in Chicago between 1925 and 1934 to study the rate of mental deficiency in various sections of the urban Chicago area. Mental deficiency among children in different areas corresponded to a gradient which was correlated negatively with socio-economic status as measured by rents and correlated positively with community disorganization as measured by rates of juvenile delinquency. They also found that mental deficiency rates were highest in deteriorated areas of Chicago where poverty and dependency were common.

Butler, Lei and McAllister (1973) state that the highest rate of labeled retardation by public schools and other public agencies is in areas of major concentration of Chicano and Black populations. These areas are also characterized by concentrations of families with low socio-economic status, poorly educated household heads, poor housing quality as reflected in old and deteriorated housing, and longer duration of residence in the community.

The same situation exists in Florida that is found in other states. There is an overrepresentation of low socio-economic status and minority students in low ability and other special classes of elementary and secondary schools. For example, in Alachua County there are 865 students
In the EMR classes (Beckum, 1975). Of this number, 732 of the students are Black and 133 are White. The total county school population is 70 percent White and 30 percent Black. Blacks represent more than 82 percent of the students currently enrolled in classes set up for the educable mentally retarded.

The Black Intellectual genocide that Williams spoke of in 1971 is being perpetrated in Alachua County when on the basis of intelligence test scores and other social and educational information, Black and other minority children are consigned to EMR classes or programs.

Young (1969) writes concerning Blacks who are classified as educational mentally retarded by school systems:

It is revealing that most of the deprived people who are labeled as retarded as some time in their lives are usually recognized as such in school situations. They are not "retarded" either before or after their school years, since they do not then fit the definition of retardation, which includes both a low intelligence quotient and a failure to adapt to social environments. School is the social environment they fail to adapt to. We are at last beginning to recognize that this is so because the attitudes and behavior required by the school, as well as the methods used for measuring what we call intelligence, are charged with cultural concepts foreign to the world of the deprived. Conventional aptitude and achievement tests, largely based on middle-class standards, concepts and experience, can be expected to, and we now know do, fail to measure accurately the potential aptitudes of slum children.

The Educable Mentally Retarded: Definitions

There are many terms used to refer to students who are on the low end of the distribution of intelligence as measured by various I.Q. tests. They are sometimes called mentally retarded, idiot, imbecile, moron, oligophrenia, endogenous, trainable, slow learner, mentally handicapped, feeble-minded, dementia, and many other terms which denote low mental capacity, low intellectual functioning and/or various degrees
of mental retardation. Kirk (1972) wrote that children with low intelligence are classified into four distinct groups:

1. The slow learner (I.Q. 80 to 92)
2. The educable mentally retarded (EMR) (I.Q. 50-55 to 75-79)
3. The trainable mentally retarded (TMR) (I.Q. 30-35 to 50-55)
4. The totally dependent or profoundly mentally retarded (I.Q. below 25-30).

Tredgold, one of the early medical authorities to define mental retardation, defines it as:

A state of incomplete development of such a kind and degree that the individual is incapable of adapting himself to the normal environment of his fellows in such a way as to maintain existence independently of supervision, control, or external support. (Tredgold, 1937, p. 407)

Sarason (1955) stated that the mentally retarded person is one who, for long or short periods of time functions intellectually below the average of their peers. He did not take socially adaptive behaviors into consideration.

In 1959 the American Association of Mental Deficiency (AAMD) adopted and proposed a new definition which included qualifying dimensions of intelligence as well as associated impairments. The definition was prepared by H.F. Heber (1959). This definition is accepted by most professional groups and reads as follows:

Mental retardation refers to subaverage general intellectual functioning which originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment in one or more of the following: (1) maturation, (2) learning and (3) social adjustment.

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation (1962) stated that:

The mentally retarded are children and adults who, as a result of inadequately developed intelligence, are significantly impaired in their ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society. . . the term "mental retardation" is a simple designation for a group of complex phenomena stemming
from many different causes, but one key common characteristic found in all cases is inadequately developed intelligence.

The AAMD, after adopting a definition in 1959, saw a need for revision. The definition, which was prepared by H. F. Heber, was revised in 1961, and is as follows:

Mental retardation refers to subaverage general intellectual functioning which originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment in adaptive behavior.

Scheerenberger (1964) stated that the necessity for impairment in adaptive behavior is important and is one of the unique features of the definition.

Masland (1963) stated that mental retardation refers to a condition of intellectual inadequacy which renders an individual incapable of performing at the level required for acceptable adjustment within his cultural environment. (p. 286)

In 1969 the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service (Children's Bureau), printed a pamphlet which stated that children who are mentally retarded are not able to learn as much or at the same rate as other children. They often use poor judgement, have poor memory, have poor reasoning abilities and have problems when it comes to making decisions based on new situations. The Health, Education and Welfare group estimated that approximately 30 out of every 1,000 children are born mentally retarded to the extent that they will benefit little or none from the regular school classes. Of this 30, 25 are "educable," 4 are "trainable," and 1 is "totally dependent." The first group, "educable," are placed in special classes since they are not able to handle or complete the curricular goals of the regular elementary school classes.Occupationally, they may learn to do some semiskilled or unskilled work to support themselves.

Cawley and Pappanikou (1967) stated that in order to define the
educable mentally retarded one may use the same definition adopted by the AAMD only with more specificity of the element of maturation, learning, and social adjustment which allows the retardate to be labeled as educable. These authors stated that one can make the definition applicable to the EMRs by inserting the phrase "resulting in a general measurable level which is one-half to three-fourths that of normality" directly after the word "Impairment" in the AAMD definition. Then the definition would read:

Mental retardation refers to ... is associated with impairment resulting in a general measurable level which is one-half to three-fourths that of normality in one or more of the following: (1) maturation, (2) learning and (3) social adjustment.

The educable mentally retarded student, according to Kirk (1972), is one who has subnormal mental development and is unable to handle or profit from the traditional educational program in the regular classroom. He further states that these students have potentialities for development in three areas:

1. educability in social adjustment to a point where he can get along independently in the community,

2. educability in academic subjects of the school at a minimum level, and

3. minimal occupational adequacies to such a degree that he can later support himself partially or totally at the adult level.

In Alachua County the following definition is currently being used for eligibility and referral of school-age students to an educable mentally retarded program. The handbook, Alachua County Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, 1974-75, states that the educable mentally retarded child is one who is impaired in his intellectual and adaptive behavior and the rate of his learning is
one-half to three-fourths that of students with normal intelligence and whose developmental status reflects his rate of learning. The measured intelligence of these students usually falls in the range of two to three standard deviations below the mean (IQ 100; SD 15-16) and the adaptive behavior falls below age and cultural expectancies.

There have been many attempts to define mental retardation (Robinson and Robinson, 1965), but it appears that a consensus of the definition can not be agreed upon. The problem of lack of agreement among a general definition prompted the AAMD, in 1959, to produce a definition which they felt would be acceptable to the various professional groups. The definition did not gain unanimous approval by all professional groups in the community but is being used by many (Smith, 1971).

One can assume then that the various disciplines currently interpret mental retardation within the scope of their profession (Kirk, 1972), but they usually include: (a) some aspect of intellectual subnormality and (b) an underline judgement that retardation involves problems in meeting the demands of society (Geloff, 1963). Mental retardation, then, is determined by rules or standards set up by a given society, professional agency or organization.

Kanner (1949), in his writings, clearly illustrates that society sets the standards for labeling the mentally retarded child: in less complex, less intellectually centered societies, they (mentally retarded) would have no trouble in obtaining and retaining a quality of realizable ambitions. Some might even be capable of gaining superiority by virtue of assets other than those measured by the intelligence test. They could make successful peasants, hunters, fishermen, tribal dancers. They can, in our own society, achieve proficiency as farmhands, factory workers, miners, waitresses.. Their principal shortcoming is a greater or lesser degree of inability to comply with the intellectual requirement of their society. In other respects they may be as mature or immature, stable or unstable, secure
or insecure, placid or moody, aggressive or submissive as any other member of the human species. Their "deficiency" is an ethnologically determined phenomenon relative to the local standards and even within those standards, relative to the educational postulates, vocational ambitions, and family expectancies. They are "subcultural" in our society but may not even that in a different, less sophisticated setting. (p. 8)

The following are brief profiles of two well known persons who at one time were labeled as intellectually inferior.

1. This individual was raised in an average American midwestern family. His mother was a schoolteacher and his father engaged in small business enterprises. Throughout this young man's entire life he attended public school for only three months. During his public school days he was always at the bottom of his class and was taken out of school at the request of his teacher. The teacher reported to the school administrators that the boy was addlebrained and should be kept out of school. His mother became enraged and withdrew him as a result of the teacher's recommendation (Dyer and Martin, 1929).

2. Relser (1930) wrote that this young man was retiring in personality and that he was very slow in learning to talk. Based on this early experience his parents felt that something was wrong and believed him retarded in development. His school experiences were not happy ones. He was bored with school and recalls only one teacher who motivated him in aspiration and an interest in the classical world. He was mediocre in school as a language student but later gained an interest in mathematics. His father did not have theoretical training, but with his abilities in technical matters, went on to conduct an electrical business (Relser, 1930).

The profiles are those of persons who were later considered intellectually gifted or as being geniuses. The first profile is that
of Albert Einstein (1879-1955). The profile indicates that he did not come from a family of high educational attainments or high socio-economic status. He did not show precocity at an early age, nor did his early school experience contribute to his later accomplishments in mathematics and physics.

The second profile is that of Thomas A. Edison (1847-1931), who invented the phonograph, the incandescent electric lamp, the motion-picture camera and many other mechanical devices. His education was acquired on a tutorial basis, and his achievements were accomplished without the stimulus of formal school.

Both of these individuals made significant contributions to society, although teachers saw them as being impaired in intellectual capacity, unmotivated and misfits in their early educational pursuits.

Special education classes for the mentally retarded were established in the United States in the early 1900s (Erdman and Olson, 1966). If special education classes had existed in the 1800s, would Einstein and Edison have been prime candidates for the EMR programs? According to guidelines used in the identification of students with learning problems, etc., both probably would have met the criteria for referral.

The Efficacy of Special Classes

There has been a continuing concern for the effectiveness of special educational programs for children who are classified as mentally retarded. Many authorities in the field believe that retarded students make as much progress in the regular classes as they do in special classes (Kirk, 1964; Smith and Kennedy, 1967). The majority of studies from Bennett (1932) to Blatt (1970), comparing regular with special class
placement for mentally retarded children, have reported that these children academically are as well off in the regular classes as in special classes. In an early study (Bennett, 1932), a comparison was made of 50 mentally handicapped children enrolled in a special class for one year with an equated group who had been enrolled in regular classes. Bennett found a significant difference in the mean achievement scores for the two groups. The mean scores of the children in the regular class were significantly higher than the children enrolled in the special class.

Pertsch (1936), in a doctoral dissertation, studied the academic progress of students in regular classes when compared with students in special classes. The two groups were paired on the basis of chronological age, mental age, and IQ. He found that students in the regular classes performed significantly better academically than did the students in special classes. They also showed a greater academic gain over a six-month instructional period.

Johnson (1962), after reviewing the special educational class efficacy studies, concluded that mentally retarded children enrolled in special classes achieve less than mentally retarded children who remain in regular classes, despite enrollment being smaller in the special classes, trained teachers, and the high educational cost. He stated that:

It is indeed paradoxical that mentally handicapped children having teachers especially trained, having more money (per capita) spent on their education, and being designed to provide for their unique needs, should be accomplishing the objectives of their education at the same or at a lower level than similar mentally handicapped children who have not had these advantages and have been forced to remain in the regular grades. (p. 66)
Goldstein, Moss and Jordan (1965) conducted a four-year study designed to ascertain the efficacy of special educational classes for mentally retarded children. They limited the study to intellectual development, social and personal adjustment, and academic achievement. One hundred twenty-six children from three counties of central Illinois were identified with IQ scores below 85 on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. Approximately one-half of the children were randomly assigned to special classes (experimental) while the others remained in their regular classes (controls). The experimental and control groups gained significantly in IQs over the first year of the study; no differences were found between groups. In academic achievement (reading) the control group, during the first two years, was superior to the experimental group; however, the experimental group caught up with but did not surpass the control group during the final two years. In arithmetic achievement the control group was better at the end of the first year, but no significant differences were found at the end of the four year study.

Simches and Bohn (1963) examined a major curriculum guide for teaching the educable mentally retarded. He concluded that the programs for the EMR students did not differ appreciably from the ones offered to the regular students. Sparks and Blackman (1965) stated that there is an increasing emphasis on special class placement and special class teacher preparation for the EMRs despite the lack of proof that differences really exist in regard to techniques, materials, etc., used by the special classroom teachers.

Laura Jordan (1973), head supervisor of Curriculum for Teachers of the Educable Mentally Handicapped, College of Education, University of Illinois, stated:
Because of the scarcity of materials developed specifically for use with the retarded, and the availability of an almost limitless selection of materials prepared for use in regular classes, all too often the teacher has settled for the reading method, the science curriculum, or the arithmetic series already in use in her school system. (p. 21)

It is evident that special programs have fulfilled neither their educational purpose nor their instructional promise (Haring and Lovitt, 1967). Gallagher (1970) posed another problem area. He states:

The great majority of youngsters were placed in special classes, not solely for reasons of intellectual retardation, but because of substantial behavioral or other learning problems as well. If a mildly retarded child is sitting quietly in the classroom and not causing any trouble for anyone, it is unlikely that he will be placed in a special class. His sole participation in special education before he anonymously drops out of school might be to serve as a member of a control group where he will be compared with his more abstreperous special brethren. (p. 429)

One can assume that Gallagher is referring to the White children who are known to be slow by teachers but who are not referred for special class placement. This is perhaps one of the reasons there is such an over-representation of Black children in the EMR special class programs.

On the grounds that research does not support the efficacy of placing children in special classes, Dunn (1968) called for the unmitigated abolishment of these classes. He argued the validity of special education classes for Blacks and other minorities with mild learning problems. Dunn further stated that he is not inferring that all special programs be eliminated. He believes special education programs should be provided for the moderately and severely retarded and for the multiply handicapped. He states:

A better education than special class placement is needed for socio-culturally deprived children with mild learning problems who have been labeled educable mentally retarded. Over the years, the status of these pupils who come from
poverty, broken and inadequate homes, and low status ethnic groups has been a checkered one. This practice continues to this day and, unless counterforces are set in motion now, it will probably become even more prevalent in the immediate future due in large measure to increased racial integration. (p. 5)

Lord (1970) has stated that one of the reasons special education got out of the mainstream was because exceptional children were not being adequately cared for in the regular classes. Even today the majority of elementary school teachers do not have training in special education.

Blatt (1970) stated that beginning with Bennett's study in 1932, Pertsch's in 1936, his study in 1956, and the many that followed, none has yet shown that special education models for training students with special needs have demonstrated efficacy or special value. The studies which have been reported have not satisfactorily demonstrated the necessity of enrolling children in special programs. The studies do indicate that teachers are confronted by many special problems with these students in the regular classroom. Blatt stated that the time for experimentation and special training of regular classroom teachers with regular supervisory staff are clearly the indicated areas that deserve attention today.

Socio-economic Status and Intelligence

The review of the literature pertaining to socio-economic status and intelligence is replete with studies attesting to the relationship between income and intelligence. Typically included under this rubric are students who are from families of low socio-economic status (as measured by educational level, occupation, parents' income and place of residence, etc.) and students from Black and other racial minority groups.
The literature tends to support the hypothesis that a child's Intelligence quotient (I.Q.) correlates positively with the socio-economic status of his family. Loewinger (1940) reviewed 97 studies and found an average correlation of .40 between children's I.Q. and their fathers' level of occupation. It has also been reported that there are larger mean differences in intelligence between low and high socio-economic status children in adolescence than in the early years of school (Bloom, 1964; Hunt, 1961; Silverman, 1965; Davis, 1948; Gordon, 1965; Karp and Sigei, 1965; and Coleman et al., 1966).

Hunt (1961) stated that a varied environment and a variety of stimuli during development are conditions more likely to be found in middle-class than in a lower-class home and that these are more conducive to higher utilization of a student's intellectual potential than impoverished and monotonous environments.

In an early study of 319 sixth grade pupils, it was found that their Intelligence scores showed a reliable relationship to the occupational level of their parents (Maddy, 1943). The children whose parents were in semi-skilled occupations scored on an average of 16.1 points below those from professional families. Maddy's findings also suggested that the neighborhood in which the child lived had an effect on his Intelligence whether the parents were in semi-skilled or professional occupations. Children from professional families who lived in low socio-economic neighborhoods scored lower than those of professional families in the high socio-economic communities. The reverse was found for children of semi-skilled parents who lived in high socio-economic neighborhoods.

Sewel and Ellenbogen (1952) studied the intellectual level of children from a predominantly rural Wisconsin county using the California
Short Form Test of Mental Maturity. The county consisted of urban, rural-nonfarm, and farm families. They assessed the relationship between the mean measured intelligence score and the social status of the family. Social status was determined by the father's occupational level, parent's educational attainment, and the family's prestige in the community. A highly significant relationship was found between measured intelligence and social status. Further, the investigators concluded that social status differentials in a child's measured intelligence existed within the urban, rural-nonfarm and farm components of that county. When comparing across population groups (urban, rural-nonfarm, and farm families), few significant differences were found among the children in the same social status categories. The authors stated that the residence of the families had little bearing on the intelligence of the children, but that their intelligence level was related more so to the social status of the family.

Estes (1953) studied 80 children. The group consisted of 40 children from low income families and 40 children from high income families. He administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) to both groups. Results revealed that children from higher socio-economic status families scored significantly higher than their counterparts. This view is also supported by Havighurst and Janke, 1944; Janke and Havighurst, 1945).

Laird (1957) did a study with two groups of eleven-year-old boys using scores from the WISC. One of the groups was composed of 30 elementary schools boys from semi-skilled families; the other group consisted of 30 elementary school boys from professional families. When scores were compared, she found marked differences in the verbal and full
scale scores than the performance scores. Her conclusion was:

...that in full scale IQs the two groups differ in intelligence classification, the P group being classified as "bright normal" and the S group as "average." Therefore, it seems necessary to refute the hypothesis that two groups of boys, drawn from two different socio-economic levels, will show similarity in age, residence, school attendance, family, unit, race, nationality, physical status and health. (p. 105)

A study by Schmuck and Schmuck (1961) shows that children's intelligence scores correlate positively with their father's occupational level. Similar results were also found by Anderson (1962) who reported that the Lorge-Thorndike yields scores which are highly related to the social class of the family. High social status was related to high mean IQ on both the verbal and nonverbal factors of the test.

Deutsch and Brown (1964) examined the differences in IQ scores of 543 urban Black and White public school children. The students' scores were grouped according to their race and the socio-economic status of their families. The students were given the Lorge-Thorndike Test, Level 1, Primary Battery. These authors concluded that on all comparisons, the mean IQ of the Black children was significantly lower than that of their White peer group.

Miller (1970) stated that the environmental conditions which appear to retard school age children tend to be associated with lower occupational categories than with higher ones. Burnes (1970) make a comparison of Black and White boys from lower class and upper middle class homes to determine group patterns on the WISC. No differences in patterns were found between races; however, differences did exist between social economic groups. When subtest scores were analyzed, Black and White subjects from lower class homes scored lower.

Stodolsky and Lesser (1967) suggested that Intelligence tests do
not measure things innate, fixed, and predetermined. Intelligence tests can, however, be thought of as only samples of learning based on general experiences or skills acquired in the child's environment or school. Further, Intelligence tests provide only a single IQ score which is not sufficient by itself and generally reveals nothing concerning abilities. Dingman and Meyers (1966) stated that children are capable of many more functions than are represented in the general Intelligence scales of an IQ score.

**Socio-economic Status and Achievement**

In an early study Shaw (1943) investigated the relationship between socio-economic status and educational achievement of students in grades four to eight. He found a correlation of .41 between scores obtained on the Sim Score Card (measure of socio-economic status) and Stanford Achievement Educational Quotients (EQs). The correlation between the Score Card and average grade was .38. When tested IQ was partialed out, there was a coefficient of .27 between the Sims Scores and EQs. He concluded that there was a fairly substantial relationship between socio-economic status and academic achievement.

In 1944, Havighurst and Janke used the Stanford-Binet, Wechsler-Bellevue, Iowa Silent Reading, Chicago Assembly Test for Girls, Minnesota Paper Form Board, and the Minnesota Mechanical Assembly (modified version) to survey ten-year-old students in a midwestern community. The findings affirmed that children of high social status tended to do better on the tests than did children from low social status.

Another study involved 127 sixth grade elementary students in Minnesota. The correlation between socio-economic status and achievement
test scores was .30 except in arithmetic which was correlated at .07. It was concluded that socio-economic status was related to academic achievement (Gough, 1946).

Anderson (1962), in the spring of 1960, administered an IQ test to all pupils attending the fifth and seventh grades of two central school systems in the greater Syracuse, New York area. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between social class and measures of intellectual functioning derived from the Lorge-Thorndike. The sample consisted of 319 fifth and 279 seventh graders. Social class was determined by Sim's hierarchy of the social prestige associated with occupations of subjects' fathers. Result of the mean verbal IQ for this group was significantly higher than the mean non-verbal IQ. He also noted a significant relationship between socio-economic status and achievement. Likewise, Wilson (1967) found that social class was a major factor in the academic achievement of elementary school age children.

An Investigation by Davis (1951) stated that the abilities in the lower socio-economic groups are wasted since teachers do not understand the culture and habits of these groups. Socio-economic factors can influence the school's diagnosis of the Intelligence of children on standard achievement or Intelligence tests. Davis further stated that children at ages 6 to 10 have an average IQ which is 8 to 12 points lower than children from high socio-economic groups. At age 14, 20-23 IQ points are seen between children of low socio-economic and high occupational groups.

Stodulsky and Lesser (1967) found that the mean differences between children of high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status are recognized at about age four (Bloom, 1964; Pasamanick and Knoblock, 1955).
With increase in a child's age, there is even a wider gap in the intelligence test differences. Several researchers have found larger mean difference in intelligence between low and high socio-economic status children in adolescence than in the beginning years of their formal education (Hunt, 1961; Bloom, 1964; Gordon, 1965).

Price (1929), in an early study, investigated the test performances of Black and White freshmen in Black and White colleges. He found that the difference in median scores was ten points in favor of the White students. He noted, however, that 20 percent of the Blacks' scores exceeded the median score of the Whites.

Another study designed to measure the differences between the achievement of Blacks and Whites was conducted by Wilkerson (1934). He used the Stanford Achievement Test which indicated that the general achievement level of Blacks was significantly lower than that of Whites.

Deutsch and Brown (1964) shared another point of view about the academic achievement and socio-economic status between Black and White in a study of 543 urban public school children. They were interested in the intellectual differences of Black and White first and fifth graders of different social classes (divided into three levels). Social class was measured by the Institute's twelve point socio-economic status scale which is based on occupation and education of the breadwinners. The Intelligence test used was the Lorge-Thorndike, Levels I and III. The mean IQ scores for White children were significantly higher than the means for Black children. The Black children at each level scored lower than White children.

Ginzberg (1956) stated that:

The achievement of Black children during the elementary grade
Is low because they bring to school the handicaps growing out of a childhood characterized by poverty, family instability, inferior social status, and isolation from the White community. There is evidence that the Intellectual potential of Black children growing up in deprived neighborhoods is already seriously stunted well before they reach school age. (p. 113)

Similarly, Young (1969), the late Executive Director of the National Urban League, Chicago, stated that by the time poor Black children reach the elementary school, there often exists built-in physical and psychological handicaps. Many Black children from poverty communities come to school for the first time without the experience or skills necessary for learning and with insufficient diets, poor health habits, and lack of motivation which often stunts intellectual growth and development.

Accordingly, the Coleman Report (1966) pointed out that the gap between the academic performance and achievement of Black students and the national norms increased the longer the students remained in the school system. Rivers et al. (1975) went on to say that when Black children score lower on ability or achievement tests than White children, the difference does not mean that White children have superior intelligence; it means that the Black child performed differently on the test from the White child. Because of low educational achievement, racial prejudice, and the failure of the schools to meet the needs of Black children, Hurst (1971) held that

. . .Public education as it has existed over the years has systematically discriminated against minority groups in a most vicious way—limiting their vision of human existence, narrowing the choice of what they will become, and depriving them of the very pursuit of life, liberty and happiness which are supposedly sacred to the American society. . .In a variety of ways, the educational institutions of our country have been segregated and segregating processes in these terms. (p. 1)

Kennedy (1963) stressed a similar attitude when he stated:
The Black baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a White baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 a year, a life expectancy which is seven years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much. (p. 153)

Silberman discussed the schools' effects on the children of the poor in the light of historical changes:

On almost any measure the schools are doing a better job of educating minority groups and lower class children now than a generation ago. But not enough better on almost any measure. The schools are still failing to provide the kind of education Blacks, Indians, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Appalachian Whites--indeed, the poor of every color, race, and ethnic background--need and deserve. (1970, p. 62)

It can be concluded that among children of the poor there is a greater incidence of low achievement than among middle and upper-class children. This indicates that one of the schools' most pressing problems is assessing how these children may best be educated. Meeting the psychological and scholastic needs of Black children is a matter of great importance today. These children must be known, individually and collectively. We must determine how Black children differ from White children, how to teach them and what the barriers are in communication. This is not a new problem area when compared to earlier decades. The schools' failure to help these children cannot be as easily overlooked (Gordon and Wilkerson, 1966).

The Myth of the IQ Test

The general concern of the experimental psychologists of the early 19th century was not the assessment of individual differences (Anastasi, 1955). Their foremost interest evolved around devising a generalized
depiction of human behavior, and the focus was directed more toward the consistencies in human behavior rather than the variances.

Sir Francis Galton, an English biologist, is given credit for starting the testing movement. He was interested in human heredity and conducted research on the measurement characteristics of related and unrelated persons. He was the first to systematically organize data on individual differences in psychological processes (Anastasi, 1955).

Numerous attempts were made by Binet and others to measure intelligence. Research was done using almost every conceivable approach. Among these were the analysis of physical traits, handwriting, and palmistry. However, these measures proved to be quite insufficient. In 1904, out of a need for measures to identify children of subnormal intelligence, the Minister of Public Instruction in Paris appointed a committee to study procedures that could be used for this purpose. Out of the study came the Binet-Simon Scale. This scale represents one of the earliest efforts at intelligence testing (Anastasi, 1955).

Today, strict hereditarians like Jensen (1969) believe that parental genes dictate the child's intelligence. Jensen argues that compensatory education has failed in its attempts at raising the IQs of those cultural groups whose scores are lower than Whites. His basic thesis is that IQ is more a matter of inheritance than environment and is, therefore, not amenable to corrective training. To Jensen and other hereditarians, human Intelligence is determined basically by genetics, and because of this, human beings differ in innate intellectual potential. They contend that Whites are innately superior in Intelligence to Blacks.

Contrary to the belief of the hereditarians, social scientists and/or environmentalists assert that people are born with essentially the same
potential for development of "intelligence," but, due to cultural and socio-economic variables, a disparity exists in the scores between races. In agreement with this thinking, Horton and Leslie (1970) maintained that environmental factors explain the differences in personality behavior and achievement among cultural groups. Cultural differences can determine and explain the variability between the IQ scores of the Black and White races.

Educational testing today is a very big business. Last year alone the standardized testing industry reported an income of more than $100 million (Green, 1974). The industry makes this money by selling its tests to schools, employment agencies, and any other agency convinced that psychological test results are valid and accurate measures of learning, abilities, education and job success. Green stated that during spring, 1974, more than 631,000 standardized tests were administered in Atlanta's public schools. Most of these tests were taken by youngsters in kindergarten through sixth grade. In Detroit 123,000 elementary school children took more than 400,000 tests during 1974.

Green (1974) posed these questions: What do these tests really tell educators and employment officials about people? What effect do they have on the person's future?

Robert Williams, an outstanding psychologist and director of Black Studies at St. Louis' Washington University, was almost a victim of the IQ test. At the age of 15 he was administered an IQ test which yielded a full scale IQ of 82, only a few points above the cut-off score for admittance into a special education class. He was counseled not to enter college because of his "poor ability" and was urged to become a brick mason or auto mechanic since he was "good with his hands and not
with his mind." Instead, he went on to earn a Ph.D. in psychology at Washington University. Williams referred to the IQ test as the hired gun in the war of scientific racism (Williams, 1970).

Gergory Ochoa, a California college professor, was a victim of the IQ test. His example clearly shows the injustice of the IQ test and how schools use the results to determine the personal worth and potential of students. He was administered an IQ test which placed him in the mentally subnormal category, a stigma which remained with him throughout his early youth. It was not until after he enlisted in the military that his ambition, capabilities, and aptitudes were discovered. He later entered college but was placed on academic probation because of his early classification as educable mentally retarded. Ochoa completed his college endeavor with all "A's" which earned him a place on the dean's list. He was still on probation. Ochoa stated that he was not able to shed the "stigma" which stayed with him since his early school days until he became a college professor. With their misuses, mislabeling, misplacements, and biases tests have thwarted the natural growth and development of "millions of people" (Jones, 1975).

The Wechsler, Blnet, and many other intelligence tests have subscales which are concerned with social values. The "correct" or "preferred" answers in many instances are not the ones that many Blacks, either poor or middle class, would agree on (Jorgenson, 1973). Black children are then penalized on these tests since the contents are based on standard and social values of the White race. Items on the Blnet test such as: "What is the thing to do if another child hits you, without meaning to do it?" discriminates against children from the slums. On the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, a similar question is asked: What is
the thing to do if a fellow (girl/boy) much smaller than yourself starts to fight with you?" Black children usually respond saying, "I'll hit (him/her) back," or "I'll beat (him/her) up." On both of these tests such responses receive a zero credit points (Massey, 1969). Thus, the Black child or any culturally different child for that matter, who replies this way will be penalized for an answer that is acceptable by his environment. Most Black children are told by their parents to fight or hit back when somebody hits or fights them. One can assume, then, that many tests are based on the White middle class culture and its values.

Green (1974) states that White Ph.D's from middle-income families design IQ test questions with White middle-class children in mind. The tests they develop usually reflect experiences to which middle-income children are exposed. In other words, the bulk of the many educational and psychological tests currently being used in the schools and employment agencies are drawn from outside the Black culture and experiences.

Havighurst and associates (1962) support Green and Williams when they state that the contents of ordinary intelligence tests favor high status children or, to be more specific, middle-class White children. Similarly, Jorgensen (1973) states that the main purpose behind the creation of such tests, beginning with Binet in 1904, was to provide indications of the mental ability of White folks. The standardization samples and the items comprising the contents are all exclusively centered around the values, culture, and experience of the White majority. He states further that the implicit but pervasive belief was that the life style, values, culture, and experiences of Black people were not relevant to the investigation of intelligence.
Cooper and associates (1967) constructed a behavior rating scale which was used to separate 58 southern Black adolescents into two groups. They used four tests (WISC, Revised Beta Examination, Ammons Full-Range Picture Vocabulary Test and Porteus Maze Test) to compare the two groups which had been judged as behaviorally non-retarded and those judged behaviorally retarded. Mental deficiency in that state is IQ 84 or less. The Porteus Maze Test was the only one capable of differentiating between the groups. On the Wechsler and Beta, all 58 subjects achieved IQs of 84 or less. The Porteus results permitted a perfect discrimination between the two groups. The investigators concluded that the three other tests may not be appropriate for Black children.

Williams (1974) writes that he and L. Wendell Rivers, a Black child psychologist and researcher, conducted a study to measure the effects of test constructions written in Black dialectal language and in standard English on the performance of Black children during intelligence testing. Eight hundred and ninety (890) Black kindergarten children, first and second grade students, were equally divided into control and experimental groups. These researchers controlled the variables of IQ, sex, grade, and age in both groups. They used the standard version of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts (BTC) and a version developed by themselves. The BTC consisted of 50 pictorial multiple-choice test items which were concerned with space, quantity, and time. The Black children taking the test in Black dialectal language scored significantly higher than the other group. The study suggested a need to develop a culture-specific psychological and educational test for Black children (See appendix C for a sample of the revised test).

Boone (1974) investigated the differences between Black and White
students on an "Intelligence" test containing items specific to the Black experiences. Two hundred Black and White students enrolled in a class at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee were used as subjects. He wanted to reverse the bias of testing and compare the scores obtained by Black and White students on the Black Intelligence Test (BIT). The results demonstrate that White students who have not been exposed to the Black environment and experience do not know the concepts and terminology necessary to do well on the Black Intelligence Test. In contrast, Black people who are not familiar with the White culture do poorly on many standard Intelligence tests.

The subject matter in schools and content of IQ and other such tests is much more familiar to middle-class children than to Black children. Many of the words, skills, and patterns of thought used are unlikely to be used in low-status Black homes. We are becoming increasingly sensitive to the fact that much of the subject matter and content of the curriculum and standardized tests is foreign to the experience of Black children and that they require a reinterpretation and a reorganization if they are to be used with all children regardless of race or socioeconomic status.

The Legal Consideration of Testing

There is increasing interest on the part of many educators regarding the validity of IQ tests in predicting the scholastic performances of minority and Black students. This concern has resulted, in many instances, in the rejection of scholastic aptitude and ability tests as valid or acceptable measuring instruments for determining the educational placement of Black students (Cameron, 1968). Based on the review of the
It is obvious that the administration of ability tests to Black children violates their civil and constitutional rights under the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment for equal protection under the law (Rivers et al., 1975). Article XIV, Section 1, of the constitution of the United States reads as follows:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction hereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens in the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without the due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (Burke, 1961)

Several Black parents have filed lawsuits in courts against the testing of their children since it violates their (the children's) rights. In most cases the judge delivered in favor of the parents, prohibiting the use of standardized tests. Five of these cases are discussed below to show where charges have been made of actual test abuse.

In the case of Diana et al. vs. California State Board of Education, Leary (1970) reported that Diana, an eight-year-old Mexican American girl, earned an IQ of 30 on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. Her low IQ placed her in the mentally defective range of functioning. The test was translated into Spanish by a school psychologist who was also a Mexican American and readministered at the request of her mother. When the test was scored, her IQ had increased by 40 points. Eight other Mexican American children were retested in Spanish and surpassed the cut-off score of 79 which was used to place students in special classes (EMR). Witty and Jenkins (1935) reported a similar case of misjudging which involved a Black child who had an IQ of 200.

The Skelly Wright decision (Hobson vs. Hansen, 1967) declared that
grouping, tracking, districting, and other devious innovations to separate Black and White students in public schools are unconstitutional. A United States District Court Judge, J. Skelly Wright, issued a 182-page decision concerning the abolishment of the tracking system in the District of Columbia schools. The case dealt with the use of standardized tests to establish the tracking system of homogeneous ability groups in both the elementary and secondary schools in the Washington, D. C., school system. The tracking system proved to be another method of resegregating Blacks and Whites within the school system. The evidence in the case suggested that grouping children on the basis of test scores (Binet and the WISC) was a denial of equal educational opportunity to the poor and the majority of Blacks enrolled in school in the nation's capitol. The evidence supports many researchers' notions concerning disproportionate numbers of Black students in EMR classes and dominating the lower tracks.

The judge stated that a child's future is being decided for him once placed in the lower tracks, i.e., the kind of job a person is qualified to do depends to a certain degree on the quality of education received. Carefully weighing the evidence in the issue of psychological testing and placement of track systems, the judge pointed out the following damages inherent in the system:

By consigning students to specifically designed curricula, the track system makes highly visible the student's status within the school structure. To the unlearned, tracks can become pejorative labels, symptomatic of which is the recent abandonment of the suggestive "Basic" for the more euphemistic "Special Academic" as the nomenclature of the lowest track. A system that presumes to tell a student who his ability is and what he can successfully learn incurs an obligation to take account of the psychological damage that can come from such an encounter between the student and the school, and to be certain that it is in a position to decide whether the student's deficiencies
are true, or only apparent. The District of Columbia school system has not shown that it is in such a position. (p. 140)

Williams (1971) writes that Judge Wright saw the tracking system and psychological testing as a means of forcing the self-fulfilling prophecy of Rosenthal and Jacobson, i.e., many teachers, acting under the false assumptions of test scores, look for the Black child to perform poorly and therefore treat him in a way as to make him conform to their low expectations. In conclusion Judge Wright stated that the tracking system must be abolished. He states:

As to the remedy with respect to the track system, the track system simply must be abolished. . . even in concept the track system is undemocratic and discriminatory. Its creator admits it is designed to prepare some children for white collar and other children for blue collar jobs. . . the danger of children completing their education wearing the wrong collar is far too great for this democracy. (p. 177)

Rivers et al. (1975) writes that many cities have abolished the track system as a result of Judge Wright's decision but have implemented other types of systems which are carbon copies of the tracking system. For example, in one city the tracking system was officially abolished, but a three level system has replaced it (A - Academic Curriculum; B - Standard Curriculum; and C - General Curriculum). Psychological test scores are still used in this system to determine what students enroll in the Academic, Standard or General Curriculum. This system, like the original tracking system, leads students to different educational careers and futures.

Another case concerning test abuse resulted in a suit for damages being brought by some public school students and their parents against officials of the Boston school system and the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Stewart et al. vs. Phillips and
Massachusetts Board of Education, 1970). The action challenged the arbitrary, irrational, and discriminatory manner in which students in the Boston public schools are denied the right to an education by being classified as educable mentally retarded and placed in special education programs. This state uses a full scale IQ of 79 on ability tests as a cut-off and basis for placing students in special educational programs (EMR). The major claim in this suit was that a numerical full scale IQ score less than 80 is an inadequate basis for placing students in special classes since the scores obtained are unfair and biased against Black students. Therefore, the state deprives these students of the right to equal protection of the laws, which is in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The seven plaintiffs on behalf of their children sued the state for $20,000 each in compensatory and punitive damages. They asked that a permanent injunction be issued declaring and enjoining that no student be placed or retained in a special class in the city of Boston unless and until several procedures are met. The procedures were as follows:

1. That a special, nine-member Commission on Individual Educational needs be established;

2. That no child be placed in a Special Education class unless a fair test has been administered by a competent psychologist, the parents are given notice, and the placement in the special class is naturally related to the child's educational needs;

3. That the Commission specify a battery of psychological tests from which examiners select the appropriate one for administration;

4. That the Commission approve a cadre of local psychologists and mental health agencies qualified to administer the tests;

5. That all children in Special Education classes be re-evaluated under the new procedures;

6. That all children found to be improperly labeled be provided
with "transitional" programs designed to compensate for the educational loss experienced while misclassified;

7. That the Commission study the procedures for administering tests;

8. That no child be placed in a special class solely on the basis of a test score.

Armstead et al. vs. Starkville, Mississippi Municipal Separate School District et al. (1970) was a suit brought against the school system on the use of Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores as a determinant for the employment and retention of elementary and secondary teachers. It was clear that the Board of Education planned to use GRE scores as a way of eliminating Black teachers in the state's transition from segregated to integrated schools. The Educational Testing Services, represented by Winton H. Manning, pointed out in an affidavit that the GREs are tests designed to assist undergraduate students in their transition to graduate school. Thus, the GRE is not an appropriate tool for screening applicants for teaching positions in that school system. Manning stated that in his best judgment:

The use of the GRE aptitude and advanced test for selection and retention of teachers in the Starkville School System... would be a blind use of these tests unless studies were first performed that would, as a minimum, establish the content validity and concurrent validity of these tests for the criteria of teacher effectiveness. (p. 22)

In conclusion, Manning noted several characteristics of aptitude and achievement tests for Blacks and Whites:

1. The test may contain items that are specifically germaine to the White, middle-class environment, thus placing Black students at a disadvantage;

2. Black students may be less familiar with test-taking strategies and will, because they are less skilled or "test-wise," be less able to compete successfully;

3. The conditions under which students are required to take the tests are such that Black students may feel anxious, threatened
and alienated, thereby impairing their ability to perform successfully on the test;

4. Tests measure abilities that are developed as a consequence of educational, social and family experience over many years. One consequence of poverty, segregation and inequality of educational opportunities to which Black students are more likely to have been subjected is reflected in lower scores on tests such as the GRE Aptitude and Advanced Test. (pp. 31-32)

Samuda (1975) writes that in the case of Larry P. et al. vs. Wilson Riles et al. (1972), the plaintiffs were six Black San Francisco elementary school children, who charged the defendants, California State Department of Education and the San Francisco School District, with having placed them in EMR classes on the basis of IQ test scores alone. The plaintiffs were retested by a Black psychologist and scored above the cutoff point of 75. The U.S. District Court judge, Robert Peckham, ordered that the defendants be restrained from placing Black children in EMR classes primarily on the basis of IQ test scores alone.

These court judgments and this evidence on ability grouping shows the harmful effects of the misuse of standardized test scores to establish homogeneous ability groups in schools. The evidence and judgments also provide educational and political justification that segregated groups as well as schools deny equal access to educational opportunities for a large segment of the population. Standardized tests as they exist today are injurious to minorities and Blacks and adversely affect our entire nation.

Williams (1971) stated that at the second annual meeting of the Association of Black Psychologists (ABP) in Washington, D.C., 1969, the following statement on testing of Black children was adopted as the Association’s official position:

The Association of Black Psychologists fully supports those
parents who have chosen to defend their rights by refusing to allow their children and themselves to be subjected to achievement, intelligence, aptitude, and performance tests.

Robert L. Williams, along with the Association of Black Psychologists, called for a "moratorium on the repeated abuse and misuse of the so-called conventional psychological tests" since they "are unfair and improperly classify Black children." They demanded "an immediate moratorium on all testing of Black people until more equitable tests are available" (Williams, 1970). These psychologists are saying that most educational and psychological tests are biased against Blacks. They are unfair, culturally biased and usually misclassify Black children.

Williams (1971) wrote that the Association charged that these tests:

1. Label Black children as uneducable;
2. Place Black children in special classes and schools;
3. Perpetuate inferior education of Blacks;
4. Assign Black children to lower education tracks than Whites;
5. Deny Black students higher educational opportunities;
6. Destroy positive intellectual growth and development of Black children.

The Bay Area (California) Association of Black Psychologists took the same stand in the deposition given in connection with the case of Larry P. et al. vs. Wilson Riles et al. (1972) in California. The deposition was stated as follows:

We, as members and representatives of the Bay Area Association of Black Psychologists strongly affirm that the ability and intelligence tests which are part of the set of criteria mandated by the State Department of Education are inappropriate and inadequate techniques. They are based on White, middle-class norms, values, and experiences and hence are culturally biased against Black children. It is thus imperative that we stop whatever enterprise that victimizes, oppresses and denies the full realization of Black children's potential. In conclusion, we the members and representatives of the Bay
Area Association of Black Psychologists reiterate our unequivocal stand and call for an immediate moratorium on the use of the current tests of Intellectual ability in use in the State of California. (Samuda, 1975, p. 4)

The APGA on March 25, 1970, passed a similar resolution. The APGA Senate issued the following declaration:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the American Personnel and Guidance Association through the Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance develop and disseminate a position paper stating the limitations of group intelligence tests particularly and generally of standardized psychological educational and employment testing for low socioeconomic and underprivileged and nonwhite individuals in educational business and industrial environments. (Samuda, 1975, p. 4)

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED: That if demonstrable progress in clarifying and rectifying this situation cannot be achieved by this time next year, proposals for a moratorium on the use of group Intelligence tests with these groups be presented.

Samuda (1975) wrote that the NAACP adopted a similar resolution at its 65th annual convention. The stand taken by ABP and the resolutions contained in the APGA and NAACP concerning the psychological and educational testing of Blacks and minorities were the inevitable results of long and repeated abuse and misuse of tests. According to these organizations, testing (educational and psychological) is intellectual genocide of Black Americans. Tests are used for labelling, sorting, and consequently misplacing Black children into special classes and programs. Such tests do not permit the Black child to develop educationally and intellectually to his fullest capacity.

The Effects of Teacher Expectations on Student Performance

The phenomenon of expectations has long been considered an energizer and shaper of behavior. Pavlov in his experiments with animals shaped the behavior of dogs. They learned to expect food or to be fed when the bell rang. With the pygmalion syndrome the effect of one person's
(teacher's) expectations on the perceived behavior of another person (student's) the conclusion appears to be the same. The well known research by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) is relevant to this issue. They noted that a teacher's expectation of a student's academic performance may have a strong influence on the student's performance and achievement. If teachers anticipate high performance by a student, he/she receives it, and vice versa. What we expect to result from a behavior usually will affect both the decision to enact that behavior and the magnitude to which that behavior may be enacted.

Teachers have certain expectations of students. What happens when the child reacts differently from what the teacher expects? Or in a manner that the teacher is not accustomed to? Or in a manner with which the teacher cannot cope? A long series of studies have been conducted to determine what effects a teacher's values, beliefs, attitudes and expectations may have on students.

Jones (1970) writes that it was reported an IBM computer that had been incorrectly programmed sent a group of "slow" students into a high track and a group of "bright" students into a low track. The error was found about a year later, but in the classes "slow" students were behaving like they were "bright" and the "bright" students were behaving as if they were dull.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) did a study on teacher expectations of students. They presented results which strongly suggest one's personal expectations of another person's subsequent performance are usually upheld. A large group of students were divided into two smaller groups who were achieving at approximately the same level. They then randomly selected and assigned a number of subjects from each
of the groups in various classrooms. The teachers were told they could expect great things from some of the students randomly selected from one of the groups; nothing was said to the teacher about the students who were randomly selected from the other groups. At the end of the school year those students who had been identified as persons from which high achievement and great things could be expected gained significantly higher achievement scores than the other group of subjects.

Beez (1968) showed the effects of teachers' expectations on the student performance. In this experiment subjects were sixth students and sixty teachers in a Head Start Program. The teachers were instructed to teach the students meanings of symbols. Half of these teachers were told that good learning would occur based on psychological and educational assessment while the other half were told that the students would not to well and to expect poor learning. The results were overwhelming; 77 percent of those alleged to have good learning capacities learned five or more symbols and only 13 percent alleged to have poor learning capacities learned as many. He states further that the teachers who expected low performance did not attempt to teach as many symbols as did the teachers who expected high performance.

Deutsch (1964) conducted a study on the social and psychological aspects in the development of Black children as learners. The results showed two-thirds of a group of Black children had negative self-images which progressively deteriorated as the students moved from first to fifth grade. Groffs (1963) conclusion supports the findings of Deutsch. Groff stated that teachers' attitudes can cause a negative influence which is detrimental to the self-image and achievement of children.

In 1971, Deutsch gave a speech on compensatory education. He
stated that he had observed many Black children and found them in their early years full of motivation and amazing curiosity. Deutsch further stated that what had impressed him the most is that something happens within the school that takes away this motivation.

Numerous studies have shown that when teachers view students as "slow learners," emotionally disturbed, "gifted," etc., the students tend to conform to the teacher's views. This phenomenon, the self-fulfilling prophecy, is frequently witnessed among students in EMR programs and low ability groups (North Carolina Advancement School, NCAS, 1975). One researcher states that teachers, to a large extent, determine the success or failure of a child in school. This predetermined opinion of the academic achievement of Blacks and other minorities may be one of the reasons for so many of these children being placed in classes for the mentally retarded (Rothstein, 1971).

Similarly, Rivers et al. (1975) stated that as a direct result of the labeling process and placement in special programs, teachers may look for the Black child to perform poorly and may on occasions communicate this to him.

It stands to reason that once the Black child is placed in a special program, he is trapped in a vicious circle and will begin to act the way he is expected to act. Hudgkinson (1962) alludes to the fact that teachers often perceive lower-class children as "difficult." These perceptions are communicated to children in many ways and, then the child begins to act "difficult." Rosenthal reported that not only do teachers' expectations produce measurable performance changes in their students, but it is communicated in a manner unbeknown to the teachers (Rosenthal, 1968).
Rlessman (1962) states that Black students perceive their teachers' rejection of them accurately. This is evident in classroom behavior (negatively), low self-concept, and achievement of many students. Children who see teachers as having favorable attitudes toward them tend to be children from middle and upper-class backgrounds (Davidson and Lang, 1960).

Teachers, similar to others, have their limitations. It is more comfortable for them to work with middle-class and upper-class children. These children do not usually express any overtly aggressive behavior. It is easier for the teacher to establish a personal relationship and express faith and confidence in students who present few problems for him. Because of the middle classness of the teacher, he/she closely identifies with the middle or upper class child. The cliche "action speaks louder than words" is a perfect example of the feelings the teacher will project to the lower class child.

The Counselor as a Consultant to Teachers

Rapid change in the modern world has markedly affected the school counselor's responsibilities. The responsibilities of the elementary school counselor for the decade are emerging (Topetzes, 1966). One of the emerging responsibilities, due to desegregation of public schools throughout the United States, is counseling Black students and consultation with teachers as they work with minority children and others with special problems.

Guidance and counseling programs have been in the school for years, but only with the last decade has there been a vigorous movement to employ counselors at the elementary school level. Counseling and
guidance in the elementary school has, within a few years, gained tremendously in importance. Concerned educators, parents, and others are recognizing a need for these personnel services in the early and formative years of the child. Recognition and correction of problem areas are, by far, more feasible and definitely to the advantage of children when done at an early age, rather than left until he/she is older and the problem has increased in intensity.

Developmental guidance is a planned and integrated part of the educational program of many schools today. It starts in the classroom with the teacher and counselor as collaborators in facilitating learning experiences for the students. The focus here is on prevention rather than remediation or crises intervention. Wrenn (1962) in his book The Counselor In a Changing World was emphatic in his views of providing counseling to "facilitate the intellectual development of students" in a non-crises curriculum setting. He emphasized the involvement of guidance in the curriculum and regular classroom activities as the more accessible means of reaching all students regardless of race or creed.

Because developmental guidance is concerned with fostering a humanistic education concept in the elementary school, it promotes the need for a good working relationship among the counselors and teachers. Effective Interpersonal relationships are essential to the counselor's work. In order to facilitate the use of guidance techniques and assist the teachers in incorporating them into their repertoire of already existing skills, the counselor must be able to communicate and function in a consultative capacity. Counselor consultation may hold the key to helping teachers better understand minority students and to better racial harmony in the schools.
Many prominent persons in the field of guidance believe that developmental guidance in the elementary school can only be accomplished through counselor consultation with teachers and others. Eckerson and Smith (1962) for over a decade have advocated consultation as the nucleus of elementary school guidance programs. Wrenn (1964) discussed consultation as a significant guidance function. Stormer (1967), Luckey (1967), and Hillman (1967) expressed the importance of counselor consultation with teachers and parents of elementary school children. Parents of Black children, especially those whose child is in special classes, need a special type of counselor assistance. However, many minority parents are scared, and justifiably so, of the White teachers and administrators. Counselors can help bridge this gap.

The ACES, ASCA Committee on Elementary School Counseling, defined consultation as the process of sharing with another person or group of persons information and ideas, of combining knowledge into new patterns, and of making mutually agreed upon decisions about the next step needed (ACES - ASCA, 1966).

Caplan (1959) states that the goal of consultation is to effect a free emotional relationship between the teacher, consultee, etc., so that each person concerned will have an empathic understanding of the client's needs and react to those needs unhindered by his own idiosyncrasies. Freeing a teacher of negative racial attitudes should be one of the main concerns of counselors. Only then can a teacher gain an empathic relationship with minority students.

Ohlsen (1967) states that the purpose of consulting with teachers is to try "to help the teacher discover why the pupil for whom the teacher sought assistance feels and behaves as he does; to help the
teacher discover and remove blocks to learning." In other words, to assist the teacher in understanding the reasons for particular behavior, especially behavior which may seem odd to the middle-class teachers but which are actually behaviors congruent with the child's mode of coping in his unique culture.

Dinkmeyer (1968) spoke in terms of consulting as being the procedure through which teachers, parents, principals, and other adults significant in the life of the child communicate. He further states that consultation involves sharing information and ideas, coordinating, comparing observations, providing a sounding board, and developing tentative hypotheses for action.

In short, consultation as it applies in the elementary school is consulting with significant others in an attempt to promote or provide learning opportunities for all students congruent with the overall purpose of the academic setting.

ACES - ASCA in a joint committee report on the elementary school counselor in 1966 identified three major functions of the elementary school counselor: counseling with individuals; consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and others significant in the life of the child; and coordination of efforts and resources to insure the child of gaining the full educational benefits the school has to offer.

To exercise his abilities as a counselor-consultant, the counselor must, first of all, be a human relations specialist, one who understands the dynamics of human behavior, personality, and communication. Stiller (1974) stressed the fact that whatever the goal of consultation, the consultant must not forget he is dealing with people to attain those ends. The degree of expertise he has in establishing positive
relationships will, in most instances, determine the effectiveness of the overall guidance program. Counselor consultation with the teacher is for the purpose of improving the educational quality by combining guidance services and classroom activities in an effort to understand and resolve problems which may block the learning process (Dinkmeyer, 1968).

The counselor-consultant must be visible and accessible. He must seek to maintain contact with other professionals in his school, and he must be aggressively "available, present where needed, and not waiting for others to seek him" (McGhearty, 1969). Informal settings such as the teachers' lounge and other places in or out of the school setting where teachers may have time for discussion could be used as a springboard for "advertising" availability. If the counselor-consultant is to be effective as a change agent, he cannot sit in the office and wait for his services to be called upon but must sell himself and demonstrate his ability to perform skillfully.

The counselor as a consultant to the teacher should endeavor to use the expertise of the teacher in his area, teaching, and remember that he has been professionally trained (Faust, 1967). The counselor-consultant is trained in human relations and the teacher in methods and procedures of teaching. Therefore, he must guard against going into the classroom and blatantly challenging the techniques being used, especially in special type classes. Instead, he should strive to integrate, expand, and facilitate the use of both their skills, each person growing and learning from the other. The ultimate goal is to devise approaches which facilitate the learning process for all children, regardless of race or ability. Consultation with teachers will require
workshops and teacher in-service training to share new knowledge and ideas. Myrick and Moni (1972) view this as an essential part of consultation in the school. These workshops present the opportunity to bring together other resources in the school and the faculty members all working together toward the same goal(s). The workshops are informative and may provide an atmosphere for future teacher-counselor consultations.

Many times the teacher is suspicious of the counselor-consultant and his reasons for wanting to come into the classroom. His fears may be well founded in history. Some counselors, in the past, have used this position as a steppingstone to principalship or some other administrative position in the school. Understandably, administrators are authority figures and authority figures are threatening. The teacher may fear the counselor as some one who wants to view his inadequacies in the classroom. By letting the counselor-consultant into the classroom, he feels his job is being jeopardized.

Another role of the counselor-consultant is case staffing. This involves bringing teachers of a specific child together and sharing information, planning, and discussing alternatives for problem solving (Faust, 1967). The counselor can be the facilitator when minority parents visit their child's teacher. The counselor, as a unique human relations specialist, is in a position of promoting better understanding between the school and all parents. However, this may be especially so if the parent is a minority.

The consultant helps the teacher to solve problems in reference to hang-ups and accepting students as people. Caplan (1959) states that the consultant helps the consultee to solve problems of his client by
by helping him to see the client as a human being, especially those who are both minority and in exceptional classes. As long as he sees the client as a Black, an EMR, or in any other way, he will not be able to help him. If the consultant ultimately helps the teacher in handling his problems, this will reflect back on the client also being helped.

The role of the counselor-consultant in today's elementary school is a unique one. He works along with teachers to help discover and remove blocks to learning (Kacskowski, 1967). He will hold a position of significance in the life of all children. He is in the position of humanizing education through the process of introducing guidance into the total school curriculum. Also, as a consultant he is in the unique position of working directly with exceptional children and with the teachers of these children. The counselor as a consultant to teachers and other school personnel can serve as the catalyst toward eliminating the emotional barriers which still separate the races (Myrick and Wittmer, 1972).
CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the population, sampling, procedures, data collection, experimental design, experimental conditions, and the instruments used in this study. An explanation of how the data was analyzed concludes this chapter.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine teacher attitudes toward students' race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior on the referral of elementary school children to an educable mentally retarded program in Alachua County. This study provides counselors with additional information and recommendations regarding the referral process and/or counseling following the placement of Black students in special classes.

Subjects

The research was conducted in Alachua County, Florida, an area of 965 square miles. Alachua County is located in North Central Florida, midway between the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. It has a total population of 290,765 (city - 70,665; urban area - 98,600; and county - 120,500) and is primarily a semi-rural area. Area residents vary from poor farm workers to factory workers, and international scholars and authors. Over 30,000 of the residents are students, staff members, and professors at the University of Florida. The University
of Florida is the largest industry and employer in the county.

Subjects in this study were the elementary school teachers in this county including regular classroom teachers, reading teachers, exceptional education teachers, speech therapists, etc. A total of 499 profiles were given out. Seventy-two percent (72%, N=359) usable ones were returned.

The Alachua County Schools are divided into four categories: elementary (including kindergarten), middle, junior-senior high and high schools. There are 21 elementary schools, seven middle schools, two junior-senior high schools, four high schools and one secondary center for exceptional child education with a total enrollment of over 22,000 students. In addition, the system maintains various other programs such as Adult Education, Agriculture-Business, Community Education, Vocation-Technical Education, and Career Education. All schools are racially integrated and contain about a 30% Black and 70% White student population.

Approximately 10% of the elementary school teachers have undergraduate majors in fields other than elementary education but are currently certified to teach in an elementary school. Overall, teacher experience in the county has a mode of 4-6 years. Additional information on the characteristics of Alachua County teachers is presented in Appendix D.

Only elementary school teachers were used in this study since the Alachua County procedures for providing special education for exceptional students 1974-75 states that:
Students being considered for placement in a program for educable mentally retarded should be identified during the primary grades and at the latest, before they leave the elementary school, except

— when new or returning to the school system

— when the intellectual disability is due to a recent accident or illness (p. 15).

Building the Bogus Student Profiles

Four bogus student profiles based on representative information from cumulative records and comments made by teachers were devised for use in this study. One profile is based on an uncooperative student with high socio-economic status while another is based on a cooperative student also with high socio-economic status. These two profiles are alike in all respects except classroom behavior. The other two profiles are just the opposite; an uncooperative low socio-economic status student, and a cooperative, low socio-economic status student.

The father's occupation, education level, residence and other information concerning the family are the same on profiles one and two and likewise for profiles three and four. When race and sex are considered, there was a total of sixteen (16) profiles.

The race and sex were included in each bogus student's profile, but were varied. That is, the same profile was presented as a Black male to one teacher, as a Black female, White male or White female to other teachers. The same was true for the other three profiles. Thus, race and sex were manipulated. Each profile contained age, grade level, IQ, and achievement test scores which were held constant across all sixteen (16) profiles.

A five point Likert-Type scale was utilized to measure the extent
of a teacher's likelihood to make use of services suggested in four statements contained on each profile. The order of the statements was manipulated on each of the four bogus profiles; that is, statement one appeared as statement two, three, or four on the other three profiles. The statements the teachers were asked to respond to are similar on each profile and are as follows:

1. Refer the child to the special education department for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.
2. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.
3. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.
4. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.

The teachers were asked to rate each statement concerning the student in the profile on the basis of one, two, three, four, or five, with one being least likely and five being a most likely choice. As can be observed, each statement focuses on a possible solution or assistance for the student described on the profile.

The statements the teachers rated were constructed by the author after compiling teachers responses to a questionnaire (see Appendix E). Several teachers were asked to rank several alternatives they would choose for a student who was believed to be very slow in learning, without any behavior problems in class, while others were asked to do likewise for a student who was believed slow in learning with behavior problems in class. The four statements listed above were those recommended most frequently by teachers. A pilot study was then conducted to test
teachers' understanding of the profiles and the statements following each profile (See Appendix F). The pilot study was successful in that teachers stated that the profiles and statements were clear, straight-forward, and concise.

Determination of Socio-Economic Status

This investigator utilized Warner's (1949) ISC scale in determining socio-economic status assigned to each of the sixteen profiles to be used in this investigation. The Warner's ISC scale was chosen since it takes into consideration several of the variables to be analyzed in this study.

The ISC identifies socio-economic class on four factors. The four factors used are: 1. occupation; 2. source of income; 3. type of house; and 4. residential area. These four factors are weighted on the basis of occupation = 4, source of income = 3, type of house = 2, and residential area = 1. A seven point Likert-Type scale is utilized on each factor with 1 being the most desirable (high S.E.S.) and 7 being the least desirable (low S.E.S.). Ratings on the Likert-Type scale are then multiplied by the values of each factor and the four scores are added together giving a total score. The higher the score, the lower the social class.

The ISC has been used to identify social classes in many studies. Warner (1949) used the scale and identified five social classes in the mythical city of Jonesville. The five classes identified were upper class, upper-middle class, lower-middle class, upper-lower class and lower-lower class. Hullihan (1964) used the ISC in his study which dealt with the relationships among social class membership, athletic
participation, and social mobility. This investigation yielded results which supported Warner's class placement based on total scores. Warner states that a score of 12-16 placed a family in the upper-class, whereas, a score of 7-84 placed a family in the lower-lower class.

**Determination of Classroom Behavior**

The profile descriptions of the cooperative (non-aggressive or non-disruptive) and the uncooperative (aggressive and/or disruptive) students were drawn from comments by teachers, students, and from behavioral data contained within students' cumulative folders. The investigator also took into consideration students' perceptions of the behavior or cooperative and uncooperative students.

**Procedures**

This study was conducted in a manner consistent with ethical standards set forth for research with human participants by the American Psychological Association and the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Section D: Research and Publication (APA, 1973; APGA, 1974).

Every school in Alachua County is served by a counselor. Most schools have at least one full-time counselor while other, smaller schools, employ a counselor on a half-time basis. Therefore, elementary counselors gave the profiles to teachers employed in their particular school.

This study was conducted during the Fall Semester, 1975. Due to the nature of the study school counselors were instructed to administrate and collect the data on the same day throughout the county to minimize
the possibilities of particular students' profiles being discussed. The elementary school counselors gave each teacher in their particular school directions, a student profile, and subsequent rating scales with the profile (Appendix G). The teachers were instructed to read the child's profile carefully and to assume that they were the teacher of the child described in the profile. After the rating was completed, teachers were asked to return each profile from each counselor as they were completed.

As mentioned, written directions were distributed with the profiles; however, verbal instructions were given by the counselors to clarify the rating procedure and insure proper responses to the items to be rated. Teachers were asked not to put their name, social security number, grade level, school or other information on the form to insure anonymity as well as any biases.

A personal data form (Appendix G) was also included to gather demographic information about the teachers to investigate possible differences between teachers of different races as hypothesized in this study.

Specifically, the research question to be answered by this study was: Does the race of the teacher and/or the socio-economic status, sex, or classroom behavior of students relate to the teachers' judgment concerning referral to an educable mentally retarded program, referral to the school counselor, requesting parent conference, and/or taking no recourse with the student in question?
Statistical Hypotheses

In order to answer the above question, this study examined four major null hypotheses. A number of minor hypotheses were also tested. The major hypotheses presented in the null form are:

\[ H_0 : \text{There is no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four student profiles with regard to desirability of placement in an EMR program.} \]

(a) \text{There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.}

(b) \text{There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of socio-economic status of the student in the profile.}

(c) \text{There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.}

(d) \text{There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile.}

(e) \text{There is no difference in teachers' rating of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.}

(f) \text{There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.}
H₀₂: There is no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four student profiles with regard to desirability of a conference with the child's parents.

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.

(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of socio-economic status of the student in the profile.

(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in profile.

(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior or the student in the profile.

(e) There is no difference in teachers' rating of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.

(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.

H₀₃: There is no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four student profiles with regard to desirability of individual or group counseling with the counselor.

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.
(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of socio-economic status of the student in the profile.
(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.
(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior or the student in the profile.
(e) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.
(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.

H₀₄: There is no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four student profiles with regard to desirability of making no referral thus leaving the child as is.

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.
(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of socio-economic status of the student in the profile.
(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.
(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile.

(e) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.

(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.

Statistical Analysis of Data

The data gathered for this investigation were processed by computer. The raw data were taken from the research instruments (Appendix G), coded on standard 80-space coding sheets, and subsequently key punched on IBM cards. Raw data were compiled from the teachers' ratings of bogus student profiles on four dependent variables: 1. refer to the school counselor, 2. request a parent/teacher conference, 3. refer to an educable mentally retarded program, or 4. do nothing, leaving the child as is.

The technique analysis of variance, using the general linear model, was employed to handle a five way factorial design having unequal numbers of subjects in the groups. Spence et al. (1968) stated that the analysis of variance technique is appropriate and the most frequently employed when experiments involve three or more groups on measures that are independent. The writer was interested in studying the interrelationship of these variables, and in drawing inferences relevant to those variables in the population from which the same groups were taken. This analysis made it possible to assess the main and interaction effects of the independent variables in this study.
The higher order four and five way interaction effects were not computed. They were confounded with error since several of the cells were based on only two observations. These cell means may not have fully reflected the true feelings of the population represented and may have produced spurious results.

Each hypotheses was tested at an alpha (α) level of .05. The requirement for the rejection of the null hypotheses at α=.05 was that the computed F-value exceed 3.88. Significant F-rations associated with interaction effects were further analyzed to determine the locations of significant differences between means. These analyses consisted of examining simple interactions and simple main effects. The level of significance for these tests was set at .01.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of Data Analysis

This chapter contains the limitations of the study, results of the investigation, and a discussion of the findings. The results of the data analysis are presented according to the statistical procedures and methodology described in Chapter III.

The major purpose of this study was to relate teachers' attitudes toward students' race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior to the referral of elementary school children to an educable mentally retarded program in Alachua County. In general, this study attempted to answer the following research questions: What is the relationship of a teacher's race and a student's sex, socio-economic status, race, and classroom behavior and the teacher's desirability for referring the student to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program, to the school counselor, making no referral, letting the student continue as is, and/or requesting a parent/teacher conference? Each subject was given a bogus student profile which contained academic and social information. Teachers were instructed to read the profile and assume they were the teacher of the particular student described. They were then asked to rate four statements pertaining to the students on a continuum of 1, 2, ..5, with 1 being a least likely and 5 being a most likely choice (Appendix G).
The subjects in the study were elementary school teachers from the Alachua County Schools (N=359). This sample consisted of 85 Black teachers (24%) and 274 White teachers (76%). The ratio of Black teachers to White teachers in the sample is approximately the same ratio as that of Black to White elementary school teachers employed in the county (Appendix D, Table 2).

The analysis of variance using a general linear model was employed to test the main and interaction effects. Because of unequal Ns the linear model was used to test differences between mean scores for each of the planned hypothesis as outlined in Chapter III. Four and five way interactions were confounded with error since several of the thirty-two cells contained only two observations. Additional testing was done on all hypothesis found to be significant to indicate directionality. Each hypothesis was tested at an alpha (α) level of .05. Requirements for rejection of the null hypothesis at $P < .05$ was that the computed $F$-value be 3.88 or greater. Results of the analysis of the data are presented in the same order of the stated hypothesis found in Chapter III.

Simple Data Description

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 present descriptive data by groups for each of the thirty-two cells on the four dependent variables (Educable Mentally Retarded, Counselor, Parent Conference, Nothing). Symbols used in the tables in this Chapter are:

- **TR** = Teachers Race (B = Black; W = White)
- **SR** = Student Race (B = Black; W = White)
- **SS** = Student Sex (M = Male; F = Female)
- **SSES** = Student Socio-economic Status (H = High; L = Low)
- **SCB** = Student Classroom Behavior (C = Cooperative; U = Uncooperative)
Table 1 displays the distribution of the ratings of teachers on bogus profiles of students (Black and White) who were cooperative and from a high socio-economic status. Ninety-two teachers were randomly assigned these profiles. This group consisted of 26 Black teachers (28%) and 66 White teachers (72%). All cell sizes, means, and standard deviations for the eight cells on the four dependent variables are listed in the table.

Table 2 displays the distribution of the ratings of teachers on bogus profiles of students (Black and White) who were uncooperative and from a high socio-economic status. Eighty-six teachers were randomly assigned these profiles. This group consisted of 25 Black teachers (29%) and 61 White teachers (71%). All cell sizes, means, and standard deviations for the eight cells on the four dependent variables are listed in the table.

Table 3 displays the distribution of the ratings of teachers on bogus profiles of students (Black and White) who were cooperative and from low socio-economic status. Ninety-five teachers were randomly assigned these profiles. This group consisted of 20 Black teachers (21%) and 75 White teachers (79%). All cell sizes, means, and standard deviations for the eight cells on the four dependent variables are listed in the table.

Table 4 displays the distribution of the ratings of teachers on bogus profiles of students (Black and White) who were uncooperative and from low socio-economic status. Eighty-six teachers were randomly assigned these profiles. This group consisted of 14 Black teachers (16%)

\[ N = \text{Number of teacher responses} \]
\[ \bar{X} = \text{Mean of the group} \]
\[ \text{SD} = \text{Standard Deviation} \]
TABLE 1
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF THE HIGH
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS/COOPERATIVE BOGUS STUDENT PROFILES ON
THE FOUR DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELLS</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF THE HIGH SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS/UNCOOPERATIVE BOGUS STUDENT PROFILES ON THE FOUR DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELLS</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF THE LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS/COOPERATIVE BOGUS STUDENT PROFILES ON THE FOUR DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELLS</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR SR SS SSES SCB</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B B M L C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B W M L C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W B M L C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W W M L C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B B F L C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B W F L C</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W B F L C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W W F L C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELLS</td>
<td>VARIABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and 72 White teachers (84%). All cell sizes, means, and standard deviations for the eight cells on the four dependent variables are listed in the table.

Results of Tested Hypotheses

The Null Hypotheses were analyzed by means of a five way analysis of variance procedure. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis One

In general, null hypothesis one stated that there would be no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four bogus student profiles with regard to placement in an Educable Mentally Retarded Program. More specifically, the sub-hypotheses for null hypothesis one were stated as follows:

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 39.98 was statistically significant ($P < .05$). The data from the study provided evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

(b) There is no significance in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the socio-economic status of the student in the profile. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 0.28 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>EMR</th>
<th>COUNSELOR</th>
<th>PARENT CONFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Race (TR)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Race (SR)</td>
<td>39.98*</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.65*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Sex (SS)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student SES (SSES)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>9.59*</td>
<td>5.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behavior (SCB)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>5.56*</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>14.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR × SR</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR × SS</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR × SSES</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR × SCB</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR × SS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR × SSES</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR × SCB</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS × SSES</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS × SCB</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES × SCB</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR × SR × SS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</td>
<td>EMR</td>
<td>COUNSELOR</td>
<td>PARENT CONFERENCE</td>
<td>NOTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR x SR x SSES</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR x SR x SCB</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR x SS x SSES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR x SS x SCB</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR x SSES x SCB</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR x SS x SSES</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR x SS x SCB</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR x SSES x SCB</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x SSES x SCB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 2.04 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 0.24 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(e) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 0.01 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above. Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-values ranged from 0.00 to 2.83 and none were statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute these null hypotheses. Therefore, none of the null hypotheses relating to interaction effect were rejected.

The only factor found to be significant in the referral of a student to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program was the race of the
student described in the profile. Table 6 shows 32 cells containing means of teachers' ratings of the bogus student profiles for referral to an educable mentally retarded program by teachers' race, student's race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior.

Since the race of the students in the profiles was significant, the unweighted means were calculated by pooling all of the means for the Black male and female students and obtaining an average. The same procedure was used for White students. Results of this analysis, as measured by teachers' rating of the profiles, indicated that Black students had an unweighted mean of 3.25 while white students had a mean of 2.09.

It can be surmised that elementary school teachers are more likely to refer Black students to an educable mentally retarded program than White students.

Findings seem to suggest a system of discrimination operating either consciously or subconsciously by teachers. As stated in Chapter 1, teachers play a major role in the educable mentally retarded referral process in the county. If teachers are indeed biased, then it stands to reason why there is a disproportionate number of Blacks in the program.

Banks and Grambs (1972), stated that Black teachers regard Black students with the same prejudices as do White teachers. The findings from this study are similar in that the race of the teacher did not make a difference in the referral of Black students to an educable mentally retarded program. The Black and White teachers alike viewed the Black students in the profile as being intellectually inferior. It appears that Black teachers have assimilated the standards and values of Whites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6
MEANS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS FOR REFERRAL TO EMR PROGRAM
In order to fit into the larger society.

Many of the Black students enrolled in Alachua County Schools are from low socio-economic backgrounds and their socio-cultural experiences are not a part of the dominant White culture. Because of this, many teachers probably view them as being deficient, culturally and mentally. Special education classes (EMR) have become a "dumping ground" for these students and are advantageous to teachers since they are a means of removing the students who are perceived as problems, thus reducing the need to deal with individual differences. The reality of the situation must be faced. Teachers are asking that children be taken out of the regular class and placed in special programs (EMR) because they do not know how to teach them. A large percentage of these students are from ethnically and/or economically disadvantaged backgrounds who function normally in their social sphere. After placement in an educable mentally retarded program, the child has a stigma which will follow him/her throughout life. Because of learning disabilities or teacher inabilities the Black child can suffer immeasurably.

Special classes will continue until educators immerse themselves into the total environment of children from inadequate and/or culturally different homes and backgrounds and insist on a comprehensive educational program that will meet the needs of all youths regardless of race, sex, or background.

Null Hypothesis Two

In general, null hypothesis two stated that there would be no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four bogus student profiles with regard to calling for a conference with the child's parents. More
specifically, the sub-hypotheses for null hypothesis two were stated as follows:

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 7 indicates that the $F$-value of 4.65 was statistically significant ($P < .05$). The data from the study provided evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the socio-economic status of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 7 indicates that the $F$-value of 9.59 was statistically significant ($P < .05$). The data from the study provided evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 7 indicates that the $F$-value of 0.11 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 7 indicates that the $F$-value of 0.96 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) There is no difference in teachers’ ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.

Inspection of Table 7 indicates that the $F$-value of 3.55 was not statistically significant. The data from the study provided evidence to refute this null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.

Inspection of Table 7 shows that one $F$-ratio was found ($4.30$, socio-economic status x student's classroom behavior) to be statistically significant ($P < .05$). Therefore, one interaction of sub-hypothesis (f) was rejected.

Two main effects (students' race and students' socio-economic status) and one interaction effect (students' socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior) were found to be significant in requesting a parent/teacher conference. Table 7 shows 32 cells with means of teachers' ratings of the bogus student profiles for requesting a parent conference by teachers' race, students' race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior.

Two main effects and one interaction effect were found to be significant. Therefore, tests for simple main effects were completed to determine the nature of significant differences between the means of teachers' ratings of the statement concerning requesting a parent/teacher conference to discuss the academic and/or social behavior problem of the student in the profile. Table 8 shows the unweighted means for the interaction effect.
TABLE 8

TABLE OF UNWEIGHTED MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High SSES</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SSES</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there was a students' socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior interaction, this may suggest that one kind of classroom behavior (cooperative) may have been operating under one level of students' socio-economic status, and another kind of classroom behavior (uncooperative) under the other level. Since the interaction was significant, an analysis of simple main effects was required. Unweighted means analysis was used because of unequal Ns to calculate the difference between means. The $F$-ratios for simple main effects are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

$F$-RATIO FOR SIMPLE MAIN EFFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS</th>
<th>$F$-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSES at C</td>
<td>$11.68^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES at U</td>
<td>$1.23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC at HSSES</td>
<td>$.50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC at LSSES</td>
<td>$2.56$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^* P < .01$
The interpretation of this interaction was that while overall students' socio-economic status appeared to be an important factor, it was more important when the student was cooperative. In other words, the difference between high and low students' socio-economic status held only when the student was cooperative. The socio-economic status difference for uncooperative students was non-significant.

Table 10 shows that the unweighted mean for Black students' profiles was smaller than Whites. This indicates as stated previously that parents of White students are more likely to be called in for a parent/teacher conference than Black parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF UNWEIGHTED MEANS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded from this analysis that the parents of White cooperative students, regardless of socio-economic status, are more likely to be called in for a parent/teacher conference than parents of Black cooperative students. If students are uncooperative, socio-economic status does not make a difference.
There is a definite need for elementary school teachers to involve Black parents in the school experiences of their children. Participation in conferences, school activities, and other school experiences of Black children would enhance parents' behaviors and attitudes toward the school. Cloward and Jones (1963) did a study on educational attitudes and participation and found that parent involvement in school affairs was positively correlated to their attitudes of the school and the importance of education.

Parental involvement in the school can influence and motivate children to want to achieve. It can also aid in modifying negative stereotype attitudes held by many middle-class teachers. Active parental participation in school affairs along with positive changes in teachers' attitudes and expectations can enhance the self-concept of Black students and increase their performance in the academic arena. Black parent involvement can harmoniously bring together the child's school and home life to set the stage for the development of self-expression, self-concept, and personal growth.

Null Hypothesis Three

In general, Null hypothesis three stated that there would be no difference in the teachers' ratings of the four bogus student profiles with regard to individual or group counseling with the school counselor. More specifically, the sub-hypotheses for null hypothesis three were stated as follows:

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 1.86 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided
no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the socio-economic status of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 1.18 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 2.14 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 5.56 was statistically significant (P < .05). The data from the study provided evidence to reject this null hypothesis.

(e) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the F-value of 0.34 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(f) There are no differences due to the interactions of the factors above.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that none of the F-values, which ranged from 0.00 to 3.78, were statistically significant. The data from the study provided no evidence to refute any of these hypotheses.

The only factor found to be significant in referral of a student to the school counselor was student cooperativeness as described in the
profiles. Table II shows 32 cells with means of teachers' ratings for referral of the bogus student to the school counselor by teachers' race, students' race, sex, socio-economic status, and classroom behavior.

Student cooperativeness was the only significant factor in whether or not the teacher referred the students described in the profiles to the school counselor. Therefore, the unweighted means were computed. Results of further analysis of data indicated that cooperative students had an unweighted mean of 4.40; whereas, the uncooperative student had an unweighted mean of 4.66.

It can be concluded that referral to the school counselor depends upon the cooperativeness (classroom behavior) of the student rather than race or sex. Students who are uncooperative are more likely to be referred to the school counselor.

Admittedly, the writer felt that Black students as described in the profiles would have been referred to the school counselor in higher numbers than would White students. However, race was not a significant factor. Research has shown that students most often referred for guidance assistance are those who exhibit uncooperative behavior (Robbins, Mercer, and Meyers, 1967; Rice, 1963; and Gilbert, 1957). This seems to hold true for elementary school teachers in Alachua County. Instead of viewing the counselor as a facilitator for developmental and preventive counseling in the classroom teachers tend to view the counselor's role as one of crisis intervention in terms of modifying behaviors of disruptive students.

Teachers should take advantage of the training and skills of the elementary school counselor. Emergency counseling situations could be drastically reduced if guidance is done in the classroom with the teachers
## TABLE II
MEANS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS FOR REFERRAL TO THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>High (C)</th>
<th>High (U)</th>
<th>Low (C)</th>
<th>Low (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and students as part of the total educative process. Guidance as an on-going part of the schools educational program can provide experiences that are specific to the needs of individual students at each level of development. If guidance experiences are provided for students at the early stages it could alleviate more complex and profound problems as the child grows older.

Null Hypothesis Four

In general, Null hypothesis four stated that no difference would exist in the teachers' ratings of the four bogus student profiles with regard to making no referral or desiring to leave the child as is. More specifically, the sub-hypotheses for null hypothesis four were rated as follows:

(a) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 0.35 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(b) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the socio-economic status of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 5.14 was statistically significant ($P < .05$). The data from the study provided evidence to reject this null hypothesis.

(c) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the sex of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 0.34 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.
(d) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the classroom behavior of the student in the profile.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 14.21 was statistically significant ($P < .05$). The data from the study provided evidence to reject this null hypothesis.

(e) There is no difference in teachers' ratings of the profiles on the basis of the race of the teacher making the rating.

Inspection of Table 5 indicates that the $F$-value of 1.41 was not statistically significant. Thus, since the data from the study provided no evidence to refute this null hypothesis, it was not rejected.

(f) There are no differences in the interactions of the factors above.

Inspection of Table 5 shows that one $F$-value was found (4.85 students socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior) to be statistically significant ($P < .05$). Therefore, one interaction of sub-hypothesis (f) was rejected.

One main effect (students' classroom behavior) and one interaction (student's socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior) were found to be significant in regard to making no referral, thus leaving the child as is. It was assumed by the writer that the White student profiles would be rated higher than Blacks by teachers in regard to leaving the child as is. However, race does not appear to be a factor. Table 12 shows 32 cells containing means of teachers' ratings for making no referral, thus leaving the child as is by teachers' race, student's race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior.

One main effect (student's classroom behavior) and one interaction (students' socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior) were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>1.42</th>
<th>1.14</th>
<th>2.33</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found to be significant. Therefore, tests for simple main effects were completed to determine the nature of significant difference between the means of teachers' ratings of the statement concerning leaving the child as is. Table 13 shows the unweighted means for the interaction effect.

**TABLE 13**

**TABLE OF UNWEIGHTED MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High SSSES</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SSSES</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A students' socio-economic status x students' classroom behavior interaction may suggest that one kind of classroom behavior (cooperative) may have been operating under one level of students' socio-economic status and another kind (uncooperative) under the other level. Because the interaction was significant, an analysis of simple main effects was required. Unweighted means analysis was used because of unequal Ns to calculate difference between means. The F-ratios for simple main effects are shown in Table 14.

**TABLE 14**

**F-RATIO FOR SIMPLE MAIN EFFECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS at C</th>
<th>SS at U</th>
<th>SS C at HSSES</th>
<th>SS C at LSSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F = 13.44*</td>
<td>F = .0074</td>
<td>F = 16.56*</td>
<td>F = 0.1007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01
The interpretation of this interaction appears to be that, while the overall effect of students' socio-economic status was significant, students' socio-economic status was a significant factor for cooperative students but not for uncooperative students. Furthermore, the overall effect of classroom behavior was significant, but its impact appears confined to the high socio-economic status student. In other words, the difference between high and low students' socio-economic status held only when the student was described as cooperative. The students' socio-economic status difference for uncooperative students was nonsignificant.

Although the overall effect of socio-economic status was statistically significant for high socio-economic status students, when the unweighted means of hypothesis four was compared with the unweighted means of hypotheses one, two and three it appeared that teachers in this study were desirous of taking some course of action for all students regardless of race, sex, socio-economic status or classroom behavior. In other words, the teachers felt that action was necessary for the students described in each of the four different bogus profiles.

Limitations of the Study

1. Since fairly large differences existed between numbers of subjects (per type profile), the sizes of the cells analyzed varied considerably. Consequently, differences between means where small Ns are observed may not be fully representative of population differences.

2. Along with classroom teachers, other instructional personnel were used as subjects, i.e., Media Specialists, Speech Therapists, etc. The resulting inference is that many of these teachers may not have had
enough exposure with students in the classroom to be familiar with the students described in the profiles. This could also hold true for the first year teachers who were subjects.

3. The subjects used in this research were limited to teachers; therefore, generalizations cannot be made to counselors, principals, or other school personnel.

4. Due to the fact that subjects used in this study were from Alachua County, generalizations to out-of-county teachers should be guarded. Only elementary school teachers were subjects; therefore, inferences may not be made to middle and/or high school teachers.

5. This study was associational in design and offered no treatment to the sample studied. Hence, no statements may be made concerning casuality among the variables investigated.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

The existence of prejudice in American society is a subject being written about constantly in both the public and professional press. The courts have ordered schools to integrate, but cannot force teachers to rid themselves of prejudices toward minorities. Many White teachers bring into the classroom the same negative stereotypical ideas about Blacks that are present in the dominant White society today. Research suggests that teachers typically have negative attitudes and low academic expectations for Black students. Other research indicates that many Blacks adopt the middle class White standards, especially those who have raised their socio-economic status, e.g., teachers. As this study suggests, many Black teachers accept the racist ideology of White teachers in regard to Black students being slow learners and poor academic achievers.

This study was designed to investigate the relationship of teachers' attitudes regarding students' race, socio-economic status, sex, and classroom behavior as it relates to the referral process to an educable mentally retarded program in Alachua County, Florida.

Elementary school teachers from the Alachua County Schools constituted the sample for this study (N=359). The educational background of the subjects varied widely. Likewise, differences in other background variables such as sex, religion, and marital status made the sample a
heterogeneous group. The sample consisted of 85 Black Teachers and 274 White teachers.

Four bogus student profiles were devised by obtaining data from teachers and cumulative folders. Each profile described a hypothetical, fourth grade student and contained information on age, sex, socioeconomic status, classroom behavior, achievement scores, intelligence test score (IQ) and family size. All variables, except race and sex were held constant among the teachers who rated the profiles. One profile appeared as a Black male, Black female, White male and White female. When each of the 4 profiles were considered, varying sex and race, there was a total of 16 profiles. Counselors in the respective schools assigned each teacher one bogus student profile to rate four statements based on the information given in the profiles.

Research hypotheses were generated in an attempt to answer the following questions: Would the race of the teacher and/or the socioeconomic status, sex, race, or classroom behavior of students relate to teacher judgments concerning 1) referral to an educable mentally retarded program, 2) referral to the school counselor, 3) make no referral thus leaving the student as is, or 4) requesting a parent/teacher conference?

The analysis of variance using the general linear model was employed to test main and interaction effects. The linear model was used because of unequal Ns to test differences between mean scores for each of the planned hypotheses. Each hypotheses was tested at an alpha (α) level of .05. Significant F-ratios associated with interaction effects were further analyzed to determine the locations of significant
differences between means. These analyses consisted of examining simple interactions and simple main effects. The level of significance for these tests was set at .01.

The findings and conclusions may not be generalized beyond a limited population since the subjects used in this study were Elementary School Teachers of Alachua County Schools. With this limitation in mind, the following conclusions were drawn from the obtained results:

1. The race of the students described in the bogus profile was significant in the referral to an educable mentally retarded program. Teachers in the study referred Black students significantly more often than they did Whites.

2. The race of the teacher in the study was not an important factor in the referral of the described students to an educable mentally retarded class. Black teachers referred Black bogus students as often as did White teachers.

3. Teachers were more likely to request a parent/teacher conference with the parents of the White student than with Blacks. However, parents of White, cooperative students, regardless of socio-economic status, were more likely to be requested for a conference.

4. Uncooperative students as described in the bogus profiles, were more likely to be referred for individual or group counseling regardless of race or sex.

5. Overall, teachers preferred to take some recourse (as compared to doing nothing) with all students as described in the profiles. However, teachers were least likely to suggest that
nothing be done with the low socio-economic status student and more likely to suggest doing nothing with the high socio-economic status student regardless of sex or race.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It would be valuable for researchers to replicate this study with larger groups of teachers, where the Ns for the races of the subjects are approximately equal.

2. Additional studies might be conducted in Alachua County using the same subjects as the present study to measure attitudinal changes after elementary school teachers have been involved in several human and/or race relations workshops.

3. This research effort was conducted with elementary school teachers in Alachua County, and inferences can be drawn only for that limited population. Perhaps similar studies should be conducted in other parts of the country to ascertain the differences in attitudes which might occur due to geographical location, e.g., the north.

4. Further investigation should be done regarding the relationship of teachers' attitudes toward each of the 4 independent variables separately. For an example, a research study could be done on teachers' attitudes toward students in sex in the referral to an EMR program.

5. Since students in Alachua County should be identified as educable mentally retarded in the elementary school years, this study was done with elementary school teachers. A similar study could be conducted with middle and/or high school teachers to ascertain
whether students race is a major factor in the referral of students to an Educable Mentally Retarded program.

6. Black children are being subjected to educational and psychological testing which are culturally biased. This method of assessing educational capabilities is culture-specific in that these instruments are designed by White middle class psychometrists and professors to assess the skills and abilities mostly valued by the middle class White population. To achieve any degree of reliability in assessing the educational and behavioral performance of Blacks, educators and psychologists must research and develop tests according to behavioral and cultural experiences of Blacks.

Recommendations for School Counselors and Teachers

The recommendations offered here resulted from a critical examination of the research findings of this study. It is recommended that in-service-training and/or pre-service-training be provided for counselors and teachers so that they:

1. Can become more accepting of Black children and their culture, helping them to develop higher expectations of these students' intellectual abilities.

2. Can help break the many social and emotional barriers which prevent minority groups from achieving or becoming secure American citizens. Teachers need to instill in Black youths a pride for their cultural heritage, a positive self-concept, and motivation to strive and liberate themselves from physical and psychological oppression.
3. Can have a working understanding of the various cultures of students they have in their schools in order to minimize cultural conflicts. If counselors and teachers are to be successful in their relationships with Black students, they must learn to recognize and appreciate their differences and gain a greater understanding of and appreciation for the values within such a group.

4. Can understand that a child's cultural difference has educational significance and that the educational program should be adapted through the curriculum and other methods to accommodate these differences. Instruction should be tailored to suit the needs of the educationally atypical child just as physical adaptations are made for the benefit of the child in a wheelchair or on crutches. Because of the preponderance of Blacks in special programs, the time has arrived for school superintendents, administrators, teachers, and other concerned educators to look for other alternatives that would make it possible to work with these students in the regular classroom.

5. Can understand that there should be a process for meeting the needs of exceptional children within the regular class, rather than placing EMR students in self-contained special classes or schools. Efforts should be made to get such children back into the mainstream.

6. Can understand the stigmatizing effects that labeling has on children. Labeling, e.g., educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabilities can be detrimental to any student. These labels deny these children the opportunity to learn
from the total range of their peers and contributed to feelings of inferiority, low self-concept, lack of self-expression and problems of acceptance.

7. Can render special services to children without the labeling process and obtain the skills necessary to deal with a wide range of abilities within the regular classroom regardless of race or intellectual level.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, it was clearly illustrated from the findings that Black children as described in the bogus profiles are treated differently from White children by teachers (Black and White) in Alachua County. This could imply that teachers do not understand Black children and on many occasions they are unable to manage them.

Black students bring from their homes different ways of perceiving things in their environment and the world. This means that they will also bring from home different styles of learning which may suggest that these culturally different behaviors could possibly be perceived by teachers as uncooperative, disruptive, or deviant.

Most teachers are socialized toward a White middle class value system. Black children coming to school have values and behaviors that deviate from what these teachers are accustomed. Having been socialized differently, teachers and Black students are faced with conflicting expectations which lead to the teachers' inability to control the behavior of these children. Being unable to admit to this inadequacy in management and teaching persons who are culturally different, the
Black children present problems beyond the classroom teachers' capabilities. These problems, whether they be viewed as culturally different or as uncooperative or disruptive, will be manifested as behavioral problems due to the teachers' own lack of tolerance and understanding, or lack of knowledge in dealing with children who are culturally different, especially Black children.

These could be some reasons there is an overrepresentation of Black students in the educable mentally retarded program in the county and throughout the United States. There is a definite need for new teaching techniques and methods when working with Black children, and a more equitable system of referral of students to educable mentally retarded classes and other special programs.
If the individual differences and needs of children were met in the regular classroom, there would be no need for various categories and labels such as educable mentally retarded, emotional disability and specific learning disabilities. We need to concentrate on more specialized learning for regular classroom teachers in understanding and coping with cultural and socio-economic differences...instead of inventing more special classes, etc. Labeling can have adverse effects on children, especially those that classify them as being intellectually deficient. It grieves me to see such an overabundance of Black children in EMR classes. When there is such a drastic unbalancing as this, I can only believe that there is a monstrous fault in the educational system.

Charlene Hampton Lanier
March, 1975
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APPENDIX A

DUE PROCESS PROCEDURES

SOURCE: Handbook--Alachua County Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, 1974-75
Due Process Procedures

District personnel are aware of the legal implications of program decisions and desire to protect the rights of the student and his parents. Although the district school board is responsible for providing an appropriate education for each exceptional student and is responsible for placement, parents have the right to due process procedures.

Due process procedures include:

a. right to prior notification of changes in education placement
b. right to a formal hearing if requested
c. right to review all records
d. right to an independent evaluation of student
e. right to counsel
f. right to cross examine witnesses
g. right to bring witnesses
h. right to appeal

Suggested guidelines for providing due process are:

1. The right to review of the educational placement of an individual student shall be available to the parents or guardians of all students, including students for whom the school has recommended special education placement, students who have been declared ineligible for special education system, and students who parents believe they require special education programs.

2. The request for a review of the educational placement of a student shall be made to the superintendent of the school district wherein the student resides.

3. The review at the local level shall occur as soon as possible but within fifteen (15) calendar days of the request.

4. The review shall be in the form of a conference between the parents, their representatives, the special education administrators, the principal authors of the placement decision, and appropriate local district personnel.

a. The superintendent of the child's home district or any designated district administrator other than special education personnel shall act as chairman of the conference.

b. The chairman shall give the parties in the review at least five (5) calendar days' notice of a conference date.
c. The chairman shall keep order, receive documents and, in general, conduct an orderly proceeding.

5. The review shall seek to establish any or all of the following:
   a. That the child has needs which require special education.
   b. That the evaluation procedures utilized in determining the child's needs have been appropriate in nature and degree.
   c. That the diagnostic profile of the child on which the placement decision was based is substantially verified.
   d. That the proposed placement is directly related to the child's educational needs.

6. Prior to the conference, the parents may request a professional worker of their choice and at their expense (including legal counsel) to meet with the appropriate school personnel to discuss the reasons for the placement. The information on which the placement decision was made shall be made available for examination by the parents or their representatives, with the following exceptions:
   a. Personal observations which, in the opinion of the superintendent of the local school district, would have no direct bearing on placement shall not be available for examination nor shall they be introduced at the review conference.
   b. Test instruments and raw data shall be reviewed only by a professional worker of like discipline.

7. A typewritten record of the conference shall be made by a court reporter who shall be paid by the district. In lieu of a court reporter, a tape recorder, followed by a typewritten transcript, may be used. The school district representative and the parents must sign the typewritten transcript.

8. At the conference, representatives of the school shall first present their findings and the reason for the proposed placement. This presentation may include verbal reports, the written record of the multidisciplinary conference at which the educational plan was developed, and any other information deemed relevant. The parents and their representative may question school personnel about the information which has been presented. The rules of evidence shall not apply to the conference.

9. The parents and their representatives may then present appropriate witnesses, reports of tests taken, and other facts which they may deem relevant.

10. After considering the facts as presented at the conference, the school officials shall recommend to the parents an affirmation of the placement decision, a denial of the decision of placement, or
alternative procedures to meet the educational needs of the student which may include further evaluation.

11. Such decision shall be communicated to the parents or guardians by certified mail within four (4) calendar days of the completion of the conference. The letter shall include the reasons for the decision.

12. The notice of the decision shall also inform the parents of their rights to a review of the placement decision by the district school board. The request for a school board review must be made in writing to the district superintendent within five (5) school days of the receipt of the local review decision.

13. By mutual agreement and for good cause, the time to request a school board level review may be extended to thirty (30) calendar days.

14. After the receipt of a request for a school board review, the district shall prepare a transcript of the local review, to include copies of all documents introduced at the conference. Copies of the transcript shall be mailed to the parents and to the attorney of the school board within seven (7) days of the request for review.

15. A request for a review by the school board shall stay any special education placement until the review has been determined unless the parents and school personnel mutually agree to continue a placement which has already been effected.

16. Upon the receipt of the request for a school board review of an educational placement, the chairman of the school board shall designate an impartial reviewing officer.

17. The reviewing officer shall examine the placement based upon a study of the transcript. He may request further information, either by oral testimony or in writing, and whatever technical assistance he deems necessary.

18. The review by the hearing officer shall be held within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the transcript. A report of the review shall decide the matter within thirty (30) calendar days of the date that the transcript is received. The school board may dismiss any review deemed lacking in substance.

19. The local school district shall be responsible for implementing the decision of the school board.
APPENDIX B

FORMS AND PROCESS FOR REFERRAL, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

SOURCE: Handbook—Alachua County Procedures for Providing Special Education for Exceptional Students, 1974-75
Process for referral, identification, and placement of exceptional students:

EMR - Educable Mentally Retarded  
TMR - Trainable Mentally Retarded  
ED - Emotionally Disturbed  
SLD - Specific Learning Disability  
SM - Socially Maladjusted  
Gifter

The "process" described below (six steps) allows for county-level support and supervision, and local school administration:

1. Local school personnel identify a "problem" and conduct a case study of the child.

2. The school principal submits a referral with the written case study and other pertinent data attached to Pupil Personnel Services.

3. These data are evaluated by the school psychologist assigned to the case. Follow-up action will be performed by the school psychologist which may include testing, consultation, parent conference, or referral to the appropriate community resource(s).

4. School psychologist submits a written Psychological Report directly to:

   Pupil Personnel Services Department  
   School Principal  
   Exceptional Student Education Department  
   Any additional personnel that the school psychologist deems appropriate

5. After receiving the Psychological Report, the school principal plans and conducts a staffing conference at the school to determine appropriate placement. Staffing conference participants may include:

   School Principal  
   Guidance Counselor  
   School Psychologist  
   Classroom Teacher(s)  
   Exceptional Student Education Teacher or Exceptional Student Education Department Representative  
   Other appropriate personnel as needed
6. The eligibility staffing committee will submit, in writing, its recommendations as to appropriate program and/or services to the Exceptional Student Education program administrator. The Exceptional Student Education program administrator will review the staffing committee's report and may make additional recommendations before authorizing program placement.
INSTRUCTIONS TO PRINCIPAL:
Received: ____________________________
Complete referral in triplicate.
Referred to: _________________________
Forward ORIGINAL AND SECOND COPY
Principal notified: _________________
to Director of Pupil Personnel
Services. Retain the THIRD COPY
In pupil's CUMULATIVE GUIDANCE
RECORD folder.

REFERRAL FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES
ALACHUA COUNTY SCHOOLS

Pupil's Name: __________________________ Age: ______

Last First Middle

Birthdate: ____________________________ Race: _____ Sex: _____ Grade: ______

Month/Day/Year

School: ___________________________ School Phone: ___________

Home Address: ___________________________ Home Phone: ___________

Parents' Name(s): ___________________________ Occupation(s): ___________

Parent Contacted: ___________ Date: ___________ How: ___________ By Whom: ___________

Parental Status: Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Adopted ( )

Guardian ( )

Number of Siblings: ______________

Previous Schools Attended: __________________________________________

Date Entered This System: __________________________

Previous Educational Program: EMR ( ) Speech ( ) TMR ( ) Gifted ( )

ED ( ) SLD ( ) Title I ( ) Regular ( ) Other ( )

Dates of Special Status: __________________________

Retention: __________________________

Basic Skills: (List significant strengths/weaknesses; denote achievement level by citing grade equivalent and materials used, what the child actually does.)

Reading: __________________________

Spelling: __________________________

Math: __________________________

Communication: (speaking/listening) __________________________

Handwriting: __________________________

Other: __________________________

Attendance History: __________________________________________

Recent Significant Changes: ______________

Discipline History: ______________ Suspensions: ______________

Medical History: (explain, give dates) __________________________

Speech/Hearing Screening Results: __________________________ Last Date: ___________

Visual Screening Results: __________________________ Last Date: ___________

Date of Last Physical: ___________ By Whom: ___________

Other Significant Medical Data: (Medication, etc.) __________________________
Referral for Psychological Services

Slosson I.Q. __________ Date Administered ____________________________

Past Psycho-Educational Test Data: (tests, results, dates)

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Other Psychological - Psychiatric Data: (diagnosis, therapy, etc.) _____

______________________________________________________________

Other Agencies Currently Involved with Child or Family: ______________

______________________________________________________________

Reason for Referral: (describe problem) ________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Teacher Observations:

1. Student engages in aggressive behaviors
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

2. Student violates school rules
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

3. Student is defiant to adults
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

4. Student engages in off-task behavior (i.e., talking, wandering, daydreaming, etc.)
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

5. Student appears nervous or worried
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

6. Student appears to be very shy or withdrawn
   ____________________________ Frequently ____________ Occasionally ____________ Rarely ____________

7. Perceptual-motor skills: Good ( ) Average ( ) Poor ( )

8. Motor coordination:
   Gross: Good ( ) Average ( ) Poor ( )
   Fine: Good ( ) Average ( ) Poor ( )

9. Hand dominance: Right ( ) Left ( ) Indeterminate ( )

Other significant background data or comments: ______________________________

______________________________________________________________

Referring Teacher: _______________ Principal ____________________________

Counselor: ______________________ Date: ________________________________

Screening Committee: Dates met ____________________________

Participants: ________________________________
Parent Notified ____________
Date Placed ____________
Program ____________

Parent Notified ____________
Date Placed ____________
Program ____________

Student ___________________________ Birthdate _________
(last) (first) (middle)

School ___________________________ Grade ____________

************************************************************

ELIGIBILITY STAFFING

Date ___________________________ Participants ___________________________

Program ___________________________

Eligible ___________________________
Not Eligible: ___________________________
   Insufficient data ___________________________
   Does not meet criteria ___________________________

Director, Pupil Personnel Services    Director, Exceptional Student Education

************************************************************

SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT/PLANNING STAFFING

Date ___________________________ Participants ___________________________

I. Action:
   Placed ___________________________
   Not Placed: ___________________________
      Reasons for non-placement ___________________________

II. Treatment Strategies (what and by whom):

III. Plans for follow-up:

Parents must be notified by the school of this action. Proof of parent notification must be on file in the student's cumulative folder before placing the student in an Exceptional Student Education program.

Counselor ___________________________ Principal ___________________________

cc: PPS - white
ESE - yellow
Principal - pink (for student's cum folder)
I. Recommendation:

Dismissal from Exceptional Student Education Program
Continuation in Exceptional Student Education Program

II. Supporting data (indicate evaluation instruments and/or procedures):

- Academic
- Social-Behavioral
- Intellectual
- Process Skill
- Parent Request

If recommendation is made for dismissal, please attach any relevant test data, behavioral observation charts, etc. and send all copies of form to Exceptional Student Education Department for finalization and distribution.

Principal
Counselor
Chairperson, School Review Committee

DISMISSAL ACTION
Recommendation for dismissal approved.
More data requested:
Date

Director, Exceptional Student Education

cc: PPS - white
ESE - yellow
Principal - pink (for student's cum folder)
Dear

Your child has been recommended for placement with a special teacher who works with students, who, because of problems in the area of ________, need assistance with their adjustment and learning. This recommendation was made in a conference of school personnel who know your child. We believe that participation for part/all of the school day with this special teacher will best meet his/her individual needs.

Please be advised that you have the right to a review of this recommendation and placement. If you wish a review, or have questions, please contact me at your earliest convenience to arrange a conference.

Please return this form to me at the above address.

Sincerely,

Principal

The principal of ___________________________ school has notified me that my child, ________________________, is recommended for placement in the Exceptional Student Education program indicated above.

Please check as appropriate: ( ) I approve of this placement.
( ) I wish to review this placement.

Date ___________________________ Parent or Guardian ___________________________
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE OF A REVISED BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS
Samples of revised Instructions of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts written in Black dialectual language and in standard English.

**Standard Version**

1. Mark the toy that is behind the sofa.
2. Mark the apple that is whole.
3. Mark the boy who is beginning to climb the tree.

**Non-Standard Version**

1. Mark the toy that is in back of the couch.
2. Mark the apple that is still all there.
3. Mark the boy who is starting to climb the tree.
   (Variations may be used: about to, getting ready to.)
APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL INFORMATION ABOUT ALACHUA COUNTY TEACHERS, TABLES D1 AND D2
Table D1
Characteristics of Alachua County Teachers
Complete Instructional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Contract Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Certification Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 25% Black and 75% White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Teachers N = 1,223

These figures were compiled by James E. Lanler and Mr. Larry B. Alcorn, Administrative Assistant, Personnel, Alachua County Board of Education on July 28, 1975.
### Table D2

Characteristics of Elementary School Teachers in Alachua County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Instructional Personnel by Race, Sex, and Certification Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race and Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures were compiled by James E. Lanier and Mr. Larry B. Alcorn, Administrative Assistant, Personnel, Alachua County School Board, on July 28, 1975.

Professional Teachers N = 535
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO TEACHERS
Dear Teacher:

I would like your help in designing a rating scale to measure alternatives when dealing with students who are very slow in learning with/without a behavior problem. By behavior problem I mean engaging in physical or verbal action that is considered by you to be socially inappropriate in the school setting.

Please rank order the following alternatives. Your name need not appear anywhere on this request.

- refer to principal
- refer to counselor
- refer to SLD
- refer to ED
- make no referral, leave as is
- request parent/teacher conference
- refer to EMR
- others (write in) ________, ________, ________.

Thank You,

James E. Lanler
School Counselor
APPENDIX F
PILOT STUDY
Dear Teacher:

I will greatly appreciate your completing this questionnaire. Please answer all the questions below. Then, carefully read the child's profile and choose one alternative for the profile. It is not necessary that you write your name anywhere on this form.

I need all the questionnaires to be filled out in this pilot study in order for it to be usable in my doctoral study at the University of Florida under the direction of Dr. Joe Wittmer, Chairman and Professor, Department of Counselor Education. Your assistance is vital to the success of this pilot study. Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James E. Lanier
Gerald, never "Jerry," (becomes very annoyed when a nickname is used) has been tutored practically since birth. He is the son of a prominent financially independent businessman in the community. His well educated and highly motivated parents have spent much time, effort, and money teaching him to read, discuss sophisticated ideas, and helping him learn to write.

In school, Gerald is a chronic daydreamer, has a short attention span, and passes in very little written work. When he does pass in work, it is very carelessly done. He often makes mistakes such as saying "was" for "saw," etc.

Exhibiting a constant state of restlessness, Gerald will not sit long enough to finish assignments. He complains of being tired in order not to do them (cannot face failure). He will sometimes lie to his peers and the teacher to get their attention. He is very nervous and fidgets with pencils, books, etc. He reads in a monotone voice and his comprehension is very low. His first grade teacher recommended that he repeat that grade, but his parents rejected her recommendation.

As his teacher, which one of the following alternatives would you choose: Choose only one of the following alternatives:

_____ 1. Refer to school counselor for individual or group counseling.  
_____ 2. Refer to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program.  
_____ 3. Let him continue as is.  
_____ 4. Refer to a community agency (e.g., community mental health).

Was the profile easily understood? Yes  No

If no, why not?
Age: 20-30______ Sex: Male______ Race: Black______
30-40______ Female______ White______
40-50______
50-60______
60-70______

Educational level: BS or BA______
Masters______
Specialist______

How many years have you been teaching:______

PROFILE

Name_________________________ Test Scores
Race_________________________ Slosson 75
Age 10 Wide Range Achievement Test
Sex_________________________ Reading 2.0
Grade 4 Spelling 1.9

Terry is a shy but cheerful child, who willingly participates in most of the school activities. He seems to be well liked by his peers and they include him in many of their play activities during the school day. He tries hard at everything he does but continually fails. His past teachers have indicated to you that he is a fine young person but just can't make it academically.

Terry is the middle child of three. His mother and father seem to be concerned and loving parents to all their children. However, they seem unconcerned about his difficulties (low grades and stuttering) and say things like "he'll grow out of it." He stutters incessantly, especially when he is excited. He appears to be unaware, or he ignores the problems he is communicating. Peers make fun of his speech quite frequently, but Terry doesn't seem to mind their taunts.

Being the model student (as far as behavior is concerned), he is always on time for class. As the class progresses, if you watch him closely, he is usually daydreaming. During playtime he, more often than not, chooses friends who are younger than he. He is passive and seldom initiates any activity on his own.

As his teacher, which one of the following alternatives would you choose: Choose only one of the following alternatives

1. Refer to school counselor for individual or group counseling.
   or
2. Refer to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program.
   or
3. Let him continue as Is.
   or
4. Refer to a community agency (e.g. community mental health).

Was the profile easily understood? Yes_____ No______
If no, why not?
Age: 20-30 Male Race: Black
30-40 Female
40-50
50-60 White
60-70
Educational level: BS or BA
Masters
Specialist
How many years have you been teaching:

**PROFILE**

Name
Test Scores
Race Slosson 75
Age 10 Wide Range Achievement Test
Sex Reading 2.0
Grade Spelling 1.9
Arithmetic 2.1

James is the youngest of six children. The oldest sibling is in prison for robbery. His family is poor, transient, and gives him very little guidance. His father deserts the family whenever the going gets rough, is an alcoholic, and only works sporadically. He is frequently placed in jail for drunkenness. James' mother is a sweet person but very ineffective. The family's social worker reports that the house is filthy with junk and trash in the yard, etc., and that there are only two beds in the house and the linen on those is usually dirty.

It is difficult to get the family history from the mother. She gets confused about when and what happened to what child. The child's cumulative folder does not give much information about him.

You find it hard to talk to James because he usually shrugs his shoulders or says "I don't know" or "I don't care." Several students have reported to you that he has begun stealing money and other small items. He often tells lies to both you and his peers. His mother tells him he is like his father, especially when he has done something wrong. James is absent from school quite frequently. He repeated the second grade.

As his teacher, which one of the following alternatives would you choose: Choose only one of the following alternatives:

_____ 1. Refer to school counselor for individual or group counseling.
       or
_____ 2. Refer to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program.
       or
_____ 3. Let him continue as is.
       or
_____ 4. Refer to a community agency (e.g. community mental health)

Was the profile easily understood? Yes____ No____
If no, why not?
Joe's cumulative folder indicates that he has been experiencing difficulty adjusting in school since kindergarten. He constantly interferes with the activities of other children in your class, refuses to follow classroom routines, and rebels against your authority and tries your patience constantly. He is usually disruptive and so uncooperative that he prevents the class from getting very much accomplished. He talks loudly, is hostile, aggressive, and gets into fights with the other children.

Joe has not missed a day of school in two years. He always wants to be the leader, not the follower. You've complained to the principal on several occasions about his attitude, feelings toward others, and defiance against authority. He is a prankster and will make remarks in class that are annoying. He has trouble respecting the rights and desires of others. Joe is seen as a marginal student, at best, by several of his past teachers.

As his teacher, which one of the following alternatives would you choose: Choose only one of the following alternatives:

1. Refer to school counselor for individual or group counseling.
   or
2. Refer to an Educable Mentally Retarded Program.
   or
3. Let him continue as is.
   or
4. Refer to a community agency (e.g. community mental health).

Was the profile easily understood? Yes____ No____
If no, why not?
APPENDIX G

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, PROFILES
Dear Teacher:

I will greatly appreciate your completing this questionnaire. Please answer all questions listed below under personal data. Assuming that you are the teacher, carefully read the attached student profile, then, circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of services in each of the four statements. It is not necessary that you write your name, school, or social security number anywhere on this form. Please remember, the number one (1) on the rating scale indicates least likely and the number five (5) indicates most likely of your making use of services in each statement.

I need all questionnaires filled out in order for it to be usable in my doctoral study at the University of Florida under the direction of Dr. Joe Wittmer, Chairman and Professor, Department of Counselor Education. It is hoped that the information obtained from this study will strengthen student services in Alachua County Schools. Your assistance is vital to the success of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James E. Lanler, Counselor
Alachua County Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>BS or BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years have you been teaching? ___
### STUDENT PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Slosson IQ 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Reading 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Spelling 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arithmetic 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This student's cumulative folder indicates that she has been experiencing difficulty adjusting in school since kindergarten. She constantly interferes with the activities of other children in your class, refuses to follow classroom routines, and rebels against your authority and tries your patience constantly. She is usually disruptive and so uncooperative that she prevents the class from getting very much accomplished. She talks loudly, is hostile, aggressive, and gets into fights with the other children.

She is the youngest of three children. The oldest sibling is in prison for robbery. Her family is poor, transient, and gives her very little guidance. Her father works sporadically, deserting the family whenever the going gets rough. He is an alcoholic and is frequently placed in jail for drunkenness. The family social worker reported that the house is filthy and very untidy. On the two beds in the house were filthy linen. Usually the yard is covered with junk and trash such as cans, paper, broken down bicycles and car parts.

She has not missed a day of school in two years. She always wants to be the leader, not the follower. You've complained to the principal on several occasions about her attitude, feelings toward others, and defiance against authority. She is a prankster and will make remarks in class that are annoying. She has trouble respecting the rights and desires of others. She is seen as a marginal student, at best, by several of her past teachers. Her first grade teacher recommended that she repeat first grade, but her parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other suggestions (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slosson IQ 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arithmetic 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student is a shy but cheerful child who willingly participates in most of the school activities. She seems to be well liked by her peers and they include her in many of their play activities during the school day. She tries hard at everything she does but continually fails. Her past teachers have indicated to you that she is a fine young person but just can't take it academically.

She is the youngest of three children. The oldest sibling is in prison for robbery. Her family is poor, transient, and gives her very little guidance. Her father works sporadically, deserting the family whenever the going gets rough. He is an alcoholic and is frequently placed in jail for drunkenness. The family social worker reported that the house is filthy and very untidy. On the two beds in the house were filthy linen. Usually the yard is covered with junk and trash such as cans, paper, broken down bicycles and car parts.

Being the model student (as far as behavior is concerned), she is always on time for class. As the class progresses, if you watch her closely she is usually daydreaming. During playtime she, more often than not, chooses friends who are younger than she. She is passive and seldom initiates any activity on her own. Her first grade teacher recommended that she repeat first grade, but her parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Least Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make no referral, let the child continue as Is.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other suggestions (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT PROFILE

Name _____________________________
Race _______________________________
Age ________________
Sex ________________________________
Grade ________________

Test Scores
Slosson IQ 70
Wide Range Achievement Test
Reading 2.0
Spelling 1.9
Arithmetic 2.1

The student is a shy but cheerful child, who willingly participates in most of the school activities. He seems to be well liked by his peers and they include him in many of their play activities during the school day. He tries hard at everything he does but continually fails. His past teachers have indicated to you that he is a fine young person but just can't make it academically.

He is the youngest of three children and has been tutored since birth. He is the son of a prominent financially independent businessman in the community. His well educated and highly motivated parents have spent much time, effort, and money teaching him to read, discussing sophisticated ideas, and helping him learn to write.

In school he is a chronic daydreamer, has a short attention span, and passes in very little written work. When he does pass in work, it is very carelessly done. He often makes mistakes such as saying "was" for "saw," etc. He is very nervous and fidgets with pencils, books, etc. He reads in a monotone voice and his comprehension is very low.

Being the model student (as far as behavior is concerned), he is always on time for class. As the class progresses, if you watch him closely, he is usually daydreaming. During playtime he, more often than not, chooses friends who are younger than he. He is passive and seldom initiates any activity on his own. His first grade teacher recommended that he repeat first grade, but his parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

1. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.  
   Least Likely  1  2  3  4  5

2. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.  
   Least Likely  1  2  3  4  5

3. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.  
   Least Likely  1  2  3  4  5

4. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.  
   Least Likely  1  2  3  4  5

5. Other suggestions (write in)
STUDENT PROFILE

Name________________________________________

Test Scores

Slosson IQ 70

Wide Range Achievement Test

Reading 2.0

Spelling 1.9

Arithmetic 2.1

This student's cumulative folder indicates that he has been experiencing difficulty adjusting in school since kindergarten. He constantly interferes with the activities of other children in your class, refuses to follow classroom routines, and rebels against your authority and tries your patience constantly. He is usually disruptive and so uncooperative that he prevents the class from getting very much accomplished. He talks loudly, is hostile, aggressive, and gets into fights with the other children.

He is the youngest of three children and has been tutored practically since birth. He is the son of a prominent, financially independent businessman in the community. His well educated and highly motivated parents have spent much time, effort, and money teaching him to read, discussing sophisticated ideas, and helping him learn to write.

In School, he is a chronic daydreamer, has a short attention span, and passes in very little written work. When he does pass in work, it is very carelessly done. He often makes mistakes such as saying "was" for "saw," etc. He is very nervous and fidgets with pencils, books, etc. He reads in a monotone voice and his comprehension is very low.

He has not missed a day of school in two years. He always wants to be the leader, not the follower. You've complained to the principal on several occasions about his attitude, feelings toward others, and defiance against authority. He is a prankster and will make remarks in class that are annoying. He has trouble respecting the rights and desires of others. He is seen as a marginal student, at best, by several of his past teachers. His first grade teacher recommended that he repeat first grade but his parents rejected her recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

1. Refer the child to the special education department for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class. 1 2 3 4 5

   Least Likely

2. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

   Most Likely

3. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Make no referral, let the child continue as is. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Other suggestions (write in) ___________________________
STUDENT PROFILE

Name ____________________________
Race ____________________________
Age ________ 10 ____________________
Sex ________ 4 ____________________
Grade ________ 4 ____________________

Test Scores
Slosson IQ 70
Wide Range Achievement Test
Reading 2.0
Spelling 1.9
Arithmetic 2.1

This student's cumulative folder indicates that he has been experiencing difficulty adjusting in school since kindergarten. He constantly interferes with the activities of other children in your class, refuses to follow classroom routines, and rebels against your authority and tries your patience constantly. He is usually disruptive and so uncooperative that he prevents the class from getting very much accomplished. He talks loudly, is hostile, aggressive, and gets into fights with the other children.

He is the youngest of three children. The oldest sibling is in prison for robbery. His family is poor, transient, and gives him very little guidance. His father works sporadically, deserting the family whenever the going gets rough. He is an alcoholic and is frequently placed in jail for drunkenness. The family social worker reported that the house is filthy and very untidy. On the two beds in the house were filthy linen. Usually the yard is covered with junk and trash such as cans, paper, broken down bicycles and car parts.

He has not missed a day of school in two years. He always wants to be the leader, not the follower. You've complained to the principal on several occasions about his attitude, feelings toward others, and defiance against authority. He is a prankster and will make remarks in class that are annoying. He has trouble respecting the rights and desires of others. He is seen as a marginal student, at best, by several of his past teachers. His first grade teacher recommended that he repeat first grade, but his parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

1. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.  
   Least Likely 1 2 3 4 5

2. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.  
   Least Likely 1 2 3 4 5

3. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.  
   Least Likely 1 2 3 4 5

4. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.  
   Least Likely 1 2 3 4 5

5. Other suggestions (Write in) ____________________________
The student is a shy, but cheerful, child who willingly participates in most of the school activities. He seems to be well liked by his peers and they include him in many of their play activities during the school day. He tries hard at everything he does but continually fails. His past teachers have indicated to you that he is a fine young person but just can't make it academically.

He is the youngest of three children. The oldest sibling is in prison for robbery. His family is poor, transient, and gives him very little guidance. His father works sporadically, deserting the family whenever the going gets rough. He is an alcoholic and is frequently placed in jail for drunkenness. The family social worker reported that the house is filthy and very untidy. On the two beds in the house were filthy linen. Usually the yard is covered with junk and trash such as cans, paper, broken down bicycles and car parts.

Being the model student (as far as behavior is concerned), he is always on time for class. As the class progresses, if you watch him closely, he is usually daydreaming. During playtime he, more often than not, chooses friends who are younger than he. He is passive and seldom initiates any activity on his own. His first grade teacher recommended that he repeat first grade, but his parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.

2. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.

3. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.

4. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.

5. Other suggestions (write in)
**STUDENT PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slosson IQ 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Reading 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Spelling 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Arithmetic 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This student's cumulative folder indicates that she has been experiencing difficulty adjusting in school since kindergarten. She constantly interferes with the activities of other children in your class, refuses to follow classroom routines, and rebels against your authority and tries your patience constantly. She is usually disruptive and so uncooperative that she prevents the class from getting very much accomplished. She talks loudly, is hostile, aggressive, and gets into fights with the other children.

She is the youngest of three children and has been tutored practically since birth. She is the daughter of a prominent, financially independent businessman in the community. Her well educated and highly motivated parents have spent much time, effort, and money teaching her to read, discussing sophisticated ideas, and helping her learn to write.

In school, she is a chronic daydreamer, has a short attention span, and passes in very little written work. When she does pass in work, it is very carelessly done. She often makes mistakes such as saying "was" for "saw," etc. She is very nervous and fidgets with pencils, books, etc. She reads in a monotone voice and her comprehension is very low.

She has not missed a day of school in two years. She always wants to be the leader, not the follower. You've complained to the principal on several occasions about her attitude, feelings toward others, and defiance against authority. She is a prankster and will make remarks in class that are annoying. She has trouble respecting the rights and desires of others. She is seen as a marginal student, at best, by several of her past teachers. Her first grade teacher recommended that she repeat first grade but her parents rejected her recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Least Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Refer the child to the special education department for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other suggestions (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student is a shy but cheerful child, who willingly participates in most of the school activities. She seems to be well liked by her peers and they include her in many of their play activities during the school day. She tries hard at everything she does but continually fails. Her past teachers have indicated to you that she is a fine young person but just can't make it academically.

She is the youngest of three children and has been tutored since birth. She is the daughter of a prominent financially independent businessman in the community. Her well educated and highly motivated parents have spent much time, effort, and money teaching her to read, discussing sophisticated ideas, and helping her learn to write.

In school she is a chronic daydreamer, has a short attention span, and passes in very little written work. When she does pass in work, it is very carelessly done. She often makes mistakes such as saying "was" for "saw," etc. She is very nervous and fidgets with pencils, books, etc. She reads in a monotone voice and her comprehension is very low.

Being the model student (as far as behavior is concerned), she is always on time for class. As the class progresses, if you watch her closely, she is usually daydreaming. During playtime she, more often than not, chooses friends who are younger than she. She is passive and seldom initiates any activity on her own. Her first grade teacher recommended that she repeat first grade, but her parents rejected the recommendation.

Based on the profile you have just read, carefully examine each of the statements listed below. Assume you are the child's teacher. Circle the number which best indicates the likelihood of you making use of each of the following statements, with the number one (1) being least likely and the number five (5) being most likely. Do this for each of the four (4) statements below.

1. Make no referral, let the child continue as is.
   Least Likely   Most Likely
   1   2   3   4   5

2. Refer the child to special education for placement in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) class.
   1   2   3   4   5

3. Request a conference with the parents to discuss the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.
   1   2   3   4   5

4. Refer to the school counselor for individual or group counseling to focus on the child's academic and/or classroom behavior.
   1   2   3   4   5

5. Other suggestions (write in)
APPENDIX H

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION
August 19, 1975

Dr. James Longstreth
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Alachua County School Board Office
1817 East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

Dear Jim:

James E. Lanier, a Black graduate student in Counselor Education and an employee of the Alachua County School Board, is planning to conduct a research study to determine the effects that teachers' attitudes toward students' race, socioeconomic status, sex, and classroom behavior have on the referral of elementary school children to an EMR program in Alachua County. You had given your verbal agreement to this previously.

James plans to conduct this study during pre-planning week and has the cooperation of the counselors who will assist him. He will need only a few minutes of the teacher's time. Jim, I feel that James needs a short letter granting him permission to carry out this research just in case a principal asks him for such a letter. Would you be willing to write him such a letter? If yes, please send it to Mr. James Lanier, 1338 N. E. 31st Place, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

Your consideration will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joe Wittmer, Chairman
Counselor Education Department

JW/kz
Enclosures
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

James Edward Lanier was born October 31, 1942, in Jacksonville, Florida. Mr. Lanier is the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Lee Lanier. He has three brothers, Marvin, Robert, and Earnest, and four sisters, Priscilla, Shirley, Carolyn, and Vera. His elementary and secondary education were completed in the public schools of Jacksonville. He graduated from Northwestern Junior/Senior High School in 1960 with letters in football and track. He was also a member of the Gold Key Chapter of the National Honor Society, student council and student government association.

He enlisted in the Air Force in 1960 and served tours of duty in Africa, Japan, Korea, Thailand, and the United States. Following his separation from the service, he entered Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Florida and received the degree of Bachelor of Science in Mathematics. While attending Edward Waters College, he played varsity football and was initiated into the Gamma Pi Chapter of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. He earned the Master of Education degree from Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, in 1971.

In 1972, Mr. Lanier was accepted by the University of Florida for doctoral studies in the Department of Counselor Education. Since his acceptance, he has earned the Specialist in Education degree (1974). He has been employed as counselor/teacher at Santa Fe Community College, Youth Counselor with the Neighborhood Youth Corp., and Guidance Counselor.
with the Alachua County Schools, the position he currently holds. Other professional work experience includes Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor with the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in Jacksonville, Florida, and Administrative Assistant/Teacher, Urban Adult Education Institute, Detroit, Michigan.

Mr. Lanier has been awarded a football and track scholarship for studies at Edward Waters College, 1966-1969; a master's level scholarship provided by the Equal Opportunity Program for studies at Michigan State University, 1969-1970; a doctoral level scholarship, provided by the Department of Rehabilitation Services Administration for studies at the University of Florida, 1972-1974; and a research grant from Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc. (FERDC).


James Edward Lanier is married to the former Charlene Hampton of Warner Robins, Georgia and is the father of Sanita Lynn Lanier.
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