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ABSTRACT

The rationale in support of mainstreaming students with handicaps into the regular education setting is based on the assumption that students with special needs will benefit from integration with their regular education peers. Teachers' attitudes towards this practice plays a crucial role in determining whether or not, or to what degree mainstreaming takes place in their sphere of influence.

This study examined the attitudes and practices of teachers regarding the mainstreaming of special education students into regular education classes. A fourteen item survey was designed using a Likert scale to determine what correlations exist between special education teachers attitudes and actual mainstreaming practices within special day classes in San Bernardino City Unified School District.

Data were analyzed using a Pearson chi-square analysis of variance. Findings indicated that reported attitudes and perceptions of subjects are inconsistent with actual mainstreaming practices. It is the position of this study, and of the respondents that mainstreaming is a viable practice. However, 73.2% of the teachers indicated their students could benefit from further integration.
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INTRODUCTION

The assumption amongst both lay people and educators has been that most special education teachers are supportive of mainstreaming (placing special education students with their non-disabled peers for any part of their school day) in one form or another. It has also been an assumption that where mainstreaming is taking place, the impetus behind the practice has been the special education community. Being a ten year member of this community, the author of this study has long suspected that this was not the case, and that the success or failure of mainstreaming within any given classroom, school, or district had a direct correlation to the acceptance or rejection of the special education faculty involved.

San Bernardino City Unified School District (SBCUSD) has thirty-six Special Day Classes with 118 special education teachers. While it has implemented the practice of mainstreaming, the practice has not been entirely successful. It is the position of this study that the primary obstacle to total success has been insufficient solicitation of feedback from the actual special education teachers. While mainstreaming is influenced by the degree of support, acceptance, and assistance provided to the students by their peers, teachers, and administrators (Stainback, Stainback, & Harris 1989), ultimately, successful mainstreaming begins with the special education teacher.

There has been a considerable amount of research done to assess the reactions of regular education teachers to mainstreaming, but little research has been done to assess the special education teachers’ feelings about this issue.

In an effort to rectify this oversight, the following study sought to assess the attitudes and perceptions of special education teachers within the
SBCUSD towards the current practice of mainstreaming. In addition, the study sought to establish whether currently held attitudes and perceptions were influenced by current practices or vice versa.

A voluntary survey (Appendix B) was devised with questions tailored towards special education teachers. The intent of the survey is listed below:

1. To ascertain what practices are in place, i.e. what form of mainstreaming the teachers are using (Inclusion, partial integration, "pull-out", segregation).

2. What the special education teachers' perceptions are of their support (regular teachers, principals, parents).

3. What special education teachers' perceptions are of the success or failure of their current form of mainstreaming.

4. Whether or not special education teachers would like to see an alternate practice in place.

The results of this study supported the author's suspicions that major inconsistencies exist between perceptions and practice of mainstreaming among Special Day Class teachers surveyed.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The term *mainstreaming*, regarding children with handicaps, has taken on more and more complex meanings over the past decade. Understanding current law and practices in special education will help to ensure the best possible education for children with special needs. The California Educational Code, Section 56364, paragraph one for 1993 states:

Special classes and centers and other removal of individuals with exceptional needs from the regular education environment shall occur only when the nature of the severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Along with the above provisions for services the educational code section 56364, paragraph two further states..."each public agency shall ensure that each individual with exceptional needs participates in those activities with non-disabled pupils to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of the individual with exceptional needs."

A review of the literature reveals that one of the earliest references to what is currently known as mainstreaming, occurred in 1946 at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the International Council of Exceptional Children. At this time, a distinguished panel of teachers and administrators discussed the subject of "Segregation versus Non-segregation of Exceptional Children." Mainstreaming was an important topic then and remains an important topic today, with many of the same issues, problems and questions.

Robb (1946) feels that children with special needs suffer a feeling of inadequacy which comes from being singled out for special treatment. When spe-
cial needs students are denied the opportunity of mingling with others of their age group and deprived of social experiences that would be a precursor to further development, then a feeling of security gained from a sense of belonging is not achieved.

The concern is not one of physical segregation versus non-segregation. It is a question of creating an environment in which an exceptional child can make satisfactory all-around growth and development (Wooden, 1946). Whenever the attitudes and perceptions of the regular education teacher can be altered in such a way that the teachers are able to modify that environment will be best for the child with exceptional needs. However, Wooden (1946) goes on to state that without such modifications, the learning environment becomes a place of frustration and defeat.

Stulken, (1946) expressed the general opinion of the panel when he stated:

"In general, it is best not to segregate an individual by placement in a special group, if he may receive as good or better training in a normal group of pupils, even though it may be necessary to give him special help and more individual attention than is usually provided in the regular classes. The exception to the rule is encountered when the detriment to the interests of the group outweighs the benefit derived by the individual from his association with the regular group."

After a comprehensive examination of literature regarding mainstreaming of children with handicaps it has been generally agreed that history does not record an orderly or positive progression of trends in the care and treatment of individuals with disabilities. From the beginning of time it has been agreed that individuals who look or act differently have been patronized,
ridiculed, exploited, cared for, tortured or even killed. Trends in the treatment of individuals with handicaps varied across centuries, with the beliefs behind the trends veering from rational to highly irrational in perceptions.

Lieberman (1985) a major opponent of the Regular Education Initiative (REI) questions the appropriateness of total integration on the basis that he feels special education will be lost if the goal is to integrate all handicapped children in a regular education environment. Integrating all children with handicaps can be a gamble of major proportions especially since it is the children who are at stake. He states, "...the major difference between regular and special education is that in regular education the system dictates the curriculum; in special education the child dictates the curriculum" (p. 514).

Bryan, Bay, and Donahue (1988) wrote concerning the feasibility of educating students with mild handicaps entirely within the classroom setting. They assert that much of the data gathered recently indicates that many handicapped children differ from regular children in information processing. Regardless of a teacher's prowess, classroom modifications may be inadequate, (by themselves), to meet the needs of all children with learning disabilities.

Special education in the United States during the last century has been like a pendulum swinging first to the right towards integration, then to the left towards segregation (Weiderholt, 1988). To date, there has been a definite increase in integration practices of persons with disabilities into the mainstream of education programs.

Research has shown that successful mainstreaming does not just happen (Stainback & Stainback, 1989). Simply placing special education students on the same campus as regular education students does not ensure that integra-
tion, or for that matter mainstreaming will occur. It doesn’t happen through osmosis, or by hoping it will take place.

For mainstreaming to work the special educator must work with special needs students in the regular classroom. Successful mainstreaming requires a great deal of work, support, acceptance, communication and coordination on the part of special education, as well as regular education teachers.

What is being challenged here is not the special education teacher’s ability to teach to the child with special needs effectively, but rather where the instruction of child with special needs will take place (Wolak, York, & Corbin, 1992). Most special educators and students can work effectively from within the regular classroom if given the proper support.

In recent years, the types of support being offered have greatly increased. Some of the support systems include cooperative and team teaching, informal and formal collaboration with educators, specialists, peers, parents and administrators. With these expanded models of support the special educator is shifting away from the traditional role of isolating students in a special day class (SDC), and moving toward a more integrated service model. This enables teaching to take place in a more functional and natural setting (Stainback, Stainback & Harris, 1989).

Voeltz (1983), presents this issue in another light by giving the following example for us to think about:

It is time now for us to realize that our children and students have as much right to attend school (and receive an individually appropriate program) in their neighborhood public school as other children do. There should be “room” for us, just as there is room for the fourth
graders who live in that neighborhood. We should not have to trade off the right to have our children attend school with their non-handicapped peers in order to obtain appropriate educational programs, anymore than the parents of a fourth grader would be told that “I’m sorry, but your neighborhood public school doesn’t have a fourth grade: if you are willing to put him in third (or fifth) grade, he can go here. Otherwise, a special bus for fourth graders will pick him up for an hour ride to a special school in another part of the city.

Another form of support for integrated teaching has come through actual legislation. Legislation is important to any issue because it brings focus to the issue. It generates thought and discussion whether the proposed legislation becomes law or not. Once laws are in place, they influence and regulate behavior. While it is overly optimistic to assume change in behavior will automatically engender change in thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes, an effect is still felt. The stronger the emotional involvement in the debate surrounding legislation, the wider the repercussions.

Brown vs. Board of Education is a case in point. The same rationale behind the 1954 Supreme Court decision influenced advocates for these with handicaps. That is, “segregation has harmful effects on both the person who is segregated and the person who does the segregating” (Friedman, 1969).

Spurred by the struggle for civil rights in the larger contexts, parents of children with handicaps joined with the civil rights lawyers to attack segregated settings for the individual with handicaps on many of the same grounds that other advocates were attacking segregation based on race (Corrigan, 1978). Eventually the advocates’ hard work for children with handi-
icaps paid off in 1972 when the landmark court case 
Pennsylvania vs. Retarded Citizens ordered access to free public schools for handicapped children.

In 1975 the Congress of the United States enacted the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), mandating a free and appropriate education for all students with handicaps in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The LRE provision of P.L. 94-142 is very specific. Brady, McDougall, and Dennis (1989) summarize the legislation: “That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public and private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped...” (p. 44). The LRE provision also states that “special classes, separate schooling, or other methods of removing handicapped children from the regular environment should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily” [Reg. 300.500] (Denti, 1991).

According to Brady and McDougall (1989), societal treatment of people with severe handicaps has improved dramatically over the past several decades. The normalization principle has emerged as a guiding philosophy for human services and has become a catalyst for the improvement of these services. In education, the steady trend toward progressive inclusion (Reynolds & Birch, 1982) of learners with handicaps into public schools has been guided by the least restrictive environment (LRE) mandates of Congress in P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and its reau-

Recently, discussion and controversy has been generated regarding the Regular Education Initiative (REI) passed in 1990. Proponents of the REI have questioned the effectiveness of special education programs (Coates, 1990; Will, 1986; and Lieberman, 1990). Advocates of the initiative assert that these students should be educated entirely in the regular classroom. They charge that pull out programs have largely failed (Weiderholt, 1989).

The major rationale for the REI lies in the concise statement by Madeleine C. Will (1986), then assistant secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Education.

At the heart of the special approach (REI) is the presumption that students with learning problems cannot be effectively taught in regular education programs even with a variety of support. Students need to be “pulled out” into special settings where they can receive remedial services. Although well-intentioned, this so called “pull-out” approach to the educational difficulties of students with learning problems has failed in many instances to meet the educational needs of these students and has created, however unwittingly, barriers to their successful education (p. 412).

Current legislation would seem to agree with Ms. Will. One of the best known cases to reach the courts, Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Holland, was one in which the parents of Rachel Holland, age 8, sued the district to get their child of moderate disabilities (with no apparent behavior problems) placed in a regular classroom. The hearing officer
ruled in their favor, and the school district is appealing the case (Zirkel & Gluckman, 1993; Viadero, 1992).

Another important part of mainstreaming is to realize that integration has become a civil-rights issue, with the 1990 passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). IDEA bans any form of discrimination against persons with disabilities, including their right to be educated in the "Least Restrictive Environment".

In a case similar to Hollands', an eight year old boy with Down Syndrome was denied the opportunity to be educated in the district where he lived. He was placed in an out-of-district segregated class for "multiply handicapped" children. His parents sued the school district, and on August 17, 1992, Oberti v. Board of Education of Clementon, New Jersey, the school district was asked to develop an inclusive education plan for Rafael within his own school district. The Honorable Judge John F. Gerry gives his statement in the landmark Oberti case:

Inclusion is a right not a privilege for a select few...it is a small price to pay to increase the opportunity of individuals with disabilities to become fully functioning, productive, and co-equal members of society, and of individuals without disabilities to learn to live in a world where individuals with disabilities are so included.

If individuals with handicaps are to acquire skills needed to function in the "real world", then they must be given the chance to succeed or fail in different environments. It works both ways, because non-handicapped individuals will not learn to be accepting or supportive of their peers with special needs unless they spend time with them. All children need to develop the
skills to interact constructively together, and the more opportunities to do so, the better.

Segregation has been perpetuated in part by the notion that schools can teach only some students effectively as opposed to the conviction that all students can learn (Alper & Ryndak, 1992).

To obtain some concrete facts on the problem of segregation versus non-segregation of children with handicaps in the regular grades a series of studies was conducted as early as 1950, at the University of Illinois (Johnson & Kirk). The purpose of these studies was to determine whether children with mental handicaps were accepted, isolated, or actively rejected by their classmates. Johnson and Kirk (1950) concluded that children with mental handicaps were accepted less (5.13%) as compared to regular children (17.45%) being accepted most of the time. Sixty-nine percent of the children with handicaps was isolated compared to 39% of the regular children. A somewhat larger group of children with handicaps, 46.15% were actively rejected by their peers while only 4.4% of regular children were rejected. The study also concludes that those who favor the placement of children with special needs in the regular grades are favoring this procedure without considering the fact that the children themselves may segregate each other (Johnson & Kirk, 1950).

In a more recent study conducted by Fox (1989) she also found that mainstreamed children with handicaps often experience rejection by their non-handicapped peers. Taking all this into consideration it must then be asked: Where are the children forming their attitudes and perceptions? Unless further study in this area can be accomplished that question may never be answered.
One of the most critical factors in mainstreaming has to do with attitudes. Attitudes of regular and special education teachers, students, and the population in general towards special needs individuals help shape their lives. Finally, Hanline (1985) states, "successful integration depends heavily on the positive attitude of teachers.

Making mainstreaming successful is not an easy task for regular education teachers, especially since these teachers are faced with large class sizes and a nationwide push to achieve excellence in education (Sapon & Shevin, 1987).

Currently special educators are responding by trying to help their regular education colleagues and students in mainstreamed settings by focusing on a wide variety of professional and peer support systems. One type of support system has been implemented in the form of inservice training. Generally, these supports have been used to assist teachers and students in both pre-referral intervention, and reintegration of students from special classes into regular classes (Graden et al., 1988; Heron & Harris, 1987; Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb & Nevin, 1986; McNeil & Thousand, 1988).

There also needs to be a strong professional and peer support system so that the special education student feels welcome in the regular education classroom. Every student needs to feel like a contributing member of society, after all what it comes down to is preparing students to function in the "real world" at their own level of ability.

In conclusion, the research indicates that acceptance of individuals with handicaps does occur if it is encouraged and reinforced. The decision to educate disabled and non-disabled children together must be made on an individual basis to best meet the needs of each child and family.
RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Null Hypothesis:

Current mainstream practices of special education classes in San Bernardino City Unified School District are a true reflection of attitudes, perceptions and practices of the special day class teachers.

Alternate Hypothesis:

Current mainstream practices of special education classes in San Bernardino City Unified School District are not an accurate reflection of attitudes, perceptions and practices of the special day class teachers.
METHODOLOGY

A relationship survey was designed to find out what practices were currently in place from the special education teachers' point of view, and to find out how special education teachers felt about these practices, or possibly why they felt that way. The questions used in this survey were developed by the research. Items used were first prepared based on the experience of the researcher and a review of the literature. In addition, a panel of experts were asked to review the survey questions and to provide input on specific items. Among the experts who gladly assisted in this effort were Dr. Louise Fulton and Dr. Richard Ashcroft, Professors of Education at California State University San Bernardino.

Permission to send out the survey was granted by Dr. Michael Karpman (see Appendix B), Director of Research and Development for San Bernardino City Unified School District. Approval was also granted by Marion Klein, Director of Special Education for San Bernardino City Unified School District, on the condition that the results are to be shared with the district upon completion of the project.

Subjects

A fourteen item survey (Appendix B) was sent to all 118 special day class (SDC) teachers at 36 school sites in San Bernardino City Unified School District. In the sample population surveys were sent to 20 elementary schools, seven junior high schools, six high schools, (including two continuation high schools), and three to segregated special education school sites.

Among the 118 SDC teachers, 46 teach students with learning handicaps (LH), 41 teach students with severe handicaps (SH), 17 teach students labeled
as communicatively handicapped (CH), and 14 teach students labeled as severely emotionally disturbed (SED). The subjects were representational of the special needs SDC population. Therefore, the results can be generalized to the San Bernardino City Unified School District.

Procedure

A survey was used as an instrument for collecting information from the subjects. The questionnaire lends itself to a quantitative study. An advantage to the questionnaire is that it was economical, had standardized questions and could be written for a specific purpose.

A four point Likert scale was chosen as a means to quantify data (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). The respondent was able to check the place on the scale which best reflected their beliefs or opinions regarding a question. A Likert scale was selected because of its flexibility since the descriptors on the scale varied to fit the nature of the question.

For this study a numeral was assigned to each response. A number one (1) indicated the most favorable response, with the exception of demographics, and a number four (4) indicated the least favorable response. An even number (four) of possible responses was used for each question to prevent the possibility of automatically choosing the middle response. In addition to the ease of which a Likert scale can be completed, it was hoped that a greater number of surveys would be returned in a timely manner.

Assumptions

The survey questions were meant to ascertain general demographic background information about the teachers as well as specific information regarding mainstreaming to see if any correlations could be drawn. The following
assumptions were tested by the researcher regarding the actual survey questions presented:

1. A positive relationship between teachers with less than ten years teaching experience and the level of mainstreaming. This may occur due to the fact that teachers with less than ten years experience have recently received the university training and push for mainstreaming.

2. A positive relationship between grade level of children with special needs and the amount of mainstreaming is expected. Thus, the younger the student the more mainstreaming will take place.

3. A positive relationship between the less severe the handicapping condition the more mainstreaming will take place.

4. A positive relationship between principal support and the level of mainstreaming is expected. Thus, the more support provided by the principal the more mainstreaming options.

5. A positive relationship between regular education teacher support and the level of mainstreaming is expected. Thus, the more regular education teacher support the greater the mainstreaming options to the special education teacher.

6. A positive relationship between the number of teacher inservices provided by the special education teacher and the amount of mainstreaming is expected. Thus, the more inservices provided to regular instructors, the more mainstreaming options and support available for the special education teacher.
All respondents are special education (SDC) teachers, and likely to be supporters of the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Initiative (see Appendix A). If special education teachers do not believe that both the regular education students and the special education students benefit from mainstreaming then the SDC teacher won’t likely promote, or utilize the option of mainstreaming. Therefore, the higher the agreement between regular and special education student benefit the more mainstreaming will take place.
RESULTS

One hundred eighteen questionnaires were sent to special day class (SDC) teachers in San Bernardino City Unified School District. Of the original mailings, 64 were returned for a 54% return rate. Therefore, a second mailing was required. Following a second mailing to the remaining 54 teachers, 25 returned their questionnaires for a total of a 75.42% return rate.

Four rankings were assigned to responses of items on the questionnaire ranging from number one (high/positive) to number four (low/negative). For each question, percentages were assigned to those rankings based on independent responses by SDC teachers. Research findings will be sent to those teachers upon completion of the project.

Initial Examination of the Data

Prior to performing statistical analysis of the data percentages were recorded for each response to initially examine the findings (see Table 1).

Over half of the SDC teachers have been teaching for ten or more years, with 54.7% of all the SDC teachers teaching at the primary level, and the remaining 45.3%, teaching at the secondary level. Within the four areas most of the teachers (36%) teach children with learning handicaps, followed closely by teachers teaching children with severe handicaps (33.7%). Teachers teaching students labeled as communicatively handicapped and severely emotionally disturbed both amounted to the same number (15.1%).

Regarding mainstreaming, fewer than half of the SDC teachers indicated they mainstream their students greater than 25% of the time. Three out of four SDC teachers mainstream their students less than two and one half
hours a day. Thus, according to the teachers, a low number of children with special needs are being mainstreamed for a small portion of the school day.

Table 1
San Bernardino City Unified School District Mainstreaming Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations of questions asked, percentages for each response.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Years of teaching experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grade level taught:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre-K to 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Type of class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of students mainstreamed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75-100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many hours in a regular education classroom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of principal support:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Extremely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of support from other teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Extremely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student benefit from time spent with regular education students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Very much)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regular education student benefit from interaction with special students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Very much)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Acceptance of your students in unstructured settings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Could your students be mainstreamed more than they are now?:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Definitely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Could your students succeed in a fully included regular program?:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Definitely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of teacher inservices attended:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Parents interest in mainstreaming:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Inclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding support for SDC teachers on school sites, three out of four teachers indicated their principal is either mostly or extremely supportive of mainstreaming. Regular education teacher support of SDC teachers is slightly less with two out of three SDC teachers indicating that their regular education colleagues support them. This indicates a strong relationship for support on school sites.

Seventy-three percent of SDC teachers indicated that students with special needs do benefit most or very much of the time with their regular education peers. Sixty-eight percent of the SDC teachers indicated that regular education students benefit most or very much of the time from being with their special education peers. All SDC teachers indicated that students in regular education were at least somewhat accepting of their special education peers, which is clearly a positive sign.

Considering all the support and benefit for mainstreaming, there wasn't a strong indication for more mainstreaming. Only one-third of the teachers felt more mainstreaming was needed, and two-thirds indicated that they are satisfied with current mainstreaming practices. On the other hand, almost 75% of the SDC teachers indicated their students could succeed in a fully included classroom if support staff were provided.

The research indicates a strong correlation between teacher inservices and the amount of mainstreaming (Larva, 1981). A surprising 84.5% of the SDC teachers have provided two or fewer inservices regarding children with exceptional needs to their colleagues. In addition, inservices delivered by professionals from outside the district, who have expertise in mainstreaming strategies may be called upon.
Regarding parents' mainstreaming views, respondents indicated that parents desire higher levels of mainstreaming than currently exist. Since relevant inservices apparently increase mainstreaming, perhaps SDC teachers could find ways to incorporate parents' views, or the parents themselves, in their mainstreaming efforts.

Statistical Analysis of Data

The nature of the data dictated that cross tabulation be used to determine if there is a discrepancy between a set of observed and expected frequencies within a given sample (Norusis, 1990). The appropriate statistical procedure is a Pearson chi-square (see Appendix C). A significance level of .05 or less was selected to determine if a relevant relationship exists among the data. Data reduction was used to collapse the number of responses into approximately equal size groups. The following interpretations of the data address the researcher's assumptions and other significant findings.

A significant relationship was not found when comparing teacher experience (question 1) to percentage of students mainstreamed (question 4) or number of hours mainstreamed per day (question 5). The Pearson chi-square values were .29059 and .72771, degrees of freedom: one and two, significance: .58984 and .69499 respectively. This shows a discrepancy with the researcher's assumption that years of teaching affects the amount of mainstreaming.

However, there was a significant relationship when relating teaching experience (question 1) with student benefit (question 8). The Pearson chi-square value was 8.11246 with two degrees of freedom and a significance of .01731. Teachers with more than ten years experience felt that only 27.7% of their students benefit very much from contact with regular education stu-
dents. In contrast, teachers with less than ten years experience felt that 58.3% of their students benefit very much.

Although not significant at the .304 level, it was evidenced when relating years of teaching and regular student benefit (question 1 and question 9), teachers with more than ten years experience, felt 31.9% of regular education students would benefit very much from interaction with special needs students. Teachers with less than ten years experience, felt 48.6% of regular education students would benefit very much from mainstreaming. Teachers with less than ten years of experience seem to have a more optimistic outlook with regard to the level of benefit to be gained from mainstreaming.

A significant relationship exists when comparing grade level (question 2) to percent of students mainstreamed (question 4). The Pearson chi-square value is 4.60737 with one degree of freedom and a significance of .03183. It was found that 61.7% of pre-kindergarten to sixth grade teachers indicated they mainstreamed less than 25% of their students. Whereas, 61.5% of teachers teaching 7th to 12th grade mainstream more than 25% of their students. A significant relationship exists proving that students in secondary grades are mainstreamed more often than would be expected, indicating a discrepancy in the researcher’s assumption that children in the primary grades are mainstreamed more often (see Table 2).
A significant relationship was also found for grade level (question 2), and hours of mainstreaming (question 5). The Pearson chi-square value is 18.87657 with two degrees of freedom and a .00008 level of significance. Of students mainstreamed in pre-kindergarten to grade six, 46.8% spend less than 1.5 hours in a regular education classroom. Of students mainstreamed in grades seven to twelve, 68.4% spend 1.5 to 2.5 hours per day in a regular education classroom (see Table 3). This reinforces the previous findings.

A significance exists between grade level (question 2), and the level of acceptance of special education students in unstructured settings (question 10). The Pearson chi-square value is 7.10785 with two degrees of freedom and a significance of .02861.
More than expected pre-kindergarten to sixth grade students and less than expected secondary students were accepted by their regular education peers. Special education students, in general, are well accepted; 79.1% are accepted most or all of the time in unstructured settings (see Table 4).

A somewhat significant relationship between class type (question 3), and hours in regular education class (question 5) was also evidenced. The Pearson chi-square value is 12.57480 with six degrees of freedom and a significance level of .05031.
Fifty-seven percent of students labeled as severely handicapped (SH) are mainstreamed more than 1.5 hours, and 92.4% of children labeled as severely emotionally disturbed (SED) are mainstreamed more than 1.5 hours. However, children labeled as SED made up only 15.3% of the sample, whereas children labeled as SH students made up 32.9% of the total sample. Eighty percent of children labeled as learning handicapped (LH) are mainstreamed more than 1.5 hours per day as well. Over half of the children (61.5%), labeled as communicatively handicapped (CH) are mainstreamed more than 1.5 hours per day. Children labeled as CH made up only 15.3% of the sample.
These results support the researcher's assumption that the severity of the handicapping condition affects the level of mainstreaming.

Significance was found between percentage of students mainstreamed and hours mainstreamed (questions 4 and 5). The Pearson chi-square value is 17.98178 with two degrees of freedom and a significance of .00012. Almost half of the children with special needs (48.2%) spend between 1.5 to 2.5 hours per day in a regular education classroom. While 23.5% of the children with special needs spend more than 3 hours in regular education, and 28.2% spend less than 1.5 hours per day in a regular education classrooms (see Table 5).

Table 5
Percentage of Students Mainstreamed (Q4) by Hours of Mainstreaming Per Day (Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3+ Hours</th>
<th>1.5 - 2.5 Hours</th>
<th>Less than 1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or Greater</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>24.70%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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gree of freedom and a significance of .01835. Teachers of pre-kindergarten to sixth grade felt that more of their students (75%), could succeed in a fully included classroom, if support services were provided. Whereas, teachers of grades seven to twelve felt only 25% of their students could succeed with support services. A discrepancy exists between the mainstreaming practices currently taking place in those grade levels.

There was no significant relationship regarding the researcher's assumption that principal support was important. Principal support did not determine whether or not teachers mainstreamed. Nor did principal support determine how much teachers mainstreamed. However, 58.8% of teachers receiving high principal support (question 6) indicated that regular education students benefited very much from mainstreaming (question 9) at a .01701 level of significance. The Pearson chi-square value was 12.04671 with four degrees of freedom.

A discrepancy exists regarding the researcher's assumption that regular education teacher support influences the level of mainstreaming. The relationship between percentage of students mainstreamed (question 4), and regular education teacher support (question 7) shows a Pearson chi-square value of 3.54187 with two degrees of freedom and a .17017 level of significance.

Significance exists among teachers who mainstream more than 25% of their students (question 4), and the benefit of mainstreaming with special and regular education students (questions 8 and 9). The Pearson chi-square values are 14.44124 and 6.47061 with two degrees of freedom and significance levels of .00073 and .03935 respectively. Over 50% felt the special education and regular education students got a lot of benefit from mainstreaming. Teachers
of .00073 and .03935 respectively. Over 50% felt the special education and regular education students got a lot of benefit from mainstreaming. Teachers who mainstream less than 25% of their students felt that less than 25% of the special and regular education students benefited from mainstreaming. The data indicates that teachers who believe in mainstreaming will mainstream more than teachers who do not hold such a belief (see Table 6).

Table 6
Percentage of Students Mainstreamed (Q4) by Benefit Received From Mainstreaming (Q8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Less than 25%</th>
<th>25% or Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it was interesting to note that of the teachers who mainstream more than 25% of their students (question 4), 90% felt their students are accepted in unstructured settings most or all of the time (question 10). The Pearson chi-square value is 6.08662 with two degrees of freedom and a .04768
ists between the percentage of students being mainstreamed, and the questions relating to student benefit.

It is also important to note that there was no level of significance when relating teacher inservices (question 13) to the percentage of students, or hours mainstreamed (questions 4 and 5). Levels of significance are .50542 and .84557 respectively. This is inconsistent with the researcher's stated assumption, that a positive correlation would occur. Likewise, when relating teacher inservices (question 13) to regular education teacher support (question 7) there was also not a significant correlation. Level of significance was .79968. This contradicts the researcher's assumption that special education teachers feel inservices play an important role in mainstreaming children with special needs.

Finally, a significant relationship exists between teacher reported parent interest in mainstreaming (question 14), and teacher reported benefit of mainstreaming (question 8). The Pearson chi-square value is 23.49381 with six degrees of freedom and a significance level of .00065. This study revealed significant data indicating parents desire more mainstreaming for their child whenever possible (see Appendix C).

**Selected Anecdotal Comments**

This study would not be complete without including a sample of comments the teachers offered on the survey form. Although teacher comments addressed a variety of issues which could not be quantified, their comments provide rich information for further study.

It is the opinion of this researcher that this is valuable information regarding the issue of mainstreaming in San Bernardino City Unified School District. The comments are discussed below in random order.
1. "Mainstreaming is important, but not so it looks good on paper. What is being forgotten is the specific needs of each individual child..."

2. "The district promotes mainstreaming, and inclusion, but there is not enough transition, follow-up, and support for teachers, and children."

3. "Why aren't the special needs children given tutors for the first three months to ensure success?"

4. "Why aren't regular education teachers who take the children with special needs given less regular education children."

5. "Why doesn't the district have student study meetings from the old special education teacher to the new teacher?"

6. "Success in mainstreaming takes adults who can team together and get along."

7. "I feel strongly about mainstreaming those students who are close cognitively to their peers...it is difficult to place all in regular education pre-school because there's such a lag in normal developmental milestones that it makes it difficult to include them with normal pre-schoolers."

8. "As a special education teacher, having taught in an inclusion classroom for over three years, I can honestly say that it is a wonderful experience for both the special and regular education child, but it definitely has its' drawbacks. Among the drawbacks that can hinder a program is the need for a written statement regarding the district and special education teachers' position on inclusion. A district pro-"
procedure, guideline or policy regarding inclusion in the best interest of all children, and not just a select few, is a must! An inclusion committee would be a good idea to write up these policies.”

9. “...I definitely feel there should be more interaction for normal children to learn about them (children with special needs), if nothing more because they are all children with the same needs.”

10. “...giving them ten support people in the regular ed. classroom would not help. They learn differently and they need to be taught differently. Teaching presented at a much slower rate. Vocabulary and sentence structure (teacher’s) must be modified.”

11. “In my opinion, insisting the GH students must be with regular education students implies something is wrong with them that can’t be addressed in the company of regular education students.”

12. “Every year I have to fight administration for the LEGAL right of my students to mainstream.”

13. “Teachers seem to resist inservices for some reason that teaches (assists) them in with our students.”

14. “Inclusion within a regular class is difficult. Not all teachers can adapt to the variety of regular students needs let alone special kids.”

15. “With the push for thematic, whole language instruction, I feel that mainstreaming is not always beneficial because I need to know not only what is covered, but how it was covered with exact vocabulary so I can tie in to it. This is nearly impossible unless I am with them.”
16. "...with year round it's hard to mainstream consistently."

17. "I feel the the only way these special needs students will receive appropriate, positive or at least normal role modeling is being in the mainstream."

18. "Many students lack the confidence not to mention the support at home that would enable better success in a mainstreamed regular education classroom."

19. "I believe teachers who are willing to take our students should be rewarded with a smaller class size."

20. "I am concerned that this survey seems to address political and attitudinal issues to the exclusion of students needs, capabilities, and interests."
DISCUSSION

Results of this survey indicated that many special day class (SDC) teachers in San Bernardino City Unified School District are applying numerous mainstreaming strategies, with a variety of students, on a daily basis. However, not enough is being done to find out more ways of meeting the needs of all the students. Thus, the results support the hypothesis that current mainstreaming practices of special education teachers in San Bernardino City Unified School District are not an accurate reflection of attitudes, perceptions and preferences of the special day class teachers.

Conclusion

Of the special education teachers surveyed within San Bernardino City Unified School District, 48.2% were using partial integration (one and one half to two hours and a half hours per day with regular education children). The majority of the teachers felt strong support from principals (76.2%), strong support from regular classroom teachers (61.3%), and strong support from parents (63.3%). The majority (66.6%) of the teachers surveyed also felt that their current practice of mainstreaming was sufficient. Paradoxically, and of gravest concern to this researcher, is the fact that 73.2% of the special education teachers surveyed felt their students could benefit from further integration, and 74.4% felt their students could handle total inclusion with support (i.e. full-time participation in a fully-integrated classroom of children with and without handicaps).

It is the position of this study that mainstreaming is a viable practice. The survey of San Bernardino City Unified School District indicates that the majority (72.9%) of the special education teachers within the District also feel it is
a viable practice. By the strong support implied above, regular education
teachers, principals, and parents also feel it is a viable practice.

The following questions arise as a result of this study: If all parties in-
volved seem to think it is viable and worthwhile, why is the average integration only 1.5 to 2 hrs per day? Why do the majority of the teachers voice contentment with the status quo only to turn around and voice the contradictory opinion that further integration would be beneficial? Lastly, if the majority of the teachers surveyed feel the majority of their students could handle total integration (inclusion), why is there no push to bring this about?

It is the opinion of this researcher that there must be some hindrance, known or unknown, to full integration existing in the San Bernardino Unified School District. If it is the purpose of educators to address the academic needs of students when the need is found, San Bernardino City Unified School District educators now have another mission or goal: to ensure for every child with special needs the opportunity to develop to their full potential in the most natural setting.

Results of this survey offer concrete proof of an unmet need. Since the passing of P.L. 94-142 Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, all U.S. schools have attempted to comply. San Bernardino City Unified School District has done an outstanding job of implementing the practice, as is attested to by the strong support of most parties involved. However, to remain at the forefront of progressive education, it is time for the district to move on to the next phase; total inclusion, when it is appropriate for specific individuals. According to the results of this study, San Bernardino City Unified School District has the support of those involved in current mainstreaming; they
need only look into the various possibilities for restructuring the classroom of the future.

**Limitations**

The major limitations of this research project were: 1) sample size and characteristics, 2) limited generalizability, and 3) question ambiguity.

The original sample population of special day class (SDC) teachers represents only the SDC teachers, and does not include resource specialist teachers, speech therapists or other special education support staff. Nor does the sample population include regular education teachers, students, principals or other administrators in the San Bernardino City Unified School District. Of the 118 SDC teachers surveyed only 89 returned their surveys even after a follow-up letter and second survey was sent. Although a 75.42% return rate was good it still was not 100 percent.

The survey was distributed within the San Bernardino City Unified School district. Therefore, it has limited generalizability since integration and inclusion policies can vary from district to district.

Some subjects included anecdotal remarks describing certain questions as ambiguous. This is to be expected in a forced choice format. Yet, the researcher feels it should be noted as a limitation since some of these questions required respondents to make interpretations regarding student, parent, principal and regular education teacher perceptions. One’s attitude is a multidimensional subject, since the attitudes in question go beyond the scope of this study.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study has supported the assumption that principals, regular education teachers, parents and students play an important role in influencing the
amount of mainstreaming occurring on school sites. More information needs to be gathered concerning these individuals’ and perceptions towards mainstreaming, along with continued information regarding special education personnel attitudes and perceptions.

A district policy on mainstreaming, written by teachers, administrators and parents of children with special needs is highly recommended. This would ensure that everyone involved in the mainstreaming process understands the specific guidelines and procedures to be followed for the success of each child involved.

Finally, the research could be expanded to include different school districts, and/or states involving administrators as well as teachers. An ethnographic study at this level would also yield valuable information as to what districts have done, both successfully and unsuccessfully, to prepare their teachers and mainstream their students.
Appendix A
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Exceptional needs:

Are those students whose needs deviate from the average in mental, sensory, physical, behavioral or communicative abilities to the extent that modification in the educational or physical environment are necessary for development to maximum potential.

Full Inclusion:

When children with exceptional needs are placed in the regular education classroom on a full time basis with his/her peers, and modifications in the regular program are given whenever appropriate to help ensure success. The student is graded on “differential standards”, and given support from the special education teacher through team teaching, consultation services or any other system of support the IEP team feels is appropriate.

Inclusion:

When children with exceptional needs participate (are included) with their regular education peers for most of the school day in social and academic areas, but may still be pulled out for speech and language services, adapted physical education or the resource specialist program.

Integration:

Is when children with special needs are placed on the same campus with regular education children and participate in most activities offered the regular education students, i.e. lunch, recess, P.E., cafeteria assistant, field trips, assemblies, etc.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE):

A provision of Public Law 94-142 which specifies that children with
handicaps are educated with children who are not handicapped to the maximum extent appropriate.

Mainstreaming:

Mainstreaming refers to children with special needs spending any part of their school day with non-handicapped peers (Lewis & Doorlag). Mainstreaming means more than physical placement in classes with normal peers. Complete integration of these children requires preparation of the special education teacher, regular classroom teacher and regular students. Special methods, modifications, techniques, and adaptations should be supplied by the special education teacher to the regular education staff.

Partial Integration:

Refers to placing children with special needs on a campus with regular education students, participating maybe in activities such as lunch or recess. The children with special needs may be on the same campus physically, but not be included in all school functions on an equal basis.

Pull-out Programs:

Refers to those programs that pull students with exceptional needs out of the classroom to work with them in an isolated or therapeutic setting, i.e. resource specialist program (RSP), Bilingual program, speech therapy or adapted physical education (APE).

REI:

The Regular Education Initiative, also referred to as the General Education Initiative (GEI), adopted in 1988 to merge special and regular education together to form one system for all students.
Segregation:

Is the isolating or separating of children with special needs from the regular education population.

Special Day Class:

Refers to a separate classroom of children with special needs that may or may not mainstream students into the regular classroom.
Appendix B
Dear Dr. Karpman,

I am currently pursuing a Master's degree in Special Education from California State University San Bernardino. I am hoping to graduate in June 1993. For the past year I have been doing research on the benefits of mainstreaming. With the full support of my advisor, Dr. Louise Fulton, and the special education program specialist, Chris LeRoy, I have decided to conduct a quantitative research review. I would like to find out the extent of mainstreaming taking place, attitudes and perceptions among special day class teachers in San Bernardino City Unified School district.

A survey will be sent to special day class teachers (SH, LH, SED, & CH) throughout San Bernardino; preschool to twelfth grade. The voluntary survey is two pages of questions that should take only five to ten minutes to complete.

Having worked for the S.B.U.S.D. for the past five years in a mainstreamed setting, I feel my results can only benefit the school district in their continuing efforts to include special education students in the educating process. The results of this study may be used in a special ed needs assessment for the district.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. If I may be of further assistance please contact me at 862-8158.

Sincerely,

Stacey Lambert-Melcher
TO: Stacey Lambert-Melcher  
FROM: Dr. Michael M. Karpman  
RE: Masters Degree Research Project  
DATE: 4/22/93  

Stacey, I would first like to thank you for coming in to see me on 4/20/93. It is always helpful to talk with the person who is going to be conducting the research project. Questions and clarification regarding procedures can be quickly addressed.

I talked with Marion Klein and we both feel that the research project is viable and could proceed as soon as you wish. The approval for the project is based on two key elements. First, it is assumed that, according to you letter, the survey will be voluntary. Second, Mrs. Klein and I will be receiving a report of findings after the project is completed.

It is my assumption that your next step will be to secure a list of SDC teachers from the Special Education office. Should you have any questions about the acquisition of the necessary data, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Good luck to you in this project—I am sure it will be a benefit to both you and the District.

cc: Marion Klein
Letter of Introduction

Dear Colleague,

I am currently conducting research concerning attitudes and perceptions towards mainstreaming in San Bernardino City Unified School District. Mainstreaming refers to special education students spending any part of the school day, i.e. recess, lunch, assemblies, academics, etc., with non-disabled peers. I am surveying 118 special day class teachers in four areas: severely handicapped, severely emotionally disturbed, learning handicapped, and communicatively handicapped.

I would appreciate your participation in the survey, however it is voluntary. Your signature is not required and your responses will remain anonymous.

Completion of the two page survey should take only a few minutes. Please place the completed survey in the envelope provided, and return to Cypress Elementary School by May 14, 1993. Your prompt attention will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns please call Stacey Lambert-Melcher at 862-8158 or 862-6675.

If you would like a copy of the results, enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope when you return the survey, and I will be glad to send them to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Stacey Lambert-Melcher
SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
MAINTREAMING SURVEY

Please take the time to read through and answer the following survey on attitudes and participation in the mainstreaming process between regular education and special day classrooms. Please circle the number that best represents your view.

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   - (10+) 1
   - (6-9) 2
   - (3-5) 3
   - (0-2) 4

2. What grade level do you teach?
   - (pre-K to 3) 1
   - (4-6) 2
   - (7-9) 3
   - (10-12) 4

3. What type of special day class do you teach?
   - (SH) 1
   - (SED) 2
   - (LH) 3
   - (CH) 4

4. What percentage of your students are mainstreamed in a regular education classroom?
   - (75-100%) 1
   - (50-74%) 2
   - (25-49%) 3
   - (0-24%) 4

5. Of the students you mainstream, how many hours of the school day are they in a regular education classroom?
   - (4+) 1
   - (3-4) 2
   - (1.5-2.5) 3
   - (0-1) 4

6. In your opinion, is your site principal supportive of mainstreaming?
   - (extremely) 1
   - (most of the time) 2
   - (some of the time) 3
   - (not at all) 4

7. In your opinion, are the regular education teachers at your site supportive?
   - (extremely) 1
   - (most of the time) 2
   - (some of the time) 3
   - (not at all) 4
8. Do you feel your students benefit from the time spent with the regular education students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(very much)</th>
<th>(most of the time)</th>
<th>(some of the time)</th>
<th>(not at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you feel that the students in the regular education classroom would benefit from interaction with special students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(very much)</th>
<th>(most of the time)</th>
<th>(some of the time)</th>
<th>(not at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. At present, are the students in the regular education program accepting of your students in unstructured settings (i.e.: recess, lunch, passing period)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(always)</th>
<th>(most of the time)</th>
<th>(some of the time)</th>
<th>(never)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In your opinion, could the majority of your students be mainstreamed more than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(definitely)</th>
<th>(most of the time)</th>
<th>(some of the time)</th>
<th>(not at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In your opinion, could your students succeed in a fully included regular education classroom if support staff were provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(definitely)</th>
<th>(most of the time)</th>
<th>(some of the time)</th>
<th>(not at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Have you conducted any teacher inservices to build rapport and promote mainstreaming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5+)</th>
<th>(3-4)</th>
<th>(1-2)</th>
<th>(none)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. To what extent are the parents of the children in your classroom interested in mainstreaming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(full inclusion)</th>
<th>(more mainstreaming)</th>
<th>(less mainstreaming)</th>
<th>(segregation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE SIDE FOR YOUR COMMENTS
Appendix C
## Q1 Teaching Experience by Q8 Student Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q8 Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ YEARS</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 10 YEARS</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Total**

119

**Total**

126

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>8.11246</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.21273</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.542

Number of Missing Observations: 3
### Q1 Teaching Experience by Q9 Regular Student Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Exp Val</th>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT LITTLE</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 UNDER 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>2.38144</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.38062</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 10.244
Number of Missing Observations: 4
### Q2 GRADE LEVEL by Q4 REG ED %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q4 25%+</th>
<th>&lt;25%</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-K TO 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Row Total | 47 | 54.7% |
|           | 39 | 45.3% |

Column Total: 86

| Total | 42 | 44 | 86 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>4.60737</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>3.72419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 19.047
Number of Missing Observations: 0
### Q2 GRADE LEVEL by Q5 RED ED HRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q5 Exp Val</th>
<th></th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3+ HRS</td>
<td>1.5-2.5</td>
<td>&lt;1.5 HRS</td>
<td>Row Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-K TO 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.00008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

- Pearson: 18.87657, DF: 2, Significance: 0.00008
- Likelihood Ratio: 21.53589, DF: 2, Significance: 0.0002

Minimum Expected Frequency: 8.941

Number of Missing Observations: 1
### Q2 GRADE LEVEL by Q10 ACCEPTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-K TO 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Total</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.10785</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.48430</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency: 6.914
Number of Missing Observations: 5
## Q2 Grade Level by Q12 Fully Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>SUCCEED</th>
<th>NOT SUCCEED</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-K TO 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square

- **Pearson**: 5.56201, DF: 1, Significance: 0.01835
- **Continuity Correction**: 4.48142, DF: 1, Significance: 0.03427

Minimum Expected Frequency: 10.884
Number of Missing Observations: 0
### Q3 CLASS TYPE by Q5 RED ED HRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q5 Exp Val</th>
<th>Q5 Row Pct</th>
<th>Q5 Col Pct</th>
<th>Q5 Tot Pct</th>
<th>Q5 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3+ HRS</td>
<td>1.5-2.5</td>
<td>&lt;1.5 HRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.57480</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.13470</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.04095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.059

Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 4 OF 12 (< 33.3%)

Number of Missing Observations: 1
### Q3 CLASS TYPE by Q6 PRINCIPAL SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.16888</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.44557</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.03648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 3.095
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 4 OF 12 (< 33.3%)
Number of Missing Observations: 2
### Q3 CLASS TYPE by Q10 ACCEPTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.00803</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.83306</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minimum Expected Frequency** - 2.568

**Cells with Expected Frequency < 5** - 5 of 12 (< 41.7%)

**Number of Missing Observations**: 5
### Q4 REG ED % by Q5 RED ED HRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exp Val</strong></td>
<td><strong>Row Pct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Pct</strong></td>
<td><strong>3+ HRS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5-2.5 HRS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% +</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Value**
- Pearson: 17.98178, DF: 2, Significance: .00012
- Likelihood Ratio: 19.53769, DF: 2, Significance: .00006

Minimum Expected Frequency: 9.882
Number of Missing Observations: 1
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### Q4 REG ED % by Q7 TEACHER SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Exp Val</th>
<th>HIGH SUPPORT</th>
<th>SOME SUPPORT</th>
<th>LITTLE SUPPORT</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 25% +

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Exp Val</th>
<th>HIGH SUPPORT</th>
<th>SOME SUPPORT</th>
<th>LITTLE SUPPORT</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### <25%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Exp Val</th>
<th>HIGH SUPPORT</th>
<th>SOME SUPPORT</th>
<th>LITTLE SUPPORT</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>3.54187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.58129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.16665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.850
Number of Missing Observations: 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 REG ED % by Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Somewhat Little</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% +</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square | Value | DF | Significance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>14.44124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.97767</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 11.233
Number of Missing Observations: 0
### Q4 REG ED % by Q9 REGULAR STUDENT BENEFIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>6.47061</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.56850</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 12.353
Number of Missing Observations: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 REG ED % by Q10 ACCEPTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>6.08652</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.34885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.901
Number of Missing Observations: 5
### Q4 REG ED % by Q13 INSERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td>INSERVICE</td>
<td>NO INSERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT Pct</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% +</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Column Total | 40 | 44 | 84 |
| Total | 47.6% | 52.4% | 100.0% |

### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.44354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.20022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.65454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 19.524
Number of Missing Observations: 2
### Q5 RED ED HRS by Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>EXP Val</th>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT LITTLE</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Value

- Pearson: $11.50497$, $DF = 4$, $Significance = 0.02144$
- Likelihood Ratio: $11.70219$, $DF = 4$, $Significance = 0.01971$

Minimum Expected Frequency = $5.412$
Number of Missing Observations: $1$
### Q5 RED ED HRS by Q13 INSERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>INSERVE</th>
<th>NO INSERVE</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Column</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

- **Value**: .33548, **DF**: 2, **Significance**: .84557
- **Likelihood Ratio**: .33571, **DF**: 2, **Significance**: .84548

**Minimum Expected Frequency** = 9.639

**Number of Missing Observations**: 3
Q6 PRINCIPAL SUPPORT by Q7 TEACHER SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Row Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI SUPPORT</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SUPPORT</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE SUPPORT</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Value  DF  Significance
Pearson        20.62311  4  .00038
Likelihood Ratio 21.78362  4  .00022

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.679
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 of 9 (33.3%)
Number of Missing Observations: 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6 PRINCIPAL SUPPORT by Q9 REGULAR STUDENT BENEFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI SUPPORT</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SUPPORT</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE SUPPORT</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.04671</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.35057</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.024
Number of Missing Observations: 3
## Q7 TEACHER SUPPORT by Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 1       | 10      | 1       | 1       | 12         |
|       |         | 5.1     | 4.2     | 2.7     | 15.0%      |
|       |         | 83.3%   | 8.3%    | 8.3%    |            |
|       |         | 29.4%   | 3.6%    | 5.6%    |            |
|       |         | 12.5%   | 1.3%    | 1.3%    |            |

|       | 2       | 13      | 14      | 10      | 37         |
|       |         | 15.7    | 13.0    | 8.3     | 46.3%      |
|       |         | 35.1%   | 37.8%   | 27.0%   |            |
|       |         | 38.2%   | 50.0%   | 55.6%   |            |
|       |         | 16.3%   | 17.5%   | 12.5%   |            |

|       | 3       | 11      | 13      | 7       | 31         |
|       |         | 13.2    | 10.9    | 7.0     | 38.8%      |
|       |         | 35.5%   | 41.9%   | 22.6%   |            |
|       |         | 32.4%   | 46.4%   | 38.9%   |            |
|       |         | 13.8%   | 16.3%   | 8.8%    |            |

|       | Column  | 34      | 28      | 18      | 80         |
|       | Total   | 42.5%   | 35.0%   | 22.5%   | 100.0%     |

### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>9.89586</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.29283</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.700
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 OF 9 (22.2%)
Number of Missing Observations: 6
### Q7 TEACHER SUPPORT by Q9 REGULAR STUDENT BENEFIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi SUPPORT</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some SUPPORT</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little SUPPORT</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>13.54392</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>15.78648</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 3.600
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 3 OF 9 (33.3%)
Number of Missing Observations: 6
Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT by Q9 REGULAR STUDENT BENEFIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Exp Val</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 33 25 27 85
Total 38.8% 29.4% 31.8% 100.0%

Chi-Square Value DF Significance
Pearson 28.65682 4 .00001
Likelihood Ratio 28.11573 4 .00001

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.765
Number of Missing Observations: 1
## Q7 TEACHER SUPPORT by Q13 INSERCUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI SUPPORT</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SUPPORT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.44708</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.79968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.44800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.79931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 5.772
Number of Missing Observations: 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT by Q10 ACCEPTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count Exp Val Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>18.15279</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>20.13256</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency = 3.951

Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 OF 9 (22.2%)

Number of Missing Observations: 5
### Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT by Q14 PARENT INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>FULL INC</th>
<th>MORE MAI</th>
<th>LESS MAI</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFIT</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Value</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>23.49381</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>27.50889</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.025
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 6 OF 12 (< 50.0%)
Number of Missing Observations: 7
Q8 STUDENT BENEFIT by Q13 INSERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INSERVE NO INSERVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Value</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>9.16422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.47549</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Expected Frequency</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Missing Observations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q9 REGULAR STUDENT BENEFIT by Q11 MORE MAINSTREAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Page 1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEFINITE MOST</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Total</th>
<th>15.7%</th>
<th>18.1%</th>
<th>45.8%</th>
<th>20.5%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.14571</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.06429</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.04203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.916
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 5 of 12 (< 41.7%)
Number of Missing Observations: 3
### Q10 Acceptance by Q14 Parent Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Exp Val</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>FULL INC MORE MAI LESS MAI SEGREGAT LUSION NSTREAMI NSTREAMI ION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTING</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>17.55625</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>16.07486</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minimum Expected Frequency** - 1.054

**Cells with Expected Frequency < 5** - 8 of 12 (66.7%)

**Number of Missing Observations:** 12
## Q11 MORE MAINSTREAM by Q12 FULLY INCLUDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>SUCCEED</th>
<th>NOT SUCCEED</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp Val</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.75991</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.23973</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.560
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 OF 8 (< 37.5%)
Number of Missing Observations: 2
### Q11. More Mainstream by Q14 Parent Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>FULL INC</th>
<th>MORE MAI</th>
<th>LESS MAI</th>
<th>SEGREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Pct</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot Pct</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITELY</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>22.12759</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.00848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19.52096</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.182
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 11 OF 16 (68.8%)
Number of Missing Observations: 9
### Q12 FULLY INCLUDED by Q14 PARENT INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>MAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row</td>
<td>LUSION</td>
<td>NSTREAM</td>
<td>NSTREAM</td>
<td>ION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCEED</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SUCCEED</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>8.87940</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.45130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.228
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 OF 8 (25.0%)
Number of Missing Observations: 7
### Q13 INSERVICES by Q14 PARENT INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>MAI</td>
<td>LESS</td>
<td>MAI</td>
<td>SEGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LUSION</td>
<td>NSTREAMI</td>
<td>NSTREAMI</td>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO INSERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.38214</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.06067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.55373</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.410

Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 4 OF 8 (50.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 8
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