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The problem of this study was to ascertain the perceptions of Texas high school principals and special education directors in regard to the participation of mentally retarded (MR) and learning disabled (LD) students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large high schools.

The purposes of the study were (1) to determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools, (2) to compare the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors, (3) to determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities, (4) to compare the perceptions of principals and special education directors in regard to those mandates, (5) to compare the perceptions of high school principals in the three school sizes, and (6) to compare the perceptions of special education directors in the three school sizes.
A questionnaire provided the data for this study. A stratified random sample of Texas high schools with enrollment of at least 100 students was used to select the participants. The questionnaire was mailed to principals and special education directors of 183 high schools, making a total of 366 mailed; 258, or 70 per cent, returned usable responses.

Among the major findings revealed by an analysis of the data are the following.

1. Special education directors were found to have highly positive perceptions in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. Principals were found to have perceptions that were neither positive nor negative.

2. Special education directors were found to have positive perceptions in regard to Public Law 94-142 as it pertains to extracurricular activities. Principals were found to have perceptions that were neither positive nor negative.

3. Special education directors were found to have a significantly higher positive score than principals in each school size in regard to both perceptions in regard to MR and LD participation and Public Law 94-142.

4. Texas high school principals' perceptions apparently were not influenced by school size.

5. Special education directors' perceptions in regard to extracurricular participation by MR and LD students were more
positive in small schools than in medium and large schools, while their perceptions in regard to Public Law 94-142 apparently were not influenced by school size.

Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions are presented.

1. It appears that working closely with the special education program may help to improve perceptions toward students and laws affecting them.

2. It appears that principals' perceptions may be improved through a more personal relationship with and awareness of MR and LD students and the laws affecting their education.

3. Low scores in regard to Public Law 94-142 may indicate an intolerance and lack of understanding of the law or philosophical differences in regard to mandated programs.

4. Low scores by principals in particular on the law section may be due to lack of ample time available to study the law.

5. There appears to be no differences in perceptions of principals in Texas high schools regardless of school size.

6. It appears that smaller schools with fewer special education students have special education directors with more positive perceptions than the directors in other school sizes.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Handicapped children have remained, until recent times, among the most ignored of all children. There has perhaps been "no other group that has existed for so long a time outside the center of public and professional concern" (12, p. 195). A reversal of this trend is certainly evident to the public and to professional educators. The recent legislation favoring the handicapped in the public school setting is considered by many to be a great step forward.

Many handicapped students are afforded equal opportunity by virtue of participation in the regular curriculum. The same handicapped students could benefit from involvement in extracurricular activities. The advantages of an education with "normal" students should not stop with the traditional curriculum. There is an advantage for many students in participation in extracurricular activities, and the involvement of the handicapped in these activities is as important as it is for the regular student (8, p. 136).

Through Public Law 94-142, educators now have a mandate to provide the same kinds of total educational experiences for both handicapped and non-handicapped students by the most
beneficial methods possible for the students. Administrators of curriculum and coordinators of extracurricular programs, however, may or may not recognize practical methods of adhering to the obligations already mandated by law in a manner that would be most beneficial to all.

As a result of this federal legislation, and also state legislation, more and more handicapped students are entering the public high schools of Texas. Many of the handicapped students are integrated into the regular classroom. This study focused upon the mentally retarded and learning disabled students in public high schools in Texas.

The study surveyed the perceptions of Texas public high school principals and special education directors in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The study also surveyed the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the sections of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

Recognizing that extracurricular activities are a vital part of the school experience for many students would seem to be an important function for today's educators. The perceptions of high school principals and special education directors would seem to influence the effectiveness of extracurricular programs for MR and LD students, as well as federal legislation for the education of the handicapped.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to ascertain the perceptions of Texas high school principals and special education directors in regard to the participation of mentally retarded (MR) and learning disabled (LD) students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large high schools.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools,

2. To compare the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools,

3. To determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools,

4. To compare the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in small, medium, and large schools toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 that deal with extracurricular activities,
5. To compare the perceptions of high school principals in small, medium, and large schools toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities, and

6. To compare the perceptions of special education directors in small, medium, and large schools toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

Research Questions

The following research questions provided the major focus of the study.

1. What are the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities?

2. What are the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with the extracurricular activities?

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of the proposed study, the following hypotheses were tested using the .05 level of significance.
1. There will be no significant differences in the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in schools of all sizes.

2. There will be no significant differences in the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small schools.

3. There will be no significant differences in the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in schools of medium size.

4. There will be no significant differences in the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in large schools.

5. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 that deal with extracurricular activities in schools of all sizes.

6. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 that deal with extracurricular activities in small schools.
7. There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 that deal with extracurricular activities in schools of medium size.

8. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 that deal with extracurricular activities in large schools.

9. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of high school principals toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools.

10. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of high school principals in small, medium, and large schools toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

11. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of special education directors in small, medium, and large schools toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities.

12. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of special education directors in small, medium, and large schools toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.
Background and Significance of the Study

The education of the mentally retarded and learning disabled has received most of its attention by educators and the public in general only recently. The concept of educating each child to the limits of his ability is relatively new (8, p. 5). Kirk further states that the current use of the term "exceptional" is itself "a reflection of radical changes in society's view of those who deviate. We have come a long way from the Spartans' practice of killing the deviant or malformed infant." But the progress has come through slow stages. Exploitation of the handicapped in the role of court jester several hundred years ago can still be found in today's circus side shows. But vast changes have occurred in society's attitude toward the handicapped person.

Historically, three stages in the development of attitudes toward the handicapped child can be recognized (2, p. 66). First, during the pre-Christian era the handicapped were persecuted, neglected, and mistreated. Second, during the spread of Christianity they were protected and pitied. Third, in very recent years there has been a movement toward accepting the handicapped and integrating them into society to the fullest extent possible.

By tracing the historical development of education for the handicapped, one can see that the strides that were made
were many years in coming. These gains were made in the area of the regular curriculum, as we shall see, with no emphasis on extracurricular activities for the handicapped. In fact, it was only in the past few years of our nation's history that emphasis has been placed upon the extracurricular programs which integrate the handicapped student with the regular student.

Reynolds and Birch carefully traced the education of the handicapped student (11, p. 14). In 1848, Edward Seguin came from France to describe his educational procedures there with mentally retarded pupils and to urge the establishment of schools for mentally retarded children and youth in the United States. In that same year Dorothea Dix confronted the Congress with the inhumanity of many programs for the "mentally ill."

Public attitude toward the mentally handicapped can be seen in labels that were given to denote their condition. It was in 1859 that Samuel Gridley Howe influenced legislative and public support for the Massachusetts School of Idiotic and Feeble-Minded Youth. It was the nation's first residential school for persons with mental retardation.

In 1878, August Schenck called for day classes for mentally retarded pupils in a speech before the American Teachers Association. It was not until 1896, however, that the first public school day classes for mentally retarded pupils were initiated. Eight years later the Vineland Training School started summer training sessions for teachers of the retarded.
The 1930's was a period of progress for handicapped students. In 1931, a section on exceptional children was formed in the U. S. Office of Education. Not much progress was made in the 1940's, but in 1950, the National Association for Retarded Citizens was formed along with other parent groups which began to press for special education. Later that same year, thirty-four states had laws subsidizing public school classes for all recognized groups of exceptional children.

The handicapped students received further assistance in education with the passage of federal laws dealing with teacher education programs. In 1958 Congress passed Public Law 85-926 to provide one million dollars to be allocated to colleges and to universities to train professional educators for special education of mentally retarded pupils. Later, in 1963, Congress legislated funds to support training of educators for all recognized groups of handicapped children and youth and to subsidize research regarding their education.

As was stated earlier, it was not until recent years that emphasis has been placed upon the total educational experience of handicapped students to include the extracurricular program. For instance, the Rehabilitation Act of 1974 deals with extracurricular services as part of its guidelines to educational institutions that receive federal monies. Public Law 94-142, passed in 1975, also deals with the total educational experience of the handicapped, including extracurricular activities. The Rehabilitation Act of 1974 and
and Public Law 94-142 will be discussed later in greater detail.

In the United States today, we are beginning to provide total programs for the handicapped in the areas of curriculum. We now realize that general programs for the ordinary child are not suitable for the handicapped child. Even though little research has been done which deals with the integration of handicapped into regular extracurricular programs, the need for the extracurricular programs for the handicapped is no less real. Therefore, the importance of extracurricular experiences for all students is outlined in the following paragraphs.

Extracurricular activities began as we know them today, in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In colonial America, little formal recognition was given to these activities in the secondary school (5, p. 8). The twentieth century, however, has seen a tremendous development in extracurricular activities in American public high schools.

The benefits that can be realized through extracurricular activities are not limited to the students with superior physical or mental ability. The role of these activities in the development of self is beginning to be reexamined. These activities provide avenues whereby the individual can acquire insights about a host of personal characteristics that are not usually brought to light in a strictly academic program.
Writers such as Robert M. McClure have expressed this view. He further states that "far from being 'frill' or a needless expense, the significance of extracurricular experiences is directly related to the stress placed on subject matter learnings, which generally increases through the grades" (9, p. 216).

Others have expressed the view that extracurricular activities are the primary means by which the schools promote one of their main stated objectives, individual growth and development (13, p. 249).

The importance of extracurricular activities is being realized even more in today's society and the public has recently restated its belief that the extracurricular program is a vital force in the school (4, p. 40). The portion of the "Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public School" dealing with extracurricular activities reflects this in its findings. The question was written as follows:

"I'd like your opinion about extracurricular activities, such as the school band, dramatics, sports, the school paper. How important are these to a young person's education--very important, fairly important, not too important, or not at all important?"

Of the respondents, 44 per cent with no children in school and 47 per cent with children in public school said it was very important. Fifty-one per cent of the parochial school parents
said it was very important. Overall, over 90 per cent of the respondents felt that extracurricular activities were important to one degree or another to the education of children.

The nature of extracurricular activities has traditionally excluded participation by most handicapped students, regardless of their social and other values. One researcher, in an early study, found that there are criteria which limit participation by certain students in extracurricular activities (6, p. 29). He noted in his research that students of low intelligence tended not to participate in such activities.

At times the criteria for selection and participation in extracurricular activities is based upon physical ability, mental ability, or scholastic standing. This practice would automatically limit participation by educable mentally retarded and language/learning disabled students who also need the activities. Some writers hold the position that this practice should not exist and that eligibility for extracurricular participation and the regulations and requirements governing eligibility should not be based on grades (3, p. 111). Interest should be a major criterion for participation. Such interest could be encouraged and fostered by administrators at the building level since they can often influence changes in curriculum and policies affecting it. Interest should be a major criterion for participation in school activities and clubs. Academic standing is to be frowned upon as a requirement for
participation (14, p. 20). Yet, this administrative criteria for selection is still used to limit participation in extracurricular activities in many schools. One survey conducted in 1974 indicated that low grades in school were a major reason for non-participation in extracurricular activities (10, p. 14).

New federal legislation has recently begun to shed a new light on education for handicapped students, not only in the curriculum itself, but also in education as it pertains to extracurricular activities. Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1974 states that discrimination is prohibited and on the "basis of handicap, no individual shall be excluded from participation in activities which receive federal financial assistance." Subpart 81.4 (b) states further:

Recipients may not do the following.

1. Deny the handicapped equality of opportunity.
2. Provide the handicapped services or benefits which are not as effective as that provided to non-handicapped.
3. Perpetuate discrimination by assisting any agency that discriminates on the basis of handicap.
4. Limit the handicapped in opportunities provided others.

Subpart 84.37 of Section 504 supports the need for this study:

1. A recipient shall provide nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities in such a manner as is necessary to afford handicapped students an opportunity for participation in such services and activities.
2. Nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities include, but are not limited to, counseling services, physical education, athletics, transportation, health services, recreational activities, special interest groups or clubs sponsored by the recipient . . . " (17, p. 6).

More recently, in November, 1975, Public Law 94-142 was passed by Congress. The effect it has for handicapped people is described best by those who refer to it as the "Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children." This law is seen as a permanent guideline to the education of handicapped children since it has no expiration date. School officials are bound by the law and cannot refuse to comply with its mandates.

Public Law 94-142 states in its purposes and findings section:

It is the purpose of the act to assure that all handicapped children have available to them within the time periods specified, a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist states and localities to provide for education of all handicapped children, and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children (16, p. 3).

These laws have greatly changed the attitudes of many teachers toward their jobs, and a number of administrators have growing concerns for administrative problems which will arise throughout the mainstreaming process.

Congress has set 1980 as the year when the "free and appropriate public education" must be available to all handicapped children if states and the local districts want to
receive funds under the new program. Public Law 94-142 requires state and local agencies to spend at least as much on handicapped children as they do on the regular students, not only in the regular curricular functions of the school, but also in the area of extracurricular services.

The intent of Public Law 94-142 is not to mandate mainstreaming, but it states that handicapped children should be educated in all areas with children who are not handicapped unless the nature of severity of the handicap is such that education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (16, p. 7). Part 121.306 of Public Law 94-142 deals with nonacademic services and relates specifically to the rights of handicapped children to participation in extracurricular activities.

The educable mentally retarded student and the learning disabled student can possess the potential needed to take part in extracurricular activities with "normal" students of the high school. These two groups of handicapped students differ from the profoundly retarded and the multiply and physically handicapped in just that respect. The MR and LD students, however, have been overlooked by some schools in regard to extracurricular activities.

Attitudes which administrators have toward the handicapped in general have been a factor in slowing the integration,
mainstreaming process since attitudes are largely responsible for the way people tend to feel and behave toward other people (7, p. 426). A study dealing with educators' preferences in special education programs indicated that over 50 per cent of the teachers and administrators surveyed favored the retention of special classes for the mildly exceptional child (1, p. 754). The educable mentally retarded and the learning disabled would fall into this category.

Many of the changes which have aided the handicapped have come through the implementation of various administrative plans. From the segregated plans of the 1960's, whereby the special education students were educated separately from the regular students to the Plan A resource programs which allowed for some integration of the handicapped, the program of special education has been influenced greatly by the administrators in charge of them. Currently, the placement of handicapped students into the regular school program includes many diverse "regular" places for the students instead of a few specialized options (11, p. 34).

Principals are often the change agents in the school system, and much of what is changed depends upon their perceptions. It is important to measure the perceptions of these administrators toward the involvement of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities since they are often responsible for the curriculum and extracurriculum policies affecting the
entire school system. The responsibility for management of the extracurricular program has traditionally rested with the principal (15, p. 51).

The directors of special education programs are also in a position to know the students their programs serve. These directors are often in a position to influence participation by handicapped students in extracurricular activities through the use of scheduling and policy changes. The perceptions of the special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities are important for this reason, and thus, should be measured.

The history of the education of the handicapped student has involved the basic curriculum as its main concern, with extracurricular activities for the handicapped being a rare, and often nonexistent concern. With the desirability of extracurricular activities established, and with the feasibility of participation by MR and LD with regular students recognized, the lack of research indicates a need for a study to determine the perceptions of selected educators toward the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. With Public Law 94-142 mandating the rights of all handicapped students to participate in extracurricular activities, determining the perceptions of selected educators toward the mandates of the law which deal with extracurricular activities would also make this study significant.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were formulated.

Extracurricular activities means those school sponsored activities including band, athletics, and club organizations which are offered as an option to students along with the regular academic curriculum.

Least restrictive environment refers to the educational setting provided for the handicapped students which allows them to function at their optimal levels and to receive the services necessary to insure equality of educational opportunity.

Mentally retarded (MR) refers to those students having IQ's from 50 to 75 who are expected eventually to achieve academic work at least to the third-grade level and occasionally to the sixth-grade level by school-leaving age.

Learning disabled (LD) refers to those students with a specific disorder or disability on one or more of the processes of speech, language, perception, behavior, reading, spelling, writing, or arithmetic.

Small schools refers to those Texas high schools with enrollment ranging from 100 to 549.

Medium schools refers to those Texas high schools with enrollment ranging from 550 to 2000.

Large schools refers to those Texas high schools with enrollment over 2000.
Limitations of the Study

Since more selective choices are often made in extra-curricular programs at the high school level, this study was limited to Texas school districts having one or more high schools with enrollment of at least 100 students in each school. The study was limited to the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in Texas high schools during 1979.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The population for this questionnaire survey was Texas high school principals and special education directors. A stratified random sample was selected from each of three school sizes, including a 20 per cent sample of small schools with enrollment ranging from 100 to 549, 20 per cent of the schools with enrollment ranging from 550 to 2000, and 20 per cent of the schools with enrollment over 2000. A minimal return of 60 per cent was deemed acceptable.

Schools with enrollment under 100 often are members of special education cooperatives and do not have their own directors of special education. For this reason, these schools were not treated in this study.

Instrument

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed from a review of related literature. The questionnaire solicited
data in relation to each of the proposed research questions and the hypotheses. The first portion of the instrument was designed to deal with the perceptions of special education directors and high school principals toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The second portion dealt with their perceptions toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

A panel of five judges was selected to check the validity of the items to be included in the questionnaire. The panel of judges consisted of one faculty member from the Division of Special Education at North Texas State University, the chairman of the Physical Education Division of North Texas State University, two Texas high school principals, and one Texas high school special education director. Each of the judges was given the questionnaire and instructed to indicate for each statement, whether they believed it was a valid statement for use in the questionnaire. They were also asked to make suggestions for additional statements to be included in the questionnaire and to comment on the structure and phrasing of each statement.

A pilot study was conducted to determine the length of time needed to respond to the questionnaire and the effectiveness of written instructions. Permission had been obtained from an Administrative Leadership faculty member at North Texas State University to administer a tentative questionnaire to a pilot group of administrators enrolled in a graduate level course.
The questionnaire was slightly modified as a result of the pilot study and the validation by the panel of judges.

Procedures for Treating Data

The population for this study included principals and special education directors in Texas public high schools with enrollment of at least one hundred. A stratified random sample of 20 per cent was selected from each of three school sizes for the two groups in the population. All public high schools included in the most recent publication of the Texas Public School Directory, supplied by the Texas Education Agency, were grouped according to enrollment. After being grouped according to size, the schools were numbered for the purpose of random selection. The Texas Public School Directory supplied the names of the principals while the names of the special education directors were supplied by the 1978-79 edition of the Special Education Directory of Programs, furnished by the Texas Education Agency.

To obtain a stratified random sample, a minimum of twenty-six schools was selected from the smallest group. The percentage necessary to obtain a minimum of twenty-six schools was the same percentage used in the other two groups to arrive at the sample. The schools actually surveyed were selected using a table of random numbers.

The questionnaires were mailed to the individual principals and special education directors at their respective schools in
April of 1979. A letter inviting the principal and special education directors to participate as a subject in the study and explaining the purpose of the study accompanied each questionnaire. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed for the convenience of each participant.

Follow-up postcards were mailed to those special education directors and principals who had not returned the questionnaires within the three weeks after the initial mailing. By May 21, 1979, the cut-off date for receiving returned questionnaires, 71 per cent of the questionnaires were returned. The questionnaires were checked for irregularities, then were coded and punched on IBM cards for data processing.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Items one through twenty-one of the questionnaire were concerned with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. Items twenty-two through thirty-eight were concerned with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. Response categories were scored 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Special attention was given while scoring the instrument since some of the items required reverse scoring. A perception score for each respondent was obtained by adding the
individual item scores in the two sections of the questionnaire separately, so that each respondent had two total scores, one for items one through twenty-one, and one for items twenty-two through thirty-eight. Perception scores were recorded for each principal and special education director who responded to the questionnaire. A high score on each section indicated a favorable or positive perception. These scores produced interval level data for which a mean score could be computed for the two groups.

Comparisons were made using the mean scores of the total perception scores on both sections of the questionnaire for each principal and special education director. A t-test was run for purposes of comparison in both areas of the questionnaire for the two groups. High school principals were compared among the small, medium, and large schools. Special education directors were also compared among the three school sizes. One-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if there was a significant difference among these group means. Hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance and retained if no differences existed at this level or at a higher level.

The results of the questionnaire were reported and presented in tables. Data were analyzed and discussed, conclusions were drawn, and recommendations were made.
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Presented in this chapter is a review of literature and research relevant to handicapped children, with emphasis on mentally retarded and learning disabled students. Included are the following sections: (1) History of Treatment of the Handicapped, (2) Federal and State Legislation Affecting the Education of the Handicapped, (3) Literature and Research Concerning Mainstreaming and Mentally Retarded and Learning Disabled Children, and (4) Literature and Research Concerning Extracurricular Activities.

History of Treatment of the Handicapped

Until recently, the prevailing definition of exceptional children involved the listing of various labels which attempted to describe the condition or conditions the children had. The definition itself listed those who are gifted, retarded, blind, partially seeing, crippled, neurologically impaired, disturbed, deaf, hard of hearing, special or general learning disabled, and others, plus combinations of these. Even this kind of definition expresses a broader recognition of the handicapped and their needs than previously existed. An even broader
interpretation is recognized as being the current emphasis in the education of the handicapped. It is recognized now that it is "the educational work to be done with the pupil that has to be the teacher's and principal's concern, more than the medical or legal name of the child's condition" (16, p. 9).

The history of education for handicapped children has been a story of neglect, denial, and rejection. It was believed that the handicapped could not be taught, were not worth teaching, or would make it just as well regardless of any help that was given (8, p. 14). Special education began in the early nineteenth century with dedicated pioneers in the field such as Gaspard Itard and Edouard Seguin, who began then to study and teach children who were mentally deficient (16, p. 15).

From the late 1700's to the early 1800's, there was virtually no education of any kind for handicapped children. Handicapped children were not accepted as being totally human; they were mistreated and, in many cases, put to death (3, p. 5). During the middle and late 1800's, handicapped persons were sent away to residential institutions or asylums. The handicapped were considered undesirables, and support for institutionalization seems to have come from the fact that this kept these undesirables out of the public eye and off the public conscience (3, p. 8).

The first efforts in the United States for the education of blind, deaf, and retarded children were copied from the
residential schools and asylums of Europe; they became the models for special education in the United States. Many states established residential schools, many times after private schools had demonstrated that the target population was educable. All exceptional children could not be accommodated by the residential schools. Facilities were limited in the state operated schools and the private ones were too expensive for many families (8, p. 20).

A new trend in public education for handicapped children in special classes emerged around 1900. One of the leaders in this movement was Alexander Graham Bell. In an address to the National Education Association, Bell suggested that an annex to the public school be built to provide special classes for the blind, deaf, and mentally retarded, so that these children would not have to attend institutions away from their homes (3, p. 8).

For the first half of this century, most children who were difficult to teach were in schools for a minimum period only. Children who progressed at a slower rate in academic subjects frequently were forced to repeat grades in school until they were embarrassed at being oversized in comparison to their classmates (16, p. 17).

Until recently, public schools had never tried to serve all children, and especially not those who were difficult to teach. During the first decades of this century, most children attended school just long enough to get a basic education. As
a result, school systems in this country were not prepared physically, philosophically, or financially to operate programs that would be far reaching to the point of serving handicapped children. Special education is costly because of its emphasis on individual problems and needs, and when school budgets were limited, as they were during the Depression of the 1930's, special class programs were not expanded (16, p. 17).

The early part of this century also saw the National Education Association take an interest in establishing special classes for the handicapped. The special classes that were held were supported by state subsidies and supplemental local school programs. Not every state, however, started and supported special classes for the handicapped. The state of Texas passed a law in 1945 concerning the education of handicapped children in special classes. Acceptance of handicapped children and recognition of their need for education were becoming the attitudes of the public in the 1950's.

A great amount of progress was made from the 1940's until the late 1960's. In 1948, for example, 442 children were enrolled in special education programs; in 1963, 1,666,000 were enrolled. According to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, during the 1972-73 school years, 2,857,551 handicapped children were receiving special education services. The increase in preparation programs for special education teachers
has been almost as great. About 77 colleges and universities were providing teacher preparation sequences for special education teachers in one or more categories in 1948; by 1954, the number was 122, and by 1973, it was over 400. In 1976, the estimate of colleges and universities involved in this field exceeded 600 (16, p. 20).

This rapid increase in college programs in the 1950's and 1960's reflected the involvement of the federal government in the financial support of special education, a support that continued into the 1970's. Although it would be difficult to determine all the influences that brought about the rapid development of public school programs for the handicapped, Reynolds and Birch (16) recognize three major influences.

First, parents of handicapped children formed a number of organizations, such as the National Association for Retarded Citizens, which was begun in 1950. It became politically and socially active, and influenced state legislatures and the Congress.

Second, many state legislatures, in response to pressure from parents' groups, passed new legislation that mandated instruction in the schools for many categories of exceptional children. The legislatures provided "excess cost" aids in one form or another to school districts that started special education programs. Excess cost aids are special categories of state or federal funding of special education programs designed to make sure that school districts do not experience any
"excess cost" when they provide specialized programs for students who have special needs.

Third, as the country made arrangements for the rehabilitation of World War II and Korean War veterans who had been seriously injured, facilities in veterans' hospitals were enlarged and new research programs were begun in various places. In higher education, departments of clinical psychology, speech pathology, and physical medicine were expanded through federal rehabilitation funds, and the influences of their investigations on behalf of veterans spread to the research and training being carried on for handicapped children.

As the country approached the 1970's, the public became more aware of the extended needs of the handicapped. Action groups and litigations caused the enactment of various legislation in many states to aid the education of the handicapped, and new federal legislation was enacted in the early 1970's which broadly affected the education of the handicapped. State and federal legislation is discussed in the following section of this chapter.

**Federal and State Legislation Affecting the Education of the Handicapped**

In the late 1950's, with public attitudes toward handicapped children improving, the first federal legislation was enacted. Public Law 85-926 established a program to provide funds to prepare college instructors who would train teachers
of the mentally retarded. This law was expanded in 1963 to include teachers of the hard of hearing, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, crippled, and others.

The enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 established federal aid to education (14, p. 29). Other laws affecting the education of the handicapped were based largely on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which set aside funds to assist local education agencies in providing various programs to aid in the education of deprived children.

Congress later amended Title I of the ESEA to include state agencies such as state supported schools for the handicapped. Grants were established to aid state agencies in providing free public education to handicapped children not covered by the original ESEA.

Title VI amended ESEA again in 1966, expanding programs for handicapped children. This amendment, Public Law 89-750, also created the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to monitor public assistance programs and projects designed to aid the handicapped.

Public Law 91-230, the Education of the Handicapped Act, was passed in 1970, and it amended the 1965 ESEA again by changing Title VI. Public Law 91-230 divided Title VI into seven sections which identified the various programs for the handicapped.
There have been many court decisions in the area of special education. There have been five basic principles of special education law which those decisions have established (26, p. 523).

1. **Zero reject**--no handicapped child may be excluded from a free appropriate public education.

2. **Nondiscriminatory evaluation**--every handicapped child must be fairly assessed so that he may be properly placed and served in the public schools.

3. **Appropriate education**--every handicapped child must be given an education that is meaningful to him, taking his handicap into account.

4. **Least restrictive placement**--a handicapped child may not be segregated inappropriately from his nonhandicapped schoolmates.

5. **Procedural due process**--each handicapped child has the right to protest a school's decisions about his education.

Two important court cases took place in the early 1970's which established a basis for the enactment of more widespread laws affecting the education of the handicapped. In 1971, in the case of **Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania**, the courts ruled that mentally retarded children were entitled to a due process hearing before they were denied access to a free public education or before they were changed from an educational assignment. The courts further stated that in regard to placement of mentally retarded
among the least restrictive alternative programs of education, placement in regular classes is preferable to any other type of program (13).

In 1972, the court ruled in the case of Mills vs. Board of Education in the District of Columbia, that all children, not just mentally retarded, were entitled to an appropriate education in the least restrictive alternative program. The court stated that each child of school age should be provided free and suitable publicly supported education regardless of the degree of the child's mental, physical, or emotional disability (10).

The passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 93-112, signaled the beginning of the spelling out of specific plans to implement recommendations and mandates set forth in previously settled court decisions. The important Section 504 of the Act outlined plans for removal of architectural barriers and for program accessibility. Subpart C on Program Accessibility states:

84.21 Discrimination Prohibited--No qualified handicapped persons shall be subjected to a program or activity because a recipient's facilities are inaccessible.

84.22 Existing Facilities--Program must be accessible to the handicapped. A recipient is not required to make each of its existing facilities accessible but may comply by:

- alteration of existing facilities
- redesign of equipment
reassignment of classes to accessible buildings

assignment of aides

other methods which would make program accessible (28).

Section 504 not only deals with the education of the handicapped in the school classroom, but also in areas of a nonacademic nature. The law states specifically that on the basis of handicap, no individual shall be excluded from participation in activities which receive federal financial assistance, including nonacademic services and extracurricular activities.

In 1974, Public Law 93-380 was enacted which revised Part B of Title VI of the ESEA. This law increased funds available to state agencies from 100 million to 600 million dollars. Public Law 93-380 required further that each state establish a goal of providing full educational opportunities for all handicapped children (14, p. 32).

In 1975 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142, was enacted. This law had such an impact in the field that it has been called the "Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children." Public Law 94-142 was enacted to assure "a free, appropriate public education" for all handicapped children. The law states specifically what procedures must be followed to accomplish these objectives. A free and appropriate education means special education and related
services which are at public expense and an individualized education program which must document the extent to which each child will be able to participate in the regular classroom. The state must assure that handicapped children will be educated with non-handicapped children to the maximum extent appropriate. Public Law 94-142, along with Section 504, further outlines the procedural safeguards relating to assignment and evaluation of handicapped students, along with describing the rights of handicapped students in special and related services in academic and extracurricular activities (27).

Through Public Law 94-142, Congress clearly established the framework within which states and schools must operate to comply. Each state must establish procedures to support and monitor the compliance of local educational agencies with the state plan. State departments of education are, therefore, "accountable to the Office of Education and local agencies are accountable to their respective state educational units" (20, p. 5).

The education of the handicapped in all areas has seen an increasing amount of federal involvement in recent years. The individual states have likewise become active in enacting programs affecting the education of handicapped children. Texas has been committed to educating all children for a number of years. Senate Bill 38, for example, committed Texas schools
in 1945 to the principle of "education for all children, regardless of variance in abilities. The basis of Special Edu-
cation is found in the belief that every child is entitled to 
full recognition of his rights to educational opportunity,
consistent with his ability" (25, p. iii). This law states 
school districts could provide special education programs for 
exceptional children between the ages of six and seventeen 
for whom regular school facilities were inadequate or not 
available. The law did not, however, make it mandatory for 
school districts to provide special education classes. The 
law created a division of Special Education in the State 
Department of Education. The Foundation School Program was 
begun with enactment of Senate Bill 116 in 1949. The bill 
guaranteed to each child of school age in Texas the avail-
ability of a minimum Foundation School Program for nine months 
of the year. In the definition of exceptional children, how-
ever, the feebleminded were added to the list of people ex-
cluded from the law (22, p. 630). Later, the legislature de-
finied physically handicapped and mentally retarded within its 
explation of exceptional children.

A continued revision of Texas legislation and new legis-
lation affecting the education of handicapped children re-
flected more liberal attitudes toward exceptional children with 
various conditions. In 1969, Senate Bill 230 changed the defi-
nition of exceptional children with various conditions. In
1969, Senate Bill 230 changed the definition of exceptional children and the eligibility. The law also made provisions for a Comprehensive Special Education Program for Exceptional Children. The new definition of exceptional children included physically handicapped, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and/or children with language and/or learning disabilities. The eligibility of children included those between the ages of three and twenty-one inclusive (23, p. 2603).

The "Plan A" comprehensive program for exceptional children was passed by the State Board of Education in 1970. Plan A provided services in addition to regular school programs to better aid the exceptional child, such as individualized education programs designed for each individual student. Under this plan, handicapped children were mainstreamed whenever possible, except in severe cases. This plan was to be operant in all school systems in the state of Texas by September 1, 1976 (25).

In 1977, the Comprehensive Special Education Program for Handicapped Children was amended by the legislature. The amended program read as follows:

The commissioner of education with the approval of the State Board of Education shall develop, and modify as necessary, a state wide design for the delivery of services to handicapped children in Texas which includes rules for the administration and funding of the special education program so that an appropriate public education is available to all handicapped children between the ages of three and twenty-one by no later than September 1, 1980. The state wide design shall include, but may
not be limited to, the provision of services primarily through local school districts and special education cooperatives, supplemented by a regional delivery structure and special allotments for districts impaired by residential or hospital placement (24, p. 19).

The federal and state governments have been making great strides in reforms for the education of the mentally retarded, learning disabled, and other handicapped children in recent years. Some would say that the progress has been slow. From the early laws affecting the education of the handicapped in Texas to the present laws of the state affecting education, the reforms have been sweeping. The impact of recent federal legislation in the field has been felt at the state level as well as the local level across the nation.

Literature and Research Concerning Mainstreaming and Mentally Retarded and Learning Disabled Children

In an effort to provide equality and quality of education for all, the federal government has mandated that all students, regardless of abilities or lack of them, be given an opportunity to experience the best and most appropriate education, curricular and extracurricular, that is possible. Many school districts have begun to integrate handicapped students into the regular classroom in order to attempt to comply with such mandates. Although Public Law 94-142 does not mandate mainstreaming, some school systems have regarded it as the answer to compliance with the law. This has not always been the case,
and mainstreaming may not provide the least restrictive environment for the handicapped child's learning needs.

Mainstreaming has been defined in many and varied ways. Most of the definitions center on moving handicapped children from segregated special education classes and integrating them with "normal" children. Maro Sapon-Shevin views mainstreaming as having two main areas of concern (18, p. 119). One area of concern involves viewing mainstreaming as a technical problem. In this case, the concerns identified tend to be technical ones, such as how to build ramps, widen doorways, and provide adequate toilet facilities. When mainstreaming is viewed as another model of service delivery, then concerns focus on administrative issues to whom the resource teachers should be responsible, how referral and testing can most efficiently be handled, and on whose class list the handicapped child's name should be recorded.

Mainstreaming has received opposition from many regular classroom teachers who just simply do not feel prepared to accept the exceptional students into their classes. John Ryor states that if the concept of mainstreaming is to be a success, much work has to be done to prepare all concerned for the transition. He further states that mainstreaming must emphasize thorough preparation of both regular and special teachers for their roles. There must be responsible leadership and clarification of responsibilities among instructional, administrative, and support personnel. Programs
of specially tailored in-service education must be developed because mainstreaming is "one of the most complex educational innovations ever undertaken, and for boards and administrators to plunge their schools into it without advance preparation carries great potential harm for regular and special students and for teachers as well" (17, p. 5).

Edward L. Solomon (21) lists several obstacles to a process of mainstreaming which would occur with the least amount of difficulty. Among the problem areas are (1) labeling the student with one disability label, when, in fact, he or she may have two or more disabilities; (2) the concept of special education itself, when all education is special; (3) school populations should include handicapped students; (4) construction or renovations in facilities to include the handicapped; (5) planning should include provision for easier transition from one school level to another; (6) parental involvement in the PTA and other organizations is essential for the parents of handicapped students; and (7) funds for special education should not be controlled by separate agencies, but should be shared so that mainstreaming works. Solomon further states that mainstreaming allows children to learn about the handicapped without prejudice and misinformation.

The success of mainstreaming is often determined by the perceptions of educators and their attitudes toward the handicapped student. Hughes (6) found in his 1978 study that a
positive attitude toward the handicapped was positively correlated with teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.

In 1967, Proctor (15) investigated the attitudes of certain groups of classroom teachers toward classroom integration of exceptional children and studied the relationship of these attitudes to knowledge of disabilities and to kind and amount of experience in teaching exceptional children. In Proctor's findings, the special education personnel were significantly more realistic in their attitudes toward classroom integration of exceptional children. The special education personnel were significantly more knowledgeable about exceptionalities in children than the regular classroom teacher.

A study by Semmel (19) on educator attitudes toward individualized education programs for the handicapped revealed that regular class teachers and principals were less positive about mainstreaming than special educators. Regular class educators were found to be considerably less informed than principals and special educators regarding individualized education programs (IEP) of Public Law 94-142.

In 1974, Fanning (2) conducted a study to analyze the attitude of educators in Arizona toward educable mentally retarded children and their integration into regular education classes. The results of the study indicated that (1) regular class urban teachers were more positive in their belief that
regular class teachers had the training and competencies necessary to teach educable mentally retarded children; (2) teachers in rural districts were significantly more willing than teachers from urban districts to remove retardates from the mainstream of society; (3) as teachers' knowledge of mentally handicapped students increased, they became more willing to remove retardates from the mainstream of society, became more authoritarian, and less willing to attribute a major cause of mental handicap to cultural impoverishment. Fanning's findings run counter to those of other studies, however.

A review of the literature indicates that the better one's knowledge of a situation, the better the attitude toward it. Consistent with this statement is the finding of Goldstein (4) that the attitudes of individuals toward the mentally retarded are often affected by the knowledge individuals have of them and their potential. In her study, Goldstein measured the attitudes of college students enrolled in a special education teacher preparation program and college students not enrolled in such a program. The former group was found to have the more positive attitude. Goldstein also found a more positive attitude with college seniors within this group than sophomores. Williams (29) found similar results in his study of teachers' attitudes toward the mainstreaming of learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, educable
mentally retarded, and physically handicapped students. The Central Pennsylvania study revealed the most positive attitude to be toward physically handicapped, then learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and, last, educable mentally retarded. Of the teachers surveyed, 55 per cent would not voluntarily mainstream educable mentally retarded. Williams' study found that those who had taught the handicapped, had taught in schools with special classes, had handicapped friends or relatives, or had had course work in the education and psychology of exceptional students were more accepting of mainstreaming of these four categories of mildly handicapped students.

Corkern (1) also found that increased familiarity with exceptional children improved attitudes toward them. Her study revealed that the attitudes of teachers was better among those with exceptional children in the family. More positive attitudes were also found among teachers with learning disabled (LD) classes as opposed to other special education teachers.

The impact of mainstreaming on regular class pupils has been an area of little research to date. The findings of a 1967 study in this area are reported by Reynolds and Birch. According to the study, (1) children are often insulated from chance introductions to lives different from their own; extraordinary effort is required to assure an encounter between a
child of the suburbs and people from different backgrounds; (2) under such conditions, children in the early elementary years learn to be hypocritical of differences; (3) whatever the nature of the prejudices of the intact group, they take root early and are deeply ingrained in six and seven year olds; (4) although parents hold prejudices, they express desires for the schools to give greater emphasis to certain kinds of human difference to hold in check the childhood seeding and growth of similar prejudices; and, (5) there is a tendency to ignore differences right in the neighborhood and to take up the study of the poor of other nations, instead. Academic consideration rather than direct involvement is encouraged (16, p. 97).

Evidence suggests that very young children readily learn to accept wide differences under the guidance of adults who are positive models of the desired behavior (16, p. 98). The success of mainstreaming may depend on such modeling for young children.

Reynolds contrasted the curriculum for the educable mentally retarded from the recent history of special education to the current trends. The curriculum was first a slowed down version of the regular curriculum. Then it became a simplification of the regular curriculum. Later, the regular curriculum was stretched out, and what was taught was being dwelled upon longer (16, p. 295).
Today, curriculum stresses the important functions of (1) thinking critically, being able to assess the realities of a given situation together with the implications, and (2) acting independently, making decisions based on realities and following through on the decisions. To become an independent adult, the educable mentally retarded youngster may have to be taught problem solving methods that apply in a general fashion to academic, personal, social, vocational, financial, and leisure situations (16, p. 297).

The learning disabled (LD) child is one who may, in fact, have many learning disabilities. The LD student may have only one disability that affects other areas. The first special education programs in America were organized for learning disabled students.

There are many forms of learning disabilities. The learning disabled child is often normal in most respects, but has a deficiency in one or more particular areas of learning. Kirk states that children with specific learning disabilities constitute a heterogeneous group of children who do not fit into the traditional categories of exceptional children, but who have significant intraindividual differences. These differences are the basic reason why LD children cannot be stereotyped, and Kirk further states that "one remedial procedure may be appropriate for one type of disability and completely inappropriate for another type of disability" (9, p. 46).
Students are generally not served well by the categories used to label and place handicapped students. As one author puts it,

The labels—retarded, disturbed, and defective—narrow rather than broaden children's opportunities. Educators, we believe, should avoid crude classifications and focus on children and concentrate instead on assessments of children that are meaningful for instructional purposes (16, p. 683).

The use of the labeling process is still another issue, elimination of which might improve educators' perceptions regarding handicapped children in all facets of their education. Then again, it is argued that categories and labels may open up opportunities for handicapped children, cause legislation to be passed in their interest, and supply rallying points for volunteer organizations (16, p. 684).

Literature and Research Concerning Extracurricular Activities

Although there is very little research regarding the participation of handicapped students in extracurricular activities, there is considerable research supporting the need for the extracurricular program for all students. The need has been recognized for a number of years. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association made its report in 1918, listing the Seven Cardinal Principles. Among them was worthy use of leisure time. The Commission stated that education should equip the individual to secure from his leisure, the recreation of body,
mind, and spirit, and the enrichment and enlargement of his personality.

The Commission stated that this objective calls for the ability to utilize the common means of enjoyment, such as music, art, literature, drama, and social intercourse, together with the fostering in each individual of one or more special vocational interests.

The Commission further stated that heretofore, the high school has given little conscious attention to this objective. It has so exclusively sought intellectual discipline that it has seldom treated literature, art, and music so as to evoke right emotional response and produce positive enjoyment. The Commission stated also that the school has failed to organize and direct the social activities of young people as it should. One of the surest ways in which to prepare pupils worthily to utilize leisure in adult life is by guiding and directing their use of leisure in youth. The school should, therefore, see that adequate recreation is provided both within the school and by other proper agencies in the community (5, p. 97).

The future of extracurricular activities is certain as seen by Oliver. During the next decade, preparation for leisure time activities within the school is seen to be among the significant curriculum trends (11, p. 372).

James (7) conducted a study to determine the relationship of extracurricular participation and attitudes toward school
among seventh graders. The Illinois study considered the extracurricular activities music, athletics, and a combination of both. Findings concluded that participants in extra-class activities had a better attitude toward school subjects, especially language arts and reading.

Osborne (12) conducted a study to determine if students who were suspended from school differed from those who were not suspended in the way they perceived their opportunities to participate in and their actual participation in extracurricular activities. The study revealed that students who were suspended from school perceived (1) that they had fewer opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities, and (2) that suspended students participated less than non-suspended students in extracurricular activities.

It would seem that attitudes toward school and perceptions regarding extracurricular activities can influence a student's participation and attendance in school. Since extracurricular activities have this kind of potential influence, it would seem essential to encourage participation by all students. The improvement of educators' perceptions regarding the participation of all students in extracurricular activities would seem to be a prerequisite to such encouragement.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The chapter is divided into the following sections: Description of the Instrument, Methods of Collecting Data, and Procedure for Analyzing Data. It describes the procedures followed in preparing, distributing, and evaluating this study.

Description of the Instrument

For the purpose of this study, a questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed to (1) measure the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities, and (2) measure the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

The background portion of the questionnaire required each respondent to indicate whether his or her position was principal or special education director, and it also asked for an indication of school size. The three school size categories were small, with enrollment of 100 to 549; medium, with enrollment of 550 to 2000; and large, with enrollment of over 2000.
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The first portion of the instrument, statements one through twenty-one, dealt with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The second portion of the instrument, statements twenty-two through thirty-eight, dealt with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. The instrument was constructed from a review of other survey instruments used to measure attitudes and perceptions, two of the most influential being "Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons," by Yuker, Block, and Campbell, (6) and Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, by Shaw (2).

The first part of the instrument corresponded with the first research question proposed in this study. The second part of the instrument corresponded with the second research question. Both positive and negative perception statements are contained in the questionnaire.

A tentative questionnaire was administered to twenty public school administrators and teachers enrolled in a graduate course at North Texas State University for evaluation concerning clarity of directions. Appropriate revisions were made from suggestions given by these participants.

Further refinement of the questionnaire was made from suggestions furnished by a five-member jury selected for
evaluation of the instrument with help from the advisory committee. The jury members were selected because of their association with the administrations of the public schools and their association with and knowledge of handicapped students (see Appendix E). The jury determined whether each proposed statement was appropriate or if additional statements were needed. The jury also aided in modifications in terminology and wording of some of the statements.

Method of Collecting Data

The study was conducted during the spring semester of the 1978-79 school year. Upon request, the Texas Education Agency furnished the most recent publication of the Public School Directory (3). The Texas Education Agency also furnished a list of special education programs and their directors (4). These two publications included the names and school addresses of 366 high school principals and special education directors.

For the purpose of stratified random sampling, a twenty per cent sample was selected from each of three groups based on their total high school enrollment as follows: 100-549, 550-2000, and over 2000. The total school enrollment for each high school was obtained from microfiche listing the total school enrollments in Texas provided on request by the Texas Education Agency (5).
The schools in each category were numbered, and a twenty per cent sample was selected from each group using a table of random numbers. The sample chosen consisted of 99 schools from the small school size, 58 from the medium school size, and 26 from the large school size.

The mailing of the questionnaire, including a cover letter (see Appendix B) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope, was made on April 6, 1979, to 183 high school principals and 183 special education directors. Within three weeks, 61 per cent of the questionnaires, a total of 223, had been returned.

On April 27, 1979, a printed postcard (see Appendix C) was mailed to those who had not responded to the first mailing. Forty-four more questionnaires were received after the postcard follow-up. The total number of returns after the initial mailing and first follow-up was 267, or approximately 73 per cent.

Of the 99 schools in the small school size, a minimum of 58 returns were needed from each of the two groups to meet the 60 per cent minimum. Sixty-three returns were received from principals in this category and 72 from special education directors. Of the 58 schools in the medium school size, a minimum of 35 returns were needed from each of the two groups to meet the 60 per cent minimum. Forty-five returns were received from principals in this category and 50 from special
education directors. Of the 26 schools in the large school size, a minimum of 16 returns were needed from each of the two groups to meet the 60 per cent minimum. Seventeen returns were received from principals in this category and 20 from special education directors.

Of the 267 questionnaires returned, 258, or 71 per cent, were usable. Nine questionnaires could not be used because of the following: six questionnaires were not completed, two questionnaires were returned with notes stating that the person did not wish to participate, and one questionnaire was returned from a respondent who indicated his or her position as superintendent.

Procedure for Analyzing Data

The questionnaires were checked and appropriate corrections were made on all irregularities. The questionnaire responses were then coded and punched into IBM cards for data processing.

The first portion of the questionnaire was designed to answer the study's first research question. The second portion of the questionnaire was designed to answer the study's second research question. For each part of the questionnaire, a mean score was printed out and a total perception score for each part of the questionnaire was computed.

Next, a comparison was made between the mean scores of the principals and the special education directors in the
area of perceptions toward the participation and then toward Public Law 94-142. A t-test was computed among the three school sizes.

A comparison was made between the mean scores of the principals and the special education directors in the area of perceptions toward the participation and then toward Public Law 94-142. A t-test was computed among the three school sizes.

A comparison was made among the mean scores of the principals group for each of the following groups: principals in small schools, principals in medium schools, and principals in large schools. A one-way analysis of variance was then computed on each grouping to determine if there was a significant difference among group means. The same comparison was made among the mean scores for special education directors, and analysis of variance was also computed to determine if there was a significant difference among means for this group.

The results of the study will be reported in Chapter IV. Tables were compiled where necessary for easy interpretation of the data.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the study as they relate to the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors. The major focus of the study dealt with two research questions. The first question was concerned with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The second research question was concerned with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the respondents with respect to school size and position held with the school district. The second section corresponds to research question one dealing with the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The third section corresponds to research question two dealing with the perception of high school principals and special education directors toward the
mandates of Public Law 94-142 dealing with extracurricular activities.

Background Information

The background information was obtained through the first two items of the questionnaire. The first item solicited information from the respondents in regard to the position each held with the school district in which he or she was employed. The choices were high school principal and special education director. Data in Table I indicate that 119 respondents were high school principals, and the number of responding special education directors was 139. The number of principals responding represents 46 per cent of the respondents, while the number of special education directors responding represents 54 per cent of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Directors</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question solicited information from the respondents in regard to the size of the high school employing
the principals and special education directors. A study of data in Table II reveals the number of responses from each of the three school sizes, along with the percentage of respondents on each school size category. A total of 198 personnel were contacted in the small school size. Of those contacted, 67 per cent responded to the questionnaire. Fifty-two per cent of the 258 total respondents were from small schools. Of 116 personnel contacted in the medium school size category, 77 per cent responded. Thirty-four per cent of the sample were from medium size schools. Of 52 personnel contacted from large schools, 69 per cent responded. Of these, 14 per cent of the sample were from large schools.

**TABLE II**

**TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS BY SCHOOL SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Number Contacted</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Per Cent Responding</th>
<th>Per Cent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table III indicate the number of respondents from each school size according to position with the school district. Of the 133 respondents from small schools, 47 per cent, were high school principals, 53 per cent were special education
directors. Of the 89 respondents from medium schools, 46 per cent were high school principals and 48, or 54 per cent, were special education directors. Of the 36 respondents from large schools, 16, or 44 per cent, were principals and 20, or 56 per cent, were special education directors.

**TABLE III**

POSITIONS OF RESPONDENTS BY SCHOOL SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire was mailed to 20 per cent of the high school principals and special education directors in each school size. A minimum of 60 per cent return was considered
acceptable from each group. Data from Table IV represent the number of schools in each school size chosen for the sample, along with the minimum number needed from each to achieve the 60 per cent desired minimum number of responses from special education directors. In the small school category, 59 responses were sufficient for achieving the 60 per cent minimum; however, a much better return rate of 72 per cent was achieved in this category. In the medium school size category, an even higher response rate of 86 per cent was recorded, while special education directors in large schools responded at the rate of 77 per cent. An overall response rate of 76 per cent was recorded for the total group of special education directors from all school sizes combined.

**TABLE IV**

SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS RESPONDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Number of Directors in Sample</th>
<th>Number Needed for 60 Per Cent Minimum</th>
<th>Actual Number Responding</th>
<th>Actual Per Cent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar data are revealed in Table V for high school principals. In the small school category, 63 per cent of the principals actually responded. The best overall principals' responses came from those in the medium school category, with 71 per cent responding. The large school principals had a response rate of 62 per cent. The overall rate of return for high school principals was 65 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Number of Principals in Sample</th>
<th>Number Needed for 60 Per Cent Minimum</th>
<th>Actual Number Responding</th>
<th>Actual Per Cent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 183 high schools were selected for the sample. The principals and special education directors from each of the schools were polled, making a total of 366 questionnaires mailed.
To answer research question one, the principals and special education directors were asked in the first part of the questionnaire to indicate their reactions to twenty-one perception statements. Each statement was scored on a five point basis with "5" being "strongly agree" and "1" being "strongly disagree." A perception score for each respondent was obtained by adding the individual points from these twenty-one statements (see Tables XVIII and XIX in Appendix E). A low score for this section indicated a strong negative perception.

Data in Table VI present a summary of the frequency distribution of special education directors' scores on the first part of the perception scale. Of the 139 responses for this group, eight were on the top range of scores and fourteen were in the middle range, with only a single response toward the negative side of the scale. A total of 116 responses fell into the "agree" range of scores, making the mean score 82.57 for special education directors. This indicates a tendency toward a positive perception in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities (see Table XVIII in Appendix E).
### TABLE VI
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEPTION SCORES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS TOWARD THE PARTICIPATION OF MR AND LD STUDENTS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Scale</th>
<th>Section Scores</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>95-105</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>74-94</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>53-73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32-52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>82.57</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table VII present a summary of the frequency distribution for principals' scores on the first part of the perception scale. Of the 119 responses for this group, three were in the top range of scores, sixty-two were on the second highest range of scores, forty-eight in the middle range, and six in the second lowest range of scores. The distribution of scores was strongly in the middle of the scale and in the next higher range. The mean score for principals in regard to perceptions toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities was 73.29, which corresponds to the "neutral" position on the perception scale. This mean
score indicates a less positive perception in this area by principals than that of special education directors (also see Table XXIII in Appendix E).

**TABLE VII**

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEPTION SCORES OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE PARTICIPATION OF MR AND LD STUDENTS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Scale</th>
<th>Section Scores</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>95-105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>74-94</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>53-73</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32-52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first twenty-one perception statement scores were added together to produce a total perception score for each principal and special education director. This allowed for comparisons between group means.

The first comparison was made with the two groups in regard to all school sizes. A t-test was utilized for the purpose of comparing the principals' group to the special education directors on the perception statements. A t = 7.24 was obtained, as the data in Table VIII reveal. The t-value
is significant at the .001 level; therefore, there appears to be a significant difference between the principal's group and the special education directors' group in regard to perceptions toward the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The special education directors appear to have a much more positive perception than principals in all school sizes considered.

**TABLE VIII**

**SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN ALL SCHOOL SIZES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>11.101</td>
<td>7.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>8.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Comparisons were made between the two groups in each of the three school sizes. As data in Table IX indicate, the t-test comparing the two groups in small schools produced a T value of 4.08, which is significant at the .001 level. There appears to be a significant difference between the perceptions of principals and special education directors in small schools. The special education directors appeared to have a much more positive perception than principals when the two were compared in the small school category.
TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN SMALL SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>72.63</td>
<td>11.615</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>86.65</td>
<td>9.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level.

A t-test was utilized to compare principals' and special education directors' perceptions in medium schools. This comparison corresponds to the third research hypothesis. As the study of Table X reveals, a T-value of 5.86 was obtained. This was found to be significant at the .001 level. The mean score for principals was 72.66, while the mean score for special education directors was 84.29. There appears to be a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups in medium schools, with special education directors again exhibiting the strong positive perception.

In order to treat the fourth research hypothesis, another t-test was performed to compare principals and special education directors in large schools. A study of data in
TABLE X

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MEDIUM SIZE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>72.66</td>
<td>11.466</td>
<td>5.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>84.29</td>
<td>5.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level.

Table XI reveals that an obtained T-value of 3.13 was significant at the .01 level. The mean score for principals was 76.63, while the mean score for special education directors was 84.88. There appears to be a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups in medium schools, with special education directors exhibiting a slightly more positive perception in large schools than principals do.

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN LARGE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>8.187</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>84.88</td>
<td>7.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.
To determine if there was a difference in principals' perceptions by school size, a one-way analysis of variance was performed. The analysis corresponds with hypothesis nine, and an F of 1.028 was obtained. This F value was not significant at the .05 level. There appears to be no significant difference in principals' perceptions according to school size. Data in Table XII reveal a summary of the analysis of variance.

**TABLE XII**

**SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPARING PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS BY SCHOOL SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>253.211</td>
<td>126.605</td>
<td>1.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14040.742</td>
<td>123.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14293.953</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at the .05 level.

In order to treat hypothesis eleven, another one-way analysis of variance was calculated. An F = 3.268 was obtained. This is significant at the .05 level, indicating that there appears to be a difference in perceptions of special education directors by school size. These data are revealed in Table XIII.
TABLE XIII
SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPARING SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS BY SCHOOL SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>418.957</td>
<td>209.479</td>
<td>3.268*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7179.180</td>
<td>64.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>7598.137</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Perceptions of High School Principals and Special Education Directors Toward the Mandates of Public Law 94-142 in Regard to Extracurricular Activities

This section deals with the second research question. Principals and special education directors were asked in the final portion of the questionnaire to indicate their reactions to seventeen additional perception statements. Each statement was scored on a five point basis using the same procedure for scoring as was used in scoring the first portion of the questionnaire. A perception score for each respondent was obtained by adding the scores from the seventeen statements (see Tables XXIV and XXV in Appendix E). A low score for this section indicated a strong negative perception.
Data in Table XIV present a summary of the frequency distribution of special education directors' scores on the second part of the perception scale. Of the total respondents, six fell into the "strongly agree" range with the majority of respondents falling into the "agree" range. Forty-four fell into the middle category, and the remaining five respondents fell into the "disagree" range of scores. The group mean score was 62.12, which indicates a slightly positive perception by special education directors toward Public Law 94-142.

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEPTION SCORES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Scale</th>
<th>Section Scores</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>77-85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60-76</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>43-59</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26-42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17-25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XV present a summary of the frequency distribution for principals' scores on the second portion of the perception scale. There was one respondent in each of the two extreme ranges of scores with the majority of scores ranging in the middle of the scale. The mean score for principals on this section was 52.45, which corresponds to the "neutral" position on the scale. This score is considerably lower than the mean score for special education directors on the same section.

TABLE XV
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEPTION SCORES OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Scale</th>
<th>Section Scores</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>77-85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60-76</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>43-59</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26-42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17-25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More comparisons were made between principals and special education directors using the $t$-test. The first comparison is described in Table XVI, data of which dealt with the perceptions
of the two groups toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. A T-value of 8.34 was obtained. This is significant at the .001 level; therefore, there appears to be a significant difference between the principals' perceptions and the perceptions of the special education directors in schools of all sizes. This t-test was calculated in relation to the fifth research hypothesis.

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PRINCIPALS' AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN ALL SCHOOL SIZES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>8.835</td>
<td>8.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>8.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level.

Comparisons were made between the two groups in each of the three school sizes. As the data in Table XVII indicate, the t-test comparing the two groups in small schools produced a T-value of 5.84, which is significant at the .001 level. This comparison was made in relation to the sixth research hypothesis, and the T-value indicates a stronger positive perception by special education directors than by high school
principals in the small school category. A notable difference is seen in the mean scores of the two groups, with principals having a mean score of 52.00 and special education directors having a score of 61.70.

**TABLE XVII**

**SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PRINCIPALS' AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN SMALL SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>7.816</td>
<td>5.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>10.320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level.

For the treatment of the seventh research hypothesis, a t-test was utilized to compare principals and special education directors in medium schools. A study of Table XVIII reveals that a T-value of 5.48 was found to be significant at the .001 level. There was a wider range in mean scores for the two groups in this school size, with special education directors having the larger mean score again. There appears to be a significant difference in the perceptions of special education directors and principals in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deals with extracurricular activities in schools of medium size.
TABLE XVIII

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PRINCIPALS' AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN MEDIUM SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>10.418</td>
<td>5.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>6.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level.

In treating the eighth research hypothesis, a t-test was utilized to compare high school principals and special education directors in large schools. Data in Table XIX reveal that the mean score for special education directors was somewhat higher than that of principals. A T-value of 2.59 was found to be significant at the .05 level. There appears, therefore, to be a significant difference in regard to the perceptions of the two groups as they relate to Public Law 94-142. The difference is not as great in the large school category as it is in the other two school sizes.

To determine if there was a significant difference in principals' perceptions toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 according to school size, a one-way analysis of
TABLE XIX

SUMMARY OF T-TEST COMPARING PRINCIPALS' AND SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD THE MANDATES OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHICH DEAL WITH EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN LARGE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>55.89</td>
<td>8.498</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Directors</td>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>7.716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.

variance was calculated. Data in Table XX reveal this analysis. The analysis corresponds with hypothesis ten, and an F value of 1.797 was obtained. This F value was not significant at the .05 level, indicating no significant difference in perceptions among principals according to school size.

TABLE XX

SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPARING PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC LAW 94-142 BY SCHOOL SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>276.805</td>
<td>138.402</td>
<td>1.797*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8778.047</td>
<td>77.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>9054.852</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at the .05 level.
An additional one-way analysis of variance was calculated in order to treat hypothesis twelve. Data are revealed in Table XXI. An $F = .165$ was obtained. This is not significant at the .05 level, indicating that there appears to be no significant differences in perceptions of special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities according to school size.

**TABLE XXI**

**SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPARING SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC LAW 94-142 BY SCHOOL SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.098</td>
<td>13.049</td>
<td>.165*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8858.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8884.184</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at the .05 level.

**Discussion of Findings**

This chapter was concerned with the presentation and analysis of data related to position held by the responding school district personnel and their respective school sizes, the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in Texas toward the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities, and the perceptions
of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. In summary, a study of the data revealed that as a group the special education directors overall had a more positive perception toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities than did high school principals, with the two groups becoming more similar as school size increased.

Special education directors as a group were found to have positive perceptions in regard to both sections of the questionnaire. Principals were found to have a neutral opinion with respect to both aspects of the instrument. The perceptions of special education directors could partly be attributed to the familiarity they have with the program, the laws affecting the special education program, and handicapped children as a group. The major focus of attention for this group is upon these people and programs. Their occupations exist totally in the interest of handicapped children, and it is their business and their obligation to know more about them than the high school principals who have to be aware of a number of programs, many federal and state laws, and the problems of many different kinds of children. These factors might also account in part for the lower score of high school principals.

Both special education directors and principals scored relatively lower on the second portion of the questionnaire
which dealt with Public Law 94-142. In general it appears that both groups have less positive perceptions regarding this law as compared to their general perceptions regarding the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. This perception may be partly attributed to the mandates of the law itself, which require much time and effort on the part of all administrators before it can work effectively. Already overworked principals and directors of special education may not welcome any new laws that require any more time.

The overall higher scores of special education directors compared to principals in all school sizes may be indicative of the broader knowledge that special education directors are required to have with regard to handicapped children in general. Research studies cited in the review of related literature indicate that the more knowledge public school personnel have about handicapped students the better their attitudes toward them.

Generally, the analyses of variance for principals and special education directors in the three school sizes revealed no differences in perceptions among the groups. Special education directors' perceptions regarding the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities, however, were more positive in smaller schools. The higher scores for directors in small and medium schools seems to indicate a more positive perception with decrease in school size. This factor
may be attributed to the familiarity the director of a small school program has with individual students, their problems, and their personal lives. Since there are fewer special education students in small schools, more time is available for the directors to work more closely with the program and to become more aware of the children within the program.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were

1. To determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools,

2. To compare the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in regard to the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities in small, medium, and large schools,

3. To determine the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extra-curricular activities,

4. To compare the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in small, medium, and large schools toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities,

5. To compare the perceptions of high school principals in small, medium, and large schools toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and toward
the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities, and

6. To compare the perceptions of special education directors in small, medium, and large high schools toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities.

The major focus of the study centered on the following research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities?

2. What are the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities?

The questionnaire used in this study was developed from a review of literature. The two sections of the main questionnaire were preceded by two questions soliciting background information from the respondents regarding school size and position with the school district. The main part of the questionnaire consisted of two sections with a total of thirty-eight perception statements. The first section, composed of statements one through twenty-one, dealt with general perceptions toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities. The second section, composed of
statements twenty-two through thirty-eight, dealt with perceptions toward the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which dealt with extracurricular activities.

The population sample of schools was selected from the 1978-79 issue of the Texas Public School Directory. Data used in the study were obtained from 258, or 70.4 per cent, of 366 high school principals and special education directors who were mailed questionnaires.

Statistical techniques utilized in the study were frequency distribution, percentage analysis, calculation of means, t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance. The two questions providing background information were analyzed by a frequency distribution and per cent. A mean score was calculated for each perception section to project the overall response of the two groups toward those perception statements. Comparisons of special education directors to principals were made for each sectional score of the questionnaire using the t-test for related samples to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups. A comparison of principal perceptions was made between the various school sizes using a one-way analysis of variance to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the groups. The same procedure using one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the special education directors in the various school sizes.
Summary of Findings

Major findings resulting from this study were as follows:

1. In regard to the first research question, special education directors were found to have highly positive perceptions according to the perception scale in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities.

2. Also in regard to the first research question, principals were found to have a perception corresponding to the neutral position on the scale, indicating a neither positive nor strongly negative overall perception.

3. In regard to the second research question, special education directors were found to have a positive perception, according to the scale, in regard to the section which dealt with Public Law 94-142. The mean score on this section was lower, however, than on the first section.

4. In treating the second research question, principals were found to have perceptions corresponding to the neutral position on the scale, indicating a neither positive nor strongly negative perception. The principals' perceptions in regard to Public Law 94-142 appear to be less positive than their perceptions in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities.

5. Special education directors' perceptions as compared to perceptions of principals were significantly more positive in all school sizes; therefore, hypothesis one was rejected.
6. Special education directors' perceptions as compared to perceptions of principals with regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities were significantly more positive in small schools and medium schools. This significant difference caused hypothesis two and three to be rejected.

7. Research hypothesis four was rejected at the .01 level, since there was a significant difference in the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors in large schools.

8. According to the perception scale, special education directors were found to have significantly higher positive score than principals in all school sizes treated as a whole and in small, medium, and large schools treated separately in regard to mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. Research hypotheses five, six, seven, and eight, consequently, were rejected.

9. Texas high school principals' perceptions apparently were not influenced by school size in regard to participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. Since there were no significant differences in principals' perceptions as measured by either part of the scale, both hypotheses nine and ten were retained.

10. Hypothesis eleven was rejected. There was a significant difference in the perceptions of special education
directors according to school size in regard to the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities.

11. By school size, there was no significant difference in perceptions among special education directors in regard to the mandates of Public Law 94-142 which deal with extracurricular activities. Hypothesis 12, therefore, was retained.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were made on the basis of the findings of the study

1. Since special education directors had high scores on the perception scale, it appears that working closely with the special education program may help to improve perceptions toward students and laws affecting them.

2. Since principals' scores were neutral on the perception scale, it appears that their perceptions may be improved through a more personal relationship with and awareness of MR and LD students and the laws affecting their education.

3. Lower scores on the section which deals with Public Law 94-142 by both groups may indicate an intolerance and lack of understanding of the law or philosophical differences in regard to mandated programs. The scores may also have been influenced by the extensive amount of time needed to become knowledgeable on all its mandates.

4. Lower scores by principals on the Public Law 94-142 section may be due to possible differences in time available
by the two groups to study and understand the law. Principals have many programs to administer, while special education directors are primarily concerned with legislation and programs affecting special education and the handicapped children it serves.

5. There appears to be no differences in perceptions of principals in Texas high schools regardless of their size. This may be partly attributed to the function of the principal as an overall administrator for all programs of the school, and their viewing this function similarly in small, medium, and large schools. There may be as little relative contact with the special education program by this group in small schools as in medium or large schools.

6. With the differences in perceptions by special education directors in the different school sizes regarding extracurricular participation, it appears that smaller schools with fewer special education students have directors with more positive perceptions. This may be due to the increased familiarity with individuals in the special education program. Special education directors in small schools have the opportunity to know the students, their families, and to follow their activities in a more personal way than those in large schools.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were made
1. Principals should attempt to become better acquainted with the underlying purposes of special education programs and legislation related to MR and LD students. This might be accomplished through attending seminars, observing special education classes, keeping up with current professional literature, and meeting students and their parents.

2. In planning extracurricular programs, special education directors should be included in order to provide input that could increase the involvement of MR and LD students.

3. High schools in Texas should examine their present extracurricular activities to determine if the needs of MR and LD students are being met and to explore ways of increasing participation on the part of these special students.

4. In addition to including MR and LD students in the regular extracurricular activities whenever practical, consideration should be given to the possibilities of providing special extracurricular activities that may also help to meet the needs of these students.

5. Teacher education institutions in Texas have been directed to integrate the concepts of Public Law 94-142 into their teacher education programs. It would be valuable for them to provide pre-service experiences that would help develop positive attitudes toward working with MR and LD students in addition to a knowledge of the legislation. This should include the opportunity to actually work with these students on a personal basis.
6. School districts should include in-service programs for principals and special education directors so that they may interact and share their knowledge in regard to Public Law 94-142 and its implications.

7. Special education directors and principals in neighboring school districts should work together in sharing ideas and resources in regard to providing activities for MR and LD students. Open lines of communication are essential when promoting needs of students who have traditionally been overlooked in certain areas of the school curriculum.

8. Schools should develop public relations programs to solicit community support for extracurricular activities for MR and LD students. Attempts should be made to communicate with local citizens and get them involved in providing resources to meet the needs of these students.

9. Administrative preparation programs for principals and supervisors should include information concerning the characteristics of MR and LD students, as well as the characteristics of other handicapped students.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Replication of this study should be made to further investigate the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding MR and LD students and their participation in other areas of the curriculum and co-curriculum.
2. Replication of this study could be made in other states to compare the perceptions of their high school principals and special education directors to those of Texas.

3. A study should be made into the type of in-service preparation concerning handicapped students provided by school districts in Texas for administrators.

4. A study should be made into the type and amount of orientation given to administrators and program directors concerning Public Law 94-142 and other legislation affecting the education of the handicapped.

5. A study should be made to compare the actual extent of participation by MR and LD students in extracurricular activities to the extent of participation as perceived by high school principals and special education directors.

6. Replication of this study could be made to investigate the perceptions of high school principals and special education directors regarding other handicapped students and their participation in extracurricular activities.
APPENDICES
QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED EDUCATORS TOWARD THE PARTICIPATION OF MR AND LD STUDENTS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

For the purposes of this questionnaire the following definitions have formulated:

Extracurricular activities as used here mean those school sponsored activities including band, sports, clubs, and other organizations which are offered as an option to students along with the regular curriculum.

Mentally retarded (MR) as used here means those students with significantly sub-average intellectual functioning who have IQ's ranging from 50 to 69 but who are considered educable (Formerly EMR).

Learning disabled (LD) refers to those students who have a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematic calculations.

Please check the appropriate boxes below:

1. Your position with this school district:
   [ ] Principal  [ ] Special Education Director

2. Your high school enrollment:
   [ ] 100-549
   [ ] 550-2000
   [ ] Over 2000

95
Directions: Please respond to the following statements whether you have or do not have MR or LD students. The following statements require you to indicate the direction and degree of feeling you have of MR and LD students in regular extracurricular activities. Check in the appropriate column:

SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
N = No Opinion  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Note: This survey recognizes the reality of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Public Law 94-142, but the survey deals only with your personal opinions and feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. It would be best if MR students would participate in school activities with "regular" students.

2. LD students can function better in school activities with "regular" students.

3. MR and LD students show as much enthusiasm for extracurricular activities as other students.

4. Involving the MR and LD students in extracurricular activities takes too much time away from the regular student.

5. Allowing the MR student to participate in extracurricular activities would place too much of a burden upon the activity sponsor, coach, or director.

6. Allowing the LD student to participate in extracurricular activities would place too much of a burden upon the activity sponsor, coach, or director.
7. Cooperation among students is better when students are grouped according to ability in extracurricular activities.

8. Athletic or club admission requirements should not be relaxed or lowered to aid any student in gaining membership.

9. Special education students, such as MR and LD students, should be represented in the student council.

10. Most handicapped students could benefit from participation in extracurricular activities.

11. Special duplicate clubs and activities should be created to accommodate the MR students.

12. Special duplicate clubs and activities should be created to accommodate the LD students.

13. Extracurricular activities in my school program should be designed for the physically able and mentally alert.

14. Just because a student is a "slow learner" does not mean he or she will be slow in extracurricular activities.

15. It would be a benefit to the school if all interested students participated in extracurricular activities.

16. While there are many criteria for participation in an extracurricular activity, grades should be the number one criterion.
17. The extra load of an extracurricular activity would present a burden too great for the MR student.

18. The extra load of an extracurricular activity would present a burden too great for the LD student.

19. Band directors, coaches, and club sponsors should, if necessary, take extra time to teach skills to slower students.

20. All MR students require more supervision in school activities.

21. LD students have no interest in participating in extracurricular activities.

22. All students should have the right to take part in extracurricular activities.

23. The individual schools should be able to set down their own criteria for limiting participation in extracurricular activities.

24. If necessary, modifications in facilities and procedures should be made to accommodate MR or LD students in extracurricular activities.

25. A particular extracurricular program should be revised if necessary, to allow participation by a single handicapped student who would otherwise be excluded.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. All legal school age residents should be able to receive a free and appropriate education regardless of cost.

27. The individual school district should not have to meet expenses for extra time and materials used to involve handicapped students in extracurricular activities.

28. Least restrictive environment should not only involve academic placement but also extracurricular placement.

29. Placement of the handicapped student in extracurricular programs with nonhandicapped students is automatically the least restrictive learning environment.

30. A mentally retarded girl should not be denied a position on the drill team solely on the basis of her handicap.

31. New federal laws dealing with the education of the handicapped give an unfair advantage to the handicapped student at the expense of the average student.

32. All students of a school should be given equal chances to participate in athletics regardless of ability level in a particular area.

33. Meeting places for school clubs should be scheduled to accommodate handicapped students who wish to attend.

34. School clubs should not change meeting times or days to accommodate handicapped students who wish to attend.
35. A free and appropriate education should not include non-academic services or extracurricular activities.

36. Regulations requiring teachers to make individualized educational plans for handicapped students are unnecessary and too time consuming to be of any value.

37. If a handicapped student requires special transportation to insure that he or she participates in some extracurricular program, the school should supply it.

38. Federal laws affecting the education of handicapped students such as Public Law 94-142, are effective and are in the best interest of the majority of students.
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE OF FIRST LETTER SENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

April 6, 1979

Dear :

Recently there has been a great deal of emphasis on meeting the needs of handicapped students in the public schools. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) has focused a great deal of attention in this area.

There is a need for research in this area in order to determine how handicapped students can best be served. This study has the approval of the Division of Secondary Education at North Texas State University and is focused on the perceptions of selected educators toward the participation of MR and LD students in extracurricular activities and toward federal legislation dealing with the rights of these students to participate in such activities.

The enclosed questionnaire should take only a few minutes to complete. As a selected participant, the success, value and accuracy of the study will depend upon you. Your reply will be held in strict confidence. The nature of the research requires that questionnaires be coded in case a follow-up letter is needed to obtain a response. No individuals or schools, however, will be identified in reporting the data, and the results of the study will be made available to you on request.

Thank you for your time in responding to the enclosed questionnaire. Included is a postage-free, self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire. An early response would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

David L. Collins
Researcher
April 27, 1979

Dear Colleague:

Approximately three weeks ago I sent to you a questionnaire related to a study concerning the participation of mentally retarded and learning disabled students in extracurricular activities. As of this date, I have not received a response from you. With the school year drawing to a close, you are probably very busy. Your response, however, will be important in making the study valid.

Please disregard this card if you have returned the questionnaire recently. I thank you for your help and cooperation in this effort.

Sincerely,

David L. Collins
APPENDIX D

LIST OF PANEL OF JUDGES

Bo Barbe
Director of Special Education
Center Independent School District
Center, Texas

Irma Caton
Chairperson, Division of Physical Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

Marjorie Chapman
Division of Special Education
College of Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

Ivan Glasscock
Principal, Denton High School
Denton, Texas

Virgil Tiemann
Principal, Alvin High School
Alvin, Texas
### APPENDIX E

#### TABLE XXII

**SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTION SCORES REGARDING THE PARTICIPATION OF MR AND LD STUDENTS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXIII
PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION SCORES REGARDING THE PARTICIPATION OF MR AND LD STUDENTS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Directors</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Directors</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Principals</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Principals</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Number of Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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