DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 123 EC 131 356

AUTHOR Beare, Paul L.
TITLE The In School-In Class Program: A Child Advocacy/Crisis Teacher Program for Behaviorally Disordered Students in a Rural School District.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 35p.: Paper presented at a Topical Conference of The Council for Exceptional Children (Minneapolis, MN, August, 1980, Section Meeting 56).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change: *Behavior Problems: Child Advocacy: *Crisis Intervention: *Morale: Program Evaluation: Secondary Education: *Student Reaction: *Teacher Attitudes: Workshops

ABSTRACT

The efficacy of a systematic program of intervention for behaviorally disordered students was investigated with 29 teachers and 487 students in secondary schools. Teacher Ss were divided into two groups, 16 experimental Ss who participated in 6 days of workshop training and served as advocates for 1 to 3 students and 13 control teachers. Student Ss were divided into three groups, 38 target students who received full intervention services, 224 nontarget experimentals who attended the same school but may or may not have received crisis teacher services, and 225 control Ss. Teacher attitude toward behavior disordered students and student attitude toward school were assessed. Data were evaluated by multiple analysis of variance and analysis of variance techniques. Findings showed no significant differences between the teacher groups on attitude toward working with behavior problem students, that intervention did not affect differences in morale, that there was a decline in the percentage of students dropping out of school, and that the intervention had some measurable effect in student behavior reaction to school. (PHP)

THE IN SCHOOL-IN CLASS PROGRAM: A Child Advocacy/Crisis Teacher Program for Behaviorally Disordered Students in a Rural School District

Paul L. Beare
Coordinator, Emotional Disturbance Teacher Training Program
Department of Education
Moorhead State University
Moorhead, Minnesota 56560

INTRODUCTION

In contrast to Mark Twain's comments about the weather, we talk a great deal about alternative mainstreaming programs for Emotionally Disturbed and Behaviorally Disordered children, but we are trying to do something about this type of intervention. Most special Educators are familiar with the cascade of services model as conceptualized by Evelyn Deno (1970). Level I and Level II of this model are idealized as being the service levels for the majority of exceptional children. Unfortunately this is not the case (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1978).

This lack of services at the mainstreaming levels amy be a direct reflection of the lack of either effective treatment models at these levels, at least for Emotionally Disturbed (ED), or of difficulties faced by school districts in implementing effective programs due to a variety of environmentally imposed limitations. The obvious conclusion is that there is a need for program models that do deliver Level I and Level II interventions in such a way that districts can adapt and use these to meet their own unique problems.

There does exist a number of recent developments in ED programming outside of self-contained classrooms that may be implemented in public schools. Alternative high schools, goal setting programs, group counseling programs, self-control curriculum models, vocational training and career counseling, etc., all have been implemented with varying degrees of success. The usefulness of these interventions varies with the needs of a school district, the philosophical model which the district embraceses, and it's ability to carry out the program. Efficacy of traditional and nontraditional services is an added concern.

Lack of Effective Secondary Programs

The provision of education services for behaviorally disordered adolescents has lagged far behind services for younger pupils. Mackie (1969) found only twelve percent of the estimated number of school age emotionally disturbed children were receiving special services. Morse, Cutler, and Fink (1964) reported only eleven percent of senior high schools in this country providing services. Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971) reported over one half of all students who fail to finish school exhibit serious malajustment. The U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare (1979) estimated that 741,000 disturbed students in the United States are not being served.

Long, Morse, and Newman (1971) observed that most problem children over age 16 were simply excluded from classes. Many dropped out and others required expulsion before leaving school. A survey by Husheren, Schultz, Manton, and Henderson (1970) implied that the most frequently given reasons for excluding a child rom school were that he "cannot profit" from the program or that he is "too disruptive."

Nelson and Lewis (1977), after examining all programs on which published information was available, concluded that the provision of educational services for behaviorally disordered adolescents has lagged far behind services for younger pupils, particularly in the public schools. They hypothesized that among the factors contributing to this is a lack of teachers qualified to work with such students. Brown and Palmer (1977) found only 10 of 118 personnel preparation programs in emotional disturbance demonstrated an attempt to provide teachers with skills and competencies necessary for working with secondary level students.

There is an obvious lack of programs for secondary level behavior problem students. The result is failure in and exclusion from schools. The requirements of Public Law 94-142 are apparently not being met. The implication of this is a need for programs defining ways to deal with special needs while keeping a special focus at retaining the children in school. Most literature on the efficacy of special programs for behaviorally disordered children certainly demonstrates the questionable usefullness of the traditional attempts at intervention (Harth, 1971; Halpern, 1970; Vacc, 1972; Glavin, 1973).

Ecological Intervention

An approach to disturbance which has been growing in popularity in the literature recently is the ecological model. This model has been used in some school based programs (Hobbs, 1971; Harth and Grosenick, 1973) with good success. Moreover community based intervention systems have also successfully adapted it as a founding philosophy (Lewis, 1973). An effective model has been developed for its implementation (Harth, 1975).

Under the ecological model we may look at behavior disorders as being a "lack of goodness of fit" (Sells, 1963). Goodness of fit refers to the congruence of an idiosyncratic individual and a unique behavior setting. The key is how adaptive or maladaptive an individual's behavior is to his particular environment or how accepting the environment is of individual's unique behavior patterns. With this concept schools don't necessarily need clinical psychologists to label kids and don't necessarily need to worry about internal dynamics. Instead, schools may respond based on any definition and the environment's requirements for goodness of fit. Interventions are based on doing what we can to create goodness of fit for students.

Discussion of the Problem

The preceding literature review serves as justification for further investigation.

The district where the investigation in question took place is Wellsville-Middleton, R-1 located in Montgomery County, Missouri. This is a small, rural school district with a total K-12 enrollment of 650 students. Small districts have some particular, indigenous problems in special services delivery and Wellsville is no exception.

The first problem is that of low, generally declining enrollment. This, of course, results in a low incidence of various disabling conditions. For example, one child with hearing impairments might require a special teacher, three with visual impairments, etc. It is not feasible to supply a full-time professional for these numbers of students. The Special Education Cooperative might seem to be a solution, but in many instances distances are too great to make it feasible, particularly in the case of more specialized, part-time services. Contracted services are also a questionable solution. In the case in question the nearest ED program was a residential institution 45 miles away. Simply hiring all the various types of special teachers is also not a feasible solution. Finances, of course, are one problem. With a total district staff of 45, five of whom are already special teachers and two who are Title I teachers, it is difficult to convince school boards, even through legal implications, of the manditory nature of additonal staffing. The biggest problem in rural areas is simply the availability of certified teachers. Learning Disabilities and Emotional Disturbance are two of the worst nationwide teacher shortage fields. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

reported that in 1977 there were 13,000 available ED teachers in the United States. They estimated the need in 1978 at 28,000 (U.S. Office of Education, 1979). These teachers are in demand in large cities with comparitively high salary schedules -- a St. Louis, a Minneapolis, a Fargo. Small towns with low salary schedules simply cannot attract personnel. Even temporarily certified personnel seem to leave as soon as permanent licensure is achieved.

With this background in mind, consider the specific problem which had to be faced-that of developing a program for Behaviorally Disordered students in a small, rural district with an estimated sixty student K-12 who required some level of service. The district had limited resources and only one certified ED teacher. For four years attempts had been made to hire additional staff, but with no success.

The problems of the school system and the students were graphically demonstrated by the student attitude toward school and by the district drop-out rate. The Wellsville drop-out rate averaged 7.5% per year for the three years prior to the project initiation (Report of the Secretary to the Board of Education, 1977). This figure for students grade 7-12, showed an overall rate of 45% leaving before completion of school. The mean drop-out grade level was 8. The Missouri Department of Education stated that the predicted rate for class A schools in the state was 2.5% with mean grade of 10. The average grades completed in the state was 11.8 while in Wellsville it was 10.0. The high school class of 1979 began with 98 students while 42 graduated.

While lacking empirical data to show it, the attitude of the students and staff toward school was equally poor. The euphemsm for the high school, used by most of the students was "The Prison". Two consultants brought in to analyze the situation, Dr. Dick Dustin of the University

of Missouri-St. Louis and Dr. Rick George, University of Iowa, concluded that student and staff attitudes were a major source of problem, along with the inadequacy of service delivery. The general teacher attitude was one of not wanting to work with ED students - - kick them out or send them to Special Education, but have them absent from the regular class.

Taking all the previously mentioned considerations into account the task which was decided upon included developing an intervention program which would provide Level I and Level II services for students experiencing emotional and behavioral problems and which would facilitate student goodness of fit with school, with themselves and with the future.

Statement of the Problem

The first problem with which the project dealt was effecting the teacher attitude toward teaching students exhibiting behavior disorders. The second was changing student attitudes and behavioral reaction to school.

Discussion of the Variables

The major variables used in the analysis of the project are defined as follows:

Teacher Attitude toward working with students exhibiting behavior problems is the positive or negative perception a teacher has toward integrating these students into his or her classroom. It is operationally defined as the teacher's point total on Watson and Hewitt's (1974) Learning Handicap Integration Inventory (LHII) assessing regular classroom teachers' perception of the effect of integrating mildly handicapped children.

Student Attitude is the positive or negative perception the student has of the school environment. It is operationally defined as the students'

point total on Wrightsman, Nelson and Taranto's (1968) School Morale Scale (SM). The total possible score of 84 can be broken down into individual attitude scores concerning seven subareas of school environment.

Student Behavioral Reaction To School is defined as the ability of the school and the student to attain sufficient goodness of fit to prevent either the school or the student from excluding the student from the school environment. This is operationally measured by attendance and drop out rates for the overall student population and for the specific population of target students directly involved with the program.

Hypotheses

Three null hypotheses were generated by this project investigation.

1. There will be no significant difference in teacher attitude between treatment and control groups.
2. There will be no significant difference in student attitude among the treatment and control groups.
3. There will be no difference in student behavioral reaction to school among treatment and control groups.

METHODS

Subjects

A quasi experimental design was utilized so that the effectiveness of various interventions could be examined. The experimental setting was Wellsville-Middleton, R-1, school district of 60 square miles containing two small towns. The control setting was the nearby Community R-6 school district of 40 square miles with three small towns. The groups measured involved only secondary students eveh though the program was K-12. The teachers measured include 16 experimentals, involved in the overall treatment program and 13 controls for the control district.

There were three student groups. Group I was comprised of 45 target students, identified as experiencing behavioral difficulties and though of as potential drop outs. This group included 13 girls and 32 boys. Group II was identified as non-target experimentals attending Wellsville High School and thus perhaps being effected by the intervention procedures. This group included 118 girls and 106 boys. Group III were control students from the control district. This group consisted of 225 students, 117 girls and 108 boys. In measuring behavioral reaction to school, previous years' drop out and attendance figures were utilized as controls rather than the control district. Due to the non-random nature of assignments to groups this was thought to be the basis for a more valid comparison.

Treatment

The initial procedures of this rather large scale intervention can be broken down into ghree main components. Following the initial year of the program a fourth component was added. The effects of each intervention component could not be measured independently because of the expected amount

of component interaction. Even though the individual results of each part of the program were no ascertained, each component will be described individually.

Having identified needs, objectives and hypothesis, the only thing left was to develop the program of intervention and the way to implement it. A competative Title IV-C grant for innovative and exemplery programs was written. It was funded for $90,000.00 over a three year pilot period. The previously mentioned additional component of the overall program was funded by a $25,000 Title IV-C grant submitted two years after the initial project. The components were as follows:

Workshops: The workshop experience consisted of six, four to six hour days. Nineteen of the twenty secondary level staff members employed by the target district participated in the optional workshops. Only one staff member declined to attend. Participants were reimbursed $5.00 per hour for workshop time. Three of the workshop days occured prior to the opening of school. These were designed mainly to effect the cognitive component of the teachers' attitude toward mainstreaming, to provide alternative behavior management techniques, and to begin to delineate the teachers' advocacy role. The three subsequent workshop days were scheduled on two Saturdays and one week day during the school year. These days were intended to provide time to deal with both problems which had arisen and with the facilitation of the overall intervention program.

The first five of the workshop days were conducted by Dr. Dick Dustin, University of Iowa, and Dr. Rick George, University of Missouri-St. Louis. The Project Director and school principal participated in carrying out the workshop activities. The final workshop day was conducted by the Project Director, without the aid of consultants.

The following is a list of modified agendas showing the topic and focus of each workshop day:

Day I: August 16, 1977

Topic: Introduction to In School-In Class Project. What it is and what is expected to be gained from the program.

Focus: To explain the mechanics of the project and to create awareness of the real problems in implementation.

Day II: August 17, 1977

Topic: Confrontation training

Focus: Exposing teachers to a series of skills in which a person manages behavior and give negative feedback in such a way that hostility is not created. Activities here center on skill training, simulation and role playing.

Day III: August 18, 1977

Topic: The Crisis Teacher and the Child Advocate

Focus: Explanation of the mechanics of the cirsis teacher and the child advocacy program. Activities include skill training and value clarification.

Day IV: November 19, 1977

Topic: Review of activities, presentation of new communication skills.

Focus: Establishment of priorities fro action when dealing with individual target students.

Day V: January 14, 1978

Topic: Review of activities, reports on project and individual achievements, review of communication skills.

Focus: Reinforcing teacher advocate actions, skills and participation.

Day VI: May 15, 1978

Topic: Review of project year, analysis of successes and failures, planning for next year.

Focus: Examination of each drop out case, planning for intervention with behavior problem students over the summer and next year, enthusiasm building for next year.

Student Advocacy/Ombudsman Program: Each of the twenty secondary level staff members employed by the district became a student advocate/ ombudsman for one to three target students. The students to whom each individual teacher was assigned depended on existing empathy between that student and the teacher, class schedules, and the lack of any existing hostility between the two. If possible, arrangements were made so that the teacher's free hour and the student's study hall coincided.

No ironclad guidelines for the selection of students to participate in the advocacy program was formulated. Rather, a staffing, involving the cirsis teacher, the principal, parents, and any affected teachers was held and a plan of action derived. No labels were assigned, but instead, an Individual Educational Program (IEP) was drawn up.

Criterion for staffing was based largely on teacher referral. Schultz (1972), Ullman (1957), Bower (1957) and Maes (1966) found teacher rating to be the best predictor of emotional and behavioral disorder in school age children. In addition to teacher referral, candidates for the advocacy program were identified by frequent absenteeism, indications by students of their possible intention to drop out, and self-referral.

The specific actions of the individual teachers depended upon the needs of the students with whom they were working. Some basic guidelines, can, however, be outlined. A primary requirement was that the teachers seek to build a positive relationship with the student they were serving. The teacher was to lend encouragement to the student, to become concerned with his behavioral and academic performance, and seek to build positive self-concepts through techniques of regular,

positive contacts at school, a telephone call or psotcard for a full day absentee, or a home visit for frequent absences or to minimize stressful situations. The teacher and staff worked through the home, when possible, to improve the student's academic and behavior performances. The teacher attempted to intercede in problems that arose between the students and other teachers, the administration, or with other students. Perhaps most importantly the teacher attempted to create an emotional climate of warmth and caring between himself and the student.

Crisis Teacher: An Intervention Now classroom (IN-class) was established and staffed by a full-time teacher trained in working with behavior disordered students and a half-time teacher's aide. The aim of this class was to accomplish the following purposes: to provide an on-the-spot safety valve for students who need relief from a personal, stressful situation; to offer relief to teachers by removing distruptive students who are interfering with classroom teaching; to diagnose the basis of behavior problems; to provide treatment options for identified problems or to provide referral to community agencies; to allow for a cooling off time without exclusion from school; to provide behavioral and attitudinal modification effecting self-image and academic success; to act as a liaison between home and school; to assist in keeping abreast of classroom assignments while out of class; and to re-integrate students into the regular classroom following any type of prolonged exclusion. Academic instruction was provided which covered the same material being missed while the student was out of the regular classroom. The IN-class provided an intermediate step on a short-term, part-time basis between the classroom and the principal's office and

between suspension and full participation in the regular school program. The IN-class also served as a compromise placement in situations where it was necessary to suspend an individual from a specific class for some given time period.

The crisis teacher served as director of the entire research program, and administrated the Advocacy program. He interceded in problems between the advocates and the target students and lent extra help when the advocates requested. The crisis teacher spent full-time with the IN-class students except, on occasion, when other more pressing program responsiblities arose. At those times, the crisis teacher was relieved by an aide trained to work in the class and by the high school counselor. The crisis teacher disseminated information about the program, assisted other staff members in maintaining enthusiasm between work-shop days, and tried to attend always to fulfillment of the overall goals of keeping students in school and causing the students and the regular classroom to be compatible.

Horizons Expansion Component

The previously discussed interventions occured during the first two years of the program. Data from these years will be discussed momentarily. As will be seen however, there were still problems form the point of view of an ecological model. It was felt goodness of fit was being fostered between the target students and the school, but not necessarily between the school and some of the student's "real world".

Wellsville-Middleton, R-1 district has a large proportaion of students of low socioeconomic status. For example, 55 percent of the district students are eligible for free lunch programs (Report of Secretary of Board of Education, 1978). Many students seem to lack an appropriate

background of environmental and cultural experiences. A random sample of Wellsville students were administered the Peabody Individual Achievement Test General Information Subtest as a pilot study. The 40 students sampled averaged 1.8 years below grade level in general information.

It was felt by the school staff that many students experiencing school problems do not share the general body of knowledge which is commonly held by citizens of their age and which is gained from certain life experiences and first hand observations. This deficit not only hinders students in the classroom but also makes it difficult for them to clearly view all the alternatives involved in making the various life choices which must be decided upon by high school students today.

These decisions include whether to stay in school, to work hard at studies, what type of career to pursue, what mode of social behavior to adapt, and the life style in which to engage. The hypothesis was developed that these decision difficulties may rest on the cause that many individuals do not clearly see all future options - or any future options. They do not realize there is a world outside their small town life in Wellsville. They don't realize that achievement and proper decision in the present can lead to success in the future.

A great many students are caught at a very early age in a cycle of either failure or lack of hope for the future. They see the type of jobs and lifestyle adults around them follow and they feel this also must be thier own future. They are isolated in a small town of 2500 people. They see few non-townspeople. They haven't been exposed to other places or experiences except perhaps through television, which does not make it part of their real world.

This is comparable to the problems faced in other small town, rural areas. This would seem to be cultural deprivation as bad or worse than

what we normally associate with large cities. The result of this line of reasoning was the Horizons Expansion Program. The purpose of this program was to extend the experiential and environmental awareness of a selection of socially and culturally deprived target students. This included virtually all the students experiencing behavioral difficulties. The method involved simply giving students some experiences which are generally part of the background of experiences of Americans, but not generally part of the experience of members of the target group.

This involved development of an applied course of study directed at local history, industry, agriculture and general culture. A one semester credit course was formulated. There was no regular meeting time. There were a few readings and assignments required, but the main classroom activities were filed trips to various localities. There were eight each semester and four in the summer. Places visited included agricultural sites - farms, grain elevator, etc.; industries - McDonnell Douglass, Anheuser Busch, etc.; historical - state capitol, Mark Twain's home, etc.; and common culture - Busch Stadium, Grant's farm, a municipal opera company, etc. At each site the students were required to individually seek out persons employed in various occupations. They asked what preparations and life events, led to such an employment. They also got to see that more than 20 people could get together without fighting, being drunk or being in church - a rare event in some small towns.

Hopefully this project would effect teachers also. Each field trip teachers attended allowed them to get paid, miss owrk, and be with the "problem" students in a non-academic setting. It should be added, to keep this from being a "deviant's class," an equal number of non-target non-exceptional students were included in all activities.

It is very difficult to instill self-actualizing ideals in a student who sees the future as following a pre-set pattern. If the student's scope and perception of the world is so narrow that only a small town, Wellsville, exists for him, then achievement or non-achievement are not particularly differentiated. Only if all students have a somewhat realistic view of the world can we hope for full motivation and self-actualization, and goodness of fit with the future.

RESULTS

The statistical analyses reported in this section included tests of all three null hypothesis previously stipulated.

Teacher Attitude

Null Hypothesis One states that there will be no significant difference in teacher attitude between treatment and control groups. The concern is with teacher attitude toward working with students exhibiting either acting out or withdrawn behavior problems. Attitude was operationally defined as teacher's score on the LHII. Forms of the LHII were employed to measure attitude toward the integration of children with both of these types of behavior problems.

A multiple analyses of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the data utilizing pretest and posttest scores for the treatment and control group teachers. The data means for both groups, for both scales, pretest and posttest, are presented in Table I.

The MANOVA for LHII total socres with combined scales showed no significant difference between the two groups overall scores, $F\ (2,26) = .70$, $p = .5073$, as computed using a Hotelling-Lawley exact test calculation of the cirtical value of F. The teachers who underwent the in-service training and who were involved in the advocacy program revealed no significant difference in attitude as compared to those teachers who received no specialized treatment.

A further section of the planned comparison was a multivariate examination of overall test effects and overall group-by-test effect. Once again, analyses utilizing the Hotelling-Lawley trace found no

TABLE I

Mean Scores on LHIl Scales

Group	N	Acting Out Scale	Withdrawn Scale
Control Teachers	26	96.35	108.23
Experimental Teachers	32	99.56	113.53
Test			
Pretest	29	100.28	113.86
Posttest	29	95.97	108.45
Group X Test			
Control Pretest	13	97.46	108.15
Control Posttest	13	95.23	108.31
Experimental Pretest	16	102.56	118.50
Experimental Posttest	16	96.56	108.56

significant differences in either overall test effects, F (2,26) = 2.85, p = .1769 or overall group-by-test effect, F (2,26) = 1.81, p = .1829. The data definitely warrants an acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Student School Morale

The analysis of variance of the total scores for the School Morale Scale was performed to test Null Hypothesis Two, which stated there will be no significant difference in student attitude among the two levels of treatment groups and control group. Means for all groups, pretest and posttest, are presented in Table II. As presented in Table III, there was a significant main effect between the groups, F (2,484) = 18.84, p = .0001. However, the target group's extremely low morale, which accounts for this effect, would be expected based on their selection bias. The true test of the null hypothesis is the within subjects analysis of variance. The group-by-test interaction measures changes by group form pretest to posttest. This was not significant, F (2,2485) = 1.45. This leads to an acceptance of the null hypothesis for Hypothesis Two.

Subscale Post Hoc Comparisions

The nature of the intervention in question was such that it was not designed to effect all elements that compose school morale. The Hotelling T on subscales of the School Morale Scale found significant group effects, F (74,79) = 4.38, p = .0001 and significant group-by-test effects, F (14,956) = 3.61, p = .0001. Fisher's LSD was used to discern the location of significant pretest to posttest changes. Of interest in particular was the attitude of the student groups toward teachers, since teacher-student goodness of fit was

TABLE II

Mean Scores on School Morale Scale

Group	N	Total
Non-Target Experimental	224	48.02
Target	38	36.68
Control	225	47.98
Test		
Pretest	487	47.59
Posttest	487	46.58
Group X Test		
Non-Target Experimental Pretest	224	48.04
Non-Target Experimental Posttest	224	48.00
Target Pretest	38	36.87
Target Posttest	38	36.05
Control Pretest	225	48.95
Control Posttest	225	47.00

TABLE III

Analysis of Variance of
Total Score for School Morale Scale

Source	df	SS	F
Between Subjects			
Group	2	4491.58	18.84*
Subjects Within Group	484	57697.00	
Within Subjects			
Test	1	81.12	1.11 NS
Group X Test	2	211.72	1.45 NS
Within Group	485	35384.00	

* P less than .0001

NS not significant

the main intervention method utilized. The comparison of pretest/posttest school morale schole on this subtest is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

Fisher's LSD Analysis of Attitude Toward Teachers Subtest Of School Morale Scale

Group	N	Attitude Score Toward Teachers	LSD
Non-Target Experimental Pretest	224	7.504	
			.443 NS
Non-Target Experimental Posttest	224	7.826	
Target	38	5.105	
			1.000 NS
Target	38	6.000	
Control	225	7.980	
			.443* Negative Direction
Control	225	7.484	

*Singnificant at p .05
NS = Not significant

The greatest subtest score change from pretest to posttest was in student morale toward teachers. The target group showed the largest gain of any group on any subtest from pretest to posttest. The control group attitude declined significantly indicating the treatment did have an effect on improving experimental students attitude compared to the controls.

Student Attrition and Attendance

Hypothesis Three stated there will be no difference in student behavioral reaction to school between treatment and control groups. Student behavioral

reaction to school was operationally defined as two measures, drop out rate for the student body and attendance rate of the target group students.

The 1974-75 drop out rate for Wellsville-Middletown R-1 school district was 5.6 percent. The 1975-76 rate was 7.46 percent and the 1976-77 rate was 7.3 percent. The drop out rate for the 1977-78 project year was 3.96 percent according to the 1977 Annual Report of Secretary to Board of Education. The 1978-79 rate was 3.54. This is an appreciable drop of over three percent. No test of significance is necessary since this figure reports on the entire district population, not a sample of any type.

The actual number of drop outs out of total enrollment of 328 students was thirteen. Of these thirteen, only three could be considered to have been members of the student target group. Three students attended school less than one week, allowing little chance for anyone to intervene in their school experience. The remaining drop outs included four females who dropped out to have children and two students who returned to school the following year.

The target group attendance for 1976-77 averaged 88.65 percent. The 1977-78 average was 89.68 percent, an increase of 1.79 days per student.

An overall analysis of the third hypothesis would have to yield a rejection of the null hypothesis. The definite, substantial decrease in drop out rate combined with the increase in attendance would certainly seem to indicate an improvement in student behavioral reaction to school as it is operationally defined.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this investigation indicated that the administered program of intervention had some measureable effect on student behavioral reaction school, but had no significant effect on either teacher attitude or student school morale.

The major finding of this study was a decline in the percentage of students dropping out of school. Because of the lack of signifcance in attitude change, the base for this detline would seem to lie in the advocacy program. Both the cirsis teacher and teacher advocates were present to facilitate a return to calm after the occurance of school crises. There were individual cases where there was increased teacher favorability toward working with problem students. There were also a number of positive relationships established between target students and teacher advocates. Subjective evaluation by State Advisory Council Teams, as well as by the school administration, lent support to the value of the crisis teacher and advocacy components. Both sources indicated that herein lay the greatest value of the intervention program, as opposed to re-educating the regular class teachers or making all students like all aspects of school.

The crisis teacher was needed to coordinate and provide leadership to the advocacy program within the district. To best facilitate an advocacy program such as the one provided for in Wellsville, the role of crisis teacher must be filled by someone outside the school administration and outside the classroom teacher models. This role provides a resource for students and teachers alike to draw upon for support and for a way around bureaucratic or impersonal rules. The crisis teacher also serves as an avenue for parents to deal with the school system. It is important that this avenue is neither administrative nor teaching, both of which

may have negative connotations for the parents of the target children.

The teacher advocates, in large, filled their role well. There were some notable successes in advocate relationships with target students. A certain number of individuals were seemingly transformed into good students by the relationship with their advocate. There were also a smaller number of notable failures in the advocacy program. A few teachers developed no rapport with their chosen student. One relationship deteriorated to the point where it culminated in a shouting match within the classroom after which the student walked out.

A major lack of efficacy in this intervention was the attempt to change teacher attitudes and expectations toward the integration and teaching of behavior disordered students. Instead of improving, the attitude and expectancy of the teachers as a whole declined measurably, if not significantly. More teachers' individual scale scores declined than improved; seven improved and nine declined in their attitude toward acting out students and five improved and eleven declined toward withdrawn students.

Three papers in the reviewed literature produced similar results. Haring, Stern, and Cruickshank (1958) found workshop experiences could not change attitudes toward behavior disordered children. Hall (1969) found lower attributes ascribed by trainees following real contact with exceptional individuals. Schotel, Iano, and McGettigan (1972) found that intial positive attitudes toward exceptional children declined following real experience with them. It is likely that much the same phenomenon occured here.

The workshop experience was designed to give teachers some effective skills for dealing with these students. It also aimed at increasing confidence and raising teachers' expectations for success. This

was accomplished in some participants and was less successful with tohers. Following this, the teachers had to deal with the reality of working with problem students, students who were not adapting to the school environment and who likely has a history of difficulties with teachers. This was understandably a hard task.

In those instances where the students with whom the teachers were dealing improved, it is easy to understand how these teachers' attitudes might also improve. In cases where the students behavior worsened, it is equally easy to understand how teacher expectations could decline. When a teacher's assigned subject did not meet his or her expectations, the expectations naturally lowered.

The advocates, even with the crisis teacher's aid, had no power to enforce attitude changes of other staff members toward target students. A negative relationship with one or two teachers often seemed to undo the positive aspects of the advocate-student relationship. Advocates could only try to persuade teachers to respond to target students in a desirable manner.

An additional weakening factor in the program impact was a lack of resources for extensive intervention in home environments. Outside agencies were brought in to intervene where appropriate, but no school agent had the position or the freedom to play a very important role in a student's affairs outside school.

The advocates and crisis teacher could often times identify urgent needs, but were helpless to do anything. The advocates were acutely aware of this and it seemed to provide a sense of frustration and even bitterness. On occasion, parents were cooperative and concerned about seeing behavioral change in their child. All parents voiced the desire

for their child to do well in school. Generally, however, the frustrating problems involved parents who obstinately refused to accept that their child was exhibiting dysfunctional behavior, or parents whose values were not those of contemporary society.

Both these problems caused extreme difficulties. Parents were encountered who encouraged their 14 year old daughter to become pregnant apparently in order to receive increased Aide to Dependent Children. The girl, now 15, is pregnant with her second child. Other parents were found who wholly supported their childrens' scapegoating, continually blaming external sources for school problems. Changing parental actions and attitudes in instances such as these is extremely difficult, if not impossible, with the facilities provided for in this intervention.

In assuming that the source of behavior change which did occur lay in the advocacy program, it would seem that the target group students' school morale on the attitude toward teachers subtest might improve. As noted in results section of this paper, this subtest recorded the largest gain from pretest to posttest of any subtest for any group. The control group did drop significantly in score on this subtest. Though the gain was not statistically significant, the significant drop in the control's score would indicate that the advocacy program had some positive effect on those whom it served.

Glasser (1971) stated that behavioral change precedes attitude change. This may have been the case in the present situation. The program's major goal, improved goodness of fit as measured by decreased drop out rate, was achieved. It is possible that the target students' attitudes will increase the longer they stay in school.

The project teachers worked as student advocates, had some successes as well as failures, but they still did not change in the direction of having a positive prognosis for the integration of behavior problem students. Rather, the teachers developed what may be a realistic attitude toward these students, not negative, but not overwhelmingly confident either. The teachers have perhaps become aware of the hard realities of serving exceptional adolescents.

Implications: Staff Attitude

The results of this study as well as the previously reviewed research make it obvious that changes in teacher attitude are vey difficult to achieve. Exposure to behaviorally disordered students negates gains which may be made through re-education. Training all teachers in methods of mainstreaming is one obvious approach to the problem. Present legislation has already mandated this. Perhaps what would be more effective is more intensive training in mainstreaming the mild, more likely to be integrated, handicaps. Working with all students, in whatever way that best serves the student, must be made part of every teacher's regular duties.

Project teachers who accepted the advocacy program as part of their regular duties and not as a forced extra duty seemed to fare better and were more persistent in their advocacy efforts.

Implications: Student Attitude

It is very difficult to interpret negative results such as were recorded on the School Morale Scale. Student attitudes in this study must instead by interpreted based on subjective observations. A major conclusion reached on the target students' reactions and feelings toward school is that there is a large amount of scapegoating by students with

chronic problems. These students often do not accept responsibility for their own actions. If they dislike school or don't get along, it is consistently seen as the school's fault or the principal's fault, rather than a normal outcome of their dysfunctional behavior. When faced with reality in various situations, that is, when their behavior needs to change, a very common student response is one of latching on to a false or farfetched hope. A large percentage of the target students claimed to have a brother or cousin or father or neighbor who cannot read, was expelled from school or dropped out, but is now making $10.00 an hour working for the railroad or driving a truck. The students state that school failure doesn't matter because they can always "get along" as the model did.

Both the scapegoating and the refusal to accept responsibility for the future, or their own actions, would seem to be a result of an externally oriented locus of control. The target students are not accepting responsibility for their problems or they feel powerless to effect their own fate. They feel this is up to "others". A need for research in this direction with school drop outs and problem students is indicated by this observation.

Environmental Impact

This program would seem to be one which can change some behaviors in certain settings. It can be an effective approach for changing non-fitting students into functional individuals, effective in the school environment. Real raises in grades of many target students were achieved; many classes were passed that had been failed in the past. There are target students who now feel comfortable staying in school who, in the

past, felt it was the worst possible alternative. They may still dislike school, but they now believe it wiser to stay. Students who would have dropped out but for the intervention are still in school.

The question arises, however, as to how much this effects the chances for a successful life experience by students who still have a large amount of real problems. The home enviornments and community mores of the Wellsville area are so varied that changing at-school behavior does not change the realities of living in Wellsville. Students and their parents do not have the same values as the school and its staff. The success of large scale intervention projects such as the one in question may depend on how it interprets the community's common value system and goals and aims of education within this system. An alternative would be to try to change student values, or at least expand students' horizons so they may see values and lifestyles that exist outside their community. This may reconcile the values and skills they meet at school with those they perceive as necessary in the outside world. This is the goal of the Horizons Expansion Program, for which no data yet exists.

Final Conclusion

School districts, even small school districts without the ability to attract large or even small numbers of highly trained personnel should still be able to implement programs to promote goodness of fit for their troubled students -- those students traditionally requiring special education services.

The law mandates and the literature recommends serving exceptional populations in least restrictive environments. It is time special educators develop and implement programs which help students in regular settings, programs

which involve all students and teachers, and which don't financially bankrupt a district.

The program herein described aims at educating students in the best way available, at keeping them in school and at instilling certain values and aspirations. Hopefully these values and aspirations will aid students in reaching the ultimate goal of this project and of all educational intervention programs -- a goodness of fit in our society.

REFERENCES

Ahlstrom, W. M. & Havighurst, R. J. 400 Losers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Bower, E. M. A process for identifying disturbed children. Children, 1957, 4, 143-147.

Brown, G. D. & Palmer, D. J. A review of BEH funded personnel preparation programs in emotional disturbance. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44, 168-174.

Deno, E. Special education as developmental capitol. Exceptional Children, 197), 37, 229- 237.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1968

Glavin, J. Follow-up of behavioral research in resource rooms. Exceptional Children, 1971, 40, 211-213.

Hall, E. P. An experimental study of the modification of attitudes toward the mentally retarded (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 30, 4282-A. (University Microfilms Number 70 - G348, 74).

Halpern, W. I. The schooling of autistic children: Preliminary findings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 46, 665-671.

Haring, N.G., Stern, C. G., & Crucikshank, W. M. Attitudes of Educators Toward Exceptional Children. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1958.

Harth, R. Ecological design of special education programs. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Teacher Educators of Children With Behavior Disorders, Atlanta, Georgia, 1975.

Harth, R. Some thoughts on the education of emotionally disturbed children. In R. Harth (Ed.) Issues in Behavior Disorders. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Harth, R. & Grosenick, J. K. Project CASA. Paper presented at the Missouri Conference on Enviornmental Intervention for Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri, 1973.

Hobbs, N. Helping disturbed children: psychological and ecological strategies. American Psychologist. 1966, 21, 1105-1115.

Lewis, W. W. Environmental intervention in emotional disturbance. Paper presented at the Missouri Conference on Environmental Interventions for Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri,,1973.

Long, N. J., Morse, W. P., & Newman, R. G. Conflict in the Classroom. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971.

Mackie, R. P. Special Education in the United States: Statistics 1948-1966. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1969.

Maes, W. R. The identification of emotionally disturbed school children. Exceptional Children, 1966, 31, 607-610.

Morse, W. C., Cutler, R. L., & Fink, A. H. Public School Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped: A Research Analysis. Washington, D. C. Council for Exceptional Children, 1964

Nelson, C. M. & Kauffman, J. M. Educational programming for secondary school age deliquent and maladjusted pupils. Behavior Disorders, 1977, 2, 102-113.

Schultz, E. W. Screening emotionally disturbed children in a rural setting. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 134-137.

Sells, S. B. An interactionist looks at the environment. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 696-702.

Shotel, Jr. R., Iano, R. P., & McGettigan, J. F. Teacher attitudes associated with the integration of handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 677-683.

Ullman, C. A. Teachers, peers, and tests as prediction of adjustment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1957, 48, 257-267.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Progress Toward a Free Appropriate Education (HEW Publication Number 79-05003). Washington: State Program Implementation Study Branch of Education for the Handicapped, January 1979.

Vacc, N. A. Long term effects of special class intervention for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 15-32

Watson, P. C. & Hewitt, F. M. The Learning Handicapped Integration Inventory Assessing Regular Classroom Teacher's Perception of the Effect of Integrating Mildly Handicapped Children. Unpublished Technical Report, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, 1976.

Wrightsman, L., Nelson, R. & Taranto, M. The Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Children's School Morale. Unpublished manuscript, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1968.