PARENT AND TEACHER ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES ON BEHAVIORS OF URBAN MIDDLE-SCHOOL MALE LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

JULIE A. EAKES SCHAEFER, M.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to the members of my committee: Drs. Michael Wiebe, Howard Stone, Wallace Edge and Nancy Elliott for their guidance, suggestions and assistance in the preparation of this paper.

Special gratitude is expressed to Dr. Edward Wylie for serving as chairman of the committee as well as his continued patience and encouragement throughout the process involved in preparing this paper.

Appreciation is also expressed to the many Dallas Independent School District administrators, special education resource room teachers and various parents for their time and cooperation so necessary for completion of the research.

A note of appreciation is expressed to Kathleen Mooney for the expert typing of this manuscript as well as information she supplied.

Most importantly, I express my fond gratitude to my family, especially my husband, Bob, who had encouraging interest, continual patience, and editorial comments making this paper possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Acknowledgements		iii
List of Tables		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	4
	Purpose	5
	Definitions	5
	Limitations of the Study	7
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	9
	Historical Background of Classification Systems for Behavior Disorders	11
	Intra-Interrater Correlation of Behavior Problems	19
	Special Uses of Behavior Checklists	26
	Affects of Student Sex, Rater Sex, Grade, Subject, Student Intelligence and Rater Race on Behavior Ratings	30
III.	METHOD	34
	Sample Selection	35
	Descriptions of Instrument	37
	Analysis of the Data	44
IV.	RESULTS	46
	Final Study	46
	Final Analysis	47
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
APPENDICES		
A.	Behavior Problem Checklist	55
B.	Application to Human Subjects Review Committee	58
C.	Consent Form	63
D.	University Approval Letter	65
E.	Dallas Independent School District Research Proposal and Letter of Approval	67
F.	Letters of Introduction	76
G.	Written Instructions for Teachers	79
H.	Letter to Parent	82
REFERENCES		84

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Analysis of Five Subtest *P*-Levels 48

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educators continue to find behavior problems a major concern (Long, Morse & Newman, 1971; Morse, 1977). Students with acting-out behaviors are time consuming, irritating, interfering and frustrating. Urban school systems, with their plurality of education and complex environments, face perplexing concerns, many of which are manifested in disruptive student behaviors which eventually lead to crisis situations in which students, teachers, and parents express a need for better coping skills.

If one were to contrast today's education with that of 15, 20 or even 30 years ago, the appraisal would show an emerging ubiquity of psychology (Beilin, 1959). With the infusion of psychology into education and a concomitant impact upon the manner in which teachers deal with children came observations on the seriousness of misbehaviors, a consciousness of social standards of conduct, and a determination of measures for describing disturbing behaviors in order to develop forms of prevention or correction of misbehaviors.

Of the earlier studies, one of the more respected shows that only 10% of the disruptive students are in classes for the emotionally disturbed and/or behaviorally disordered (Bowers, 1960) where behavior is dealt with as part of the educational process. The other 90% may be in placements where the main theme is academic growth and therefore are being dealt with in a rather haphazard manner, or may have a pattern of nonattendance and eventually drop out around the eighth grade (Berry, 1974; Graves, 1976).

As long as he can be labeled/certified learning disabled, mentally retarded, or is generally functioning two to three years below academic grade level, the resource room has become a good dumping ground for the student with a behavior problem (Morse, 1977).

The labeling is a result of special education wavering between the concept of the total child and the concept of labeling/certifying the child. The P.L. 94-142 mandate protects the rights of the child by making sure he is certified, labeled and categorized before he can receive any special help (Morris & Arrant, 1978; Morse, 1977). Conversely, this may mean that many students with behavior problems are not getting help and that many may be mislabeled and/or certified in order to place them in classrooms for the emotionally disturbed or in resource rooms

(Hampe, 1975). In the regular urban school setting many disruptive students are being suspended or placed in special education classrooms because the regular classroom teacher often has fears about classroom control deteriorating (Morse, 1977). Unfortunately many resource rooms are organized in such a manner as to deal with academics and not behaviors since there is such a heterogeneous student population. With an influx of students with behavior problems in the resource room, teachers of resource students are beginning to express a need for training in classroom and behavior management techniques.

The middle-school age has become a concern for various reasons: expectations of self and important others are changing and perceptible physiological and emotional changes as well. These combined changes increase the possibility of behavior problems. The middle-school (seventh- and eighth- grade) special education teachers are responding to students with conduct problems by expressing needs for determining if their opinions are shared by parents, as well as methods for dealing with presenting disruptive behaviors (Pattavina & Gotts, 1979; Swift & Back, 1973).

Several studies have substantiated teacher's abilities to act as effective observers of student's behavior patterns (Bullock & Brown, 1972; Harth & Glavin, 1971;

Nelson, 1971; Westman, Berman & Rice, 1967). Generally, teachers with whom the student has contact, will perceive a student with a behavior disorder and it is assumed that the behavior disorder also appears at home (Cassel, 1964; Kaufman, Swan & Wood, 1979; Quay & Quay, 1965).

Statement of the Problem

There are few studies which measure parent and teacher attitudes of child behaviors. The results of these are somewhat contradictory and utilize a primary pupil population (Auger, 1975; Becker, 1960; Cassel, 1964; Kaufman et al., 1979; Morris & Arrant, 1978; Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker & Quay, 1959; Peterson, Becker, Shoemaker, Luria & Hellmer, 1961; Quay, Sprague, Shulman & Miller, 1966; Ribner, Bittlingmaier & Breslin, 1976; Speer, 1971). There are few studies which compare the parent and teacher attitudes of secondary students; possibly because behaviors at this age level are most often situational (Quay & Werry, 1979; Ribner et al., 1976).

There are important implications of a common behavioral vantage point between parents and teachers. P.L. 94-142 requires a multidisciplinary approach, including parents, to assessing and planning for the child (Department of Special Education, 1979). It is important

in facilitating communication between the parent and teacher that similar perspectives be present as far as behavioral factors are concerned (Kaufman et al., 1979). Current review of the literature did not produce studies measuring urban parent and resource room teacher attitudes of behaviors of middle-school learning disabled male students. It was therefore necessary to obtain evidence to see if there was an agreement in ratings between parents and teachers, two diverse groups of raters with differing perspectives; and to examine the extent to which teachers' attitudes are shared by the parents of specific classroom children.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to measure if there were attitudinal differences of parents and resource room teachers concerning behaviors of male urban middle-school learning disabled students.

Definitions

The resource room was defined as a special classroom facility where small-group instruction is provided by a special educator (Hewitt & Forness, 1977). The remaining terms are defined in Policies and Administrative Procedures for the Education of Handicapped Students,

prepared by the Department of Special Education, Texas Education Agency, November 1979.

Definition of Learning Disabled Students:

> "Learning disabled students" are students who demonstrate a significant discrepancy between academic achievement and intellectual abilities in one or more of the areas of oral expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skills, reading comprehension, mathematics calculation, mathematics reasoning, or spelling; for whom it is determined that the discrepancy is not primarily the result of visual handicap, hearing impairment, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage; and for whom the inherent disability exists to a degree such that they cannot be adequately served in the regular classes of the public schools without the provision of special services. (p. 4)

Special eligibility criteria for determining that a student is learning disabled:

> A student who is learning disabled is one who has been determined by a multidisciplinary team not to be achieving commensurate with his/her age and ability levels. The lack of achievement is found when the student is provided with learning experiences appropriate for his/her age and ability levels in one or more of the following areas: oral expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skills, reading comprehension, mathematics calculation, mathematics reasoning, or spelling. The term does not include students whose severe discrepancy between ability and achievement is primarily the result of: a visual, hearing or orthopedic handicap; mental retardation; emotional disturbance; or environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage. (p. 25).

The term "self-contained" referred to "homeroom/special education departmentalized": "The student receives

more than three hours per day of special education instruction" (p. 49).

Limitations of the Study

The study was designed to compare the attitudes of parents and teachers using the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (1975) only. The following stipulations were employed in the study:

1) Only male student behaviors would be analyzed.

2) The students would be the ages of 12 years, no months to 14 years, 11 months of age.

3) Only students with a primary handicap of learning disabilities with a Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) full scale IQ of 70 or above would be used. There would be no limitation on the ceiling for the intelligence quotient.

4) The students would be enrolled in either the seventh or eighth grade of a Dallas Independent School District middle school.

5) The selected students would be enrolled in at least one resource room class period a day but no more than three resource room class periods a day.

6) If a student was enrolled with more than one resource room teacher a day, the teacher that had the student enrolled the most class periods would complete

the checklist. If the student was enrolled with the same number of teachers as class periods (two or three class periods) the resource room teacher that had the student enrolled in a class during the day prior to the other resource room teacher would complete the checklist.

7) English would be the primary language in the home.

8) Only one parent/guardian and one teacher would complete the checklist for each selected student.

9) If the child was not residing with a parent, the legal guardian or adult that the student resided with would be given the checklist to complete.

10) Any explanation of how to fill out the checklist would be given by the writer to every resource room teacher involved. These teachers in turn would explain the checklist to the selected parent/guardian.

11) Dimensions of student behaviors would be correlated, not qualities within the raters.

12) Race of teacher, parent or student would not be a determining factor.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Comparing parent and teacher opinions has continually held an important place in educational research (Becker, 1960; Cassel, 1964; McCarthy & Paraskevopoulos, 1969; Quay, Sprague, Shulman & Miller, 1966). As student behavior comes to the forefront as a factor capable of impeding teaching and learning, parents are continually requested to take an active role in the discipline and education of their children. In order to have consistency between home and school, parent-teacher correlations appear to be important factors. Some recent examples in the last 10 years include the study of Ribner, Breslin and Bittlingmaier (1976) comparing the pattern of perceptions of parents and teachers on a variety of behaviors of multiply handicapped exceptional children placed in special classes. This study found that after a parent-teacher conference, the parents tended to restructure their patterns of perceptions to be similar to those of the teacher's.

Auger (1975) had elementary school teachers, special education teachers, and parents of emotionally disturbed children correlate their perceptions of the behavioral

desciptors on the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (1967). The study found that parents viewed the socialized delinquency behaviors to be of greatest consequence upon the mental health of their children while educators attached significantly more importance to personality problems. The author concluded that, "perhaps the greatest practical significance of these data lies in the fact that long-term consistency is hardly possible if those problem areas addressed by the special educators . . . are not the same ones viewed as important by the parents" (p. 872).

The Kaufman (Kaufman, Swan & Wood, 1979) and Winetsky (1978) studies used a similar rationale for their research, examining the differences between the behavioral expectations of significant figures involved in a multi-system child rearing--the parent and teacher. Both studies lended empirical support to findings of close similarity on perceptions of behavioral factors for parents and teachers. The Winetsky study did isolate social class and ethnicity of the subjects and found a closer correlation if the parents were Anglo, middle-class.

Hampe (1975) again compared parent and teacher opinions of child behavior on the suspicion that students were placed in classes for the learning disabled not only because of their learning problems, but also because they

were difficult to manage. Parents were given the Louisville Behavior Checklist and teachers used the School Behavior Checklist. Although there was no correlation between checklists, evidence from the study suggested that parents and teachers focus not only on academic performance, but also on behavioral aspects when deciding on special class placement.

Other studies compared parent attitudes, teacher attitudes and mental health worker attitudes (Morris & Arrant, 1968; Stevens, 1980). A number of the investigators assumed that the behavior factors analyzed of teachers' ratings were applicable to those of parents' (Becker, Peterson, Luria, Shoemaker, & Hellmer, 1962; Quay, Sprague, Shulman, & Miller, 1966; Speer, 1971; Zold & Speer, 1971). Most of the studies dealt only with the child up through age 11 and if involving the middle-school age (12-14) did not isolate this age group from the elementary students. These studies do however, present the important parameters in looking at both parent and teacher attitudes of student behaviors.

Historical Background of Classification Systems for Behavior Disorders

Many authors attempted to develop a diagnostic classification system in order to assist in educational

and therapeutic intervention (Achenbach, 1966; Bard, Sidwell & Wittenbrook, 1955; Rutter, 1965); but none gathered enough followers to support one defined system (Lessing & Zagorin, 1971). Therefore, descriptive classification systems of symptoms defined in behavioral terms were developed.

Peterson (1961) was one of the first to set up a bipolar division of symptoms called Personality Problem and Conduct Problem. This study was followed by Collins, Maxwell & Cameron (1962), with their Rebelliousness and Anxiety factors, Achenbach's (1966) Internalizing-Externalizing factors and Miller's (1967) Aggression and Inhibition factors. The symptoms included in the classification symptoms were effective for rating children's behavior problems in that they were disturbing behaviors that had a direct effect on classroom learning, i.e., disobedience, destructiveness, and temper tantrums.

The factor of learning disabilities was also defined as a basic syndrome of behavior disorders (Collins, Maxwell & Cameron, 1962; Miller, 1967; O'Grady, 1974), but showed no stability in other studies (Peterson, 1961; Quay, 1964; Quay & Quay, 1965) and generally was dropped as a classification. From the descriptive symptom classification systems, developed behavior checklists and rating scales.

Wickman studied the behavior problems of children as early as the 1925-26 school year. His studies are known as the father of present day behavior problem checklists. Wickman (1928) studied behavior problems of children as reported by 511 Cleveland school teachers. He found 50 behavior problems to be relatively serious according to the teachers.

A few years after Wickman, McClure (1929) sent a questionnaire out to all teachers in grades one through eight in order to determine the undesirable characteristics of classroom problem pupils. Of 26,346 children covered in the survey, 533 (2%) were reported to be problems.

In 1929, Laycock (1934) investigated 167 elementary Canadian teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior and compared them with Wickman's (1928) previous findings. Of a list of 109 traits previously compiled from teachers, 43 of Wickman's 50 were common and had a high correlation of .78. The Laycock study found the most frequent behavior difficulties to be violation of school work requirements, violations of classroom rules and violation of general school regulations. These same teachers felt the following behavior maladjustments to be the most serious: violations of general standards of morality and integrity, transgressions against authority, violations of school

and classroom regulation and school work requirements. These behaviors did not focus on pupils difficulties or any personality traits. When Laycock compared the ratings of the Canadian group of teachers for seriousness of behavior traits with Wickman's (1928) findings of mental health hygienists, he found an almost reversal of the teacher rating to the mental hygienists.

During the 1932, 1933 and 1934 summers, Peck (1935) examined student behavior problem case studies written by her teacher students enrolled in child psychology classes at the University of Texas. Her report on the case studies revealed an opposite emphasis than that previously reported by Wickman (1928) and Laycock (1934). She found her teacher students to be more concerned with undesirable personality traits than disciplinary offenses. The technique Peck used for securing the teacher responses probably influenced the results of her study. She asked that they write a case study on a maladjusted pupil, explain factors causing the maladjustment, and what should be done for the child.

Ellis and Miller (1936) compared the results of Wickman's (1928) study to 382 Denver junior and senior high-school teachers in 1935. Wickman's 50 item rating scale was employed. The Denver teachers' ratings correlated .49 with the ratings of Wickman's hygienists.

Wickman's hygienists considered withdrawal/recessive personality traits as most serious and the Denver teachers did not rank order any of these traits lower than 32 of the total 50 traits. This study indicated that teachers were beginning to be aware of poor personality traits as a serious nature of behavior problems rather than those of classroom orderliness or transgressions.

In 1940, Mitchell (1942) conducted a study similar to Wickman's (1928) in order to see if there were any changes after 12 years in teachers' and mental hygienists' thinking about behavior problems. Three hundred ninety-five teachers from Cleveland, Ohio; Lakewood, Ohio; and Minneapolis, Minnesota were used to rate the seriousness of behavior problems which were to be compared with 76 mental hygienists, psychiatrists, and psychologists from 17 states. He found a correlation coefficient of +.70 between the means of ratings by teachers and by mental hygienists in 1940. In comparing seriousness of traits as rated by the 1927 and 1940 mental hygienists, Mitchell (1942) found a marked difference in seriousness of "nervousness" and "enuresis" traits. The 1940 hygienists found them only of slight consequence. The results of this study may have indicated a change in attitude of the mental hygienists.

Wickman's study (1928) was again replicated after 25 years by Stouffer (1952). In this study a coefficient of correlation of +.52 was obtained when Wickman's original instructions were given to the two types of raters (teachers and mental hygienists). When the instructions were modified to give both groups the same instructions, a coefficient of correlation of .61 was obtained. Stouffer's teacher raters still found the traits relating to honesty, sex, truancy and classroom order very serious. However, problems concerned with withdrawing/recessive personality traits gained impetus.

Because of previous criticism of the Wickman study (1928) by Peck (1935), Sparks (1952) used Wickman's rating score to determine if instructions to the raters was of significance. Sparks gave instructions to 762 Iowa teachers, half of which were told to rate the forms in relation to future adjustment of the child while the other half were told to determine which problems were the most troublesome to them. The conclusions were that the teachers rated them differently according to what the instructions were, but neither group correlated well on a psychological basis. Sparks did find that teachers with training beyond the bachelor's degree had a tendency to more closely agree with the mental hygienists' evaluations.

The Wickman (1928) study was re-examined in 1951 by Schrupp and Gjerde (1953) using 199 San Diego, California secondary and elementary school teachers and 37 mental hygienists employed by public school guidance agencies from San Diego and Long Beach, California. The ratings were then correlated to the 1927 Wickman study and the 1940 Mitchell study. The Schrupp and Gjerde mental hygienists correlated highly (.80 to .88) with the 1927 and 1940 mental hygienists (now called clinicians). The 1951 teachers correlated highly with the 1927 and 1940 teachers (.76 to .81). The 1951 clinicians correlated .56 to the 1951 teachers (significant to the one percent level). This study replicated the difference in directions given to teacher and clinician which may have had an effect on results. In general the correlations suggest that there was an increase in agreement between teachers and clinicians from the 1927 study to 1951, and that this agreement was probably due to a change in teacher rather than clinician attitude.

Stouffer and Owens (1955) again replicated Wickman's study (1928) and again found that the behavior problem child was identified chiefly by annoying, disorderly, irresponsible, aggressive, untruthful, disobedient behavior. In 1955 Hunter (1957) replicated the study and found the same conclusions as Stouffer and Owens. Hunter

also confirmed Sparks (1952) study that teachers with more training than a bachelor's degree correlated significantly with the mental hygienists. This study also added the dimension of teacher experience. Hunter found that teachers with more than 5 years of experience but less than 10 years of experience seemed to match more closely with mental hygienists.

Tolor, Scarpetti and Lane (1967) compared 118 elementary urban school teachers with 23 clinical psychologists using the Staten Island Behavior Scale (Mandell and Silberstein [cited in Tolor, Scarpetti and Lane, 1967]). This study found that teachers differed significantly on 22% of the 295 behavior items. The teachers felt that aggressive behaviors were more serious than withdrawal behaviors. In reviewing Lewis' theory (1965), the authors of this study relate the "continuity hypothesis" which states that "emotional disturbance in a child is symptomatic of a continuing psychological process that may lead to adult mental illness" (p. 465), concluding that the acting-out aggressive child is more likely to become more apparently disturbed as an adult than the timid, withdrawn child.

Beilin (1959) reappraised all the Wickman studies and concluded that after 30 years, differences still existed between the attitudes of teachers and those of

clinicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, and mental hygienists. Beilin questioned why in preceding studies the belief that the mental hygienist's ratings were implicitly accurate ones. Beilin expounded on the theory that the different roles of teachers and clinicians would be reflected in their attitudinal patterns. Teachers are essentially task oriented, concerned with imparting information and skills. They would therefore find aggressive and disruptive behaviors an invasion of their teacher tasks than would a clinician. The mental health worker would be more concerned with preventing poor adjustment and promoting good adjustment behaviors. Beilin felt that the two groups would continue to perceive child behavior differently.

Intra-Interrater Correlation of Behavior Problems

In the study of behavior problems one factor that needs attention is that of interrater scores. Students have been known to act-out in one classroom and not in another for various reasons. Characteristically, the behavior problem or acting-out child is generally one who defies the teacher's rules and/or structure of the classroom and spends more time on nonacademics (Walker, 1979). Because so much time is spent on nonacademics the key skills such as reading and mathematics are often deficient

enough to cause below grade level functioning in all academic areas. Generally "normal" children are most disruptive during unstructured times such as recess, passing in the hallway, in the lunchroom and on the bus. The behavior problem child has an even more difficult time in these settings and often because of lack of discriminatory ability and/or low tolerance level may become physically aggressive. Generally speaking, the behavior disordered child has a name for himself and is well known throughout the school. His reputation precedes him or her and often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy (Walker, 1979).

In any examination of an individual student it is important to look at how all important people in the child's life see him. Studies generally are expanded to large numbers of students and therefore interrater studies are done using a particular instrument.

In 1927, Wickman (1928) compared the attitudes of teachers toward the seriousness of common classroom behavior problems. The teachers were enrolled in one of three different college classes at Teachers College, Columbia University. Wickman used a self-devised scale at the beginning and then again at the end of the college semester. The study showed that problems of unsocial, introverted and recessive types were ranked more serious

on second ratings, and that there was a tendency to assign less seriousness to problems such as heterosexual activity, masturbation, obscene notes, tardiness, and smoking. Speculation on this study was that the change of ranking by the teachers resulted from course instruction on tendencies in children which develop a good or ineffective social life. A clearer understanding and objective considerations of these rather than traditional or emotional abhorences of other problems resulted in the change.

Bain (1934) in 1932, readministered Wickman's (1928) test in order to evaluate college students' attitudes on behavior about the seriousness of problems. She found that after a semester of work in various child psychology courses, there were certain consistent trends toward teachers changes of attitude. Problems of unsocial, introverted, and recessive types were ranked relatively more serious on second rating. The increased importance placed upon the shy, retiring child led to the inference that teachers were basing their evaluations more on the child's welfare and less on their own emotional comfort level.

Two previous studies (Becker et al., 1959; Peterson et al., 1959) had yielded results associating father attitudes as being intimately related to child

maladjustment tendencies. These studies gave Peterson et al. (1961), and Becker (1960) reason for further analysis of the subject. As a parameter of these studies independent evaluations of each child behavior were obtained from their respective parents and teachers using the Behavior Problem Checklist (BPC) in the Peterson study, and a 72 bipolar, seven-point rating scale with antonym pairs of adjectives in the Becker study. These studies found correlations between parent ratings and teacher ratings of child behavior to be relatively low from .24 on the personality problem subscale to .41 on the conduct problem subscale (r=34 between parents and teachers in the Becker study). The authors of these studies did feel that these correlations were situational and that in general studies between parent ratings and teacher ratings would be significant.

The Child Behavior Rating Scale (CBBS) was used in 1964 by Cassel (1964) to make comparisons among the ratings made by teachers and both parents for 800 primary pupils. This study also made additional comparisons between the ratings of teachers, each parent and select guidance test data including: Metropolitan Achievement Test; California Test of Mental Maturity; Metropolitan Readiness Test; Goodenough (DAP); Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children; and the social quotient from The

Vineland Social Maturity Scale. The findings from this study indicated that there were generally high correlations between the parents; that teacher ratings were generally higher than parent ratings; and that there was a significantly positive relationship (at one percent level of confidence) between parent ratings and teacher ratings with guidance data.

Quay and Quay (1965), in an attempt to further the description of behavior problems, gave two teachers of 259 seventh graders and 259 eighth graders the 58 item Peterson Behavior Checklist. This study was done at Old Orchard Junior High School in Skokie, Illinois. The ratings from this study were then compared to previous studies on fifth and sixth graders by Peterson (1961) and adolescent delinquents by Quay (1964). Interrater factor score correlation was high on the conduct problem subscale (seventh grade, .58; eighth grade, .71) but limited on the personality-problem dimension (seventh grade, .31; eighth grade, .22). This was explained as a result of untrained raters and a departmentalized school system where the teachers had only one contact hour per day with each student.

Quay, Sprague et al. (1966) followed this with another study using parents and teachers of children referred to a child guidance clinic with the child's

average chronological age being 10-5. The results of the investigation which used the Behavior Problem Checklist again, indicated a higher agreement between parents than between either parent and teacher. The agreement between parent and teacher was higher in the conduct dimension of the questionnaire than any other dimension.

Auger (1975) investigated the extent which parents of a group of primary children, elementary school teachers and special education teachers in a residential treatment center were in agreement on the importance of children's behaviors. The Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist was used and the parents and teachers were asked to rate the importance of the behavior items rather than the degree a child evidenced the behavior. An analysis of the results indicated that special educators attached greater importance to Socialized Delinquency items. This was determined to be a result of parents viewing behaviors that might interfere with melding into middle class America or conspicuous to law enforcement as posing a threat.

An interesting study by Ribner et al., in 1976 used both inter- and intrarater comparisons of parents and teachers of both normal and learning disabled students. The children ranged from age 6 to 11 years, and the instruments used were the Classroom Behavior Inventory

and Home Behavior Inventory (Schaefer et al., 1966). In terms of similarity between profiles of parent and teacher perceptions, significant positive correlations were obtained only after a period of interaction between parent and teacher. Interpretation of the findings indicated that parents of learning disabled students viewed their children more favorably before exposure to normal students and interaction with teachers where expected normal behavior was explained.

Inconsistent with the majority of the previous studies was one done by Kaufman et al., in 1979 where a referral form checklist was used. The validity of parents as behavior raters was seemingly enhanced since the factor structure for the parents was similar to that for teachers.

Speer (1971) attempted to get a baseline using the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist on ratings of child guidance clinic children and to compare these with parents of nonclinic children. The results showed that parents of clinic children showed significantly higher interrater correlation of concern on the clinic child than on clinic child siblings or parents of nonclinic children.

Special Uses of Behavior Checklists

The assumption that children with learning disabilities could be differentiated from emotionally disturbed children was studied by McCarthy and Paraskevopoulos (1969). The study used the Behavior Problem Checklist in order to differentiate the children in terms of observable social behaviors using only children between the ages of 6 and 13 years. The results of this study were that teachers perceived and rated behaviors of emotionally disturbed, learning disabled and average children differently. The teachers of the emotionally disturbed rated their students more severely than teachers of the learning disabled or average student; teachers of the learning disabled rated their students more severely than average students. There were implications that special education teachers were biased in their rating as a result of behavior expectations.

Glavin and DeGirolamo (1970) used the Behavior Problem Checklist in a study to determine the extent and nature of academic underachievement of emotionally disturbed children. They were specifically interested in the academic area of spelling. They found that the withdrawn child made significantly more unrecognizable spelling errors and that the conduct problem child would more often refuse to write the words, suggesting that

behavioral adjustment class students manifest higher anxiety and rigidity scores than regular class students.

In an attempt to evaluate special class placement for behavior problem children in public schools, a study (Glavin et al., 1971) was done placing these children in a special resource room program during the classes they were having achievement difficulty. The group made significant gains in reading arithmetic and their behavior. Their behavior was rated before placement in the resource room, during placement, and in their mainstreamed classes. Behavior improved from a deviant behavior rate of 76.1% of the time to 39.8% of the time. Unfortunately there was little carry-over into the mainstreamed classes, as there was still acting-out behavior 58.1% of the time.

Glavin and Annesley (1971) again used the Behavior Problem Checklist. This time the study correlated reading and arithmetic achievement, two basic skill areas, among students classified as emotionally disturbed. Of the 130 students surveyed the majority of the children were characterized by conduct-problem behavior (hyperactive-aggression). Of these behavior-problem children, 81.5% were underachieving in reading, and 72.3% were underachieving in arithmetic. The implications from the study were that within the classroom for the emotionally disturbed, a great deal of emphasis was placed on

treatment/therapy of behavior and very little emphasis on academics. The assumption being that once behavior is under control the academic will take care of itself. However, Graubard (1967), from his study of children institutionalized for more than 2 years and having returned to the community, found 95% were still deficient in reading by an average of 3 years. Furthermore, from the previous study (Glavin et al., 1971) there are indications that with improvement in academic achievement, behavior is also significantly improved.

A study in North Sacramento, California (Bradfield et al., 1973) used the Behavior Problem Checklist to relate behavior problems of regular and mentally retarded students before and after the students were integrated for academic classes. These factors were compared to control groups of all regular class students and all special education class students. Interestingly, the mean number of behavior problems encountered by regular class teachers were more severe at the beginning of the year before integration, than for the special education classes. After integration, during the year, there was a marked decline in behavioral problems for a model program while the control classes remained significantly the same.

The Rogeness, Bednar, Diesenhaus (1974) study surveyed problem behavior both cross-sectionally and longitudinally, in several of the grades of an elementary school in a low socioeconomic area of Chicago. The modified version of the Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist was used in the spring of 1969 and again in the spring of 1972. There was a drop in behavior problems over the four-year span, and a stabilization of problem behavior across grade levels. During the two intervening years, three changes took place which may have been factors in interpreting the correlations. 1) In the summer of 1970 two policemen were shot and killed in a housing project that supplied much of the student enrollment. By January of 1971 the enrollment had dropped by over 500 students; people were moving out of the projects at a faster rate and into them at a slower rate. 2) In the spring of 1971 a new school was built and grades kindergarten through third were transferred out. 3) Over the summer of 1970, transfers were frozen for teachers and therefore the faculty became more stabilized. The authors of this study postulated that every school has a relatively fixed level of problem behaviors that have the potential of being created and maintained by the social system in the school.

Webb and Oski (1974), found that of 38 anemic students in a Philadelphia Junior high, there were significant conduct-problem disturbances. The Behavior Problem Checklist was the determining tool in the study. Their findings suggested that a selective effect of iron deficiency may involve heightened restlessness, irritability and disruptive behaviors, therefore impairing ability to learn in the regular class setting.

Langhorne et al. (1976) used the Conners Behavior Rating Scale to determine primary or core symptoms of hyperkinesis seen in boys attending a clinic between 1967 and 1972. The results of this study were that hyperkinesia was source-related rather than symptom-related; that the symptoms displayed by the checklist from parents and teachers were heterogeneous.

Effects of Student Sex, Rater Sex, Grade, Subject, Student Intelligence and Rater Race on Behavior Ratings

Previously Reviewed Studies

Haggarty (1925) confirmed the belief that boys rather than girls present larger numbers of behavior situations at every age up to 15 years, after which, the number of boys in school became negligible. These figures could have been a result of predetermined behaviors being presented to the raters.

McClure (1929) found a high correlation coefficient (.86) between sexes. He found girls had larger percentages than boys on 11 of 35 traits. Generally, the boys were reported to have five to one as many problems as girls.

Beilin (1959), from the Wickman factors, found that the proportion of girls to boys with behavior problems was 66 to 88%. Not only was there a difference in proportion, but also behaviors were different. Ullman (1952) explained this as boys adjustment patterns being more blatant, whereas girls deal with problems in an "intrapsychic level."

In using the Hahnemann High School Behavior Rating Scale Swift and Spivack (1973) found that boys tended to display more difficulty with classroom behavior than girls. The authors also noted that in urban schools, mathematics was the subject in which students were rated as displaying significantly more dependence and acting-out behaviors. Suburban students had more difficulty with English.

McClure's study (1929), previously referred to, reported that of all grades one through eight public schools in Toledo, the sixth and seventh grades had the largest percentage of problems. Rate of behavior problems dropped in the eighth grade because after finishing

seventh grade, at that time, the student could get a work permit and therefore many students were out of school.

The percentage of problem cases in special education classes (8.68%) was four times that of all cases covered in the survey. This seemed to indicate to the author that the needs of the child in special classes are not met as well as the needs of students in standard classes.

The difference in behaviors between the 100 children with the highest IQ's and the 100 children with the lowest, was .04. The IQ's ranged from a full scale score of 45 to 151. This difference would tend to indicate that intelligence was not a factor in behavior problems.

Peck (1935), in 175 problem behavior case studies, found 114 were of boys, 52 of adolescents and 62 of preadolescents. This study did not agree with Wickman's (1928) study in that fewer problems were reported for the preadolescents than for adolescents.

Ellis and Miller (1936) found that women teachers consistently rated problems as more serious than the men teachers. Hunter (1957) found that in 1955, men and women teachers gave similar evaluations to overt aggressive and attacking behaviors as rated on Wickman's scale (1928). Men teachers definitely considered problems related to sex much less serious than women teachers. Women teachers rated slovenliness in appearance,

destruction of school property and suggestibility less serious than men teachers.

In comparing ethnicity of the rater, Hunter (1957) found that Negro teachers considered tardiness, laziness and carelessness in work considerably more serious than Caucasian teachers or mental hygienists. Negro teachers thought that cruelty-bullying, impertinence-defiance and temper tantrums were definitely less serious than Caucasian teachers.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The perceptions of two main groups were evaluated. The first group consisted of Resource Room teachers of learning disabled children with a primary handicap of learning disabilities associated with perceptual-motor handicaps who had been placed in special resource room classes. All students evaluated were males and enrolled in seventh- or eighth-grade special education classrooms within the Dallas Independent School District. The second group was parents of the selected male learning disabled resource room students.

The total number of students were selected from all available middle-school resource room sources within the Dallas Independent School District. Male students were selected through the use of a computer list of all potential seventh- and eighth-grade male students enrolled within a resource room for at least one hour a day but no more than three hours a day on the basis of a learning disability major handicap. The sample drawn was sufficient to obtain an N of 50. The students in the resource rooms were selected from the Dallas Independent School District on the basis of characteristics of grade, sex,

and educational placement. All resource room units relied heavily on the educational process as part of their treatment program. All had teachers employed by the local public school system and accredited by the Texas Education Agency. The resource room teachers of the selected students were given written and verbal instructions by the writer on procedures for rating the child's behavior on the Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1975, see Appendix A). Parents were given written and verbal instructions by the selected resource room teachers on procedures for rating the child's behavior on the Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1975).

Sample Selection

Through the use of a computer list of potential seventh- and eighth- grade male students enrolled within a resource room at least one hour a day but no more than three hours a day, a sample was drawn through the process of random selection in order to obtain an *N* of 50. The selected students met the following criteria:

1) male.
2) 12 years, no months to 14 years, 11 months of age.

3) primary handicap of learning disabilities with a Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised full scale IQ of 70 or above.

4) enrolled in either the seventh or eighth grade of a Dallas Independent School District middle school.

5) enrolled in at least one resource room class period a day but no more than three resource room class periods a day.

6) English as the primary language.

Criteria for placement in the Dallas Independent School District resource room class is based on results of a battery of tests that are given by a Texas Education Agency accredited associate psychologist and an educational diagnostician. The battery of tests includes: the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R), Bender-Gestalt Visual Motor Test (B-G), Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test (DAP), Frostig Test of Perceptual Development (Frostig), Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude (Detroit), Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT), Key Math Test, and Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (Woodcock). Critical performance on these tests is not clearly specified, but the general criteria for learning

disability placement is a Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised full scale score of 70 or above; emotional problems not judged as primary; no secondary deficits; no major physical disabilities; underachievement on the Wide Range Achievement Test, and/or Peabody Individual Achievement Test, and/or Key Math, and/or Woodcock Reading Mastery Test; deficits of three years or more on age equivalents for the total Bender-Gestalt Visual Motor Test, and/or Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test, and/or Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, and/or Frostig Test of Perceptual Development, and/or Detroit Tests of Linguistic Ability, and/or Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities.

Descriptions of Instrument

Since isolated factors vary between parents and teachers, the most meaningful way to study agreement in dimensions underlying parents' and teachers' perceptions is to have both raters fill out the same instrument and to use an instrument using questions based on factors common to both groups (Kaufman et al., 1979).

Lessing and Zagorin (1971) state that in choosing a behavior checklist the important factors to consider are that the checklist has selected the most frequently reported symptoms of all representative cases; that those

symptoms providing statistically significant discrimination between normal and non-normal cases are included, and that the symptoms are subjectively important. Using the above criteria as a base for choosing a checklist, the following items were considered: 1) ability to produce item samples that would be optimal for the major purpose of the diagnostic classification inherent within the specific study; 2) readability, i.e., terminology interpretable to the general teacher and parent population with regular semantic similarity; 3) simplicity of directions; and 4) time spent in completion of rating.

In reviewing the many behavioral checklists there were some that were more widely used than others because of ease in completing, readability and standardization. One of the first checklists to be used on a universal basis was the Wichita Guidance Center Checklist which was first used in 1955 by Engel and eventually modified by Brewer (1961). The checklist has item samples from symptoms reported to a child guidance clinic based on narrative descriptions composed by 25 mothers such as "does not seem to be learning like he should," and "makes only passing grades." Because of the questionable methods of generating symptoms in this checklist (mother's narrative descriptions), Lessing and Schilling (1966) suggested that the use of this checklist would inevitably permit

the projection of primary syndromes which in fact were not there.

The Child Behavior Rating Scale (CBRS) (Cassel, 1962) is a psychological instrument developed and standardized for the assessment of personality adjustments of preschool and primary grade pupils. There are 78 items each descriptive of some aspects of child behavior which are classified into five adjustment areas: self-adjustment, home adjustment, social adjustment, school adjustment and physical adjustment. The checklist appears to have good standardization, validity and reliability. Because it is a tool developed for, and to be used in conjunction with the young child, and because of the six-point scoring scale value, this checklist was not chosen.

The Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Scale (Spivack & Swift, 1967), contains 47 items that are rated on a seven-point scale on 11 subscales including classroom disturbance, impatience, disrespect-defiance, extreme blame, achievement anxiety, external reliance, comprehension, inattention-withdrawn, irrelevant responsiveness, creative initiative, and need closeness to teacher. There is a question as to the independence of many of the Devereaux subscales (Schaefer et al., 1975) and the checklist is limited to elementary age students. The

first four and the ninth subscales do correlate .71 with the conduct problem subscale of the Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1975). The sixth (external reliance) and eighth (inattention-withdrawn) subscales correlated .46 with the inadequacy-immaturity subscales of the Behavior Problem Checklist on a study by Von Isser (Von Isser, Quay & Love, 1980). The Devereaux does not measure deviant behavior nor the anxiety-withdrawal dimensions, therefore limiting its utility.

Another widely used instrument for identifying students with serious deviant behavior in the classroom is the Conners Teacher Questionnaire (Conners, 1969). This questionnaire contains 36 items rated on a four-point scale that yields scores on four subscales: conduct problem, inattentive-passive, tension-anxiety and hyperactivity. The Conners is significantly interrelated with the Behavior Problem Checklist (BPC). The conduct problem subscale of the Behavior Problem Checklist correlated with both the conduct problem and hyperactivity subscales of the Conners. Conners inattentive-passive subscale correlates with the Behavior Problem Checklist inadequacy-immaturity subscale. The tension-anxiety subscale on the Conners correlates with the anxiety-withdrawal dimension on the Behavior Problem Checklist (Von Isser et al., 1980). The Conners appears to be a valid instrument to

use; the only question involves the independent hyperactivity subscale. Conners (1969) points out that it is questionable whether hyperactivity can be independent from conduct problems since their relationship (r=.66) suggests that it would be difficult to find a hyperactive child that did not also have some conduct problems.

The Hahnemann High School Behavior Rating Scale (HHSB) (Spivack & Swift, 1971) is one of the few devices that describes the overt behavior of students for both regular and special education class junior and senior high school students. All behavior items are placed under 13 factor categories. These are: reasoning ability, originality, verbal interaction, rapport with teacher, anxious producer, general anxiety, quiet-withdrawn, poor work habits, lack of intellectual independence, dogmatic-inflexible, verbal negativism, disturbance-restlessness, and expressed inability. Swift and Spivack (1973) measured with the Hahnemann High School Behavior Rating Scale the overt classroom behavior and its relation to achievement success or failure with 602 students attending eight different urban ghetto schools and 882 suburban students. The major purpose of the study was to gain norms for the assessment of achievement related classroom behavior (Swift & Spivack, 1973), which is the rationale for the use of the Hahnemann High School

Behavior Rating Scale. This behavior rating scale assumes a high level of word comprehension on the part of the scorer. Because of the method of standardization, the word comprehension and the general format of this device, its use is limited.

The Quay and Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (1975) is a carefully structured, well known, and widely utilized instrument for assessing the behavior of emotionally disturbed and normal subjects. The 55 items comprising the scale were generated by factor analysis of problem behavior in public school children, institutionalized juvenile delinquents, students in public school special classes for the emotionally disturbed, and children in a clinical setting. The Behavior Problem Checklist is composed of 55 behavior problems that are observed with some frequency in children and adolescents. These behavior problems have been classified into four factors on the basis of a number of studies (Quay & Peterson, 1975). The behavior dimensions measured by the checklist are: conduct disorder, personality disorder, inadequacy-immaturity, socialized delinquency and "flag" items for psychotic behavior. Conduct disorder has been defined as aggressive, psychopathic, and unsocialized behavior. Personality disorder is comprised of anxiety, neuroticism, and withdrawal. Inadequacy-immaturity has

been defined as failure in development or regression. Socialized delinquency is comprised of antisocial behavior that is gang-oriented. The factors are to be scored following the Quay and Peterson (1975) manual. If a symptom is absent it is scored "0"; if a symptom is present, it is scored "1". The total scores are calculated for each of the factors.

The Behavior Problem Checklist's 55 items were originally derived from studies of 477 case history records. The original factor analysis by Peterson (1961) indicated an interrelation among the clustering into two areas called "conduct problem" and "personality problem," which seems to illustrate that most problem behaviors in public schools were accounted for by the dimensions of aggression and withdrawal. The third dimension of inadequacy-immaturity was added after studies by Quay (Quay & Quay, 1965). These three dimensions were subsequently verified by studies on juvenile delinquents (Quay, 1964, 1966); students in classes for the emotionally disturbed (Quay, Morse & Cutler, 1966); children seen in a child guidance clinic (Lessing & Zagorin, 1971; Peterson et al., 1961); and children with learning disabilities (McCarthy & Paraskevopoulos, 1969). Cross-cultural generality of the first two dimensions, conduct problem and personality

problem, were also obtained (Gordon & Gallimore, 1972; Peterson, 1961).

The six items comprising the socialized delinquency subscale were added to the Behavior Problem Checklist after studies of case history records of juvenile delinquents were done (Hewett & Jenkins, 1974; Quay et al., 1966).

Analysis of the Data

The SPSS Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test concerning agreement between two cumulative distributions was used. If the hypothesis was rejected, the chi-square was to be used to determine which items on the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist were different. Other statistical methods were to be used if needed.

Ho_1: No significant difference on the Conduct Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

Ho_2: No significant difference on the Personality Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

Ho_3: No significant difference on the Inadequacy-Immaturity subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

Ho_4: No significant difference on the Socialized Delinquency subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

Ho_5: No significant difference on the Psychotic Behavior subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The major purpose of this study was to obtain evidence regarding attitudinal differences of parents and resource room teachers concerning behaviors of urban male middle-school learning disabled students. Evidence was obtained regarding parent and teacher agreement in the five behavioral subcategories of: Conduct Problems, Personality Problems, Inadequacy-Immaturity, Socialized Delinquency and "flag items" for Psychotic Behaviors. The extent to which teachers' attitudes were shared by the parents of the selected resource room students in the five subcategories was examined.

Final Study

The research sample was drawn from all 20 middle schools within the Dallas Independent School District. A computerized list was obtained with descriptors of: male, seventh or eighth grade, a major handicap of learning disabilities, an instructional arrangement of resource room less than half day. This computerized list contained 124 students that met all criteria for the study. Of the 124 identified students, four students had transferred

out of the Dallas Independent School District, three students had been removed from special education, two students had been truant for at least 4 months, one student had been in the special education class only 3 weeks and six students had Spanish only speaking parents. These 16 students were deleted from the study. The remaining 108 identified students comprised the basis for the study. The identified students were scattered among 31 special education resource room teachers. The teachers had between one and nine students to do a behavior checklist on and to contact the parents of these same selected students. The study was conducted during the months of February, March and April, 1982. In mid-April a follow-up letter was sent to all parents of students in the four middle schools with the largest number of identified students (total of 60) to pursue enough parental returns in order to obtain an N of 50. Sample behavior checklists were returned by teachers for 56% of the sample and by parents for 49% of the sample. All of the returned checklists were accepted for analysis.

Final Analysis

The SPSS Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to determine agreement between the two cumulative distributions of parent and teacher attitudes. The computer

printout provided a 2-tailed p value for testing significance. A significance level of $p<.05/5=.01$ was used to conclude whether there was a significant difference between parent and teacher attitudes within the five hypothesis which correlated with the five categories of the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1975). Comparison of the significance levels for the five separate analyses found no significant difference between parent and teacher attitudes on any of the subtests. The p values for the five subcategories are presented in Table 1. All of the scores were fairly consistent.

Table 1

Analysis of Five Subtest P-Levels

Subtest	P-Level
Conduct Problems	P= .741
Personality Problems	P= .623
Inadequacy-Immaturity	P= .113
Socialized Delinquency	P=1.000
Psychotic Behavior	P=1.000

In the categories of Socialized Delinquency and Psychotic Behavior the subtest scores of parent attitudes and teacher attitudes were very nearly the same with a $p=1.000$. The Conduct Problem subtest showed parent and

teacher agreement with a p=.741 and the Personality Problems subtest was also in agreement with a p=.623. The only questionable p value was the Inadequacy-Immaturity subtest of p=.113. However at a .01 significance level there is still the same conclusion of no significant difference, the agreement is just not as strong as in the other subtests.

Since there was no significant difference between parent and teacher attitudes on any of the subtests, the proposed null hypotheses were therefore accepted. The hypotheses included:

HO_1: No significant difference on the Conduct Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

HO_2: No significant difference on the Personality Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

HO_3: No significant difference on the Inadequacy-Immaturity subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

HO_4: No significant difference on the Socialized Delinquency subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

HO_5: No significant difference on the Psychotic Behavior subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

Since no significant differences were found and none of the hypotheses were rejected, there was no reason to test for which items within the five categories were different.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1975) was given to 31 Dallas Independent School District middle-school special education resource room teachers to be completed on 108 identified male seventh- or eighth-grade students with a major handicap of learning disabilities and placement in the special education resource room for at least one class period but no more than three class periods a day. Parents of the 108 identified students were given written and verbal instructions by the resource room teachers on procedures for rating the child's behavior on the Behavior Problem Checklist. Over a three-month period, checklists were returned by teachers for 56% of the identified student sample population and by parents for 49% of the sample population. After the data had been collected in order to obtain an N of at least 50, the SPSS Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to test for agreement between parent and teacher attitudes within five subcategories of the Behavior Problem Checklist. The five subcategories comprised the five hypothesis of concern. At a p=.01 significance level the tests found no significant

difference between parent and teacher attitudes on any of the subtests therefore no hypotheses were rejected. The hypotheses and their conclusions follow:

HO_1: No significant difference on the Conduct Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

$p=.741$

Conclude that there is no significant difference on Conduct Problems scores.

HO_2: No significant difference on the Personality Problems subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

$p=.623$

Conclude that there is no significant difference on Personality Problems scores.

HO_3: No significant difference on the Inadequacy-Immaturity subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

$p=.113$

Conclude that there is no significant difference on Inadequacy-Immaturity subtest scores.

HO_4: No significant difference on the Socialized Delinquency subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

$p=1.000$

Conclude that there is no significant difference on the Socialized Delinquency scores.

HO_5: No significant difference on the Psychotic Behavior subtest scores between parent and teacher attitudes.

$p=1.000$

Conclude that there is no significant difference on the Psychotic Behavior scores.

Implications from this study could possibly be twofold. One implication may be that for the specific group studied, the Dallas Independent School District middle-school special education resource room teachers and/or principals and/or counselors are attempting to communicate with parents regarding their child's behavior and therefore parents can report a comparable behavior attitude as the special education resource room teachers. A second and possibly more plausible implication considering variances in teacher/administrator concern and ability to contact parents, might be that any behaviors found within the school are also observed in the home. A change of environment and concomitant behavioral expectations does not play an important role in a student displaying or not displaying particular observable behaviors.

Further investigation of parent and resource room teachers' attitudinal differences using the Quay-Peterson

Behavior Problem Checklist with samples representing an elementary or high school population might be undertaken.

APPENDIX A

BEHAVIOR PROBLEM CHECKLIST

Donald R. Peterson, Ph.D.

and

Herbert C. Quay, Ph.D.

Please complete items 1 to 6 as appropriate

1. Name of child

_____

2. Age of child _____ 3. Sex of child _____

4. Name of person completing this checklist

_____

5. Relationship to child (circle one)

   Mother Father Teacher Other _____
   (Please specify)

6. Other identifying information

_____

_____

_____

On the other side of this page, some common behavior problems of children are described. Please read each description and decide whether or not it represents a problem as far as the child named above is concerned. If an item represents a problem mark an X in the space provided. If an item does not represent a problem, leave the space blank. Please consider every item for every child you are evaluating.

Copyright © 1979, Donald R. Peterson and Herbert C. Quay

Behavior Problem Checklist

___ 1. Oddness, bizarre behavior
___ 2. Restlessness, inability to sit still
___ 3. Attention-seeking, "show-off" behavior
___ 4. Stays out late at night
___ 5. Doesn't know how to have fun, behaves like a little adult
___ 6. Self-consciousness, easily embarrassed
___ 7. Fixed expression, lack of emotional reactivity
___ 8. Disruptiveness, tendency to annoy and bother others
___ 9. Feelings of inferiority
___ 10. Steals in company with others
___ 11. Boisterousness, rowdiness
___ 12. Crying over minor annoyances and hurts
___ 13. Preoccupation, "in a world of his own"
___ 14. Shyness, bashfulness
___ 15. Social withdrawal, preference for solitary activities
___ 16. Dislike for school
___ 17. Jealousy over attention paid other children
___ 18. Belongs to a gang
___ 19. Repetitive speech
___ 20. Short attention span
___ 21. Lack of self-confidence
___ 22. Inattentiveness to what others say
___ 23. Easily flustered and confused
___ 24. Incoherent speech
___ 25. Fighting
___ 26. Loyal to delinquent friends
___ 27. Temper tantrums
___ 28. Reticence, secretiveness
___ 29. Truancy from school
___ 30. Hypersensitivity, feelings easily hurt
___ 31. Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks
___ 32. Anxiety, chronic general fearfulness
___ 33. Irresponsibility, undependability
___ 34. Excessive daydreaming
___ 35. Masturbation
___ 36. Has bad companions
___ 37. Tension, inability to relax
___ 38. Disobedience, difficulty in disciplinary control
___ 39. Depression, chronic sadness
___ 40. Uncooperativeness in group situations
___ 41. Aloofness, social reserve
___ 42. Passivity, suggestibility, easily led by others
___ 43. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poor muscular coordination
___ 44. Hyperactivity, "always on the go"
___ 45. Distractibility
___ 46. Destructiveness in regard to own or others' property
___ 47. Negativism, tendency to do the opposite of what is requested
___ 48. Impertinence, sauciness
___ 49. Sluggishness, lethargy
___ 50. Drowsiness
___ 51. Profane language, swearing, cursing
___ 52. Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness, easily startled
___ 53. Irritability, hot-tempered, easily aroused to anger
___ 54. Enuresis, bed-wetting
___ 55. Often has physical complaints, e.g. headaches, stomach aches

For scoring and interpretation as indicated in the checklist *Manual*

Factor Scores: CP_____ PP_____ IL_____ SD_____ PB_____

APPENDIX B

APPLICATION TO HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Subject: Research and Investigation Involving Humans

Statement by Program Director and Approved by Department Chairman

This abbreviated form is designed for describing proposed programs in which the investigators consider there will be justifiable minimal risk to human participants. If any member of the Human Subjects Review Committee should require additional information, the investigator will be so notified.

Five copies of this Statement and a specimen Statement of Informed Consent should be submitted at least two weeks before the planned starting date to the chairman or vice chairman on the appropriate campus.

Title of Study: Parent and Teacher Attudinal Differences on Behaviors of Urban Middle School Male Learning Disabled Students

Program Director (s): Dr. E. J. Wylie

Graduate Student: Julie Eakes Schaefer

Estimated beginning date of study: November, 1981

Estimated duration: three months

Address where approval letter is to be sent:

Julie Schaefer

1129 Brandy Station

Richardson, Texas 75080

Is this research being conducted for the thesis or professional paper?
Y ___ N X ; for the dissertation? Y X N _____.

1. Brief description of the study (use additional pages or attachments, if desired, and include the approximate number and ages of participants, and where they will be obtained).

One parent/guardian and one resource room teacher of approximately 50 urban middle school male learning disabled students will be given the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist to fill out regarding the behavior of their selected child/student. All students will be enrolled in a Dallas Independent School District middle school resource room on the basis of a major handicapping condition of learning disabled for at least one hour a day but no more than three hours a day. Ages included will be twelve years no months, to fourteen years eleven months. The parent/teacher will be given the following verbal and written instructions; instructions to parents will be in parenthesis, "On the attached page, some common behavior problems of children are described. Please read each description and decide whether or not it represents a problem as far as the selected student- (your child) is concerned. If an item represents a problem mark an X in the space provided. If an item does

2. What are the potential risks to the human subjects involved in this research or investigation? "Risk" includes the possibility of public embarrassment and improper release of data. Even seemingly nonsignificant risks should be stated and the protective procedures described in #3 below.

None

3. Outline the steps to be taken to protect the rights and welfare of the individuals involved.

No names or any form of identification will be used on the forms. Upon completion of the checklist both the teacher and parent will place the checklist in an individual envelope to be mailed back to the investigator.

4. Outline the method for obtaining informed consent from the subjects or from the person legally responsible for the subjects. Attach documents, i.e., a specimen informed consent form. These may be properly executed through completion of either (a) the written description form, or (b) the oral description form. Specimen copies are available from departmental chairmen. Other forms which provide the same information may be acceptable. A written description of what is orally told to the subject must accompany the oral form in the application.

The attached consent form (Texas Woman's University Human Subjects Review Committee Form B) will be used to gain consent from the participating parent and teacher. If either parent or teacher is unwilling to sign a consent form and/or participate in the study they will be released from the study as will the name of the selected student.

1. continued

not represent a problem, leave the space blank."

Teachers will be given instructions by the investigator. Parents/guardians will be given instructions by the participating resource room teacher. The checklists will be sent back to the investigator upon completion.

The data will be analyzed through the use of the SPSS Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test concerning agreement between two cumulative distributions. If the hypothesis is rejected, the chi-square will be used to determine which items on the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist are different. Other statistical methods will be used if needed.

5. If the proposed study includes the administration of personality tests, inventories, or questionnaires, indicate how the subjects are given the opportunity to express their willingness to participate. If the subjects are less than the age of legal consent, or mentally incapacitated, indicate how consent of parents, guardians, other qualified representatives will be obtained.

If either parent or teacher is unwilling to sign a consent form and/or participate in the study they will be released from participating. The selected student will then be omitted from the study.

As part of a parent/teacher conference (preceeding the actual conference) the parent will be asked to fill out the checklist on the understanding that it is part of a study on middle school urban male learning disabled students. The responses on the checklist are anonymous and upon completing the checklist the parent is to place it in an individual envelope, seal the envelope and return it to the resource room teacher who will then mail it to the investigator. The teacher, after filling in responses on her checklist,will mail it to the investigator.

Signature of Approval _____ Date 11-9-81
Program Director

Signature of Approval _____ Date 11-9-81
Graduate Student

Signature of Approval Ernest O. Watkins Date 11-11-81
Dean, Department Head or Director

Date received by Committee Chairman: _____

APPENDIX C

Consent Form
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

(Form B)

Title of Project: Parent and Teacher Attitudinal Differences on Behaviors of Urban Middle School Male Learning Disabled Students

Consent to Act as A Subject for Research and Investigation:

I have received an oral description of this study, including a fair explanation of the procedures and their purpose, any associated discomforts or risks, and a description of the possible benefits. An offer has been made to me to answer all questions about the study. I understand that my name will not be used in any release of the data and that I am free to withdraw at any time. I further understand that no medical service or compensation is provided to subjects by the university as a result of injury from participation in research.

Signature _____ Date _____

Witness _____ Date _____

Certification by Person Explaining the Study:

This is to certify that I have fully informed and explained to the above named person a description of the listed elements of informed consent.

Signature _____ Date _____

Position _____

Witness _____ Date _____

One copy of this form, signed and witnessed, must be given to each subject. A second copy must be retained by the investigator for filing with the Chariman of the Human Subjects Review Committee. A third copy may be made for the investigator's files.

APPENDIX D

TWU Texas Woman's University
P.O. Box 22479, Denton, Texas 76204 (817) 383-2302, Metro 434-1757, Tex-An 834-2133
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

January 28, 1982

Mrs. Julie Grossman Schaefer
1129 Brandy Station
Richardson, TX 75080

Dear Mrs. Schaefer:

Thank you very much for sending written authorization of clearance.

I have placed the clearance with the prospectus of your study and have noted that final approval has now been given the prospectus.

I look forward to seeing the results of your study.

Sincerely yours,

Robert S. Pawlowski
Provost

dl

cc Dr. Edward Wylie
Dr. Ernest O. Watkins

APPENDIX E

RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM
DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Instructions: (1) Complete this form (please type). (2) Attach a concise abstract (three or less single-spaced pages, typewritten) summarizing the nature of the study, the primary references in the literature supporting its need, and its expected applied or theoretical value. (3) Include one sample of all forms, questionnaires, and tests (except those of the District's System-wide Testing Program) that you plan to administer to District personnel or students in data-collection. (4) Submit the above to: Division of Accountability and Development, Room 101, 3700 Ross Avenue (Box 6), Dallas, Texas 75204.

Name: Julie Eakes Schaefer Address: 1129 Brandy Station, Richardson, Texas 75080

Professional Address: Cabell/NW Sub-district, Box 154 Phone: 247-4202 Date: 11/11/81

Designate the targeted area(s) and topic(s) specified in the applied research plan developed by the Department of Research, Evaluation and Information Systems (Report No. 76-892) that the study would impact. If not applicable, please type "NONE."

Area of Study Classroom management

Specific Topic School attitude

1. Title of study: Parent and Teacher Attitudinal Differences on Behaviors of Urban Middle School Male Learning Disabled Students

2. Major hypotheses/questions to be investigated: The purpose of the study is to measure if there are attitudinal differences of parents and resource room teachers concerning behaviors of male urban middle school learning disabled students.

3. Summary and/or rationale: P.L. 94-142 requires a multidisciplinary approach, including parents to assessing and planning for the child. It is therefore important in facilitating communication between the parent and teacher that similar perspectives be present as far as behavioral factors are concerned.

4. Student population(s) or data desired (describe in detail): One parent/guardian and one resource room teacher of approximately 100 urban middle school male learning disabled students will be given the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist to fill out regarding the behavior of their selected child/student. All students will be enrolled

5. Titles of instruments (forms, questionnaires, tests, etc.) to be used for data collection: Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist (1975)

6. Procedures planned for implementing treatment(s), administering instruments, and/or collecting data from school records: Students will be selected randomly from a computerized list of all possible male middle school learning disabled students enrolled in the DISD school on a non-self contained basis. One parent/guardian and one resource room teacher of approximately 100 students will be given the Quay-Peterson to fill out. The parent/teacher will be given the following verbal and written instructions; instructions to parents will be in parenthesis, "On the attached page, some common behavior problems of children are described. Please read each description and decide whether or not it represents a problem as far as the selected student (your child) is

#4 continued

in a Dallas Independent School District middle school resource room on the basis of a major handicapping condition of learning disabled for at least one hour a day but no more than three hours a day. Ages included will be twelve years no months, to fourteen years eleven months.

#6 continued

concerned. If an item represents a problem mark an X in the space provided. If an item does not represent a problem, leave the space blank."

Teachers will be given instructions by the investigator. Parents/ guardians will be given instructions by the participating resource room teacher as part of a parent/teacher conference. The checklists will be sent back to the investigator upon completion. No names or any form of identification other than a code differentiation between parent and teacher responses will be used on the forms.

The attached consent form (Texas Woman's University Human Subjects Review Committee Form B) will be used to gain consent from the participating parent and teacher. If either parent or teacher is unwilling to sign a consent form and/or participate in the study he will be released from the study as will the name of the selected student.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM

7. Design and statistical techniques planned for data analysis: The SPSS Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test concerning agreement between two cumulative distributions will be used. If the hypothesis is rejected, the chi-square will be used to determine which items on the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist are different.
8. Expected beginning date and completion date of study: In the form of an abstract.

9. Form in which findings will be reported:

"I, the applicant, do hereby agree that I will abide by the policies and regulations of the Dallas Independent School District and will furnish a copy of the abstract and report describing the findings of the study to the Associate Superintendent - Accountability/Development."

Signature of Applicant

If you are presently a student, please ask the professional sponsoring your research (i.e., major professor, chairperson of your advisory committee, department head, etc.) to sign the following:

"I am familiar with the proposed study and feel that the researcher submitting this proposal is professionally qualified to undertake this investigation. I also believe the research design to be valid and appropriate."

Signature of Sponsoring Professional

Position or Title

Name of Department and Institution

FOR DISTRICT USE ONLY

Date approved
Assigned to for coordination
Associate Superintendent Accountability/Development

The purpose of the study is to measure if there are attitudinal differences of parents and resource room teachers concerning behaviors of male urban middle school learning disabled students.

Educators continue to find behavior problems a major concern (Long, Morse & Newman, 1971; Morse, 1977). Students with acting-out behaviors are time consuming, irritating, interfering and frustrating. Urban school systems, with their plurality of education and complex environments, face perplexing concerns, many of which are manifested in disruptive student behaviors which eventually lead to crisis situations in which students, teachers, and parents express a need for better coping skills.

Although outdated, one of the more respected studies shows that only 10% of the disruptive students are in classes for the emotionally disturbed and/or behaviorally disordered (Bowers, 1960) where behavior is dealt with as part of the educational process. The other 90% may be in placements where the main theme is academic growth and therefore are being dealt with in a rather haphazard manner, or may have a pattern of nonattendance and eventually drop out around the eighth grade (Berry, 1974; Graves, 1976).

As long as he can be labeled/certified learning disabled, mentally retarded, or is generally functioning two to three years below academic grade level, the resource room has become a good dumping ground for the student with a behavior problem (Morse, 1977).

The labeling is a result of special education wavering between the concept of the total child and the concept of labeling/certifying the child. The P.L. 94-142 mandate protects the rights of the child by making sure he is certified, labeled and categorized before he can receive any special help (Morris & Arrant, 1978; Morse, 1977). Conversely, this may mean that many students with behavior problems are not getting help and that many may be mislabeled and/or certified in order to place them in classrooms for the emotionally disturbed or in resource rooms (Hampe, 1975). In the regular urban school setting many disruptive students are being suspended or placed in special education classrooms because the regular classroom teacher often has fears about classroom control deteriorating (Morse, 1977). Unfortunately many resource rooms are organized in such a manner as to deal with academics and not behaviors since there is such a heterogeneous student population. With an influx of students with behavior problems in the resource room, teachers of resourced students are beginning to express a need for training in classroom and behavior management techniques.

The middle school age has become a concern for various reasons: expectations of self and important others are changing and perceptible physiological and emotional changes as well. These combined changes increase the possibility of behavior problems.

The middle-school (seventh and eighth grade) special education teachers are responding to students with conduct problems by expressing needs for determining if their opinions are shared by parents (Pattavina & Gotts, 1979; Swift & Back, 1973).

Several studies have substantiated teacher's abilities to act as effective observers of student's behavior patterns (Bullock & Brown, 1972; Harth & Glavin, 1971; Nelson, 1971; Westman, Bermann & Rice, 1967). Generally, teachers with whom the student has contact, will perceive a student with a behavior disorder and it is assumed that the behavior disorder appears at home (Cassel, 1964; Kaufman, Swan & Wood, 1979; Quay & Quay, 1965). There are few studies which measure parent and teacher attitudes of child behaviors. The results of these are somewhat contradictory and utilize a primary pupil population (Auger, 1975; Becker, 1960; Cassel, 1964; Kaufman et al., 1979; Morris & Arrant, 1978; Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker & Quay, 1959; Peterson, Becker, Shoemaker, Luria & Hellmer, 1961; Quay, Sprague, Shulman & Miller, 1966; Ribner, Bittlingmaier & Breslin, 1976; Speer, 1971). There are few studies which compare the parent and teacher attitudes of secondary students, possibly because behaviors at this age level are most often situational (Ribner et al., 1976; Quay & Werry, 1979).

There are important implications of a common behavioral vantage point between parents and teachers. P.L. 94-142 requires a multidisciplinary approach, including parents to assessing and planning for the child (Department of Special Education, 1979). It is therefore important in facilitating communication between the parent and teacher that similar perspectives be present as far as behavioral factors are concerned (Kaufman et al., 1979). Other possible implications for the study might be: 1) a determination of a percent behavior/conduct problem students are among the learning disabled resource room male student population; 2) to describe the general observable behaviors (not types of individuals) of learning disabled resource room male students in order to facilitate diagnosis and placement of children; 3) as an aid in pre-service teacher training and encouragement for greater emphasis on preparation for classroom behavior management.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auger, T. Differences in child symptom ratings among teachers and parents of emotionally disturbed children. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 867-873.

Becker, W.C. The relationship of factors in parental ratings of self and each other to the behavior of kindergarten children as rated by mothers, father, and teachers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1960, 24 507-527.

Berry, G. L. Self concept and need factors of inner-city high school adolescents and dropouts. Child Study Journal, 1974, 4, 1.

Bowers, E. M. Early identification of emotionally handicapped children in school. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1960.

Bullock, L. M., & Brown, R. K., Behavioral dimensions of emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 740-741.

Cassel, R. N. A comparison of teacher and parent ratings on the child behavior rating scale for 800 primary pupils. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 57(8), 437-439.

Department of Special Education. Policies and administrative procedures for the education of handicapped students (TEA publication ADO 871 01). Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1979.

Graves, M. S. The race for attendance. Instructor, 1976, 86(2), 70-73.

Hampe, E. Parents' and teachers' perceptions of personality characteristics of children selected for classes for the learning disabled. Psychological Reports, 1975, 31(1), 183-189.

Harth, R., & Glavin, J. P. Validity of teacher rating as a subtest for screening emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 1971, 37, 605-606.

Kaufman, A. T., Swan, W. W. & Wood, M. M. Dimensions of problem behaviors of em ally disturbed children as seen by their parents and teachers. Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16(2), 207-217.

Long, N., Morse, W., & Newman, R. (Eds.). Conflict in the classroom (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Morris, J. D., & Arrant, D. Behavior ratings of emotionally disturbed children by teachers, parents, and school psychologists. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15 (3), 450-456.

Morse, W. Serving the needs of individuals with behavior disorders. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44, 158-164.

Nelson, C. M. Techniques for screening conduct disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1970-1971, 37, 501-507.

Pattavina, P., & Gotts, E. A generic teaching guide. Unpublished report used during in-service training by CONSERT Project, School of Human Development, University of Texas at Dallas, 1979.

Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.

Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Shoemaker, D. J., Luria, Z., & Hellmer, L. A. Child behavior problems and parental attitudes. Child Development, 1961, 32, 151-162.

Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. Manual for the behavior problem checklist. D. R. Peterson, 39 North Fifth Avenue, Highland Park, N. J. 08904. 1975.

Quay, H. C., & Quay, L. C. Behavior problems in early adolescence. Child Development, 1965, 36, 215-220.

Quay, H. C., Sprague, R. C., Shulman, H. S., & Miller, A. L. Some correlates of personality disorder and conduct disorder in a child guidance clinic sample. Psychology in the Schools, 1966, 3. 44-47.

Quay, H. C., & Werry, J. S. Psychopathological disorders of childhood. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972 (2nd edition, 1979).

Ribner, S., Bittlingmaier, B., & Breslin, E. T. A comparison of parent and teacher perceptions of the behavior of exceptional children. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69(9), 345-348.

Speer, D. C. Behavior problem checklist (Peterson-Quay): Base-line data from parents of child guidance and nonclinic children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 221-228.

Swift, M. & Back, L. A method for aiding teachers of the troubled adolescent. Adolescence, 1923, 8(29), 1-16.

Westman, J. C., Bermann, E., & Rice, D. L. Nursery school behavior and later school adjustment. American School of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37, 725-731.

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright
General Superintendent

January 19, 1982

Ms Julie Schaefer
1129 Brandy Station
Richardson, TX 75080

Dear Ms. Schaefer:

This letter is to acknowledge receipt and review of your research proposal entitled, "Parent and Teacher Attitudinal Differences on Behaviors of Urban Middle School Male Learning Disabled Students." This specific proposal has been reviewed by the learning administrators and found to be consistent with departmental information needs, therefore, we are designating Dr. Ruth Turner as a contact person, who can facilitate the implementation of this particular study. Upon completion and approval of this particular study, we request that a copy of it be forwarded to my department for depositing in the District archives.

Thank you for your continued interest in this District's programs, and good luck in your studies.

Sincerely,

William J. Webster

William Webster
Associate Superintendent
Accountability

fm

cc: Ruth Turner
Allen Sullivan

3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204, 214/824-1620

APPENDIX F

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright
General Superintendent

February 9, 1982

Dear Principal:

This is to introduce Mrs. Julie Schaefer. Mrs. Schaefer is doing research comparing parent and teacher attitudes on behaviors of middle school male learning disabled students. A few students enrolled in your school have been selected for the study. The study involves teachers and parents completing a brief behavior checklist. This will take minimal teacher time.

This study has been reviewed and accepted by the DISD learning administrators; your cooperation in its implementation would be appreciated. If you have any questions about the research, further information can be provided by Mrs. Schaefer.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ruth Turner

Ruth Turner
Director
Special Education

Approved: Allen R Sullivan

Allen R. Sullivan
Assistant Superintendent
Student Support Services

3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204, 214/824-1620

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright
General Superintendent

February 9, 1982

Dear Teacher:

This is to introduce Mrs. Julie Schaefer. Mrs. Schaefer is doing research comparing parent and teacher attitudes on behaviors of middle school male learning disabled students. A few students enrolled in your school have been selected for the study. The study involves teachers and parents completing a brief behavior checklist. This will take minimal teacher time.

This study has been reviewed and accepted by the DISD learning administrators; your cooperation in its implementation would be appreciated. If you have any questions about the research, further information can be provided by Mrs. Schaefer.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ruth Turner

Ruth Turner
Director
Special Education

Approved: Allen R. Sullivan

Allen R. Sullivan
Assistant Superintendent
Student Support Services

3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204, 214/824-1620

APPENDIX G

WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS

You will find a packet for each student you are to do a behavior check on. Within each packet you will find the following:

1. plain stamped envelope
2. stamped envelope addressed to me
3. cover sheet with student's name on
4. two behavior problem checklists, one with P (parent) and one with T (teacher)
5. a letter addressed to the parent explaining what the parent is to do
6. two consent forms with a blue "x" and a red "x"

I am also providing you with a copy of the letter to the parent for your use and to assist in answering questions as well as a letter signed by Ruth Turner and Al Sullivan. I have also spoken with your school principal and he has given me permission to ask you to participate in the research. If you are willing to assist in the project, I am asking that you sign a consent form for the university (TWU) and a copy will be provided for your files (13 or whatever).

These are the general instructions for you to follow:-------

1. Contact by phone as soon as possible the parents (or guardian) of the selected students and explain about the study asking for their assistance. If the parent can, have them come into the school for a conference. If the parent is unable to come in, explain how to fill out the checklist.
2. Fill out the behavior checklist marked with a "T" at the top.
3. Sign your signature (A. Hitler, Harpootmanoogie and/or Ronald Reagan are inappropriate) and date all consent forms where the blue "X" is. Write resource room teacher where it says "position".
4. Address the plain stamped envelope to the home if the parent can't come into the school and enclose within this envelope: the envelope addressed to me, the letter to the parent, the behavior checklist with "P" at the top and the 2 consent forms you have signed on the bottom.
5. mail the letter/s to the parent/s.
6. In the DISD blue lined envelope, enclose all behavior checklists you have filled out and place that envelope in the school mail.
7. Pat yourself on the back. You have done a wonderful job.

I really appreciate your help. If there are any questions please contact me at my office (247-4202) or home (699-8884).

Sincerely,

Julie Schaefer

Julie Schaefer

APPENDIX H

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright
General Superintendent

February 12, 1982

Dear Parent:

Your child has been selected as a subject for research that I am doing in cooperation with the DISD special education department. The research is on your attitudes on behavior and your child's resource room teacher's attitudes on behavior. The study has been reviewed and accepted by the DISD learning administrators. The resource room teacher has probably already contacted you about the study.

You will find enclosed two (2) consent forms titled "Texas Woman's University Human Subjects Review Committee", a Behavior Problem Checklist, and an envelope addressed to me. The Behavior Problem Checklist describes some common behavior problems of children. Please read each description on the checklist and decide whether or not it represents a problem behavior as far as your child is concerned. If the behavior represents a problem for your child please mark an X on the space provided. If the behavior does not represent a problem, leave the space blank. You may find a few, many or none of the behaviors represent a problem for your child. When you have completed the checklist, enclose it in the envelope addressed to me. Also, sign your name on one (1) of the consent forms and include it in the envelope. The other consent form is for you to keep. Your answers on the checklist will be kept private. You will notice there are no markings on the form other than a blue P to indicate it is a parent responding. To repeat:

1. Fill in the checklist
2. Sign one of the consent forms
3. Place both the checklist and consent form (signed) in the envelope addressed to me
4. Seal and mail the envelope or give the envelope to the teacher

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call me.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. Please do this as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Julie Schaefer

Julie Schaefer (247-4202)

3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204, 214/824-1620

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M. The classification of children's psychiatric symptoms: A factor analytic study. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(7).

Auger, T. Differences in child symptom ratings among teachers and parents of emotionally disturbed children. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 867-873.

Bain, W. E. A study of the attitudes of teachers toward behavior problems. Child Development, 1934, 5, 19-35.

Bard, J. A., Sidwell, R. T., & Wittenbrook, J. M. A practical classification for emotionally disturbed children treated in a welfare setting. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1955, 121, 568-572.

Becker, W. C. The relationship of factors in parental ratings of self and each other to the behavior of kindergarten children as rated by mothers, fathers, and teachers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1960, 24, 507-527.

Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Heller, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. Factors in parental behavior and personality as related to problem behavior in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 107-118.

Beilin, H. Teachers' and clinicians' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children: A reappraisal. Child Development, 1959, 30, 9-25.

Berry, G. L. Self concept and need factors of inner-city high school adolescents and dropouts. Child Study Journal, 1974, 4, 1.

Bowers, E. M. Early identification of emotionally handicapped children in school. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1960.

Bradfield, R. H., Brown, J., Kaplan, P., Rickert, E., & Stannard, R. The special child in the regular classroom. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 384-390.

Brewer, J. E. A checklist of child behavior problems for use by parents. Wichita Guidance Center, Wichita, 1961.

Bullock, L. M., & Brown, R. K. Behavioral dimensions of emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 740-741.

Cassel, R. N. The child behavior rating scale manual. Los Angeles, Ca.: Western Psychological Services, 1962.

Cassel, R. N. A comparison of teacher and parent ratings on the child behavior rating scale for 800 primary pupils. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 57(8), 437-439.

Collins, L. F., Maxwell, A. E., & Cameron, K. A factor analysis of some child psychiatric clinic data. Journal of Mental Science, 1962, 108, 274-284.

Conners, C. K. A teacher rating scale for use in drug studies with children. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126, 884-888.

Department of Special Education. Policies and administrative procedures for the education of handicapped students (TEA publication ADO 871 01). Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1979.

Engel, M. The development of a scale to be used in play therapy research. Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science, 1955, 58, 561-565.

Glavin, J. P., & Annesley, F. R. Reading and arithmetic correlates of conduct problem and withdrawn children. The Journal of Special Education, 1971, 5(3), 213-219.

Glavin, J. P., & DeGirolamo, G. Spelling errors of withdrawn and conduct problem children. The Journal of Special Education, 1970, 4, 199-204.

Glavin, J. P., Quay, H. C., Annesley, F. R., & Werry, J. S. An experimental resource room for behavior problem children. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 131-137.

Gordon, C. P., & Gallimore, R. Teacher ratings of behavior problems in Hawaiian-American adolescents. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1972, 3(2), 209-213.

Graubard, P. S. Psycholinguistic correlates of reading disability in disturbed delinquent children. The Journal of Special Education, 1967, 1, 363-368.

Graves, M. S. The race for attendance. Instructor, 1976, 86(2), 70-73.

Haggerty, M. E. The incidence of undesirable behavior in public school children. Journal of Educational Research, 1925, XII, 102-122.

Hampe, E. Parents' and teachers' perceptions of personality characteristics of children selected for classes for the learning disabled. Psychological Reports, 1975, 31(1), 183-189.

Harth, R., & Glavin, J. P. Validity of teacher rating as a subtest for screening emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1970-1971, 37, 605-606.

Hewett, K. M., & Forness, S. R. Education of exceptional learners (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Hewett, L. E., & Jenkins, R. L. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: The dynamics of their origin. Springfield, Ill.: Green, 1946.

Hunter, E. C. Changes in teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior over the last thirty years. Mental Hygiene, 1957, 41, 3-11.

Kaufman, A. T., Swan, W. W., & Wood, M. M. Dimensions of problem behaviors of emotionally disturbed children as seen by their parents and teachers. Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16(2), 207-217.

Langhorne, J. E., Loney, J., Paternite, C. E., & Bechtold, H. P. Childhood hyperkinesis: A return to the source. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1976, 85(2), 201-209.

Laycock, W. R. Teachers' reactions of maladjustments of school children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1934, 4, 11-19.

Lessing, E. E., & Schilling, F. H. Relationship between treatment selection variables and treatment outcome in a child guidance clinic: An application of data-processing methods. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 1966, 5, 313-348.

Lessing, E. E., & Zagorin, S. W. Dimensions of psychopathology in middle childhood as evaluated by three symptom checklists. Educational and Psychological Measurements, 1971, 31(1), 175-198.

Lewis, W. W. Continuity and intervention in emotional disturbance: A review. Exceptional Children, 1965, 31, 465-475.

Long, N., Morse, W., & Newman R. (Eds.). Conflict in the Classroom (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

McCarthy, J. M., & Paraskevopoulos, J. Behavior patterns of learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and average children. Exceptional Children, 1969, 15, 69-74.

McClure, W. E. Characteristics of problem children based on judgments of teachers. Journal of Juvenile Research, 1929, 13, 124-140.

Miller, L. C. Louisville behavior checklist for males, 6-12 years of age. Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 885-896.

Mitchell, J. C. A study of teachers' and of mental-hygienists' ratings of certain behavior problems of children. Journal of Educational Research, 1942, 36, 292-307.

Morris, J. D., & Arrant, D. Behavior ratings of emotionally disturbed children by teachers, parents, and school psychologists. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15(3), 450-456.

Morse, W. Serving the needs of individuals with behavior disorders. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44, 158-164.

Nelson, C. M. Techniques for screening conduct disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1970-1971, 37, 501-507.

O'Grady, D. J. Psycholinguistic abilities in learning-disabled, emotionally disturbed, and normal children. The Journal of Special Education, 1947, 8(2), 157-165.

Paraskevopoulos, J., & McCarthy, J. M. Behavior patterns of children with special learning disabilities. Psychology in the Schools, 1970, 7, 42-46.

Pattavina, P., & Gotts, E. A generic teaching guide. Unpublished manuscript used during in-service training, 1979. (Available from CONSERT Project, School of Human Development, University of Texas at Dallas.)

Peck, L. Teachers' reports of the problems of unadjusted school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1935, 26, 123-138.

Peterson, D. R. Behavior problems of middle childhood. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 205-209.

Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.

Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Shoemaker, D. J., Luria, Z., & Hellmer, L. A. Child behavior problems and parental attitudes. Child Development, 1961, 32, 151-162.

Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavior ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 1, 33-37.

Quay, H. C., Morse, W. C., & Cutler, R. L. Personality patterns of pupils in special classes for the emotionally disturbed. Exceptional Children, 1966, 12, 297-301.

Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. Manual for the behavior problem checklist. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Children's Research Center, 1967.

Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. Manual for the behavior problem checklist. D. R. Peterson, 39 North Fifth Avenue, Highland Park, N.J. 08904. 1975.

Quay, H. C., & Quay, L. C. Behavior problems in early adolescence. Child Development, 1965, 36, 215-220.

Quay, H. C., Sprague, R. C., Shulman, H. S., & Miller, A. L. Some correlates of personality disorder and conduct disorder in a child guidance clinic sample. Psychology in the Schools, 1966, 3, 44-47.

Quay, H. C., & Werry, J. S. Psychopathological disorders of childhood, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1979.

Quay, H. C., Werry, J. S., McQueen, M., & Sprague, R. L. Remediation of the conduct problem child in the special class setting. Exceptional Children, 1966, 12, 509-515.

Ribner, S., Bittlingmaier, B., & Breslin, E. T. A comparison of parent and teacher perceptions of the behavior of exceptional children. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69(9), 345-348.

Rogeness, G. A., Bednar, R. A., & Diesenhaus, H. The social system and children's behavior problems. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 44(4), 497-503.

Rutter, M. Classification and categorization in child psychiatry. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1965, 6, 71-83.

Schaefer, E. S., Aaronson, M., & Burgoon, B. Classroom behavior inventory. National Institute of Mental Health, 1966.

Schaefer, C., Baker, E., & Zawel, D. A factor analytic and reliability study of the Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 12, 295-300.

Schrupp, M. H., & Gjerde, C. M. Teacher growth in attitudes toward behavior problems in children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, 203-214.

Sklarz, D. P. Behavioral teacher. The Clearing House, 1979, 52(9), 429-430.

Sparks, J. N. Teachers' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, 284-291.

Speer, D. C. Behavior problem checklist (Peterson-Quay): Base-line data from parents of child guidance and nonclinic children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 221-228.

Spivack, G., & Swift, M. Devereaux elementary school behavior scale manual. Devon, PA.: The Devereaux Foundation, 1967.

Stevens, G. Bias in attributions of positive and negative behavior in children by school psychologists, parents and teachers. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1980, 50, 1283-1290.

Stouffer, G. A. W. Behavior problems of children as viewed by teachers and mental hygienists. Mental Hygiene, 1952, 36, 271-285.

Stouffer, G. A. W., & Owens, J. Behavior problems of children as identified by today's teachers and compared with those reported by E. K. Wickman. Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 48(5), 321-331.

Swift, M., & Back, L. A method for aiding teachers of the troubled adolescent. Adolescence, 1923, 8(29), 1-16.

Swift, M. S., & Spivack, G. Academic success and classroom behavior in secondary schools. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 392-399.

Tolar, A., Scarpetti, W. L., & Lane, P. A. Teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior revisited. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58(3), 175-180.

Ullman, C. A. Identification of maladjusted school children. Public Health Monogram No. 7. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

Von Isser, A., Quay, H. C., & Love, C. R. Interrelationships among three measures of deviant behavior. Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 272-276.

Walker, H. M. The acting-out child: Coping with classroom disruption. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Webb, T. E., & Oski, F. A. Behavioral status of young adolescents with iron deficiency anemia. The Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8(2), 153-156.

Westman, J. C., Bermann, E., & Rice, D. L. Nursery school behavior and later school adjustment. American School of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37, 725-731.

Wickman, E. K. Children's behavior and teachers' attitudes. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

Winetsky, C. S. Comparison of the expectations of parents and teachers for the behavior of preschool children. Child Development, 1978, 49(4), 1146-1154.

Zold, A. C., & Speer, D. C. Follow-up study of child guidance patients by means of the Behavior Problem Checklist. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 219-524.