

1968

A Comparison of the Needs and Values of Graduating Prospective Teachers of Special Education and The Needs and Values of Graduating Prospective Teachers of Regular Education

Steven Wilbur Baker
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baker, Steven Wilbur, "A Comparison of the Needs and Values of Graduating Prospective Teachers of Special Education and The Needs and Values of Graduating Prospective Teachers of Regular Education" (1968). *All Master's Theses*. 802.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/802>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

A COMPARISON OF THE NEEDS AND VALUES OF GRADUATING
PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND
THE NEEDS AND VALUES OF GRADUATING PROSPECTIVE
TEACHERS OF REGULAR EDUCATION

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Steven Wilbur Baker

June, 1968

LD

5771.3

B168c

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

170949

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Hyrum S. Henderson, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Dohn A. Miller

Daryl Basler

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members and Jim Olson for their help and participation in this paper. The many hours spent by Dr. Henderson and Jim helping lay the groundwork and giving helpful suggestions were especially appreciated. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Miller, whose efforts helped make this year's studies possible.

Most of all, I wish to thank Linda and Jollee, my wife and daughter, for their continued support and willingness to make sacrifices this year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Hypotheses of the Study	3
Terms Used in the Study	5
Needs and values	6
Special education	6
Regular education	6
Exceptional children	6
Graduating prospective teachers of special education	6
Incoming prospective teachers of special education	6
Incoming prospective teachers of regular education	7
Related Research	7
II. METHOD	10
Subjects	10
Instruments	10
Procedures Used in the Study	13

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. RESULTS	15
IV. DISCUSSION	22
Research Implications	26
V. SUMMARY	28
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIXES	33

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. "t" Test Statistical Levels of Confidence for Various Comparisons on the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule	16
2. "t" Test Statistical Comparisons of Various Groups on the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values . .	18
3. "t" Test Statistical Comparisons of Various Groups on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule . . .	19

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally there has been a shortage of special education teachers (President's Panel on Mental Retardation, 1962) which has not been alleviated within recent years (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1960). This summons the question as to whether unique personality traits are helpful or necessary to successfully teach special education classes. As a vocational choice should satisfy basic needs (Forer, 1953) it would behoove educators to have at their disposal a list of those personality traits needed for a teacher to satisfactorily teach special education. This, of course, rests on the assumption that a basic core of personality traits should be possessed by successful special education teachers, and furthermore that these traits can be identified. Once identified, experimental techniques would be needed to determine their practical value (Meisgeier, 1965).

Purpose of the Study

Research in the area of special education teachers by Reginald L. Jones and by James Olson served as a guideline for the present study. Jones wrote an article, which appeared in the Exceptional Children Journal, December, 1966,

indicating the need for a three phased program doing research on special education teachers. The three phases are: (a) delineation of the status of certain areas of special education teaching as occupational areas, the images held of these areas and their practitioners, and the relationship of the images of special education teaching compared to the images of other occupations; (b) a delineation of the actual unique characteristics and experiences possessed by special education practitioners, as compared to persons in other occupational areas; and (c) a meshing of data obtained from the two analyses above, taking account of the interactions among variables where appropriate (Jones, 1966). Olson (1968) directed a study toward the second phase stated in Jones' article. Olson's study, an unpublished master's thesis, compared the needs and values of college students entering the special education and regular education programs.

Aside from Olson's study little has been done to compare the special education teacher or prospective teacher to other occupational areas. The literature indicates that several studies have been done on the special education teacher, but these have failed to cast him against other groups (Jones, 1966).

The purpose of the present study is three-fold. This study compared the needs and values of graduating prospective regular education teachers to graduating prospective special education teachers by the use of the Edwards Personal

Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. Also, this study compared the results of these graduating prospective teachers to results obtained in a comparison of entering prospective special education and regular education teachers (Olson, 1968). Finally, the results from this study were compared to the general college normative samples available for the two instruments used in Olson's study and this study (Edwards, 1959; Allport, Vernon, Lindzey, 1960). The statistical data obtained revealed if there was or was not a significant difference between the needs and values of each group of graduating prospective teachers, and between these groups and the general college normative samples as measured by these instruments.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of graduating prospective teachers of special education and the needs and values of the prospective teacher of regular education as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was postulated.

2. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of graduating prospective teachers of special education and the needs and values of graduating prospective teachers of regular education as measured by the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values was postulated.

3. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of special education and the needs and values of the incoming prospective teacher of special education as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was postulated.

4. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of special education and the needs and values of the incoming prospective teacher of special education as measured by the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values was postulated.

5. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of regular education and the needs and values of the incoming prospective teacher of regular education as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was postulated.

6. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of regular education and the needs and values of the incoming prospective teacher of regular education as measured by the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values was postulated.

7. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of special education and the needs and values of the general college normative sample as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was postulated.

8. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of graduating prospective teachers of special education and the needs and values of the general college normative sample as measured by the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values was postulated.

9. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of regular education and the needs and values of the general college normative sample as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was postulated.

10. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the needs and values of the graduating prospective teacher of regular education and the needs and values of the general college normative sample as measured by the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values was postulated.

11. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the cumulative grade point average of the graduating prospective teacher of special education and the cumulative grade point average of the graduating prospective teacher of regular education, based on a four point scale, was postulated.

Terms Used in the Study

The following terms need defining within the scope of this study:

Needs and Values

For the purpose of this study, the term refers to the 15 manifest needs of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the six basic values of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values.

Special Education

This term refers to that area of education designated for those pupils unable to benefit from the regular education programs.

Regular Education

The term refers to that area of education designated for those pupils who are able to benefit from typical academic, and/or social, and/or physical instruction.

Exceptional Children

This is a term referring to those pupils who are unable to benefit from the regular education program.

Graduating Prospective Teachers of Special Education

This refers to those college students, enrolled in a Special Education 490 (Seminar in Special Education), who have completed all other education program requirements for certification in Washington State.

Incoming Prospective Teachers of Special Education

This refers to those college students enrolled in a

Special Education 343 (Education of Exceptional Children) class and who do plan to major or minor in special education.

Incoming Prospective Teachers of Regular Education

This term refers to those college students enrolled in an Education 307 (Introduction to Education) class, and who do not plan to major or minor in special education.

Related Research

A review of the literature revealed that studies have been done on the needs and values that prospective and employed teachers in special education possess. Most of these studies, however, have been confined to the traits of the special education teacher without comparison to other areas (Jones, 1966).

Olson (1968), conducted a study similar to the present one. The study compared needs and values of entering prospective teachers of special education and regular education enrolled at Central Washington State College, using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. The results indicated significant differences on the following: (1) the prospective special education teachers were significantly higher (.05 level) on the Abasement need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; (2) the special education group was significantly higher (.01 and .02 levels) on the Social and Religious values respectively of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values; (3) the regular

education group was significantly higher (.02 level) on the Political value of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. Olson concluded that "the study did indicate significant differences in certain areas, but it made clear that there is also a very strong correlation on a number of the needs and values of these two groups."

Jones and Gottfried (1966) directed a study at the prestige of special education teachers as compared to regular education teachers. The 138 college undergraduates and practicing teachers completed a paired comparison questionnaire which yielded results showing that special education teachers of all exceptionalities possessed higher prestige than regular teachers.

Meisgeier (1965) used a five point criteria to identify the characteristics of successful student teachers of mentally or physically handicapped children. Several instruments and records constituted the criteria of scholastic aptitude, scholastic achievement, educational or vocational interest, personality, and attitudes toward children and teaching. Of the 19 correlation variables which measured the five criteria at or beyond the .05 level, six were found to be significant at the .01 level. Five examples of these need variables are vigor, dominance, enthusiasm, stability, and responsibility.

A study implying that special education teachers possess different needs and values than other teachers was conducted by Badt (1957). Two groups, consisting of education and

non-education college students at the University of Illinois, were used to determine attitudes toward exceptional children and different areas of special education. Both groups reported unfavorable attitudes towards many of the exceptionality areas. Education students were found almost as reluctant as non-education students to accept exceptional children as a group.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 48 college students enrolled in the education sequence at Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington. The graduating prospective special education teachers were enrolled in Special Education 490 (Seminar in Special Education) and included 21 tested for both the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. All of these students, 7 males and 14 females, were completing a minor in special education. The graduating prospective regular education teachers were enrolled in Education 490 (Seminar in Education) and included 29 tested for both of the tests. All of these students, 12 males and 17 females tested on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and 13 males and 16 females tested on the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values, were completing the education sequence but none indicated a minor in special education.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were selected primarily because they afforded valuable comparisons to the groups

tested by Olson (1968). A review of the literature and the Buros Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook indicated that the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values were both promising instruments. Both are relatively easy to administer and score.

Allan L. Edwards developed the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) at the University of Washington in 1953-1954. This test purports to measure 15 needs originating from the manifest needs theorized by H. A. Murray and others (Edwards, 1959; Hall and Lindzey, 1957). These needs are: (1) achievement, (2) deference, (3) order, (4) exhibition, (5) autonomy, (6) affiliation, (7) intraception, (8) succorance, (9) dominance, (10) abasement, (11) nurturance, (12) change, (13) endurance, (14) heterosexuality, (15) aggression. A detailed explanation of these needs is supplied in the appendix of the present study. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule has incorporated strength by the addition of two features. First is a forced-choice technique which makes the testee choose between two equally desirable or undesirable statements (Edwards, 1953). This helps negate the role of social desirability in all but two categories, succorance and endurance. However, the correlations between these two variables and a measure of social desirability are only $-.32$ and $.32$ respectively. The second feature measures consistency of response on 15 identical sets of questions scattered throughout the other 210 items. This measure, the consistency

score, represents the number of agreements between the identical repeated statements.

The reliability coefficients are quite high ranging from .60 to .87 for internal consistency (split-half, $N = 1509$), and from .74 to .87 for a stability coefficient (test-retest, one week interval, $N = 89$). These coefficients were based on results of tests administered to students from the 29 colleges comprising the college normative group.

A pure criterion is needed to measure a test's validity, or the extent to which it measures what it purports to measure (Noll, 1957). As a pure criterion is not available in the areas of personal needs and values, validity measures in these areas are virtually negligible. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule derives its validity from correlations with inventory and rating measurements (Buros, 1965; Bernarin and Jessor, 1957). Anastasi (1961) stated that "In its present state, the EPPS is a highly promising research instrument which has contributed several ingenious innovations in test construction (p. 518)."

The Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values is the 1960 edition of the 1951 revision of the original test published in 1931. The test is derived from Spranger's 6 types of men--theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious (Allport, Vernon, Lindzey, 1960). Spranger developed these types on the premise that personalities are best known through a study of a person's values or evaluative attitudes.

Reliability coefficients include a split-half reliability of .84 to .95, and stability coefficients from .77 to .92 and .84 to .93 (test-retest, one and two month intervals, respectively with $N = 34$ and $N = 53$). Validity measures were obtained from correlations with other interest and motivation measures (Guba and Getzels, 1956).

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values are adequate instruments of measurement for use in research in the area of needs and values of college students (Olson, 1968).

Procedures Used in the Study

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values were administered to the testing sample, graduating prospective teachers of special education in Special Education 490 and graduating prospective teachers of regular education in Education 490, at Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington. Each student was asked to identify himself by sex, age, and cumulative grade point average and to record his major and minor fields of study on the front cover of the test. The tests were numbered to allow the student to re-identify himself if he desired to see the results of his tests. Upon completion of the testing, the writer scored the tests and gathered the data for the final statistical analysis. This raw data, along with means and standard deviations from the study by Olson (1968) and the general and sex college norms

from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (1959) and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values (1960), was presented to the Data Processing Center at Central Washington State College. The following statistical analysis was obtained: a mean, standard deviation, variance, standard error, degree of freedom, and a "t" test on each of the 15 subtests plus the consistency score of both measures used. This information made it possible to determine if there was a significant difference between groups on any of the 15 subtests plus the consistency score of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, or any of the 6 subtests of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values, or cumulative grade point averages.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 present the "t" values, degrees of freedom, and those "t's" significant at or beyond the .05 level on comparisons between the various groups. Sex differences were included in the analysis. They were not used in the results and discussion, however, except to further clarify general findings, because of the small size of these samples. The means, standard deviations, and raw scores are listed in Appendix C.

Those hypotheses not rejected, according to their numbers which are stated on p. 3, include numbers 1, 3, 4, 10, and 11. Hypothesis 11, which compared the cumulative grade point averages disclosed the graduating prospective regular education teachers possessed 2.763 while the graduating prospective special education teachers possessed 2.745. The remainder of the results were concerned with the hypotheses that were rejected.

The graduating prospective teachers of special education scored higher (.001) on the social value of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values than the graduating prospective teachers of regular education (hypothesis #2).

TABLE 1

"t" TEST STATISTICAL LEVELS OF CONFIDENCE FOR VARIOUS COMPARISONS ON THE ALLPORT
VERNON LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES AND THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values								
	SE-M&W vs. Norm	SE-W vs. Norm	SE-M vs. Norm	RE-M vs. Norm	RE-M&W vs. SE-M&W	RE-M vs. SE-M	RE-W vs. SE-W	RE-M&W vs. Olson's Group
Theoretical								
Economic	SE-L .02	SE-L .02					SE-L .01	
Aesthetic				RE-H .01				
Social	SE-H.001	SE-H .01	SE-H.001		SE-H.001	SE-H .01	SE-H .02	RE-L .05
Political								
Religious			SE-L .01					
Cumulative Grade Point Averages	2.745	2.807	2.601	2.740				

KEY: SE = Special Education
RE = Regular Education
M&W = Men & women
M = Men
W = Women
Norm = College Normative Sample
L = Lower
H = Higher

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

	RE-M&W vs. Norm	RE-W vs. Norm	RE-M vs. Norm	SE-M&W vs. Norm	SE-M vs. Norm	RE-W vs. SE-W	RE-M&W vs. Olson's Group
Achievement	RE-L .01	RE-L .05	RE-L .05	SE-L .05	SE-L.001		
Deference		RE-L .05					
Order							
Exhibition							
Autonomy			RE-H .05				
Affiliation						SE-L .05	
Intracception				SE-H .01	SE-H .05		
Succorance							
Dominance	RE-L .05						
Abasement							
Nurturance				SE-H .02	SE-H .05		
Change		RE-H .01					
Endurance							RE-H .05
Heterosexuality							
Aggression							
Consistency			RE-L .02				
Cumulative Grade Point Averages	2.763	2.779	2.740	2.745	2.601		

TABLE 2

"t" TEST STATISTICAL COMPARISONS OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE
ALLPORT VERNON LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES

	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
RE-M&W vs. SE-M&W 48 df	- .277	1.987	.343	-4.378****	1.899	.604
RE-W vs. SE-W 28 df	- .552	2.784**	- .411	-2.644***	1.697	.088
RE-M vs. SE-M 18 df	- .160	.030	.929	-3.332**	.712	1.884
RE-M&W vs. Olson's RE 73 df	- .813	- .351	.718	-2.023*	- .499	1.532
SE-M&W vs. Olson's SE 54 df	.399	- .952	1.737	.968	- .216	-1.261
RE-M&W vs. Norm 3805 df	-1.430	- .061	1.433	- .129	.598	- .330
RE-W vs. Norm 1303 df	- .083	1.276	- .787	- .320	1.335	- .267
RE-M vs. Norm 2500 df	-1.421	- .809	2.313*	- .144	.052	- .426
SE-M&W vs. Norm 3797 df	- .774	-2.488***	1.019	5.701****	-1.971	-1.018
SE-W vs. Norm 1301 df	.609	-2.542***	- .386	3.296**	-1.078	- .347
SE-M vs. Norm 2494 df	- .906	- .553	.642	3.903****	- .861	-3.254**

*Significant at the .05 level; **at the .01 level; ***at the .02 level; **** at the .001 level.

TABLE 3

"t" TEST STATISTICAL COMPARISONS OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE
EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

	RE-M&W vs. SE-M&W 48 df	RE-W vs. SE-W 29 df	RE-M vs. SE-M 17 df	RE-M&W vs. Olson's RE group 60 df	SE-M&W vs. Olson's SE group 68 df
Achievement	- .424	-1.188	1.177	-1.248	- .681
Deference	-1.617	-2.004	- .081	- .442	1.445
Order	1.008	.264	1.400	1.538	.409
Exhibition	-1.298	-1.138	- .563	-1.111	1.480
Autonomy	- .424	- .611	.249	.761	.043
Affiliation	.798	2.213*	-1.133	- .310	-1.226
Intracception	-1.592	- .891	-1.283	- .710	.691
Succorance	.206	- .510	1.303	- .879	- .580
Dominance	- .334	- .446	- .784	-1.298	.285
Abasement	.123	.074	- .054	.237	-1.671
Nurturance	- .972	.415	-1.836	.517	1.119
Change	.858	1.716	.108	.701	- .814
Endurance	.987	1.020	.199	2.011*	- .266
Heterosexuality	.803	.742	.260	- .395	.539
Aggression	1.111	.450	.814	.253	- .250
Consistency Score	-1.617	- .768	-1.079	-1.063	1.419
Cumulative Grade Point Average	.190	- .266	.695		

*Significant at the .05 level.

	RE-M&W vs. Norm 1536 df	RE-W vs. Norm 764 df	RE-M vs. Norm 770 df	SE-M&W vs. Norm 1528 df	SE-W vs. Norm 761 df	SE-M vs. Norm 765 df
Achievement	-2.986**	-2.055*	-2.013*	-2.265*	- .266	-3.780****
Deference	-1.017	-2.209*	1.225	1.195	.674	.683
Order	.447	- .525	1.433	- .849	- .853	- .100
Exhibition	- .834	- .543	- .588	.841	1.005	.030
Autonomy	- .123	.820	- .802	.835	2.050*	- .685
Affiliation	.409	1.364	-1.405	-1.202	-1.721	- .694
Intracception	.379	.508	- .069	2.700**	1.477	2.185*
Succorance	- .631	-1.052	- .057	- .424	- .193	- .845
Dominance	-2.129*	-1.576	-1.197	-1.759	- .974	- .805
Abasement	.860	-1.506	1.621	.823	-1.281	1.665
Nurturance	.935	1.282	- .495	2.394***	.791	2.053*
Change	1.480	3.243**	-1.554	.329	.536	-1.073
Endurance	1.735	1.251	1.177	.018	- .064	.096
Heterosexuality	- .102	.984	-1.277	- .851	.146	- .559
Aggression	1.033	- .002	1.906	- .538	- .551	.877
Consistency Score	-1.255	.376	-2.358***	1.196	1.454	.205

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

***Significant at the .02 level.

****Significant at the .001 level.

Comparisons between the graduating prospective teachers of regular education and incoming prospective teachers of regular education showed the graduating sample to be higher (.05) on endurance need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (hypothesis #6).

Comparisons between the graduating prospective special education teachers and the college normative sample of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule revealed the special education sample scored lower (.05) on the achievement need. The special education sample was higher (.01) on the intra-ception need, and higher (.02) on the nurturance need (hypothesis #7). Comparisons between the graduating special education sample and the college normative sample of the Study of Values revealed the special education sample to be lower (.02) on the economic value. The special education sample was higher (.001) on the social value (hypothesis #8).

Comparisons between the graduating prospective regular education teachers and the college normative sample of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule showed the regular education sample to be lower (.01) on the achievement need. The regular education sample was lower on the dominance need (hypothesis #9).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

A comparative study was conducted on the needs and values of two groups of graduating prospective teachers, those completing the regular education sequence and those completing the special education sequence. These groups were compared to similar groups entering the sequences (Olson, 1968), and to the college normative samples (Edwards, 1959; Allport Vernon Lindzey, 1960). The two instruments used in this study were the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. The special education sample was enrolled in Special Education 490 (Seminar in Special Education), and the regular education sample was enrolled in Education 490 (Seminar in Education).

The 15 variables of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, which are based on the 15 manifest needs of Murray, et. al. (1938), were used to measure the needs of various groups. Also used were the six values of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values based upon Spranger's types of men (Allport Vernon Lindzey, 1960).

Comparisons between graduating prospective teachers of special education and regular education revealed no significant differences on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The special education sample scored significantly higher on the social value of the Study of Values. The social value includes kindness, sympathy, and unselfishness. All teachers would be expected to possess these qualities; the regular education sample was not abnormally low in this area. The special education group's higher score in this area may reveal the characteristics which motivate it to work with a child possessing exceptionalities and who perhaps needs more kindness and sympathy.

Comparisons between the graduating prospective special education teachers and incoming prospective special education teachers revealed no significant differences on either measure. Comparisons between graduating prospective regular education and incoming prospective regular education teachers revealed a significant difference on each measure. The graduating regular education sample scored significantly higher on the endurance need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Endurance includes the ability or desire to keep at a job until it is finished, even though it may involve long hours without observable progress. This difference could be explained in terms of maturation plus an additional two or three years of successfully meeting deadlines for college assignments. The graduating regular education teachers were significantly lower on the social value of the Study of Values than the incoming regular education sample; the graduating regular education sample

was not abnormally low in this area. Olson (1968) found prospective special education teachers to be significantly higher, also, which seems to indicate that the difference in this area may be expressed in a larger sample.

Graduating prospective teachers of regular education and special education as compared to the college normative samples revealed a number of significant differences. Both groups of prospective teachers scored significantly lower than the norms on the achievement need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Although prospective teachers should have a need to achieve they may not expect or desire to become a recognized authority, write a great novel or play, or be able to consistently do things better than others. Rather, it would seem that they would like to help others achieve, which would perhaps involve more co-operation with instead of competition against others.

The graduating prospective regular education group scored significantly lower than the normative sample on the dominance need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Dominance consists of the need to control one's human environment by dissuading, restraining, or prohibiting others, and by commanding others. These would not seem to be needs of prospective teachers. The low score in this area seems compatible with the low score obtained on the achievement need.

Graduating prospective special education teachers scored significantly higher on the intraception and nurturance needs

of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule than the normative sample. Intraception involves the observation of one's self and others for motives and feelings, prediction, and being able to put one's self in another's place. Nurturance includes assisting the less fortunate, treating others with kindness and sympathy, and forgiving others. These results may indicate that the prospective special education teacher chooses this area because of a compassion and empathy for these children.

The graduating prospective special education teachers scored significantly lower on the economic value of the Study of Values than the college normative sample. This seems to reflect the special education person's high social need as Allport Vernon Lindzey (1960) state "He (the social man) is likely to find the theoretical, economic, and aesthetic attitudes cold and inhuman (p. 5)." The special education sample was significantly higher than the normative sample on the social value. The high social value is very compatible with the low economic value and low achievement need, and high intraception and nurturance needs.

This, then, would seem to disclose the personality of the prospective special education teacher as being directed by kindness, unselfishness, compassion, and empathy for the less fortunate.

The results of this study failed to find the prospective special education teacher significantly lower than prospective

regular education teachers on the political value as was found in Olson's (1968) study. Olson also found the special education sample scored significantly higher on the abasement need and the religious value. The present study failed to disclose similar results. These differences between Olson's study and the present study may indicate that the prospective teacher's needs and values change during the course of his college preparation period. The differences between the results of Olson's study and the present study may indicate, instead, that one or both of the studies is not representative of the general prospective teacher population.

The dominance, intraception, nurturance, and economic scores obtained against the normative samples may be examples of the limited significance of these results. Graduating prospective teachers showed significant differences as a group, in these areas, but analysis of the men and women subgroups revealed both were not significantly different from the normative group. Further studies in this area will be necessary to determine if significant differences exist, and the exact nature of any differences.

Research Implications

Because of the limited amount of research done on the characteristics of the special education prospective teacher and practicing teacher, this study has possibilities for further application. This type of study could be done using larger samples with comparable sex ratios, and sampling

practicing teachers of both regular education and special education. Exceptionality area interests could yield more information and valuable interpretation also.

Once a common core of significant differences are identified in this area, the information could be valuable for counseling prospective teachers and practicing teachers, and channeling students into areas compatible with their needs and values. This could help alleviate the present shortage of teachers in special education.

The fact that both incoming and graduating prospective special education teachers were significantly higher on the social value than both the regular education and college normative samples strongly indicated that one significant difference of a common core has been identified.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

It was concluded in the present study that there were areas of significant difference between the graduating prospective teachers of special education and the graduating prospective teachers of regular education with regard to their needs and values, and between these groups and college general normative samples. The two instruments used to obtain this information were the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. The tests were administered to both groups of graduating prospective teachers in the final stage of their preparation for the teaching profession.

The raw data was gathered for each of the 15 subtests of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the six subtests of the Allport Vernon Lindzey Study of Values. This data was then analyzed by means of the "t" test to find if there were any significant difference. Results showed no significant differences between graduating prospective teachers of regular education and special education on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The special education group scored significantly higher on the social value of the Study of Values.

No significant differences were found between the graduating and incoming prospective special education teachers on either instrument. Comparisons between the graduating and incoming prospective teachers of regular education revealed the graduating group to be significantly higher on the endurance need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The incoming group scored significantly higher on the social value of the Study of Values.

Results of comparisons between both groups of graduating prospective teachers and the college normative samples revealed the prospective teachers were significantly lower on the achievement need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The regular education group scored significantly lower on the dominance need of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The special education graduating prospective teachers were significantly higher than the normative sample on the intraception and nurturance needs of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The special education group was significantly lower on the economic value and significantly higher on the social value of the Study of Values than the normative group.

The dominance, intraception, nurturance, and economic scores obtained against the normative samples are suspect because the men and women subgroups did not both score significantly different than the norms although as a group the scores were significantly different.

The fact that both incoming and graduating prospective special education teachers were significantly higher on the social value than both the regular education and college normative samples strongly indicated that one significant difference of a common core has been identified. Additional studies are needed to accurately evaluate the general significance of the differences found in this study and Olson's (1968) study.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. Study of Values. (3rd ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.
- Anastasi, Anne. Psychological testing. (2nd ed.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.
- Badt, M. I. Attitudes of university students toward exceptional children and special education. Exceptional Children, 1957, Vol. 23, 286-290, 336.
- Bernardin, A. C., & Jessor, R. A construct validation to the Edwards personal preference schedule with respect to dependency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, Vol. 21, 63-67.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.) The sixth mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Edwards, A. L. Edwards personal preference schedule. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Forer, B. R. Personality factors in occupational choice. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1953, Vol. 13, 361-366.
- Gottfried, N. W., & Jones, R. L. Career choice factors in special education. Exceptional Children, 1964, Vol. 30, 218-223.
- Guba, E. G., & Getzels, J. W. Interest and value patterns of Air Force officers. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1956, Vol. 6, 465-470.
- Hall, Calvin S., & Lindzey, Gardner. Theories of personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Jones, R. L. Research on the special education teacher and special education teaching. Exceptional Children, 1966, Vol. 33, 251-257.
- Jones, R. L. Special education teaching in the occupational structure: A factor analytic study. A paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children, Toronto, 1966.

- Jones, R. L., & Gottfried, N. W. The prestige of special education teaching. Exceptional Children, 1966, Vol. 32, 425-468.
- Jones, R. L., & Gottfried, N. W. Psychological needs and preferences for teaching exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 1966, Vol. 32, 313-321.
- Meisgeier, C. The identification of successful teachers of mentally or physically handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1965, Vol. 32, 229-236.
- Noll, V. H. Introduction to educational measurement. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957.
- Olson, James. A comparative study of the needs and values of prospective teachers of special education and regular education. Unpublished masters thesis, Central Washington State College, 1968.
- President's Panel on Mental Retardation. A proposed program for national action to combat mental retardation. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Spranger, E. Types of men. Translated from 5th German edition of Lebensformen by Paul J. W. Pigors. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag. American agent: Stechert-Hafner, Inc., 31 East 10th St., New York, 3. Cited by G. W. Allport, P. E. Vernon, & G. Lindzey, Study of values. (3rd ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.
- Western Interstate Council on Higher Education. Teachers of exceptional children for the west. Boulder, Colorado: Author, 1960.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

ALLPORT VERNON LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES

SIX BASIC VALUES

1. The Theoretical. The dominant interest of the theoretical man is the discovery of truth. In the pursuit of this goal he characteristically takes a "cognitive" attitude, one that looks for identities and differences; one that divests itself of judgments regarding the beauty or utility of objects, and seeks only to observe and to reason. Since the interests of the theoretical man are empirical, critical, and rational, he is necessarily an intellectualist, frequently a scientist or philosopher. His chief aim in life is to order and systematize his knowledge.

2. The Economic. The economic man is characteristically interested in what is useful. Based originally upon the satisfaction of bodily needs (self-preservation), the interest in utilities develops to embrace the practical affairs of the business world--the production, marketing, and consumption of goods, the elaboration of credit, and the accumulation of tangible wealth. This type is thoroughly "practical" and conforms well to the prevailing stereotype of the average American businessman.

The economic attitude frequently comes into conflict with other values. The economic man wants education to be practical, and regards unapplied knowledge as waste. Great feats of engineering and application result from the demands economic men make upon science. The value of utility likewise conflicts with the aesthetic value, except when art serves commercial ends. In his personal life the economic man is likely to confuse luxury with beauty. In his relations with people he is more likely to be interested in surpassing them in wealth than in dominating them (political attitude) or in serving them (social attitude). In some cases the economic man may be said to make his religion the worship of Mammon. In other instances, however, he may have regard for the traditional God, but inclines to consider Him as the giver of good gifts, of wealth, prosperity, and other tangible blessings.

3. The Aesthetic. The aesthetic man sees his highest value in form and harmony. Each single experience is judged from the standpoint of grace, symmetry, or fitness. He regards life as a procession of events; each single impression is enjoyed for its own sake. He need not be a creative artist, nor need he be effete; he is aesthetic if he but finds his chief interest in the artistic episodes of life.

The aesthetic attitude is, in a sense, diametrically opposed to the theoretical; the former is concerned with the diversity, and the latter with the identities of experience.

The aesthetic man either chooses, with Keats, to consider truth as equivalent to beauty, or agrees with Mencken, that, "to make a thing charming is a million times more important than to make it true." In the economic sphere the aesthete sees the process of manufacturing, advertising, and trade as a wholesale destruction of the values most important to him. In social affairs he may be said to be interested in persons but not in the welfare of persons; he tends toward individualism and self-sufficiency.. Aesthetic people often like the beautiful insignia of pomp and power, but oppose political activity when it makes for the repression of individuality. In the field of religion they are likely to confuse beauty with purer religious experience.

4. The Social. The highest value for this type is love of people. In the Study of Values it is the altruistic or philanthropic aspect of love that is measured. The social man prizes other persons as ends, and is therefore himself kind, sympathetic, and unselfish. He is likely to find the theoretical, economic, and aesthetic attitudes cold and inhuman. In contrast to the political type, the social man regards love as itself the only suitable form of human relationship. Spranger adds that in its purest form the social interest is selfless and tends to approach very closely to the religious attitude.

5. The Political. The political man is interested primarily in power. His activities are not necessarily within the narrow field of politics; but whatever his vocation, he betrays himself as a Machtmensch. Leaders in any field generally have high power value. Since competition and struggle play a large part in all life, many philosophers have seen power as the most universal and most fundamental of motives. There are, however, certain personalities in whom the desire for a direct expression of this motive is uppermost, who wish above all else for personal power, influence, and renown.

6. The Religious. The highest value of the religious man may be called unity. He is mystical, and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate himself to its embracing totality. Spranger defines the religious man as one "whose mental structure is permanently directed to the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience." Some men of this type are "immanent mystics," that is, they find their religious experience in the affirmation of life and in active participation therein. A Faust with his zest and enthusiasm sees something divine in every event. The "transcendental mystic," on the other hand, seeks to unite himself with a higher reality by withdrawing from life; he is the ascetic, and, like the holy men of India, finds the experience of unity through self-denial and

meditation. In many individuals the negation and affirmation of life alternate to yield the greatest satisfaction.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE MANIFEST NEEDS

1. Achievement. To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. Deference. To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. Order. To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. Exhibition. To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. Autonomy. To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. Affiliation. To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. Intraseption. To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. Succorance. To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. Dominance. To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. Abasement. To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. Nurturance. To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness

and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. Change. To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. Endurance. To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. Heterosexuality. To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. Aggression. To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

RAW DATA

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE ALLPORT VERNON LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES

Special Education Group								
	Men and Women (N = 21)		Men (N = 7)		Women (N = 14)		(Olson, 1968) Men and Women (N = 35)	
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.
Theoretical	38.38	8.07	41.00	8.02	37.07	8.07	37.54	6.71
Economic	36.33	7.33	41.00	8.50	34.00	5.64	38.17	6.36
Aesthetic	40.52	7.35	37.42	9.62	42.07	5.73	37.02	7.17
Social	48.61	7.26	50.14	8.83	47.85	6.57	46.77	6.29
Political	37.80	5.98	40.85	6.38	36.28	5.35	38.17	6.14
Religious	38.33	12.02	29.57	6.99	42.71	11.74	42.28	10.11

Regular Education Group

	Men and Women (N = 29)		Men (N = 13)		Women (N = 16)		(Olson, 1968) Men and Women (N = 35)	
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.
Theoretical	37.75	7.46	40.38	8.51	35.62	5.93	39.28	8.55
Economic	40.25	6.22	41.11	7.38	39.56	5.24	40.80	7.01
Aesthetic	41.32	9.16	41.73	10.33	41.00	8.43	39.84	7.85
Social	39.37	7.50	36.76	8.01	41.50	6.56	42.82	6.64
Political	41.05	5.92	43.03	6.79	39.43	4.73	41.82	7.40
Religious	40.33	10.91	36.96	10.43	43.08	10.84	36.34	11.07

General College Normative Sample

	Men and Women (N = 3778)		Men (N = 2489)		Women (N = 1289)	
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.
Theoretical	39.75	7.27	43.75	7.34	35.75	7.19
Economic	40.33	7.61	42.78	7.92	37.87	7.30
Aesthetic	38.88	8.42	35.09	8.49	42.67	8.34
Social	39.56	7.03	37.09	7.03	42.03	7.02
Political	40.39	6.44	42.94	6.64	37.84	6.23
Religious	41.01	9.31	38.20	9.32	43.81	9.40

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE
EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

Special Education Group							
	Men and Women (N = 21)		Men (N = 7)		Women (N = 14)		(Olson, 1968) Men and Women (N = 49)
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M} S.D.
Achievement	12.09	4.59	11.33	3.38	12.71	5.10	12.87 3.92
Deference	12.85	4.02	12.50	4.50	13.14	4.09	11.32 4.13
Order	9.52	3.82	9.83	2.31	9.21	4.45	9.08 4.78
Exhibition	14.80	2.52	14.66	2.58	15.00	2.63	13.71 3.45
Autonomy	13.85	2.95	12.83	2.40	14.00	3.06	13.81 4.81
Affiliation	15.28	3.40	15.16	2.40	15.92	3.14	16.38 3.52
Intracception	19.57	4.80	19.33	4.76	19.28	4.93	18.71 4.64
Succorance	11.14	5.22	7.50	5.08	12.28	4.68	11.89 4.37
Dominance	13.90	4.97	17.50	3.08	12.92	4.76	13.55 4.16
Abasement	14.47	4.50	15.33	6.08	13.78	3.80	16.42 4.42
Nurturance	17.14	3.63	17.16	4.11	17.21	3.70	16.04 4.07
Change	16.66	4.36	13.66	2.73	17.85	4.53	17.59 4.32
Endurance	12.66	4.04	14.16	4.53	12.57	3.34	12.97 5.49
Heterosexuality	15.04	5.01	15.00	7.04	14.50	4.03	14.32 5.10
Aggression	11.19	4.29	14.00	2.89	9.92	4.44	11.46 4.22
Consistency Score	12.09	1.72	11.40	2.50	12.28	1.38	11.40 2.12
Cum. GPA	2.745	.341	2.601	.447	2.807	.282	

Regular Education Group

	Men and Women (N = 29)		Men (N = 12)		Women (N = 17)		(Olson, 1968) Men and Women (N = 33)	
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.
Achievement	11.72	4.75	13.41	3.82	10.52	5.07	13.18	4.39
Deference	11.06	3.83	12.33	3.14	10.17	4.11	11.48	3.51
Order	10.62	4.53	12.00	4.24	9.64	4.60	8.90	4.17
Exhibition	13.93	2.59	13.91	2.81	13.94	2.51	14.75	3.25
Autonomy	13.20	4.43	13.25	4.67	13.17	4.40	12.36	4.25
Affiliation	16.51	4.25	13.58	3.44	18.58	3.53	16.87	4.91
Intraception	17.06	4.90	16.00	5.96	17.82	4.01	18.03	5.75
Succorance	11.13	4.14	10.66	4.35	11.47	4.09	12.09	4.37
Dominance	13.82	5.01	16.25	3.38	12.11	5.34	15.33	3.97
Abasement	14.41	4.66	15.16	6.22	13.88	3.27	14.12	5.02
Nurturance	16.03	4.64	13.50	3.72	17.82	4.46	15.42	4.61
Change	17.79	5.20	13.83	3.68	20.58	4.24	16.90	4.64
Endurance	14.27	4.99	14.66	5.86	14.00	4.44	11.75	4.37
Heterosexuality	15.89	5.88	15.83	4.87	15.94	6.56	16.45	5.11
Aggression	12.62	4.75	15.50	4.88	10.58	3.53	12.30	5.12
Consistency Score	11.20	1.83	10.25	1.86	11.88	1.53	11.69	1.77
Cum. GPA	2.763	.281	2.740	.273	2.779	.294		

General College Normative Sample

	Men and Women (N = 1509)		Men (N = 760)		Women (N = 749)	
	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.	\bar{M}	S.D.
Achievement	14.38	4.36	15.66	4.13	13.08	4.19
Deference	11.80	3.71	11.21	3.59	12.40	3.72
Order	10.24	4.34	10.23	4.31	10.24	4.37
Exhibition	14.34	3.59	14.40	3.53	14.28	3.65
Autonomy	13.31	4.53	14.34	4.45	12.29	4.34
Affiliation	16.19	4.36	15.00	4.32	17.40	4.07
Intracception	16.72	5.01	16.12	5.23	17.32	4.70
Succorance	11.63	4.65	10.74	4.70	12.53	4.42
Dominance	15.83	5.02	17.44	4.88	14.18	4.60
Abasement	13.66	5.14	12.24	4.93	15.11	4.94
Nurturance	15.22	4.76	14.04	4.88	16.42	4.41
Change	16.35	4.88	15.51	4.47	17.20	4.87
Endurance	12.65	5.25	12.66	5.30	12.63	5.19
Heterosexuality	16.01	5.68	17.65	5.48	14.34	5.39
Aggression	11.70	4.73	12.79	4.59	10.59	4.61
Consistency Score	11.64	1.84	11.53	1.88	11.74	1.79

ALLPORT VERNON LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES

Regular Education

Females - N = 16

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	GPA
05	33	43	47	30	47	40	3.00
07	33	43	34	43	40	47	3.20
12	40	47	42	43	48	20	2.91
15	34	37	55	31	38	45	2.50
16	35	50	30	42	33	50	3.00
17	28	38	47	39	33	55	2.30
20	46	32	54	39	39	30	3.05
21	35	39	37	35	45	49	3.19
22	30	36	34	56	39	45	2.90
25	30	29	45	45	34	57	2.90
28	40	39	41	39	44	37	2.89
31	49	41	38	47	34	31	2.69
32	30	35	29	50	40	56	2.50
37	32	41	37	42	41	47	2.50
38	40	42	33	39	39	47	2.70
40	35	41	53	44	37	30	2.65

Males - N = 13

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	GPA
01	42	50	33	38	48	29	2.50
02	51	41	33	36	48	31	2.50
03	55	46	39	45	34	21	3.20
04	39	29	38	50	35	49	2.75
11	29	31	57	27	41	55	3.09
13	45	44	35	45	38	33	2.92
14	31	46	29	40	55	39	2.50
18	36	53	40	28	47	36	2.95
23	47	39	45	36	45	28	2.50
29	32	35	59	37	34	43	2.85
30	43	44	34	34	38	47	2.76
33	47	44	59	21	45	24	2.30
39	30	32	41	41	51	45	2.60

Special Education

Females - N = 14

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	GPA
08	35	27	35	57	29	57	2.98
19	44	27	45	39	38	47	3.20
24	42	36	44	36	36	46	2.39
26	38	23	54	51	38	36	2.80
41	33	38	39	53	48	29	2.79
43	59	42	37	50	32	20	3.10
44	29	34	37	51	38	51	3.00
45	36	40	38	51	31	44	2.40
46	39	31	44	51	31	44	2.47
73	29	42	47	53	42	27	2.70
80	39	34	48	45	35	39	3.17
83	26	33	41	46	32	62	2.98
93	36	34	46	36	35	53	2.88
57	34	35	34	51	43	43	2.73

Males - N = 7

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	GPA
34	52	37	26	53	31	41	2.60
35	34	46	28	60	45	27	2.00
36	40	49	42	40	43	26	2.42
42	42	29	51	53	35	30	3.34
57	47	43	30	49	49	22	2.47
45	44	51	39	37	45	24	2.77
64	28	32	46	59	38	37	2.93

EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

Regular Education

Females - N = 17

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	C	GPA
05	16	7	5	16	16	17	10	18	21	11	11	23	16	11	12	9	3.00
06	6	7	7	15	15	19	20	19	4	18	21	15	12	23	9	10	2.20
07	18	13	10	14	10	14	17	7	16	12	26	20	19	7	7	11	3.20
09	9	10	10	19	15	15	18	17	8	14	19	14	6	25	11	13	2.86
10	14	11	9	15	17	18	16	5	18	9	16	21	15	17	9	9	2.50
12	19	7	7	9	17	20	14	10	17	9	10	25	14	19	13	11	2.91
15	8	6	5	12	13	19	18	8	12	14	16	27	18	17	17	13	2.50
16	3	11	7	17	17	19	14	15	4	17	19	21	9	24	13	13	3.00
17	9	13	20	13	7	12	25	12	5	19	16	11	21	16	11	14	2.30
20	6	11	13	14	9	21	21	7	8	15	22	18	14	22	9	13	3.05
21	12	15	12	12	5	21	19	13	9	17	15	23	20	10	7	13	3.19
22	7	12	7	17	15	24	19	11	8	17	20	21	16	15	1	14	2.90
25	11	2	8	12	22	15	18	10	15	13	19	24	13	14	14	12	2.90
27	3	7	17	14	13	17	18	9	13	17	11	22	17	20	12	11	2.60
28	15	17	16	12	7	18	21	8	18	9	18	22	12	6	11	12	2.89
31	16	9	3	15	13	21	24	12	16	13	20	25	7	3	13	12	2.69
32	7	10	8	11	13	26	11	14	14	12	24	18	9	22	11	12	2.50

Males - N = 12

01	9	9	18	13	14	11	17	12	19	21	12	17	9	13	16	10	2.50
02	12	12	9	17	17	10	21	7	18	19	10	10	22	10	16	11	2.56
03	16	10	10	13	5	20	14	9	21	12	18	11	23	13	15	10	3.20
04	13	17	15	15	14	15	12	8	19	11	16	18	15	12	10	8	2.75
11	15	16	9	17	10	8	21	22	13	16	7	11	12	18	15	13	3.09
13	16	12	5	9	21	11	26	5	17	12	14	19	17	13	13	12	2.92
14	6	15	16	10	9	12	3	11	21	10	16	10	19	25	27	9	2.50
18	19	9	8	16	13	16	18	14	12	21	14	15	4	11	20	10	2.95
23	12	12	18	12	9	16	12	9	16	15	19	14	18	18	10	11	2.50
29	12	16	10	13	11	12	20	11	14	28	15	8	7	18	15	13	2.85
30	12	14	15	14	18	17	16	12	12	12	13	17	13	15	10	7	2.76
33	19	7	11	18	18	15	12	8	13	5	8	16	17	24	19	9	2.30

Special Education

Females - N = 14

ID No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	C	GPA
08	5	10	5	16	15	23	27	8	16	11	19	21	11	15	8	14	2.98
19	9	21	6	13	15	16	19	13	13	16	18	18	12	17	4	13	3.20
24	17	10	11	16	17	13	16	9	7	18	14	15	15	14	18	13	2.39
26	14	9	5	14	18	13	22	11	10	13	18	24	13	16	10	11	2.80
43	23	11	4	12	15	17	18	6	21	17	16	21	11	8	10	13	3.10
44	10	8	5	18	10	18	14	18	20	11	19	19	7	20	13	11	3.00
46	9	14	9	12	15	19	24	17	8	19	15	14	19	13	3	11	2.47
58	11	15	9	21	17	18	10	18	12	9	20	15	9	16	10	12	2.40
59	19	7	14	14	11	11	25	22	11	13	8	12	12	19	12	14	2.73
73	12	18	12	12	13	13	14	11	9	16	21	16	14	15	14	9	2.70
80	13	15	9	14	16	16	19	8	16	8	17	25	17	9	8	12	3.17
83	5	14	10	17	9	16	22	11	7	19	19	17	16	20	8	13	2.98
93	15	15	6	14	16	13	24	10	12	14	14	23	11	8	15	13	2.88
63	16	17	21	17	9	17	16	10	19	9	23	10	9	13	4	13	2.50

Males - N = 7

34	15	20	10	13	16	14	27	10	16	11	13	12	14	9	10	9	2.60
35	11	9	6	17	14	18	19	9	22	21	20	10	6	12	16	12	2.00
36	7	12	11	15	12	15	16	9	15	12	14	18	19	23	12	12	2.42
42	15	7	13	18	14	14	13	14	14	11	16	13	17	18	13	14	3.35
57	8	14	9	11	12	18	20	3	18	25	24	14	13	6	15	14	2.47
45	12	13	10	14	9	12	21	0	20	12	16	15	16	22	18	8	2.77
64	8	11	12	13	18	7	25	17	6	19	16	18	5	23	12	13	2.93