

1969

## A Survey of Existing Programs for Problem Students in the First-Class Districts of Washington State

Gerard A. McElholm  
*Central Washington University*

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



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Humane Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

McElholm, Gerard A., "A Survey of Existing Programs for Problem Students in the First-Class Districts of Washington State" (1969). *All Master's Theses*. 1168.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1168>

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](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

204

A SURVEY OF EXISTING PROGRAMS FOR PROBLEM  
STUDENTS IN THE FIRST-CLASS DISTRICTS  
OF WASHINGTON STATE

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the School of Education  
Central Washington State College

---

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

---

by  
Gerard A. McElholm  
August 1969

LD  
5771.31  
m34

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

174599

Library  
Central Washington  
State College  
Ellensburg, Washington

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Dan A. Unruh

---

Lloyd M. Gabriel

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. William Gaskell for his help and guidance in the development of this thesis as chairman of the graduate committee.

Acknowledgment is also made to Dr. Dan Unruh and Dr. Lloyd Gabriel for their most helpful criticisms and suggestions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the study . . . . .	2
Definitions of Terms Used . . . . .	3
Anti-social behavioral problems . . . . .	3
Emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted child . . . . .	3
Problem student . . . . .	3
Delinquent student . . . . .	3
Delinquent prone . . . . .	3
Program or special program . . . . .	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	5
Recognition and Referral of Anti-Social Behavioral Problem Students . . . . .	5
Types of Programs . . . . .	7
Teacher Qualifications and Preparation for Work with Problem Children . . . . .	16
Evaluation of Programs . . . . .	18
Advantages and Disadvantages of Special Programs . . . . .	20
Advantages . . . . .	20
Disadvantages . . . . .	21

CHAPTER	PAGE
Characteristics that were Conducive to	
Good Programs . . . . .	21
Summary . . . . .	22
III. PROCEDURES . . . . .	24
The Questionnaire . . . . .	24
The Respondents . . . . .	25
The Response . . . . .	26
The Validity of the Evaluation . . . . .	26
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	27
Programs Reported . . . . .	27
Districts with programs . . . . .	27
Physical Organization of Programs . . . . .	30
Special school . . . . .	30
District-wide class . . . . .	30
Class in each school . . . . .	30
Work-study type program . . . . .	31
Night school . . . . .	31
Referral Procedures . . . . .	33
School personnel responsible for	
referral . . . . .	33
Identification of students for the	
programs . . . . .	33
Types of Students Placed in Special	
Programs . . . . .	34

CHAPTER	PAGE
Content of Programs . . . . .	36
Subjects taught in programs . . . . .	36
Extra-curricular activities . . . . .	40
Philosophy of Programs . . . . .	42
Rules and regulations . . . . .	42
Home visits and guidance . . . . .	43
Teacher Preparation for Special Programs .	43
Teacher experience prior to work with special students . . . . .	43
Training for special program teaching . .	44
Advantages and Disadvantages of Programs for Problem Students . . . . .	46
Advantages . . . . .	46
Disadvantages . . . . .	47
Evaluation of Special Programs by Respondents . . . . .	50
V. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	51
Summary . . . . .	51
Conclusions . . . . .	52
Recommendations . . . . .	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	59
APPENDIX A . . . . .	62
APPENDIX B . . . . .	73



LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. A Comparison of Districts, With and Without Programs for Problem Students in Terms of District Enrollments . . . . .	29
II. Physical Organizations of Programs . . . . .	32
III. Type of Student Served by Programs . . . . .	36
IV. Subjects Taught in Programs . . . . .	39
V. Extra-Curricular Activities Offered in Programs . . . . .	41
VI. Training and Experience of Teachers of Special Programs . . . . .	45
VII. Advantages and Disadvantages of Special Programs . . . . .	48

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Educators are constantly faced with the problem of what to do with students who have problems that could result in their removal from the regular classroom situation. It is extremely difficult for school people to sever the education of a student even though they realize that all regular attempts to rectify the behavioral problems have failed. Should the student be given one more chance, and in the process possibly disrupt the educational advancement of other students who are more willing or able to benefit from the educational experience?

Endeavoring to resolve this dilemma some school districts have created programs that are designed to give students an opportunity to prove to themselves, and the school, that they want to continue in school in a manner that is socially and academically acceptable.

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to determine what programs were being used in the first-class school districts of Washington State for students who had problems that had caused, or could have

caused, their removal from the regular classes, and to analyze these programs in light of other programs that seem to be successful throughout the nation.

Importance of the study. Democracy functions under two major emphases--the worth of the individual and the welfare of the group. Since the group is but a multiple, the individual must assume first priority in the study of any human institution. Children with problems should be given special consideration in the educational program. They must be protected not only from physical disease, and crippling conditions, but also from social and emotional maladjustment.

Educators must see that all students get the best education possible so that they will be prepared for full citizenship. Without proper preparation problem students could become burdens on our society--burdens that could possibly be prevented if the proper programs were available.

This study was designed to analyze, through a survey of the first-class school districts of Washington State, the existing programs for problem children, and compare them with programs that seem to be successful elsewhere in the country.

## II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Anti-social behavioral problem. Throughout the report of this study the term "anti-social behavioral problem" shall be interpreted as indicating problems in students that necessitates a special educational design.

Emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted child. The term "emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted" in this study shall refer to those students who are out of harmony with their environment from failure to reach a satisfactory adjustment between their desires and their condition in life (13:11), and as such require education other than the regular classroom type.

Problem student. For the purpose of this study the term "problem student" shall be used in reference to students who cannot or will not adjust to the regular classroom.

Delinquent-prone. The term "delinquent-prone" shall refer to students who had shown indications of developing into severe classroom problems.

Program or special program. Throughout the report of this study the term "program" or "special program"

shall be interpreted as referring to an education design specially structured for those students who cannot or will not function in a regular program.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Students with anti-social behavioral problems are a great concern to teachers and administrators in many schools. In an effort to alleviate this problem some school districts have created special classes, or special schools, for these students. Programs of this kind serve two purposes. (1) They remove the student from the regular classroom, thus giving the teacher, and the remaining students, a better opportunity to pursue the educational endeavor. (2) The students removed have a better chance for continuing in school, due to the designs of the special programs.

#### I. RECOGNITION AND REFERRAL OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL PROBLEM STUDENTS

The "600" schools in New York were designed for students who had severe behavioral problems and who could not or would not get along in regular classroom situations. These students were referred from the regular schools by their teachers and administrators when their anti-social behavior became extreme. Each student recommended came with a case history folder which included his record of attendance, a description of his difficulties, his

achievements, his attitudes, likes and dislikes. It included data on his capacity and physical condition, and indicated any previous contact with the Bureau of Child Guidance. This together with an interview with the student and parents or case worker determined whether or not the student was a suitable candidate for the "600" schools (12:215-18).

The procedure used by the "600" schools of New York for recognition and referral of problem students was generally the same for the limited number of programs elsewhere that this writer found in the literature. In most cases the student became a severe classroom problem before a special program was initiated.

An exception to the rule of placing students in special programs after problems developed was the program in Columbus, Ohio, for delinquent-prone seventh grade boys. In the Columbus program sixth grade teachers selected the boys on the basis of their experience with them in the elementary grades. Severe emotional problems and I.Q.'s below seventy were screened out (6:26-8). In this program an attempt was made at helping students overcome their problems before they reached a pattern that would result in more drastic action being taken.

In a research analysis for the National Education Association, Morse, Cutler and Fink (8:10) surveyed fifty-four programs to determine the types of students placed in special programs due to behavioral problems. Out of the programs investigated, these researchers found that most respondents to their questions gave multiple answers, but that the most frequent responses were general adjustment difficulties, moderately psychiatrically disturbed and acting-out pupils who disrupt the regular classes. Responses less frequently given were seriously psychiatrically disturbed and antisocial or recognized delinquent problems. Underachieving, or learning difficulties, was not reported as being a cause for students being placed in special programs.

## II. TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Programs for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students varied from work-study programs to complete academic programs. The class environments varied from permissive to autocratic. Some classes were in rooms of regular buildings; some were in facilities other than schools, and in some cases entire buildings were devoted to programs for these students. In the following paragraphs a summarization has been made of the programs found in the review of literature.



The Columbus, Ohio, program for delinquent-prone boys (6:26) had as its central core a three-hour time block. During this time, language arts, social studies and geography with special units dealing with work, school, the family, and law enforcement, were taught. The reading program was emphasized to help for better reading. This curriculum had, as its central overall aim, the ability to provide the pupils with alternative ways of interpreting and evaluating their environment and their relationship to it, and to bring about a change in their self-concepts. The material was relevant to the prior experiences of the students . . . middle-class norms and values were not brought into slum classrooms. The lessons were intrinsically interesting (6:26-27).

Class control was based on mutual respect in the Columbus program. The students could do what they pleased as long as they did not infringe upon the teacher's right to teach and the other students' right to learn. Permissiveness was not the rule, however. When a student infringed upon the teaching, he was asked to isolate himself from the class and to think about his error. When the student felt that he was able to respect the rights of others he was allowed to return to the class on his

own volition. It was agreed in this program that corporal punishment, belittlement and shaming did not work (6:27-28).

Home visitations by the teachers was also an integral part of the Columbus program. It was hoped that the teachers would gain insight into behavioral problems and perhaps prove helpful to parents in making constructive suggestions in terms of home problems related to student difficulties (6:28).

The New York "600" schools had broad functional units of instruction geared to the interests, abilities, and needs of each group. Pupils were allowed to work at their own speed and in accordance with their own capacities. The approach to this program included:

- a. Consideration of each child as a unique personality with special needs and interests.
- b. Socialization and restructuring of attitudes.
- c. Enrichment of the cultural background through art, music, literature, drama, and guest speakers.
- d. Cooperation with other agencies in a position to contribute to the present and future welfare of the pupils (12:215-218).

Behavior was seen as symptomatic in the "600" schools and an earnest attempt was made to anticipate critical situations, conflicts and frustrations by eliminating triggering incidents. Sometimes, a little intelligent neglect was utilized, sometimes a shift to a

substitute activity, a change of pace, or a change of grouping or environment served to relieve the pressure (12:215-218).

A pilot program of a different nature, for boys who were having severe difficulty adjusting to school, home, and the community, was set up at George Westinghouse Vocational High School in New York. This program involved both study and work. During the morning, students in this program, had a two-period core of history and English with an overall guidance section woven in followed by two periods of machine shop. Where possible, remedial reading was scheduled for those who had low reading ability. Such jobs as errand boys, clerical workers, apprentices for butchers, and lithographers, and stock boys were provided, through community cooperation, as the work part of the program (10:5-19).

In East Orange, New Jersey, a program was designed for perpetual trouble-makers who were suspended from regular classes. This program was housed in an old church basement away from the regular school buildings. The students attended this special class for the length of their suspension and, during this time, they were required to do the same work that would be required in their regular classes (2:26-27). This approach made it possible

for the suspended students to return to school after the suspension time was served out, without having fallen behind the regular class.

Discipline problems did not disappear in the East Orange, New Jersey class--there were blowups, arguments, and interruptions; but, because the class was small, teachers could take the troubled student to another area and work with the causes rather than the symptoms. According to the author of this article, the causes were usually assignments that the student could not handle (2:26-27).

Boys and girls who were unable to conduct themselves in a proper way in regular classes in San Diego were sent to Snyder High School. The course of study at Snyder was anything the student wished to learn, and they could change as often as they wanted until they found something that suited them. It was hoped that, in this way, students would discover the need for additional study and thus get training in the basic skills (3:40-45).

The Snyder School allowed a permissive atmosphere. Students were dressed any way they pleased, provided they were decently covered. This did not necessarily mean that the staff approved, but they recognized that dress and appearance was the students' way of defying society

and that it was a minor gesture compared to the rest of their behavior (3:40-45).

A Social Adjustment Program in Los Angeles was designed for problem children. Its purpose was to modify as quickly as possible the child's behavior so that he could return as quickly as possible to the regular school program. This program was not thought of as a last resort device, but rather as a positive approach to helping pupils get along in regular school (7:295).

The emphasis in the Los Angeles Social Adjustment Program was placed on therapy rather than academic achievement. Remedial measures were stressed. Short-range, rather than long-range, assignments were given so that students would have a chance to experience successful accomplishment. A personal adjustment period was an important part of this program. During the personal adjustment period, students talked over their problems and attempted to find solutions for them (7:295).

Some school systems had small or less elaborate programs for their problem students. In one school a social adjustment room was established for these students, with its main purpose being to give aid and direction to the problem child for adjustment to a normal situation. Students were assigned to this program for one or more periods, depending on the number of classes in which they

were having difficulties. They were also assigned to this room for home room and lunch period, thus taking away the socialization aspect. When the student was released, he could return to his regular classes and home room and he could also socialize in the lunch room. Any infraction of classroom procedures could result in his reassignment to the social adjustment class again (11:53-60).

A different approach was used at the Whittier School in Washington, D.C. Here a special social adjustment class was in operation, but with little success, due to too many troublesome boys being in the same class. The general feeling was that this plan worked fine in terms of keeping the boys from disrupting the regular classes, but it was not giving them the confidence and self-esteem they needed to master their problems (1:225).

The Whittier School program was changed to a "Big Brother Program", using high school boys as big brothers. It was known that the big brothers would be young enough to be trusted as friends, yet old enough to be understanding of the problem boys' difficulties. The problem students were reassigned to regular classes with understanding teachers who were responsible for the academic work and the big brothers visited their charges two to five times a week (1:225).

The Quincy Youth Development Project was a program designed by the Youth Development Project of the University of Chicago. This program was designed to educate the problem child who seemed to be below-average intellectually. The objectives of this program were:

1. That each child should be able to communicate verbally with his associates, and with the people upon whom he would depend for his financial security.
2. He should be able to write an acceptable letter.
3. He should be able to follow simple instructions.
4. He should be able to use his reasoning to form opinions.
5. He should be able to read a newspaper.
6. He should be able to make use of simple practical mathematics.
7. He should know how people make their living in the community.
8. He should anticipate the need of the roles he might play in the future.
9. He should learn how an individual can best get along with others in the home and elsewhere (9:174-178).

The core of the Quincy Program was based on reading, language arts, basic business mathematics, and a modified civics course. Units were planned around such topics as: "Let's Take a Look at You"; "At Home"; "At School"; "At Work"; "In Your Community"; and "In Your Country" (9:174-178).

To create a warm, relaxed and informal class setting which would allow freedoms not normally acceptable in a regular class, a kind of code was established in the

Quincy Youth Development Project. This code said in effect that in the class there were no rules. Students could do as they pleased, provided they did not infringe on the rights of others in the group, or within the school setting, on the rights of the classroom teacher. Some of the best learning centered around the code (9:174-178).

Learning was needs directed in the Quincy Youth Development Project and many problem students settled down when they saw the need for learning. Student confidence gradually was built up through this process (1:174-178).

Wasson reported, from a survey of twenty-two large school districts in the United States, that programs for problem students had no significant variations in curriculum. Most said that the curriculum offered in the special programs closely paralleled that offered in the regular schools augmented by vocational and commercial courses. The usual arts and crafts, homemaking, music, and industrial arts courses were also included in most offerings (14:345-353).



### III. TEACHER QUALIFICATION AND PREPARATION FOR WORK WITH PROBLEM CHILDREN

In most of the studies reviewed by this writer, there was little mention of special training for teachers of classes for problem children. Teachers chosen for this task were generally people who had regular certification, but who had the ability to understand and get close to youngsters in trouble. In some instances, teachers were picked for their breadth of interest, their sense of humor or their patient understanding (3:45-46). In others they were chosen because they were products of slum environments (6:26-28). A survey of twenty-two large districts revealed that only two districts required special training for working with problem children (14:345-353).

A more comprehensive study by Morse, Cutler, and Fink for the National Education Association (8:16-19) revealed that many administrators did not seek teachers with special qualifications, either in terms of experience or personal attitude and skill with children. Usually they looked for teachers who had a successful history of work with children in regular classrooms.

Data from the study by Morse, Cutler, and Fink (8:15-17) on teacher preparation in terms of experience

for seventy-one teachers in the field, indicated that 33 percent had had more than ten years experience in special education before working with problem students. Regular classroom experience accounted for 37 percent of those entering the field, whereas only 9 percent had a long-term specialized background. The remaining 21 percent had from one to ten years experience in special education.

In terms of training, the Morse, Cutler, and Fink study (8:15-17) pointed out that 32 percent of the seventy-one teachers questioned were trained as regular classroom teachers. Training in other special education areas accounted for 30 percent. Some short-term training was reported by 19 percent, and 19 percent indicated extensive specialization with disturbed children.

A study by Mackie and Gunn revealed that only nine states had some type of special certification for teaching delinquent and neglected or socially and emotionally maladjusted youngsters. These authors reported that most teachers working with problem children had no special qualifications, and that few special teacher-training programs were available at the college level (4:561).

#### IV. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

In the literature reviewed by this writer, little evidence of any thorough evaluation of programs for problem children was found.

In the Quincy Youth Development Project (9:174-78) it was decided that the program came too late for the more seriously maladjusted, but to others it gave incentive. Academic growth was little, but attitude and behavior improved as the two-year study moved along.

The work-study program in New York's George Washington Vocational High School (10:5-19) changed disruptive behavior and antagonistic attitudes to more positive and serious outlooks. Attendance improved and was usually above 90 percent. It was agreed in this program that there were more improvements than failures.

The Big Brother Program at the Whittier School in Washington, D. C., (1:225) was established when too many troublesome boys in a special social-adjustment class created problems. "Big Brothers" were effective when good relationships developed; however, the anticipated relationships did not develop in all cases.

Other programs were judged to be successful if they kept students from dropping out of school (2:26-27), helped students to be more presentable and get a

job (3:40-45), or helped students adjust to regular classroom situations (11:57-60). Sometimes adjustment to regular classes was accomplished by using the special class or school as a threat.

An evaluation of program success by Morse, Cutler, and Fink (8:97) showed that site visitors, and school personnel tended to judge programs differently. Site visitors rated 15 percent of the programs clear failure, whereas school personnel only rated 5 percent clear failures. Limited success was given to 11 percent of the programs by site visitors, but school personnel placed 21 percent in this category. In the category of encouraging success, site visitors placed 30 percent, with school personnel nearly in accord at 29 percent. Site visitors surpassed school personnel at rating programs outstanding successes, with the former at 40 percent and the latter at 21 percent. Programs with insufficient data for evaluation were counted at 4 percent by site visitors, whereas this category was placed at 25 percent by school personnel.

The site visitors tended to see more extremes at both ends of the success continuum. Nearly three-fourths of the programs were judged by them to be either

"encouraging" or "outstanding" in their success. The same categories, when judged by school personnel, only totaled 50 percent. Failure was rated three times higher by the site visitors than by school personnel (8:97).

The study by Morse, Cutler, and Fink revealed that judged success was most often related to how well the teachers' efforts were appreciated. Many people responsible for these programs said that success depended on the quality of the teacher. Other factors which were related to judgments of success or failure were: (a) not enough structure; (b) too much expense; (c) lack of sufficient opportunity for outside treatment; (d) too few students going back to regular classes; (e) class size and transportation problems (8:98).

#### V. ADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGES OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

From a survey of twenty-two large districts in the United States, Wasson lists the following advantages and disadvantages for special classes or schools (14:345-53).

##### Advantages

1. Removal of students from situation in which classes may be disturbed.
2. Students could be given a program in which success could be experienced.
3. Could allow for closer supervision.

4. Could provide greater individual attention.
5. Could provide an atmosphere in which there would be less pressure.
6. Students could be given more privileges.
7. Could furnish new opportunities for students.
8. Could meet the special needs of problem children.
9. Could ease the situation in regular classroom.
10. Could allow problem students to stay in school where they might be unable to cope with a full day's program in a regular class or school (14:345-53).

### Disadvantages

1. A special school or class could be used as a threat.
2. Students in a special program could carry a stigma.
3. The educational experiences could be less broad than those of the regular program.
4. Facilities could be poorer than in regular programs.
5. These programs could become "catchalls" (14:345-53).

## V. CHARACTERISTICS THAT WERE CONDUCTIVE TO GOOD PROGRAMS

Wasson suggested, from a survey of large districts, that the following characteristics should be included in programs for problem children (14:345-53).

1. The relaxation of academic pressures.
2. Individualized and flexible instructional programs.
3. The centering of the program in activities rather than textbooks.
4. A sufficient variety of course offerings to meet the needs of all kinds of students.
5. Stress upon remedial work in the basic learning skills at any indicated level.

6. Elasticity in the application of a minimum number of rules and regulations in a relaxed and permissive environment.
7. An intensive but informal guidance program, stressing the uniqueness of each personality, and his problems and adjustments to home, employment and society as well as to school.
8. A staff carefully selected for possession of the guidance point of view--for their interest in students as persons, rather than for their interest in a particular subject.
9. The elimination of any stigma attached to adjustment education, and the development in the students of an esprit de corps, and in the staff of pride in helping the students most difficult to reach.

In general, most researchers stated that the educational birthright of the normal well-behaved student certainly belonged to the problem student as well. The old idea that, since they were different, one had to wait until they were behaving better before they could be taught has been left behind. Some of the fear of students actions' which used to make schoolrooms more like prisons has also been lost. If what is being done in modern education was useful, interesting, and supporting to normal children, it certainly has a place with the disturbed.

## VI. SUMMARY

The literature dealing with programs designed for problem students was reviewed in this chapter. Special emphasis was given to recognition and referral

procedures, types of programs, teacher qualification and preparation, evaluation, advantages and disadvantages, and characteristics that were conducive to good programs for problem children.



## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES

Several steps were employed in this exploration of programs for problem students in the First Class School Districts of the State of Washington. A review of the literature on programs for problem students was the first step. Next, a questionnaire was constructed and duplicated. Five questionnaires were then sent to administrators of school districts in King County as a pilot sample to determine the type of response and to eliminate the possibility of biased questions. Then the names and addresses of the administrators responsible for special programs in each of the sixty-three First Class School Districts of Washington were ascertained. Following this, a letter and questionnaire were sent to the administrators responsible for special programs in each of the First Class School Districts of the State of Washington. Non-respondents were then sent a follow-up card. Finally a tabulation of the results was made.

#### I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was composed of twenty-seven items--thirteen of which required a yes or no response, and fourteen required multiple-choice responses. The

first question asked the respondents whether or not their district had a program, or programs, for problem children. If the answer was no to this question, additional responses were not necessary. If the response was yes to the first question, completion of the questionnaire was requested.

All questions, after the first, sought information regarding the types of programs offered for problem children. These questions were grouped into the following general areas: (1) the physical organization of the programs, (2) referral procedures, (3) types of students placed in special programs, (4) philosophy of programs, (5) teacher preparation for special programs, (6) advantages and disadvantages of programs for problem children, (7) evaluation of special programs by respondents. The responses to these items are tabulated and summarized in the following chapter.

## II. THE RESPONDENTS

The respondents to this survey were chosen from the Washington State Directory, 1968 edition.

The titles of the respondents varied according to the size of the districts. In larger districts, directors of pupil personnel services, or directors of

special education were selected. In smaller districts, assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum, or in the case of the smallest districts, superintendents were chosen.

### III. THE RESPONSE

Of the sixty-three possible responses, fifty-seven were received, or, in terms of percent, it can be said that the questionnaire had a 90 percent response.

### IV. THE VALIDITY OF THE EVALUATION

The responses to the questionnaire indicate a high degree of validity because, as Guilford notes, the higher the percent of return, the smaller becomes the effect of bias. Furthermore, unless the questions refer directly to the personality or behavior of the author, there is little reason to suspect bias (5:372).

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

The questionnaire was designed to find out if the First Class School Districts of Washington had programs for problem students, and if so, what kind of programs were being offered.

#### I. PROGRAMS REPORTED

##### Districts with Programs

Of the fifty-seven districts that responded to the questionnaire, thirty-four or 59.6 percent, reported that they had no program that dealt exclusively with problem students as defined in this survey. Twenty-three, or 40.4 percent, reported that they had a program, or programs, for problem students.

District size, in terms of student enrollment, had some bearing on whether or not the district had a program for problem students.

An examination of Table I reveals that the percentage of school districts without programs for problem students, in the less than five-thousand enrollment category, was greater than the percentage of those with programs. As the enrollment size increased there was a

small increase in the percentage of districts with programs over those without programs.

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS, WITH AND WITHOUT PROGRAMS FOR  
 PROBLEM STUDENTS IN TERMS OF DISTRICT ENROLLMENTS

Size of District by Enrollment	Number of Districts with Programs	Percent	Number of Districts without Programs	Percent
Up to 5,000	8	35	17	50
5,000 to 10,000	8	35	11	32
10,000 to 15,000	3	13	4	12
15,000 to 20,000	1	4	1	3
20,000 and over	3	13	1	3

## II. PHYSICAL ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

### Special School

Four districts, or 17.4 percent, reported having special schools devoted entirely to problem students. Two of these districts had enrollments over 15,000 and the other two had enrollments of less than 5,000. Other types of programs were available in the four districts.

### District-wide Class

The district-wide class, where students from several schools were assigned for a special program, was one of the most often checked responses. Fourteen, or 60.8 percent, of the districts responding reported having this type program. With the exception of three districts, this program was offered, together with other programs for problem students.

### Class in Each School

Nine districts, or 39.1 percent, reported having classes in each school devoted to problem students. Four of these districts, or 17.4 percent, reported having full-day classes, and five, or 21.2 percent, reported that they had part-day classes.

### Work-study type Program

The combination of work and study proved to be a popular program in many of the districts reporting programs for problem students. Of the twenty-three districts reporting programs, fourteen, or 60.8 percent, reported this approach. Eleven of the fourteen districts offered other types of programs as well as the work-study technique, and three offered the work-study program only.

### Night School

Two districts, or 8.7 percent of those reporting programs for problem students, added night school as their approach to dealing with problem students.

Table II indicates that many of the districts reported combinations of programs. Twelve, or 52.2 percent, of the districts had more than one type of program. Eleven, or 47.8 percent, relied on one program. Of the eleven single approach programs, four, or 36.3 percent, were district-wide classes; three, or 27.2 percent, were classes in each school, and one, or 9 percent, was a night school program.



TABLE II  
PHYSICAL ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

Type of Program	Number of Districts having Program	Percent
Special school	4	17.4
Class serving entire district	14	60.8
Class in each school	9	39.1
Part day	5	
Full day	4	
Work study	14	60.8
Night school	2	8.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>43*</b>	

\*Twelve districts reported having a combination of programs.

### III. REFERRAL PROCEDURES

#### School Personnel Responsible for Referral

Procedures by which students were admitted to the programs varied both within districts as well as among districts. While most districts, seventeen or 73.9 percent, indicated a team of school personnel made the decision to admit the student to the program, three districts, or 13 percent, indicated the classroom teacher; two or 8.7 percent, indicated the class counselor; five or 21.7 percent, the school psychologist, and four or 17.4 percent, the school principal. Interestingly, no district indicated that the vice-principal made the decision to admit students to these special programs for problem students.

#### Identification of Students for the Programs

Identification of students for problem student programs was accomplished in several ways, most of which were used by a large portion of the districts. Evaluation by the school psychologist was used in twenty-one, or 91.3 percent, of the districts. Classroom teacher observations, and reports of behavior in and around the school buildings were each used in

nineteen, or 82.6 percent, of the districts reporting programs. Information from the students' accumulative records were used in eighteen, or 78.3 percent of the districts, and the students' academic record was evaluated in sixteen, or 69.6 percent, of the districts. Four respondents added additional criteria used in their districts for evaluating students for special programs. These were: anecdotal records; Juvenile Court records; medical and social evaluation; and, behavior in home and community. Most respondents reported that most of the foregoing criteria was used during the evaluative process. Only one district chose one criterion, and that was the school psychologist. Another district claimed to only use the school psychologist and the students' academic record.

#### IV. TYPES OF STUDENTS PLACED IN SPECIAL PROGRAMS

During the review of literature related to programs designed for problem students, it was evident that there was much overlapping, in terms of the type of students, in these programs. As evidenced in Table III, most respondents reported several classifications being served. General adjustment difficulties was the most

frequent response, with twenty, or 87 percent, of the respondents reporting this category of student in the programs. In no case, however, was the category general adjustment difficulties reported by itself. As a matter of fact, there was no single response by any respondent to this question. Seventeen, or 74 percent, of the districts reported that underachievers, or students with learning difficulties, were in the programs. Moderately psychiatrically disturbed was the choice of sixteen, or 69.6 percent, of the respondents, while five, or 22 percent, chose seriously psychiatrically disturbed to describe some students in their programs. Students who acted out, and disrupted the regular classes, were placed in special programs according to fifteen, or 65.2 percent, of the respondents, and twelve, or 52.9 percent of those reporting programs for problem children chose anti-social as a descriptive term for students in the programs. Nine, or 39.1 percent, reported that the term recognized delinquent suited some of the students in their program.

It was evident from the data received, in terms of types of students served, that the underlying causes for students being placed in the programs were many, and

that the symptoms, rather than the causes, were the prime factors in determining placement in special programs.

TABLE III  
TYPE OF STUDENT SERVED BY PROGRAMS

Type of Student	Districts Reporting	Percent
General adjustment difficulties	20	87
Moderately psychiatrically disturbed	16	69.6
Acting-out students who disrupt regular classes	15	65.2
Seriously psychiatrically disturbed	5	22
Recognized delinquent	9	39.1
Anti-social	12	52.2
Underachievers or learning difficulties	17	74 *

\*All districts reported serving more than one type of student.

#### V. CONTENT OF PROGRAMS

##### Subjects Taught in Programs

Language arts was the most frequently offered subject area in the programs of the twenty-three districts that reported programs for problem students. Twenty, or

87 percent, of the respondents said they offered language arts. Of the three remaining districts, one reported that courses were offered on the basis of student needs, and two failed to respond to this question. Social studies was the second most frequently taught course, with nineteen, or 82.6 percent, responding in the affirmative to this part of the question. Eighteen, or 78.2 percent, of the respondents reported that mathematics and remedial reading was offered. Physical education and classes in personal adjustment were reported by thirteen, or 56.5 percent, of the respondents as being part of their programs. Other subjects offered were: science; art; crafts; study skills; and shop courses. These were part of the programs of eleven, or 48 percent, of the districts with problem student programs. Home economics was checked by eight, or 35 percent, of the respondents. It was not determined if home economics was offered both to boys and girls, but it was assumed that girls would be part of these programs and as such would be in home economics classes. The class offering that received the least response was music, with seven, or 30 percent, of the districts making it available to their problem students.

Most districts offered a wide variety of subjects to students who were unable to operate in the regular classroom setting. As Table IV makes clear, language arts, social studies, mathematics and remedial reading were most frequently reported as being taught. It was surprising to this writer to find that study skills was offered by less than half of the districts reporting programs, because problem students and poor study habits often go hand in hand.

TABLE IV  
SUBJECTS TAUGHT IN PROGRAMS

Subjects	Districts including subject in program	Percent
Language Arts	20	87
Social Studies	19	82.6
Mathematics	18	78.2
Remedial Reading	18	78.2
Physical Education	13	56.6
Personal Adjustment	13	56.6
Science	11	48
Art	11	48
Crafts	11	48
Study Skills	11	48
Shop Classes	11	48
Home Economics	8	35
Music	7	30



### Extra-curricular Activities

There was a great variation among districts concerning what extra-curricular activities the students of special programs could participate in. Four, or 17.4 percent, of the districts allowed no participation at all. The remaining nineteen, or 82.2 percent, permitted participation in intramurals, and fourteen, or 60.9 percent, of the districts permitted inter-school athletic participation. Participation in clubs was allowed by sixteen, or 70 percent, of the respondents, and drama and student government involvement was permissible in thirteen, or 56.5 percent, of the districts reporting programs. A study of Table V shows that ten, or 43.5 percent, of the respondents indicated that participation in all extra-curricular activities was permissible.

TABLE V  
EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES OFFERED IN PROGRAMS

Extra-curricular Activities	Districts Allowing Participation	Percent
Inter-school Athletics	14	60.9
Intramurals	19	82.2
Drama	13	56.5
Clubs	16	70
Student Government	13	56.5
None	4	17.4
All	10	43.5

## VI. PHILOSOPHY OF PROGRAMS

In describing their programs in general terms, twenty-one, or 91.6 percent, of the respondents said that the program was child-centered as opposed to subject-centered. The same number, though not the same districts, indicated that the programs were flexible to meet the needs of the students. Seventeen, or 74 percent, reported that their programs were centered in activities rather than in textbooks. All districts reporting described their programs as designed to provide greater individual attention, and twenty-two, or 95.7 percent, indicated that their programs allowed for the relaxation of academic pressure.

### Rules and Regulations

In describing the general environment of the programs, in terms of rules and regulations, eighteen, or 78.3 percent, of the districts indicated democratic, two or 9 percent, denoted autocratic as the term best fitting their programs, and seven, or 30 percent, said their programs were permissive. Some districts indicated both democratic and permissive, since the terms were not necessarily mutually exclusive.

### Home Visits and Guidance

In sixteen districts, or 69.6 percent, the special class teacher visited the home, while in eighteen districts, or 78.3 percent, other school personnel visited the home. A special guidance program for problem students was provided by nine, or 39.1 percent, of the districts responding. Other districts apparently included these students in the regular guidance program, since fourteen, or 60.8 percent, of the responses indicated that the guidance program stressed the uniqueness of each personality while sixteen, or 69.6 percent, stressed the student's problems and adjustments to home, employment and society, as well as to school.

## VII. TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS

### Teaching Experience Prior to Work with Special Students

Teachers with regular classroom experience, or those with special education experience, conducted the programs for problem students. Seventeen districts, or 73.9 percent, indicated that their special program teachers had over four years of regular teaching experience while only seven, or 30 percent, had less than four years of regular teaching experience. Eighteen districts, or 78.3 percent, indicated teachers had experience in special education.

### Training for Special Program Teaching

Training for regular classroom teaching was the most often reported preparation for teaching in special programs. Nineteen, or 82.6 percent, of the districts reporting used teachers trained for regular classroom teaching, while twelve, or 52.2 percent, used teachers trained in the area of special education. Eight, or 34.8 percent, of the districts reporting special programs, reported that some of their teachers had short-term training for work with problem children, and four, or 17.4 percent, reported teachers with extensive specialization with problem children. The distribution of training and experience is shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

## TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Regular Classroom Experience	Districts Reporting	Percent
1 to 3 years	7	30
4 to 10 years	15	65.2
Over 10 years	2	8.7
Special Education Experience	Districts Reporting	Percent
1 to 3 years	11	47.8
4 to 10 years	4	17.4
Over 10 years	3	13
Training	Districts Reporting	Percent
As regular classroom teacher	19	82.6
As special education teacher	12	52.2
Short-term training with problem students	8	34.8
Extensive specialization with problem students	4*	17.4

\*These numbers did not total to twenty-three since some districts reported teachers in more than one category.

VIII. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF  
PROGRAMS FOR PROBLEM STUDENTS

Advantages

In terms of advantages, the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that providing greater individual attention was the greatest value in these programs.

Twenty-one, or 91.3 percent, checked providing greater individual attention. Meeting the special needs of problem children was second, with nineteen, or 82.6 percent, of the districts reporting this as an advantage.

Seventeen, or 73.9 percent, of the districts reporting programs, said that advantages to special programs were:

(1) students can be given a program in which success can be experienced; (2) special programs can provide an atmosphere in which there can be less pressure; and, (3) programs can furnish new opportunities for students. Allowing for closer supervision, and allowing problem students to stay in school when they might be unable to cope with a full day's program in a regular class was reported as advantageous by fourteen, or 60.9 percent, of the districts with programs. Eleven, or 47.8 percent, reported the removal of

problem students from situations in which regular classes might be disturbed and easing the regular classroom situation, as being worthwhile.

### Disadvantages

A stigma being attached to students in special programs was rated as being the greatest disadvantage by fifteen, or 65.2 percent, of the districts reporting programs. Eight, or 34.8 percent, responded that the educational experiences could be less broad than those of the regular program. The program becoming a catchall was rated as a disadvantage by five, or 21.7 percent, of the respondents. Four, or 17.4 percent, said that facilities for special programs were poorer than those of the regular programs, and only two, or 8.7 percent, reported that the special programs could be used as a threat. Table VII gives the distribution of the advantages and disadvantages in descending order.



TABLE VII  
ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Advantages	Districts Reporting	Percent
Can provide greater individual attention	21	91.3
Students can be given a program in which success can be experienced	17	73.9
Provides an atmosphere in which there can be less pressure	17	73.9
Can furnish new opportunities for students	17	73.9
Can allow for closer supervision	14	60.9
Can allow problem students to stay in school when they might be unable to cope with a regular class	14	60.9
Can ease the situation in the regular classroom	11	47.8
It removes the problem students from situations in which regular classes may be disturbed	11	47.8

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

Disadvantages	Districts Reporting	Percent
Students in the program can carry a stigma	15	65.2
The educational experiences are less broad than those of the regular program	8	34.8
The program can be a catchall	5	21.7
Facilities are poorer than those of the regular program	4	17.4
Special program can be used as a threat	2	8.7

## IX. EVALUATION OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS BY RESPONDENTS

When asked to indicate the success of their programs, eighteen, or 78.3 percent, of the districts chose encouraging success, whereas three, or 13 percent, chose limited success, and two, or 8.7 percent, chose outstanding success. None of the respondents rated their program as a clear failure.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the purpose of this chapter to summarize the study, and to present warranted conclusions based on the data gathered during the course of this investigation.

#### I. SUMMARY

The problem of this study is an investigation of programs being used in the first-class school districts of Washington State for students who have problems that have caused, or may cause their removal from regular classes.

In Chapter One it was stated that the problem was to investigate approaches taken by school districts in coping with problem students. The importance of the study was stated in terms of benefaction for both the individual and society. The terms used in the study were defined.

In Chapter Two the research and literature bearing particularly upon programs in operation throughout the nation for problem students were reviewed. The areas surveyed in the literature were as follows: recognition and referral of anti-social behavioral problem students, types of programs, teacher qualification and preparation

for work with problem children, evaluation of programs, advantages and disadvantages of special programs, and characteristics that were conducive to good programs.

Chapter Three described the procedures used in doing this study.

Chapter Four presents the results and findings of the study with respect to the questionnaires. In presenting the results and findings, the questionnaires were analyzed and quantified in terms of percent.

Chapter Five presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The chief conclusion was that many districts had programs for problem students and that these programs varied in nature. It was recommended that additional research be done in the area of evaluation of programs for problem students.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

1. Many first-class school districts in the State of Washington have programs that are especially designed for problem students; however, the number of first-class districts with programs is not in the majority--roughly 60 percent are without programs for problem children.

2. District size, by enrollment, has a bearing on whether or not there is a program for problem students. A smaller percentage of the smaller districts have programs than do the larger districts.

3. District-wide classes, where students from several schools meet for special programs, and work-study type programs are the most popular approaches to programs for problem children in Washington State's first-class school districts.

4. There is a lack of agreement as to what kind of program is best for problem children, as is evidenced by the variety of programs being offered.

5. A large majority of the districts with programs involve many school personnel in the referral process. Problem students are referred to special programs in a few of the districts surveyed by only one member of the school staff.

6. Most districts with programs for problem children do an adequate job of identification of students for the programs. Use is made of most available material, and in most cases special school personnel are used to help with the identification.

7. In the districts reporting programs for problem students there is a great variation in terms of

the types of students placed in the programs. It would seem, from the questionnaire responses, that students with serious mental disorders are often placed in programs with students who have problems of a much lesser degree. A large percentage of the programs serve students who are classified as underachievers or students with learning difficulties. One is forced to conclude that in a great many instances the programs become "catchalls" for students with many different kinds of problems.

8. Generally speaking, the overall conclusion demonstrates that districts offering programs for problem students fulfill the essential requirements for a sound program, in terms of curriculum content. A few districts offer only the basic courses, but most have offerings as varied as those available in the regular program.

9. The majority of the districts in the survey with programs permit students in the special program to participate in a great variety of extra-curricular activities. Only four districts forbid extra-curricular participation. Over half of the districts with special programs for problem children permit the students in the special programs to participate in student government. This seems to indicate that most districts with problem

student programs think in terms of correction rather than in terms of punishment.

10. It can be concluded from the responses to the questionnaires that most programs for problem children are child-centered rather than subject-centered.

11. There is general agreement that flexibility to meet the students' needs is important in programs for problem students.

12. Most districts state that their programs are centered in activities rather than textbooks.

13. All districts in the survey agree that greater individual attention is necessary for students in special programs.

14. A large majority of the districts with special programs allow a relaxation of academic pressure for problem students.

15. A democratic environment seems to be the best description of most special programs.

16. Home visits are conducted by a high percentage of the districts that have programs for problem students.

17. Less than half of the districts with special programs have special guidance programs for problem children. Most problem children are included in the regular program.



18. Most teachers working with problem students have several years' experience either as a regular classroom teacher or as a teacher of other types of special education.

19. The majority of teachers in problem student programs are trained as regular classroom teachers.

20. The majority of the districts with programs for problem students indicate that these programs are beneficial for the students in them, and by removing problem students from the regular programs, one is forced to the conclusion that the regular classroom will have a better environment for learning.

21. Over half of the districts with special programs reflect that a stigma could be attached to students in them.

22. It might be concluded that some few districts think of special programs as being punitive in nature.

23. All districts indicate that their special programs are successful.

24. It can be concluded from the responses to the questionnaires that programs for problem children in the first class school districts of Washington State are similar in most respects to programs for problem children throughout the nation. It can also be concluded

that there is a genuine effort throughout the first class districts of Washington State, as there is throughout the nation, to give problem students an opportunity to prove to themselves, and the school, that they want to continue in school in a manner that is socially and academically acceptable.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions made in this study, the following recommendations appear to be appropriate.

1. It is recommended that a program for problem children be adopted in each of the first class districts of Washington. Such a program would be beneficial in two ways. The first being that it would remove the problem child from the regular classroom environment, thus giving the rest of the class a better chance for learning, and the second would be to give the problem child a better chance at getting the help and understanding needed.

2. It is recommended that teachers working with problem students be trained in this area, rather than as regular classroom teachers.

3. It is recommended that problem students should be identified and helped before suspension is necessary.

4. It is recommended that as many school personnel as possible, and all available records be utilized in the identification process.

5. It is recommended that programs for problem children be corrective, rather than punitive in nature.

6. It is recommended that problem children programs be protected from becoming "catchalls" for many different kinds of problems.

7. It is recommended that programs for problem children offer all of the courses that are offered in regular programs.

8. It is recommended that students in special programs have the same opportunities, in terms of extra-curricular activities, as students in regular programs.

9. It is recommended that child-centered, flexible, and activity-oriented programs be available for problem children.

10. It is recommended that special program enrollment be kept as small as possible to allow for greater individual attention.

11. It is recommended that additional research be done in the evaluation of programs for problem children.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bloomberg, Claire M., and Carolyn H. Troupe. "Big Brothers to Troubled Children," National Education Association Journal, 53:225, January, 1964.
2. Braun, Robert J. "How One District Handles Incurrigibles," The Education Digest, 32:26-7, December, 1966.
3. Cox, Katherin C. "Permissive Atmosphere in Adjustment School," Clearring House, 30:40-5, September, 1955.
4. Cruickshank, William M., and Orville G. Johnson. Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
5. Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950.
6. Hall, Nason E. "Saving the Trouble Prone," National Education Journal, 54:26-8, April, 1965.
7. Layne, William S. "A Technique for Handling the Atypical Behavior Problem," California Journal of Secondary Education, 31:295-97, May, 1956.
8. Morce, C., Richard L. Cutler and Albert H. Fink. Public School Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped: A Research Analysis. A Project of the Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association, 1964.
9. Pellmann, Maurine, and Gordon P. Tiddle. "The Quincy Youth Development Project--A Program for the Problem Child," Phi Delta Kappan, 40:174-78, January, 1959.
10. Savitzky, Charles. "A Rehabilitation Project in Cooperative Education," High Points, 841:5-19, November, 1959.
11. Schachter, Norman. "In Lieu of Special School," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 41:53-60, November, 1967.

12. Smith, Carol C. "The 600 Schools," Education, 80:215-18, December, 1959.
13. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Teachers of Children who are Socially and Emotionally Maladjusted. 52:11, 1957.
14. Wasson, J. E. "Meeting the Needs of Maladjusted--Reluctant Learners," California Journal of Secondary Education, 34:345-53, October, 1959.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

21246 31st South  
Seattle, WN 98188  
August 15, 1968

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

As an administrator responsible for the education of all students in your district you are, I am sure, interested in programs for students who are disruptive in regular classroom settings.

Under the direction of Dr. W. Gaskell, Central Washington State College, I am writing a field study that is designed to reflect current prevalent practices in programs for problem students. The study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the Master of Education Degree at Central Washington State College.

To complete this study, I will need to have you take a few minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Your prompt response would be greatly appreciated and in return I can offer a summary of the study and an analysis of the returns.\*

The results of this study should prove beneficial to administrators and teachers working with problem students. The information will be regarded as confidential and the names of school districts and individuals will not be reported in the study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Gerard A. McElholm

\* \_\_\_ I would like a summary of the study.



DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Problem student for the purpose of this study shall be used in reference to students who, in the disciplinary sense, have not adjusted to the regular classroom and as a result have been suspended or might be suspended because of their behavior.

Program shall be used in reference to special schools or classes designed for problem students.

DIRECTIONS:

For questions requiring a yes or no response check the appropriate column. Check any or all appropriate responses to the multiple questions. If the response to the first question is no please return the questionnaire nevertheless.

- |   | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| 1. Do you have a program or programs for problem children in your district?                               | ___        | ___       |
| 2. Is the program a special school that deals exclusively with problem students?                          | ___        | ___       |
| 3. Is the program a special district-wide class where problem students are assigned from several schools? | ___        | ___       |
| 4. Does each school have a class that devotes the full school day to problem students?                    | ___        | ___       |

yes no

5. Does each school have a class that devotes part of the school day to problem students? \_\_\_\_\_
- a. How many hours per day? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Is there a work study type program in your district for problem students? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Who decides what students will be served by the program?
- a. The classroom teacher \_\_\_\_\_
- b. The class counselor \_\_\_\_\_
- c. The school psychologist \_\_\_\_\_
- d. The principal \_\_\_\_\_
- e. The vice-principal \_\_\_\_\_
- f. A team of school personnel \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
8. Are students recommended for the program
- a. After they have been suspended from the regular program? \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Before suspension when problems are increasing? \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

yes no

9. What criteria is used in identifying students for the program?

- a. Classroom teachers' observations \_\_\_\_\_
- b. An evaluation of the student's accumulative records \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Behavior in and around the school building \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Evaluation of the student by school psychologist \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Academic record \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. What type of student is served by the program?

- a. General adjustment difficulties \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Moderately psychiatrically disturbed \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Acting out students who disrupt regular classes \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Seriously psychiatrically disturbed \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Recognized delinquent \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Anti-social \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Underachievers or learning difficulties \_\_\_\_\_

yes no

h. Others \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. What subjects are taught in the program?

- a. Language arts \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Social studies \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Mathematics \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Science \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Remedial reading \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Art \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Music \_\_\_\_\_
- h. Crafts \_\_\_\_\_
- i. Study skills \_\_\_\_\_
- j. Shop \_\_\_\_\_
- k. Home economics \_\_\_\_\_
- l. Physical education \_\_\_\_\_
- m. Personal adjustment \_\_\_\_\_
- n. Others \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. What extra-curricular activities are students allowed to participate in while in the program?

- a. Inter-school athletics \_\_\_\_\_

yes   no

- b. Intramurals \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Drama \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Clubs \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Student government \_\_\_\_\_
- f. None \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

13. Does the program allow the relaxation of academic pressure? \_\_\_\_\_
14. Is the program designed for greater individual attention? \_\_\_\_\_
15. Is the program centered in activities rather than textbooks? \_\_\_\_\_
16. Is the program flexible enough to meet the needs of the students? \_\_\_\_\_
17. Would the general environment of the program in terms of rules and regulations be classified as:
- a. Permissive \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Autocratic \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Democratic \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
18. Would the type of instruction in the program be classified as:
- a. Child centered \_\_\_\_\_

yes no

b. Subject matter centered \_\_\_\_\_

c. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_19. Does the teacher in the program visit  
the homes of the problem students? \_\_\_\_\_20. Do other school personnel visit the  
home of the problem student? \_\_\_\_\_21. Is there a special guidance program for  
problem students? \_\_\_\_\_

22. Does the guidance program stress:

a. The uniqueness of each  
personality? \_\_\_\_\_b. The student's problems  
and adjustment to home,  
employment and society  
as well as to school? \_\_\_\_\_c. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_23. In terms of experience what preparation  
do teachers in the program have?a. One to three years in  
regular classes \_\_\_\_\_b. Four to ten years in  
regular classes \_\_\_\_\_c. Over ten years in regular  
classes \_\_\_\_\_d. One to three years in  
special education \_\_\_\_\_

yes no

- e. Four to ten years in special education \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Long term specialized background \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

24. In terms of training what preparation do teachers in the program have?

- a. Trained as a regular classroom teacher \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Trained in other special education areas \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Short term training with problem children \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Extensive specialization with problem children \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

25. How would you rate the program?

- a. Clear failure \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Limited success \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Encouraging success \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Outstanding success \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

yes   no

## 26. Advantages of the program:

- a. It removes the student from situations in which class may be disturbed. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Students can be given a program in which success can be experienced. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Allows for closer supervision. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Can provide greater individual attention. \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Provides an atmosphere in which there can be less pressure. \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Can furnish new opportunities for students. \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Can meet the special needs of problem children. \_\_\_\_\_
- h. Can ease the situation in the regular classroom. \_\_\_\_\_
- i. Can allow problem students to stay in school when they might be unable to cope with a full day's program in a regular class. \_\_\_\_\_
- j. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



yes no

27. Disadvantages of the program:

- a. Special school or class can be used as a threat. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Student in the program can carry a stigma. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. The educational experiences are less broad than those of the regular program. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Facilities are poorer than those of the regular program. \_\_\_\_\_
- e. The program can be a "Catchall." \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Others \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

21246 31st South  
Seattle, WN 98188  
September 16, 1968

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

I know that this is a busy time of the year for you, but I would very much appreciate your taking a few minutes to complete the questionnaire on "Programs for Problem Students" that you received about a month ago.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

G. A. McElholm