A STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ACROSS TEN NATIONS IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ARSELIA BLOCK SEHLER
1969

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ACROSS TEN NATIONS IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

presented by

Arselia Block Sehler

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Special Education

Date May

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ACROSS TEN NATIONS IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

By

Arselia Block Sehler

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine representative objectives for special education in the United States current in 1967, and to use that list as a measure by which objectives might also be examined across ten nations in Europe. Exploratory in design, the study was a search for habilitative goals with international validity for special education. Particular emphasis was placed upon the degree of attention accorded each of fifty objectives identified for the United States, both as the objectives were perceived relative to each other and as the United States was perceived in relation to each of the European special education programs visited. The European approaches were evaluated in turn by twenty-two American educators during the course of a six week special education study tour. Countries studied were: England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the U.S.S.R., Finland, Sweden, Holland, and the United States.

Literature concerning international special education was found to be very limited, and primarily descriptive

rather than comparative in approach. This study was unique in that a number of educators simultaneously evaluated objectives for ten nations, using an instrument prepared for that purpose before the study tour. They similarly evaluated approaches taken by their own nation immediately before and after exposure to foreign programs.

Five questions were explored. These dealt primarily with how manifest the objectives were to the observers for evaluation, and the degree of attention they appeared to be accorded in each nation.

The objectives were presented on a Report Form as fifty items for judgment on a five-point scale. The data secured was made available for evaluation through the use of the Michigan State University CDC 3600 digital computer.

Scores for the United States were compared with scores across nations. Objectives were found to have been most manifest for observation in the United States, England, and the U. S. S. R., and least in France. They also appeared more manifest for the United States on the posttrip than on the pretrip analysis. Items found to be most manifest tended to be practical rather than academic in nature.

Nineteen objectives emerged both as manifest and high on the attention scale. Many of these objectives appeared to relate rather directly to a life continuum responsibility for the handicapped client and for individualized approaches to his education. Of the fifty objectives, the United

States was perceived as most commited to that of adjusting school requirements for exceptional children.

Emergent objectives were also examined for degree of attention accorded across nations. Ranked thus, the United States was generally perceived in the lower middle ranks. Concerning items relating to a continuum of responsibility, Holland and Sweden held the superior rankings, with the U. S. S. R. third, Switzerland fourth, and the United States fifth. For attention to objectives relating to individualizing instruction, the nations apparently most concerned were, in order: the U. S. S. R., Holland, Switzerland, and Sweden, with the United States perceived as exceeding only Hungary, France, and Germany in this regard.

A comparison of pretrip and posttrip evaluations of American approaches indicated little overall change. However, with regard to several of the emergent objectives the observers perceived the United States as according somewhat less attention on the posttrip evaluation.

Implications of the study were suggested for students of special education and for those responsible for providing inservice or graduate study experiences for them. The effectiveness of this approach to data collection was also favorably noted. Considerable additional data is presented in both narrative and tabular form in the Appendix, and is thus made available to those concerned with aspects of habilitation not discussed in the body of the report.

Commitment to the emergent United States objectives appeared higher in general in half of the European nations studied than in America. A responsibility for Americans to secure more information concerning the approaches taken by other nations is strongly implied.

Common ground appears to exist for international communication concerning two aspects: an extension of educational responsibility to include the life continuum of the handicapped, and the individualizing of the approaches to their problems. On these two topics European educators may rather freely communicate with each other, as well as with professionals interested in the exceptional individual on this continent.

Finally, local districts and concerned citizens in the United States may evaluate regional approaches as they appear relative to the data in this study, particularly as it was perceived across their own nation. Rationale for changes may emerge, and the habilitation of exceptional individuals be brought closer to realization.

A STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ACROSS TEN NATIONS IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

By

Arselia Block Sehler

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Elementary and Special Education

1969

DEDICATION

To all who have cared for me and believed in me. Especially John Sehler.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most appreciative of the consistent support given me by my doctoral committee, particularly by my major advisor, Dr. Charles E. Henley. Dr. Henley's interest and encouragement throughout my entire doctoral program was invaluable. Each of the other members of the committee was uniquely valuable to me in the sharing of his own expertise: Dr. Charles V. Mange, Dr. John R. Hurley, and Dr. John E. Jordan. Dr. Jordan was particularly helpful in providing assistance in regard to the cross-national data.

I am also indebted to Dr. Corinne Kass, then of the United States Office of Education, for the insights which she shared with me during my early consideration of the topic for this study.

Finally, I should like to thank Dr. Eric Graf of Ithaca College for enabling me to collect data on the tour which he directed for Study Abroad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Development of Special Education

Evolvement of Approaches

Special education is no recent phenomenon, either in Europe or on this continent. Special provisions, however limited, have existed in the United States for well over a century, and for an even longer span abroad. European approaches were often taken as a model for early educational provisions in this country. This has been true for the education of the atypical child as well as for his normal sibling. Despite this fact, communication and cooperation between special educators here and abroad has been minimal.

We may think of the true beginnings of special education in a very broad sense, in that there came about an acknowledgment of differences so marked in individuals as to cause other people to act in a special way toward them. The outline of this history, in part the narrative of an evolving refinement of civilized peoples, is so general as to need no documentation. It followed

these four steps: (1) the abnormal or weak were destroyed or left to die; (2) they were feared, scorned, ridiculed or imprisoned, existing miserably in filth and hopelessness; (3) they were pitied and recognized as proper subjects for humanitarian efforts; (4) they were minimally educated within a segregated milieu.

In the United States and other major countries there appears to be some evidence that a fifth important concept has evolved. This concept emerges as the belief that the handicapped are potentially enriching members of society rather than its dependants, and that they should be habilitated to reach that goal. The habilitation concept is conceived by some to include even those with multiple disabilities, or with major physical, mental, or emotional problems. The goal of habilitation implies, at long last, a full measure of citizenship, self-fulfillment, and integration for this minority group of our population.

Delineation of Objectives

Habilitation as thus described is an amorphous concept. In order to give it body it will be necessary for us to consider aspects such as programming for individuals with quite different characteristics and limitations, at different stages in their lives. Educational aspects, viewed from the concept of habilitation, are complex. Although objectives such as the availability of well-trained teachers are generally considered important to

successful habilitation, many agencies and personnel other than educators are involved. Again, objectives may be expressed in such generalities as that of establishing provisions for the welfare of the handicapped across their full life span. Or they may be expressed through more specific statements, such as insuring the availability of appropriate driver training to handicapped youth.

It appears obvious that any listing of objectives relating to the habilitative concept in special education may most accurately be described as an operational measure. The concept of habilitation is open-ended, and no listing of objectives could appropriately be considered as "fixed." However, the desired result of all of our efforts will continue to be best represented by those fully-functioning "exceptional" adults among us who have achieved a status of dignity in our society.

Mutuality of Problems

International Approach

Today more and more people are coming to believe that it is not enough to look about within our own country and to assume that all of the answers, or necessarily even the better answers, are to be found there. In the task of analyzing our objectives for special education and giving thought to the soundness of our

philosophy, we may benefit from knowing what other nations believe should take priority. How do they move to resolve the problems of atypical people? What objectives do they consider valid?

Could we not, then, compare the theories and programs of special education, country by country? Not readily, for this type of information is largely inaccessible across national boundaries. Such information, when it has been verbally expressed, has been prepared for local, or at the most, national use, and is seldom available in translation. Occasionally publications will appear with captions or chapter summaries in English. At any rate, we may well ask ourselves how much real understanding we gain by reading a mass of numbers and program descriptions, however available they might be to us. For purposes of communication and cooperative planning we may find this type of data of very limited value.

As for scholarly research, it is very scant indeed. Only recently have our tools been sharpened and our interests quickened to the point of earnest endeavors in comparative special education.

Purpose of This Study

This study was designed to identify habilitative objectives of special education currently meaningful in the United States, and, in a search for new insights, to examine their relevance in foreign settings. A new

methodology for gathering international data was derived for the study. It is thus exploratory in design, both in method and in content. The data secured from this approach, new both in international study and to special education, will be available for the consideration of all who seek cooperative solutions to the problems of the handicapped.

Value of the Study

Scope of the Study

Focus on Objectives

Since World War II the critics of general education in the United States have been making themselves heard. They have in many cases succeeded in becoming "change agents." As a result, a reevaluation of twentieth century practices in education has caused change to be effected at a quickened pace. But reevaluations, soundly based, include a fresh examination of objectives as well as of the results.

As for special education, little formal attention has been devoted to objectives. Even the popular push of the last three decades for integration or reintegration of the handicapped into American public schools was often viewed as much a "means" as it was an end. At the same time, in the course of relieving regular teachers of their more difficult students, the special educators have comforted themselves with the assumption that special

classes provided optimum placement for the noticeably exceptional. Such contradictions suggest the need for an examination of the products of our educational programming. But in addition they should provoke us into a continuous and ongoing examination of the goals of special education. What objectives are truly appropriate at this time and in this place? It is from this perspective that future "products" may be upgraded.

This study was designed to identify those objectives of special education which provide motivation for current practices. Data generated through an international study of representative objectives is thus made available. The data may be cited by local administrators to provide a rationale for certain special education objectives, and for procedures proposed to move the local program toward these objectives. These goals may heretofore have been given little or no consideration. On the other hand, it is possible that very strong emphasis is being placed upon a certain objective locally, and yet it is, according to this data, relatively unimportant. In such case a local reevaluation may be appropriate. A marked difference between local and national or international approaches might indicate either progress or the antithesis of progress. In either case, a study of provocative data could lead to a reevaluation and subsequent improvement of service on the local level.

Breadth of Approach

The objectives examined were phrased to include the categories of exceptionality currently recognized in the United States. References to every age level were included. Different modes of service are suggested. The study therefore offers data pertinent to the leadership task of every individual whose concern includes the special child. Parents, teachers, and administrators are especially close to particular children or groups of children, and therefore may feel a personal involvement in relating their services to appropriate objectives. Legislators, representatives of public and private agencies, and representatives of related professional disciplines are also concerned with objectives. For all who acknowledge a continuing responsibility to examine "the status quo" of the philosophy of special education, this data has implications.

International Implications

Timeliness

International education is attracting increasing attention in the United States. The passing of the *International Education Act of 1966* was a milestone. The National Education Association noted:

> *International education is and has been an important part of American education. Improvement of international education is therefore a goal of the National Education Association. To this end federal*

> legislation is needed. The Association urges its Legislative Commission to exert every effort to ensure the full funding and implementation of the International Education Act of 1966 and to encourage full participation by institutions of teacher education.[1]

The approach taken in this study of special education objectives appears therefore to be timely. It is in step with the trend to examine educational data of other nations and regions in a search for new insights.

Value to Other Nations

The use of this cross-national data need not, of course, be limited to special educators on this continent. Since the study does cross national boundaries, all who are involved with the education and welfare of exceptional individuals may find this comparative data thought-provoking. This is particularly true of educators of the ten countries studied. They are enabled with this data to (1) examine fifty objectives representative of certain United States views, and (2) observe how these objectives were perceived in relation to other nations, including their own.

Methodology

This research may also be of value because it is based upon a method of securing data which is apparently without precedence in international studies. Aspects

---

[1]*NEA Resolution 67-9, International Education: passed at the Forty-Sixth Representative Assembly, 1967.*

unique to the approach employed are: (1) the development and utilization of a predetermined instrument which called upon ideas and judgments rather than facts about specific educational programs; (2) the use of this instrument by a number of observers, simultaneously, and immediately after being exposed to each of the ten European approaches.

Limitations

Bias

The data gathered in this study is an expression of the judgment of United States and Ontario educators. These educators spoke English, and their education and teaching experiences were based on experiences on this continent. They considered fifty objectives derived from literature of United States origin. Their judgments were further shaped from differing local backgrounds and professional experiences and varied academic courses. Therefore the data generated by their European observations can be given credence only as approaches perceived from the United States-Ontario point of view. This bias, both obvious and pronounced, delimits the study.

Structure

The objectives toward which attention was directed were a sampling of those in evidence in the United States

just prior to the study. This represents a limitation: first, in that the objectives observed, although representative, were not necessarily inclusive; and second, the stated objectives limited the reporting to themselves, to the exclusion of other objectives which may have been pertinent in a particular nation or nations.

It may be noted, however, that the fifty objectives selected for attention did provide a baseline for the analysis of national approaches. Also, another avenue was provided the observers through which they were free to record whatever aspects they considered significant. This permitted the addition of objectives where the need was felt by the observer.[1]

We may conclude only that the fifty objectives were used as a point of observation characteristic of educational approaches in certain, but not necessarily in all, areas of the United States.

Exposure

A significant limitation exists in regard to the brief exposure of the observers to those ten European programs. It was often difficult to secure information.

---

[1] In Appendix B will be found a duplication of the Report Form which was used by the observers throughout the trip. Reference is here made to page 6 of the form, entitled, "Educating the Exceptional Child: An Overview." On this page, respondents answered the question, "What has particularly impressed or concerned you about the special education program in this country?"

Since lectures and onsite study together provided the primary basis upon which the educators marked the Report Form, they frequently found themselves without evidence upon which to base judgment. Thus, being unable to score such items on a qualitative basis, they marked many of them with a zero. Where a qualitative judgment could be made, the data upon which it was based was confined to a great extent to observations, lectures, and questions and answers, rather than upon a definitive background of reading and research. The findings must be considered with this limitation in mind.

Research Questions

This study was designed to explore special education objectives, to discover what it is that special educators across nations wish to accomplish. Objectives suggested as appropriate to the United States were taken as a model.

The following questions were posed:

Question One: Manifest Factor

To what extent were the selected United States objectives for special education manifest to the observers on the study tour (1) across nations, and (2) for the United States?

Question Two: Attention Factor

To what extent were the selected United States objectives perceived by these observers to be the object

of the attention of special educators (1) across nations and (2) for the United States?

Question Three: Emergent Objectives

Which of the selected United States objectives appeared to these observers to be both manifest and emphasized by attention (1) across nations and (2) in the United States?

Question Four: Altered Perceptions

How did the observers perceive the selected United States objectives just before and again just after their exposure to European approaches to special education?

Question Five: National Similarities and Differences

Which nations did the United States appear to these observers to most resemble, or to least resemble, in regard to objectives?

Definition of Terms

Certain terms appear in the evaluation instrument or are frequently referred to in this report. They are here defined:

Special education: Educational modifications and provisions designed to serve that child who deviates from the normal child as to his physical, mental or emotional

characteristics, and who gives evidence of requiring special services in order to develop to his own maximum capacity.

International education: A study which "connotes the various kinds of relationships, intellectual, cultural and educational, among individuals and groups of two or more nations. It refers also to the various methods of international cooperation, understanding and exchange."[1]

Comparative education: A study which connotes "the analysis of educational systems and problems in two or more natural environments."[2] The term is used in this paper as providing a means to compare systems, rather than to describe a single system. It is "not for the purpose of determining which system, idea or method is superior, but rather in order to understand the factors underlying similarities and difference in education in various countries."[3]

Habilitation: A "building up," used in the sense of special education as an enabling program designed to specially assist the physically, mentally, or emotionally

---

[1]Quoted from a footnote by Stewart E. Fraser in his Chapter V, "International and Comparative Education," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 37, No. 1 (February, 1967), p. 57. Fraser took his definition from "a forthcoming book by Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, A History of International and Comparative Education, Nineteenth Century Documents, to be published by Scott, Foresman and Co."

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

atypical individual to achieve a successful adulthood as a free and fully-functioning member of his own society. The term is here conceived to represent the prime major objective of special programming in the United States. The political philosophy represented by this concept is egalitarian, implying the right of equality of educational opportunity.

Objectives of special education: Desirable practices or outcomes of practices considered beneficial to the education and habilitation of exceptional children. The fifty objectives to which reference is made in this report are those which were identified as representative of United States approaches and which were included in the Report Form.

Issue: A "coming forth," used here as an idea put forth and circulated in regard to special education, neutral in itself, but phrased for purposes of this instrument as expressing a representative and valid United States objective.

Problem: Term used in the Report Form to indicate an acknowledged objective for exceptional children in the nation observed, one not wholly realized.

Manifest Objectives: Those items relating to special education which were apparent enough to the participants enroute to have elicited an appreciable number of scaled responses from them, as they marked

the Report Forms.[1] Information relating to these objectives had been secured through the observers having heard speakers in the various nations, by their having seen actual evidence of the realization of objectives during site visits, or by means of both avenues of information.

Manifest Factor: The definitive characteristic of "Manifest Objectives."

Attention Factor: The definitive characteristic of objectives relative to the amount of attention or emphasis accorded them in lectures or visible on site tours, recorded on the basis of a five-point scale.

Emergent Objectives. Those nineteen of the fifty selected United States objectives which showed themselves to be high both on the Manifest Factor and on the Attention Factor, as perceived across nations in this study.

---

[1]The participants clearly defined all items referring to objectives which were not discernible at a given time and place by checking in the zero column on the Report Form, rather than by utilizing the five-point scale of intensity.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It may be stated at the outset that no study directly comparable to this research was found, either in the literature relating to comparative and international education or to special education. However, there were important, if indirectly related, contributions, a few of which were helpful to the writer in conceptualizing the approach taken to the present research.

The more applicable of these references are suggested in the following discussion. They are included under: (1) comparative and international education, (2) comparative special education, and (3) travel related to attitude change.

Research

Comparative and International Education

Approaches to Research

The writer wished to set up a study which would indicate international similarities and differences in special education, both as to the determination of

objectives and as to what appeared to be important movements toward the accomplishment of those objectives. It was therefore necessary to devise an approach unique to an exploration of the habilitative goal of special education. Examination of the literature in comparative education clarified the major obstacles to this task and led to a delimiting of approach to the study.

One major pitfall to a comparative study centers about the difficulty of generalization from one society to another. To overcome this involves the necessity for great dedication to minutiae, and, more important, for achieving a grasp of the broad background of the total education structure, as well as of the approaches to special education in each country studied. Each picture must be drawn within the political and social milieu of that nation. There are also practical considerations which face the researcher, such as the length of time permitted for the study, probable language barriers, and the financial resources necessary to conduct such research. Among others, Kandel[1] and Bereday[2] stressed the significance of true knowledgeability.

---

[1]I. L. Kandel, The New Era in Education, A Comparative Study (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955).

[2]George Z. P. Bereday, Comparative Method in Education (Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964).

Bereday suggests four steps which may "point the way to the future for comparative education."[1] Step I involves only a description of pedagogical data for Country A, Country B, etc. Step II involves interpretation, an evaluation of pedagogical data in light of the historical, political, economic, and social aspects of each country, the data still being viewed separately. Step III introduces juxtaposition for the purpose of establishing similarities and differences, at which time a hypothesis for comparative analysis could be made and criteria of comparability established. Finally, in Step IV, a simultaneous comparison could be made between Countries A and B, the hypothesis tested, and a conclusion drawn for any two hypothetical countries. The approach appeared to this writer to be exemplary, while at the same time beyond the limitations of the present exploratory study. It is offered in the present review of literature for the serious consideration of those who wish to research international special education in the future and to consummate that research beyond its present depth and scope. Bereday is strongly suspicious of any short-term study which would profess to compare several nations on more than one theme or problem. "No student of comparative education can attempt the total comparative

---

[1] Ibid., p. 28.

approach . . . without a life-long, full time preparation for the task."[1]

King,[2] in considering perspectives for an international review of education, indicates that if our comparison is to be made between cultures, we must use a time scale (for cultures are in different stages) and we must consider the resources, both human and material, which are available. Therefore we will ultimately be considering values and ideas. Values and ideas are apparently at once the most important and the least verifiable facets of information available for empirical study.

In King's introduction to World Perspectives in Education, the writer does offer some encouragement to that researcher whose dedication is necessarily less than total, as Bereday suggested that it should be. In acknowledging the human element persistent to such types of research he opens the door to exploratory approaches, "Blinkered and biased though we may be," and asserts that "whatever expedient we propose will be full of implications for ourselves."

> But who are we to look at other people's problems and diagnose the crux of their decisions? As we have constantly seen . . . every observation

---

[1] Ibid., p. 23.

[2] Edmund J. King, World Perspectives in Education (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 28.

> we venture upon is an engagement of our own selves and our background. Blinkered and biased though we may be, however, we may actually be of help to them as friends can help each other everywhere. Yet insight, and certainly communication, can only develop where our study is undertaken sympathetically in consonance with the whole life-force of another society's system. . . . What we are looking at is a variation on ourselves, seen through eyes which have an interest; and whatever expedient we propose will be full of implications for ourselves.
>
> Therefore, though in the interest of academic exactness and universal validity we shall try to bring scientific coldness into our inquiries, we shall vitiate the whole proceeding if we imagine that we can ever actually isolate phenomena and lay them side by side in absolute detachment. Nothing animate can be treated in quite that way, least of all among human kind. Consequently, when we think we have found our comparable items and have started to work on them, we must not only beware of our own personal entanglements as far as possible but also acknowledge that we can never deal with any problem in a "once and for all" snap judgment.[1]
>
> In the last analysis we shall discover that some problems can hardly ever be wormed out of their setting, but must be reviewed in situ almost by implication. That is to say, we must be content to make progress by glimpses and surmises and by adducing apparently comparable instances, because we cannot really secure either disengaged "pure" vision in ourselves or convenient laboratory conditions for the study of a deeply entrenched problem. So far from considering this repetitive incompleteness to be the lazy man's woolly way of dealing with such a situation, we ought to recognize that this is the cumulative or peripheral method of the biologist studying any complex ecological problem. Of all ecological complexes, education is the most intricate.[2]

Finally, one note on "commonalities" is rung by Kandel when he says, although not without a firm warning concerning interpretation:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 28.

[2] Ibid., p. 29.

> Now, while it is axiomatic that the character of every educational system is determined by the ethos or culture pattern of the nation that it is designed to serve, an examination of the accounts of the educational reforms planned or already under way in the three democracies--England, France, and the United States--will show that many of the problems which have been dealt with are common to them all.[1] This does not mean that the solutions can be the same or that a universal theory of education can be formulated to cover all cases.[2]

Inclusion of Special Education

As for information about special education in the literature of comparative education, international studies have included the special fields only incidentally. Typical is the comprehensive bibliography for one graduate course in comparative education[3] which listed 198 books, only one of which dealt primarily with an exceptionality, and that with the gifted child!

UNESCO[4] and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare[5] have provided some of the more

---

[1]Underlining that of this writer.

[2]Kandel, loc. cit., p. 371.

[3]Education 804E, Michigan State University, 1966, Dr. Carl Gross, instructor.

[4]UNESCO, "France," World Survey of Education (Paris: 1958), reprint; UNESCO, "Comparative Cross-National Research," International Social Science Bulletin, Vol. 7, 1955), p. 4.

[5]United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau, Research Relating to Children, Bulletin No. 19 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966); see also

comprehensive sources of materials for comparative studies, some of which do include statistics on the handicapped. Statistics appear to be more readily accessible than commentary or interpretation.

Comparative Special Education

There appears to be very limited representation of comparative data is special education. Those sources of reference material to which the researcher may turn as a matter of form[1] proved singularly unproductive in this phase of the search. Of slight benefit also were question searches put through the special education Instructional Materials Center[2] at Michigan State University on

---

President's Panel on Mental Retardation, Bibliography of World Literature on Mental Retardation, a report prepared by the Public Health Service (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963); United States Health, Education and Welfare Department, Report of the Task Force on Behavioral and Social Research (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964); United States Health, Education and Welfare Department, Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation, An Introduction to Mental Retardation Problems, Plans and Programs (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June, 1965).

[1]Education Index (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1929 to date); UNESCO, Education Abstracts (Paris: Educational Clearing House, UNESCO, 1949 to date); Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960).

[2]The USOE/MSU Regional Instructional Materials Center at Michigan State University, East Lansing, was established in 1965 and became one of a network of what is now fourteen regional centers. These centers were established after the President's Panel on Mental Retardation made their reports of their studies of European programs for the mentally retarded. This center has developed a computer-operated question-answer service to aid the special education student in his search of the literature.

two separate occasions. The ERIC[1] publications also offered little helpful information.

Data Reported by Outside Observers

Significant is the fact that an on-site survey of European practices in educating the retarded was undertaken by a sophisticated "team" appointed by President Kennedy in 1960, and that the report was made generally available. Familiarity with this important committee's work[2] challenged the writer to devise an approach to group study that would be practicable under somewhat different circumstances.

It appears to be true that special educators from the United States have begun to take an international view of programs, particularly in the last decade.[3] They have

---

[1]ERIC-CEC is the Educational Research Information Center--Council for Exceptional Children. This center has a computer-based information retrieval system. It is part of the network sponsored by the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

[2]President's Panel on Mental Retardation, Report of Mission to Denmark and Sweden; Report of Mission to the Netherlands; Report of Mission to the U.S.S.R. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962).

[3]Lloyd M. Dunn and Samuel A. Kirk, "Impressions of Soviet Psycho-Educational Service and Research in Mental Retardation," Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 3 (November, 1960), 199-211; Darrell A. Hindman, "Highlighting Programs for the Mentally Retarded in Denmark and Holland," Exceptional Children, Vol. 28, no. 1 (September, 1961), 19-22; Satoru Izutzu and Marvin E. Powell, "Special Education of Handicapped Children in Japan," Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 5 (January, 1961), 252-259; Clara Langerhaus, "Special Education in Central America and Mexico," Exceptional Children, Vol. 25 no. 5

studied various foreign approaches and contributed facts and particular program descriptions, along with their individual interpretations of this data. They have frankly spoken from their background of special education in the United States. The "Education of Exceptional Children" editions of 1963 and 1966, in the Review of Educational Research,[1] included a scattering of such references, the publications being primarily descriptive in nature. The majority of these reports elaborated upon a single nation's approach to service, or perhaps the approach of a few nations. In those instances where comparisons were drawn, the approach was likely to be informal and philosophical in tone, rather than characterized by the precision of an empirical study. Therefore the studies, although international in scope, were not in a strict sense "comparative."

Particular mention should be made of the Taylor and Taylor publication,[2] a comprehensive survey of services for

---

(January, 1959), 202-204, 220; Fred J. Schnoell, "Problems of Retardation in Australia," International Review of Education, Vol. 3 (1957), 192-197; John W. Tenny, "Special Education in the Soviet Union," Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 6 (February, 1960), 296-304; Thomas J. Watson, "Some Arrangements for Training Teachers for Special Education in England," Exceptional Children, Vol. 27,no. 6 (February, 1961), 307-308.

[1]Review of Educational Research (Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association, 1941 to date), February 1963 and 1966.

[2]Wallace W. Taylor and Isabelle W. Taylor, Special Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Western Europe (New York: International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, 1960).

physically handicapped children in twenty-one countries in Western Europe. These authors have presented a description of European special education services and their development, as well as of the related aspects of administration, organization, staffing, and financing of these services.

The pioneers in this area may have persuaded their own professional community to take its first steps towards achieving a broader national perspective and toward effecting some reevaluation within their own fields of endeavor.

Data Reported by Nationals

A second significant source of information on international approaches to special education stems from international organizations and their conferences.[1] On such occasions the presentations through which varied national

---

[1]Herbert Goldstein, "Report on International Conference of Teachers of Backward Children," Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 3 (November, 1960), 139-146; Eugene J. Taylor (ed.), Rehabilitation and World Peace: Report of Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, August 28-September 2, 1960 (New York: The Society, 1960), 423 pp.; World Health Organization, The Mentally Sub-Normal Child, Report of a Joint Expert Committee Convened by WHO with the Participation of the United Nations, ILO, and UNESCO (Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association, April, 1954), 3-46; Council for Exceptional Children, Selected Convention Papers, "Special Education: Strategies for Educational Progress," Report of the 44th Annual CEC Convention, Toronto, Canada, April 17-24, 1966 (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 226-238.

approaches are described frequently may be given by individuals describing their own programs. Although this approach has obvious strengths, the fact remains that reporting remains descriptive and primarily subjective, despite what we may presume to be the high professional and ethical standards of those individuals making the presentations.

It becomes increasingly apparent at this point that the material produced by, and available to, United States special educators is not only fragmented in scope but is generally found to be far removed from the standards for comparative studies suggested by Bereday, King, and other experts in comparative education. The Step I proposed by Bereday, to which previous reference was made[2] (description of pedagogical data for Country A, Country B, etc.) most nearly approximates the approach taken by the majority of these authors. The deeper interpretive level of Step II is in most instances poorly defined or lacking. As for juxtaposition (Step III), enabling one to draw a simultaneous and authentic comparison, little or nothing yet published would be defensible. And we lack readiness for that most important Step IV, the testing of hypotheses through drawing comparisons.

---

[1]Bereday, op. cit., p. 28.

One Empirical Approach to Comparative Data in Special Education

One new and more clearly objective approach to an important phase of special education, a many-faceted study relating to attitudes toward the physically handicapped, has recently been completed at Michigan State University. This was a group research study, both international and intranational, under the direction of John E. Jordan. Thousands of individuals in twelve countries were surveyed, and a dozen or more doctoral dissertations have already evolved through this study of the United States, Costa Rica, Colombia, Peru, England, Holland, France, Yugoslavia, Denmark, Japan, and Belgium.[1] A later on-going project ("ABS-MR"), which analyzed attitudes related to mental retardation, "used instrumentation which was fully evolved via facet theory principles."[2] Increasing sophistication of instrumentation characterizes this group research.

---

[1]The final report of this research project which contains the original statistical data is available as follows: John E. Jordan, Attitudes Toward Education and Physically Disabled Persons in Eleven Nations, Research Report No. 1, Latin American Studies Center (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1968).

[2]John E. Jordan, "Cross-cultural Attitudes Toward Education and Physically Handicapped Persons in Eleven Nations," Lecture presented at the 7th International Congress on Mental Health, London, England, August 12-17, 1968, East Lansing, Michigan, p. 21. (Mimeographed.)

In addition to the task of the analysis of attitudes undertaken in these studies, the problem of cross-cultural measurement was in itself a major hurdle. Hypotheses "were designed to test for differences within-and-across nations for persons or groups with different interpersonal value orientations."[1] Data was secured which could be analyzed between groups (four), across all nations, or "to differentiate between two specific nations across all variables."[2] The research problems of relevancy, equivalency, and comparability are compounded in cross-cultural/national/linguistic studies and were delineated in the analysis of the data procured through this research.

It is significant to note that the approach taken in the Jordan group research has been designed to permit the drawing of comparisons between national groups and among variables. It would appear that this approach comes far closer to approximating Bereday's ideal for Step III and IV, juxtaposition and hypothesis testing, than has anything to which previous reference has been made.

Travel Related to Attitude Change

The results of the present study, in addition to suggesting relationships in regard to issues in special education, will include data relative to change or lack

---

[1] Ibid., p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 20.

of change in the analysis of the home area of the participants after viewing foreign programs. Comparable studies were not found. However, evidence of changes in "world-mindedness" of traveler educators, suggest a degree of flexibility, a broadened perspective due to experiences abroad. Virgilio[1] and Williams[2] confirm this impression. Defining world-mindedness as a person's strong feeling that the welfare of his country is tied up with the welfare of the rest of the world, Virgilio found in measuring attitudes of elementary teachers that those who have visited foreign countries "tend to be more world-minded."[3]

Summary

Three approaches have been taken in this review of the literature.

1. Authorities in comparative education were reviewed. No significant information in regard to special education on an international base was found. This phase of the search was

---

[1]Andrew D. Virgilio, "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Attitudes of Elementary Teachers Toward Selected Questions Related to International Affairs" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1960).

[2]Walter G. Williams, Jr., "An Exploratory Study of Influencing Selected Teachers to Become Interested and Involved in the Area of International Understanding" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965).

[3]"Research Clues," NEA Journal, Feature (January, 1967), 68.

helpful, however, both from the point of view of methodology and of rationale.

2. The area of special education itself was reviewed. It appears that descriptions of approaches taken by countries outside of the United States are few. This information appeared: (1) as reported by United States educators upon their return from study abroad, and (2) as reported by outside nationals at international conferences and in a limited body of foreign literature available to United States educators. Little evidence exists to indicate that the sophisticated goals of comparative research have been seriously attempted. Unique is the approach of one body of group research (Jordan et al.) to which the techniques of computer analysis have been applied, and for which new computer programs have been created, allowing for cross-cultural comparisons of data by variable and by nation.
3. Finally, two studies on "world-mindedness" were reported, both of which suggest that travel may indeed alter the perspective of the traveler.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

In order to secure data for this study, it was essential first to identify those sources of objectives broadly appropriate to special education in the United States. It was then necessary to order and refine a list of such objectives which would be in keeping with the original rationale and criteria. Part I of this chapter describes this early phase of the study and concludes with a list of the fifty objectives actually chosen. Part II describes the entire Report Form (Parts A, B, and C) from the point of view of its content and construction. Part III deals with the Report Form from the point of view of the administration of the instrument by the researcher. Part IV includes the following: (1) background information concerning the study tour experience; (2) the response secured through the use of the Report Forms; and (3) an explanation of the content and use of the personal data sheets. Part V describes those methods employed which enabled the writer to analyze the responses secured on Part A of the Report Forms from all observers, for fifty objectives, and across nations.

Part I: Identification of Objectives

Selection of Objectives

Habilitation is a complex and diffuse goal. It may be realized for a handicapped individual through the attainment of a number of more specific objectives, which may vary even within disability areas. The task here was to define certain of those objectives for examination across nations. These objectives were to be derived from a study of policies and programs expressed and observable on the United States scene just prior to July, 1967.

The United States provided a base line or general point of reference for the entire study. It was carried through as a constant by the use of the English language and through the North American background of the observers. Finally, the data was interpreted primarily as it related to the United States and to the Americans who studied abroad.

In this study, objectives have been defined as "desirable practices or outcomes of practices considered beneficial to the education and habilitation of exceptional children."

Sources of Objectives

What is special education all about? What are we in the United States really trying to do for the handicapped? Which objectives are receiving the most attention? The search for these answers began when the writer began to identify a set of representative United States objectives which would conform to the requisites just described.

Preliminaries

Preliminary planning involved, not only the initial search of the literature, but a number of conferences in regard to the feasibility of the study and the possibility of arriving at any listing characteristic of United States objectives for special education. Faculty members from Michigan State University from the Departments of Elementary and Special Education, Secondary Education, and Counseling and Rehabilitation were consulted. In addition, a visit was made to the national headquarters of the Council for Exceptional Children at the National Education Association headquarters in Washington, D.C., and in May, 1967, the topic was discussed with personnel from that office. The question, "What sources best represent current national thinking about objectives for special education?" was explored. From these discussions emerged a decision to study with particular care the material included in House[1] and Senate[2] hearings on the education and training of the handicapped, data pertinent to the passing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Dr. Samuel Kirk and a number of other well known special educators presented

---

[1]U.S., Congress, House, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, of the Committee on Education and Labor, Education and Training of the Handicapped, Parts 1, 2, 3, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1966.

[2]U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Parts 1 through 6, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1966.

their views at those hearings. Many of their comments related closely to objectives.

Other References

A study of the report of the State of Michigan, Senate Subcommittee on Special Education (the Levin report)[1] served to verify many of the essential concerns and objectives for special education which were expressed in the national hearings.

An analysis of the Index[2] for the 1966-1967 volume of Exceptional Children (the national publication for the Council for Exceptional Children) further verified the pertinence of certain objectives.

Publications of the National Education Association were also scanned during the visit made to those headquarters. Identifying the purposes of United States education has historically been a task of the Educational Policies Commission, and their later publications[3] were reviewed.

---

[1]Michigan, Subcommittee on Special Education, of the Senate Education Committee, Report on Special Education in Michigan, Lansing, April, 1966.

[2]Exceptional Children, Index, Vol. 33, no. 7 (1966-1967), 673-674.

[3]The Educational Policies Commission, The Central Purpose of American Education (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1961); and The Educational Policies Commission, Contemporary Issues in Elementary Education (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1960).

These were the primary sources which were consulted for the purpose of satisfying the basic requisites for objectives: the criteria of timeliness and of cross-national and cross-categorical inclusiveness. These and other pertinent criteria will next be explained.

Criteria for Choice of Items

Sources for objectives had thus been identified. Three basic criteria were applied as the list of objectives was initially compiled. These were:

1. There was verifiable evidence of their timeliness in the United States within a year preceding July 1, 1967.
2. The objectives were characteristic of more than one region of the United States.
3. The objectives were inclusive of the generally recognized types of handicapping conditions (categories) in the field.

A careful examination was made of the data which had accrued by the process described. It was evident that more definitive criteria would have to be established in order to reduce the material to useable form. The following additional criteria evolved:

1. Although the objectives of general education could not actually be divorced from those of special education, only items relating rather specifically to the latter were to be included. This decision was necessarily made, because of two factors, (1) the length of the Report Form, and (2) the limited educational opportunities which these students were to have opened to them in the ten nations visited.

2. Although special education as defined in this study cuts across all disability areas, the categorical areas were to be mentioned specifically in at least one context. Care was taken to insure some examination of objectives for the multiply handicapped, culturally deprived, gifted, mentally handicapped, physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, and neurologically impaired children.

3. Although the elementary years generally embrace the bulk of the special educator's attention, both the earlier and later periods were to be specifically included for observation. The later period was considered particularly significant to the larger concept of habilitation.

4. Although public school education provided the general frame of reference, the contributions of other disciplines and other sources of services were also to be included. Different special education approaches within public school programs were also to be considered.

Prior to the actual construction of the scale the items had been reduced to fifty. A third category of criteria related to the presentation of the objectives in appropriate terminology and format:

1. The items were to be stated briefly but specifically. The decision was made to state the majority of the objectives on a specific rather than a general basis. This was to encourage the participant to search for a factual basis from which he might make his judgments concerning an objective.

2. Items were to be phrased clearly, but in a manner consistent with the educational background of the type of group anticipated for this study tour.

3. Items were to be phrased as desirable characteristics, as objectives, which, if realized, should be of benefit to exceptional children.

4. Items were to be expressed uniformly, and in such a manner that each idea could be logically associated with each gradation on the scale (1, Not at all; 2, To a slight extent; 3, To a moderate extent; 4, To a large extent; 5, To a maximum extent).

Presentation of Objectives

A review of the procedure leading to the compilation of the list of objectives follows.

Refinement

Criteria were applied to the mass of notes which represented evaluations of the basic sources of materials. Duplications were noted, and items mentioned in more than one context were transferred from a list of nearly two hundred items to the list of fifty which was finally adopted. Certain items which appeared to represent newly-emerging objectives were also included.

Terminology

Since a single objective might have been expressed in several different ways in different contexts, the statement of each objective was a task unique to itself. The form chosen was that of a gerund phrase, with each objective being stated so that it might be scored on the basis of a five-point scale.

Order

Finally, in preparing the list of items to be incorporated into a Report Form, thought was given to the

order of presentation. Each item was placed in relation to the item preceding and following it. The earlier items on the scale will be found to be of a general nature. Later items are clustered insofar as it appeared practicable by topic. For example, items 42-50 relate primarily to the education and utilization of school personnel.

Listing

The list of objectives finally selected for use in the Report Form follows. Included after each item and enclosed in parentheses is the brief content description which is used to designate that item in the report of the findings in Chapter IV and V.

1. Establishing a total life program for the handicapped. (Total Life Program)

2. Lessening the schism between general and special education. (Schism, General and Special Education).

3. Reducing the confusion in terminology (emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted; brain damaged, etc.). (Confusion in Terminology).

4. Breaking down the "hardened" categories of medical classifications. (Breaking down Categories).

5. Reducing architectural barriers to educational, occupational and civic opportunities. (Architectural Barriers).

6. Adjusting programs to accommodate an increasing incidence of severely and multiply-handicapped. (Severely and Multiply-handicapped).

7. Influencing legislation designed to improve special education. (Influencing Legislation).

8. Cutting across color and race lines in providing for the exceptional child. (Color and Race Lines).

9. Providing for males and females with comparable adequacy in special education programming. (Males and Females).

10. Providing for flexible programming for those children whose handicaps or abilities lessen or increase perceptibly during their school years. (Flexible Programming).

11. Coping with the problem of population density as it affects programming. (Population Density).

12. Achieving greater acceptance of the handicapped by the nonhandicapped. (Acceptance of Handicapped).

13. Insuring adequate financial support for the education of the handicapped. (Financial Support).

14. Compensating for retardation believed environmentally induced. (Environmental Retardation).

15. Providing centers to function as advisory sources for curriculum development. (Curriculum Development Centers).

16. Making available a central source of research dissemination, such as ERIC. (Research Dissemination).

17. Offering continuing educational and recreational opportunities for the mature handicapped. (Opportunities for Mature Handicapped).

18. Achieving early identification of atypical children. (Early Identification).

19. Providing appropriate services for exceptional children of ages 1-5. (Services, Ages One to Five).

20. Arriving at a broad evaluation of individual abilities and disabilities for each child. (Broad Evaluation).

21. Insuring the handicapped of evaluation, medical care, and educational opportunity regardless of the financial or social status of the family. (Opportunity Regardless of Status).

22. Sharing provisions for special needs with pupils attending private institutions. (Provisions in Private Institutions).

23. Adapting institutions to a fluid and more complex population of handicapped individuals. (Adapting to Changing Needs).

24. Providing vocational guidance, and offering practical assistance to the handicapped in finding their place in suitable vocations (e.g., work-study programs). (Vocational Assistance).

25. Assuming the responsibility for transporting the handicapped to suitable programs, when necessary. (Transporting the Handicapped).

26. Establishing special classes for the emotionally disturbed. (Classes for Emotionally Disturbed).

27. Providing trained school social workers and offering psychiatric assistance to disturbed children. (Offering Psychiatric Assistance).

28. Providing the gifted with adequate opportunity to develop their potentials. (Provisions for Gifted).

29. Making it possible for the physically handicapped to go on to higher education when they are mentally able. (Higher Education, Physically Handicapped).

30. Providing physical education opportunities, and recreational facilities, suitable for handicapped children. (Physical Education and Recreation).

31. Enabling the severely handicapped to make some contribution to the world of work, although within a sheltered environment. (Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience).

32. Furnishing special training opportunities and automobile operational devices, thus enabling a number of the physically and mentally handicapped to drive a car. (Enabling Handicapped to Drive).

33. Experimenting with promising new ideas suggested by research, and conducting "action research." (Experimentation and Action Research).

34. Regulating class size in accordance to type and special needs of the handicapped. (Regulating Class Size).

35. Freely utilizing the tools of automation for teaching the handicapped (e.g., teaching machines for the deaf, etc.). (Utilizing Automation in Teaching).

36. Adjusting the subject matter, and quantity, of schoolwork required, to the physical and/or mental abilities of handicapped children. (Adjusting School Requirements).

37. Applying individualized "prescriptive teaching" techniques, as with the neurologically impaired. (Prescriptive Teaching).

38. Reporting realistically and meaningfully to the parents of exceptional children, and involving their support in the education process. (Involving Parents in Education).

39. Incorporating special therapies (physical, speech, occupational) within the school program of the exceptional child. (Special Therapies in School).

40. Facilitating the interdisciplinary sharing of responsibility for decision-making in regard to individual "cases." (Interdisciplinary Team Decisions).

41. Engaging and utilizing the support of community agencies. (Utilizing Community Agencies).

42. Imposing "certification" standards, including some internship experiences, for administrators of special education programs. (Certification Standards for Administrators).

43. Requiring teachers to have medical background and training in their field of exceptionality. (Teacher Training in Exceptionalities).

44. Requiring special education teachers to have a foundation of basic courses in child development and learning theory. (Teacher Training, Basic Courses).

45. Requiring apprenticeship or practice teaching experiences for teachers of the handicapped, including experience with normal children. (Practice Teaching, Regular and Special).

46. Promoting the status of teachers of the handicapped to be equal to the status accorded teachers of regular children. (Status of Teachers of Handicapped).

47. Adequately compensating special education teachers for the skills and training considered important to their preparation. (Adequate Pay for Special Educators).

48. Insuring the recruitment of an adequate number of qualified personnel. (Recruitment of Qualified Personnel).

49. Using non-professional personnel to a satisfactory extent in order to implement the professional objectives of the program. (Utilizing Non-professional Personnel).

50. Providing for the continuing "in-service" education of those professionals working with the exceptional child. (Providing for In-service Education).

Part II: Construction and Use of the Report Form

Part A: Fifty Objectives

With the fifty United States objectives for special education having been identified, stated, and organized for examination across nations, the task became that of the construction of the Report Form. Initially Part A, consisting of pages 1-6 of the Report Form, was to have been the entire instrument. It remained the major section and provides the greater part of the data used in this study.

The fifty objectives were listed down the left half of five legal sized pages, in a column referred to hereafter

as Column I. Immediately above that column, and repeated at the top of each page, was the scoring key for the five-point scale. The entire list was preceded by an introduction headed "Educating the Exceptional Child: Issues of Concern." The introduction gave a general description of the setting in which the Form was to be used, some information about the study itself, and brief instructions. These were supplemented by more complete instructions given orally by the researcher upon the first presentation of the Form.

Columns II and III:
Response Columns

Space was allowed for observers to check their responses on a 1-5 basis for all items upon which they felt they had some basis for judgment. Each objective, according to the observer's perception, might be checked as receiving no attention at all in that nation (1), to apparently receiving attention to a maximum degree (5).

It was acknowledged at the outset that there would probably be instances when the observer would have little or no personal background of information from which to respond to an item on the Report Form. In such case he was urged to take the option of marking the zero column rather than to employ the five-point scale. Printed instructions read, "If you have no basis whatsoever for

judgment, simply mark the zero column of the scale. Otherwise, scale by degree . . . "

Columns II and III:
Dual Perception Check

The introduction to the Report Form suggested that observers were to "see and hear about" special education in each nation. Column II provided the avenue for reporting the "hearing about." Column III provided the avenue for reporting what they noted on site visits. Roughly fifty per cent of the professional time spent in each nation was spent in hearing about that nation's approach to special education from local educators. The other half was spent in site visits.

The oral instructions given by the researcher at the outset of the study proved to be very valuable in that it gave opportunity for elaboration upon the use of the two columns. A number of the participants asked questions and the ensuing discussion did much to clarify the meaning of the headings of Columns II and III. The heading for Column II read, "The issue is viewed as a problem." This was interpreted as, "I hear them saying that the issue is viewed as a worthwhile problem to work on--that it is a legitimate objective for special education, in that it indicates one desirable outcome." The heading for Column III read, "Attempts are being made to resolve the problem." This was interpreted as, "Obviously attempts are being made

to resolve the problem--because programs and facilities to accomplish this objective really exist--I've seen some of them."

This dual perception check required the observer to think twice concerning each objective for each nation. Theory and practice were both taken into consideration. The combination provided as complete a response concerning each objective as it appeared possible to elicit. The two columns were considered of equal weight in all statistical procedures for each item.

Part B. Free Response Page

As the construction of the Report Form progressed, it appeared that it might be helpful to provide a means by which the observers could more freely report their perceptions. Part A, it will be recalled, was highly structured, with the objectives also being of United States origin. Conceivably the observers might have perceived other objectives. Or they might have wished to express some of their feelings about what they saw. They may have drawn some conclusions of their own. With this thought in mind, page 6 was added.

It was entitled, "Educating the Exceptional Child: An Overview." This question followed: "What has particularly impressed or concerned you about the special education program in this country?"

Some of the data thus procurred was analyzed en route and was periodically discussed in seminars along the way. Request for this had come from the participants and it provided motivation for them to continue marking the Report Forms for each nation. It was a type of reward for their cooperative effort. Even more important to them, perhaps, was the bulletin which was prepared from the page 6 data and mailed to all participants in October, 1967. This bulletin, entitled "European Approaches to Special Education: A Summary of Impressions Reported by Students Participating in the Ithaca College Study Tour" is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix D. Although the data was here reported dispassionately, the "human element" is clearly present in this part of the study.

Part C: Mapping Sentences

The Report Form contained a third section, pages 7-9. Here three "mapping sentences,"[1] for three major types of disability, were charted by the observers. Thus they summarized their perceptions of "theory and practice" relating in turn to physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped individuals of each nation.

---

[1]Completion of a "mapping sentence" imposes several instances of decision-making on the part of the subject. The final sentence which he offers as a representation of his own thinking is his unique combination of ideas. It was derived from the choice of a number of alternatives offered in several instances for consideration. Choosing from alternatives, he moved to the expression of that single complete thought.

The possibilities for use of this data were two-fold: it could be used in a general way to add to the interpretation of the data secured in Part A, or it could be statistically analyzed and handled as a separate piece of research. The decision was made to exclude it from the present report. Procedures for analysis of this type of data are very new. John E. Jordan and his students, in the group research to which previous reference has been made, have conducted research through the medium of mapping sentences by making a facet analysis of item content. Dr. Louis Guttman, Scientific Director of the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, and Dr. Jordan, together evolved these mapping sentences and applied their analysis for the first time in 1968.

Part III: Administration of the Report Form

The nine-page Report Form was filled out by each participant a total of twelve times: (1) initially, after the first assembly of the group in London, when the pretrip analysis of United States objectives was made; (2) ten times throughout the trip, with the forms being collected before the professional program began in each new country; (3) finally, in Amsterdam, at the conclusion of the tour, when the participants made their posttrip analysis of the United States objectives.

Copies of the Report Form were duplicated by off-set process before departure and hand-carried throughout the

trip. Despite the obvious disadvantages of this plan, it insured success. Otherwise, problems relating to the time element and the difficulty of finding facilities and supplies for duplicating the forms would have added greatly to the responsibility of the researcher throughout the tour. Reliance upon postal service would also have been unwise. A simplified type of Report Form could have been employed, but it would have been less satisfactory in other respects.

The amount of time taken to fill out each copy of the Report Form varied according to the individual and the professional experiences in each country. Trial use of the Form in the United States before departure suggested that twenty to twenty-five minutes might be necessary the first time or two. After the participants became more familiar with the questions they completed the Form more rapidly. Occasionally they took much longer, particularly when they became involved in writing their impressions at some length to the free-response question.

The researcher introduced the Report Form and generally outlined the plan at the first meeting of the group. A number of questions were posed at the outset concerning the fifty objectives and the use of Columns II and III. Some of the participants spoke to the researcher about particular questions later. This was a very easy and natural thing to do in that the researcher was herself a participant and

constantly with the group. In this manner uniformity of interpretation of the Form was, in so far as possible, insured.

Part IV: Collection of Data

Background

On July 2, 1967, a group of twenty-five special educators convened for the first time as participants of an European study tour given under the direction of Dr. Eric Graf, of Ithaca College, New York. Dr. Graf, Chairman of the Departments of Psychology and Sociology at Ithaca College, was also the director of the class seminars and the professional liaison person with foreign professional personnel on this, the second summer study tour so organized.[1]

The educators were the members of the graduate class enrolled for the summer term through Ithaca College in Education 566, a course entitled "European Approaches to Special Education: Psychology of the Mentally Retarded and Multiple Handicapped Child." A choice of six or eight hours of graduate credit was available to those participants who elected to take the tour for credit.

At the time of that first meeting held in Ramsay Hall, London, the requirements for Education 566 were

---

[1]This tour was organized through Study Abroad, Inc., of P.O. Box 1505, Escondido, California and 250 West 57th Street, New York 19, New York.

outlined by Dr. Graf. The completion of the Report Forms, although encouraged by Dr. Graf, were not a part of the original requirements for credit. At that meeting he gave this writer the opportunity to describe and present the research plan for the consideration of the group. It could have been accepted or rejected by the group as a whole at that time or individually by members. A tentative agreement was reached to the effect that the tour participants would fill out the personal data sheets and evaluate the programs in the United States or Ontario with which they were familiar. They also agreed to complete a Report Form for England and return all of these to the writer before their professional experience in France was begun. The procedure thus inaugurated was continued throughout the tour.

The group observed programs in ten metropolitan areas in eastern and western Europe. These were, in the order visited: London, Paris, Bonn, Geneva, Prague, Budapest, Moscow, Helsinki, Stockholm, and Amsterdam.

Initially, in each nation, a special educator from a university or special school in the area would address the group and allow for questions and answers. When the lecture was not in English, translators were provided. Since both Dr. and Mrs. Graf had background in other languages they often lent additional assistance to the group, if, for example, they perceived the connotation of

certain terminology to be misleading. Thus the language barrier, usually a formidable one in international study, was kept to a minimum.

Following the lectures, there were discussion periods, demonstrations, displays of curricular materials to peruse, and site visitations, according to the plans made by the host educators in anticipation of the arrival of this group. The type and relative success of the entire experience varied from nation to nation. Factors were: the importance attached to different phases of special education, the effectiveness of the lecturers, the time available for site visits, and the availability and quality of special education facilities in the area.

Response

Cooperation in filling out the Report Forms was maintained throughout the tour. One member of the original group left the tour in France. The data provided by two other members was not sufficiently complete to be included in the analysis of the fifty objectives (Part A). Data provided by twenty-two participants is thus included. A few of their Report Forms were not completed due to illness or other personal factors, which was responsible for the loss of six per cent of maximum possible responses.

Participants

The study was begun on the assumption that the group of United States educators who would be attracted by such a tour would be made up of professionals with adequate to superior educational background, and that they would be both knowledgeable of special education and motivated toward professional growth. It was presumed that if such a group were in fact to emerge, then their judgments, their perceptions of the things they saw, heard, and read about during the course of the study experience would be of value to other educators.

Personal data sheets[1] were filled out by this group in London. Items for the data sheets were designed to present a rather detailed picture of the individuals making up the study tour. They provided information as to age; sex; formal education with description of earned degrees; years of total professional experience in education; years of experience in special education as teacher, administrator, or clinician; geographic area represented, and size of population from which regional special education reporting was drawn; types of pupil preferred by participants (by category); and stated motivation for having taken the trip. A cursory analysis was made of these data sheets as they were returned to the researcher in England. Had they

[1]A copy of these Personal Data record forms will be found in Appendix B.

failed to meet basic expectations, the study would not have been continued.

Part V: Analysis of Research

Procedures

Processing

Statistical procedures used for the analysis of Part A of the Report Form (pages 1-5) are here discussed. Findings are reported from Part A only in the body of this paper.

Responses from the Report Form, Part A, were first recorded on special scoring sheets and then transferred to punched cards. The data were scored according to detailed instructions (see Code Book, Appendix C). The Michigan State University Control Data Corporation 3600 digital computer (CDC 3600) was used for all data analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Two frequency Column Count Programs,[1] designated as FCC I and FCC II, were used. These programs provided printouts of frequency, per cent and adjusted per cent of all data from the Report Form (A) and also from the personal data sheets. This information proved helpful in enabling the writer to gain a clinical "feel" for the data.

---

[1] J. Clark, "Manual of Computer Programs" (East Lansing, Michigan: Research Services, Department of Communications, Michigan State University, 1964). (Mimeographed.)

Another set of printouts provided, by objective item number (1-50), the number of responses, the mean, standard deviation, and rank of that item by mean for each nation (twelve reports) and a summary sheet. This data is reported in tabular form as Appendix A.

Cross-National Data: Emergent Objectives

With the printouts available as described, the writer proceeded with the analysis. Search for the better items of all observed items was undertaken.

Better items were considered to be those items which qualified on each of two factors, the Manifest Factor and the Attention Factor. These items were then called "Emergent Objectives."

Manifest Factor

Columns II and III of Part A of the Report Form had elicited a dual perception check, both the "hear about" and "see" aspects of the experience. Where there was no basis for judgment for one or both columns, the observers had checked the zero rather than a number on the 1-5 scale. Items which were most "Manifest" across nations in the two columns, by actual count of the scaled responses, were considered the better items on the Manifest Factor. Conversely, these were the items with the smallest number of zeros recorded across nations.

Attention Factor

When the observers did have a basis for judgment, either from hearing about an objective in a nation or from seeing evidence of its accomplishment, they marked that objective on a scale of 1-5, the larger number indicating the greater amount of attention being accorded that objective in that nation. Items of highest mean by rank across nations were considered the better items on the Attention Factor.

Clustering

Nineteen of the fifty objectives qualified thus as Emergent Objectives. These were listed and scanned for ideational commonality. Five of them shared a common relationship within the "continuum of responsibility" for the handicapped, ten of them suggested "individualizing educational services" and four others dealt with "administrative aspects." After classification, interpretations of these groups of objectives were then drawn by cross-analysis of the printout sheets previously described.

Cross-National Data: Fifty Objectives

Although the primary focus of this study was upon objectives for special education, the focus was also upon the United States and perceived relationships with the ten other nations as to objectives. Some of those relationships were suggested through a study of the body of data

including all objectives. Others were better determined by examination of individual Emergent Objectives.

The United States Pretrip and Posttrip Forms were also examined as to the fifty objectives, which were ranked and compared by mean.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The identification of objectives for special education was begun with a search of the literature and further developed and expressed through the definition of fifty representative items for the Report Form Part A. The pertinence of the fifty representative United States objectives was gauged by (1) the extent to which they were manifest to the group of observers, and (2) the degree of attention which they were perceived to be attracting across nations. This report of research findings will focus upon these United States objectives, particularly from the point of view of the position of the United States in relation to other nations concerning them.

Part I of this chapter describes the nature of this group of participants. Information secured through the personal data sheets[1] was analyzed. Part II presents tables and discussion concerning the five research questions explored in this study. These questions dealt in turn with (1) the Manifest Factor across nations and in the United States; (2) the Attention Factor across nations and in the

[1]See Appendix B.

United States; (3) the identification and classification of Emergent Objectives; (4) alteration of perceptions concerning United States objectives, comparing Pretrip and Posttrip Report Forms; and (5) similarities and differences perceived across nations as to United States objectives.

Part I: Nature of Participants

Importance

The initial findings of the study dealt with the nature of the group of observers upon whose perceptions this research is based. It was crucial that this group be considered adequately qualified for the task requested of them. These qualifications included educational background, teaching and other professional experience, experience with exceptional children and an interest in particular types of exceptionality, and professional motivation for travel.

Description

An analysis of the data secured through the personal data sheets revealed the following:

Sex

There were nineteen women and three men, who were accompanied by their wives.

Age

Members of the group ranged in age from 22 to 62 years. Their mean age was 49.5 years; the median was 47.5 years.

Education

All of the participants had some coursework beyond the Bachelor's degree. Seventeen of the participants held the equivalent of a Master's degree or beyond, if we include the three members who had one additional year of non-degree graduate work. Three people had four earned degrees or their equivalent, excluding a Doctorate, and two others held Doctorates.

Table 1 summarizes the educational status of the participants.

TABLE 1.--Educational status of tour participants.

Description of Degrees Held	Number of Participants	% of Group Represented
One degree (B.A., B.S.) plus additional coursework	5	22.73*
One degree plus one additional year non-degree	3	13.64
Two degrees (includes M.A., M.S., A.S., A.A.) excluding Doctorate	9	40.91
Four degrees or equivalent, excluding Doctorate	3	13.64
Three degrees, including Doctorate	1	4.55
Five degrees, including Doctorate	1	4.55
TOTAL	22	100.02**

* Numbers were rounded to second place in this study.
** Discrepancy due to rounding.

Professional Education Experience

Most of the professional experience of this group was in actual classroom teaching. However, some of it was clinical or administrative. Only one participant had no formal professional experience outside of her practice teaching. All but three had five years or more. When we examine the professional experience in education, both general and special, we find the group mean to be 12.25 years. Table 2 provides further data.

TABLE 2.--Professional education experience of tour participants.

Number of Years of Professional Experience	Number of Participants	% of Group Represented
0	1	4.55
1 - 4	2	9.10
5 - 9	6	27.27
10 - 14	6	27.27
15 - 19	4	18.18
20 - 24	3	13.64
Range in Years 0-24 TOTAL	22	100.01

Experience in Special Education

For the most part, the participants had had experience first in general education and later in special education. The group mean of professional experience in working with

the exceptional child was 8.13 years, of which a mean of 6.43 years was spent in actual teaching of the exceptional. Two people had informal but no formal experience in special education. Two-thirds of the group had spent five or more years in special education. Table 3 indicates the special education experience of the group.

TABLE 3.--Participants' professional experience in special education.

Number of Years of Professional Experience	Number of Participants	% of Group Represented
0	2	9.10
2 - 4	5	22.72
5 - 9	7	31.82
10 - 14	4	18.18
15 - 19	3	13.64
20 - 24	1	4.55
Range in Years: 0-24 TOTAL	22	100.01

Geographic Data

Nine members, or 40.91% of the group, were from the eastern section of the United States. Six, or 27.27% were from the western portion of the United States, three

(13.64%) were from the Midwest, and one (4.55%) was from the South. Three (13.64%) were from Ontario.[1]

When asked to define the home region from which they were reporting, the participants tended to identify those portions of the metropolitan areas with which they felt they had the most familiarity. As a consequence, nine (40.91%) identified regions with a population under 100,000, five (22.73%) identified populations of 100,000 - 500,000, four (18.18%) identified populations of 500,000 - 1,000,000, and four more (18.18%) identified populations of over 1,000,000. Participants were more likely to be familiar with urban than with rural areas.

Areas of Choice

Participants were asked to indicate that type of pupil in which they had the greatest personal interest. A preponderance of interest was indicated in the retarded, giving the greatest total in first and second choices (45.00% or 63.18%, including trainable). This was to be expected in light of the nature of the brochure from Ithaca College, and other advertising before the trip in which retardation was particularly mentioned. Then, too, this is generally conceded to be the largest major category of children who benefit from special education. More

[1]Data from the entire group is included in this study. Regional differences were obviously present among and between all five areas here roughly categorized.

surprising was the relatively high percentage of those indicating the area of emotionally disturbed as first, second, or third choice: 59.09%, with none indicating it to be their least preferred area. Table 4 summarizes the data in regard to exceptionality areas of choice.

TABLE 4.--Exceptionality areas of choice indicated by participants.

Exceptionality Area	Percentage of Participating Group By Order of Choice			
	First	Second	Third	Last
Gifted	0	9.09	0	27.27
Normal	22.73	4.55	4.55	13.64
Educable Retarded	22.27	22.73	13.64	0
Trainable Retarded	18.18	0	18.18	13.64
Orthopedic and Special Health	4.55	4.55	9.09	4.55
Visually Handicapped	0	0	13.64	13.64
Speech and Hearing Handicapped	9.09	4.55	4.55	9.09
Emotionally Disturbed	9.09	36.36	13.64	0
Multiply Handicapped	9.09	18.18	13.64	0

Motivation for Travel

Participants were asked to rate their purposes for taking the tour. Only four people of the twenty-two

indicated purposes other than those directly related to special education. Half or 50% indicated as first choice, "to learn more about special education" and another 31.82% gave "to get new ideas for use in working with or planning for exceptional children." In indicating their second choice, 72.72% still maintained that their interest was in special education, with the responses evenly distributed on the above-mentioned items. For a third choice the majority of the group (54.54%) gravitated evenly between "to travel, enjoying foreign countries" (27.27%) and "to earn academic credit" (27.27%).

Summary

The twenty-two participants in this study were individuals who had all had some personal experience with exceptional children. Two-thirds of the group had spent five or more years in special education. All but two people had worked directly with the exceptional in some professional capacity.

Participants brought to their task of evaluating foreign programs experience both in regular and in special education. The group mean of 12.25 years in education included 8.13 years of professional responsibility in special education, 6.43 years of which involved direct teaching of the exceptional child.

As for educational background, seventeen of the twenty-two held the Master's degree or at least one year

of coursework beyond the Bachelor's. All had some coursework beyond the Bachelor's and two held Doctorates. All but one had taken courses directly applicable to special education, and the majority had taken a great deal of coursework to qualify for the responsibilities they were currently assuming in the field.

A majority of the group was primarily concerned with retardation as a disability, particularly within the educable range. However, the group appeared to be almost equally concerned with the emotionally disturbed child.

These educators were most familiar with programs in urban areas on this continent. The eastern portion of the United States was represented by the largest number (9) although areas of the west (6), midwest (3), south (1) and Ontario (3) were also represented.

This study tour involved a considerable expenditure of money.[1] Motivation for taking the tour was explored. The majority of the participants stated at the outset a commitment to learn more about special education and to get new ideas for use in working with or planning for exceptional children. Their perseverance in carrying out this study attests to the sincerity of that professional commitment.

---

[1]The basic tour cost was $1,875. It is doubtful if any students spent less than $2,100 when tuition, all meals, and incidentals were included. Only one member was funded out of other than personal resources. At least one other member had borrowed an appreciable sum in order to make the tour.

Part II: Research Questions

Five major questions were explored in this study.

Question One: Manifest Factor

To what extent were the selected United States objectives for special education manifest to the observers on the study tour (1) across nations, and (2) for the United States?

Manifest Across Nations

Twenty-two participants were asked to rate each of fifty objectives twice (Columns II and III) for a total of twelve times. This task was completed through the Report Forms, which were returned 94% of the time with responses to the fifty objectives indicated either by zero or number. Occasionally students were unable to participate in the study of a particular nation because of illness or other personal reasons.

Analysis was made of those Report Forms which were returned.[1] On Table 5 will be found the fifty items ranked by number of scaled numerical responses elicited across nations. The items varied as to this Manifest Factor, for the availability of data upon which observers could pass judgment had varied according to what they had

---

[1]On Table 13, page 92, will be found the Manifest Factor shown as relative to individual nations. Table 5 presents this Factor as the objectives appeared in relation to each other across nations.

TABLE 5.--Manifest Factor across nations: fifty special education objectives ranked by number of scaled responses made by observers.

Rank of Item	Item Number	Description of Objective	Number of Responses
1	21	Opportunity Regardless of Status	478
2	34	Regulating Class Size	460
3	24	Vocational Assistance	458
4	18	Early Identification	458
5	39	Special Therapies in School	455
6	1	Total Life Program	449
7	20	Broad Evaluation	449
8	31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	448
9	40	Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	442
10	10	Flexible Programming	435
11	36	Adjusting School Requirements	427
12	6	Severely and Multiply Handicapped	427
13	19	Services, Ages One to Five	425
14	13	Financial Support	424
15	26	Classes for Emotionally Disturbed	424
16	27	Psychiatric Assistance	422
17	45	Practice Teaching, Regular and Special	418
18	38	Involving Parents in Education	412
19	11	Population Density	410
20	30	Physical Education and Recreation	404
21	44	Teacher Training, Basic Courses	404
22	23	Adapting to Changing Needs	398
23	47	Adequate Pay for Special Educators	395
24	29	Higher Education, Physically Handicapped	391

25	25	Transporting the Handicapped	387
26	14	Environmental Retardation	386
27	33	Experimentation and Action Research	384
28	46	Status of Teachers of the Handicapped	380
29	17	Opportunities for Mature Handicapped	378
30	9	Males and Females	372
31	49	Utilizing Non-professional Personnel	372
32	42	Certification Standards for Administrators	370
33	43	Teacher Training in Exceptionalities	368
34	48	Recruitment of Qualified Personnel	364
35	2	Schism, General and Special Education	364
36	7	Influencing Legislation	361
37	12	Acceptance of Handicapped	352
38	41	Utilizing Community Agencies	351
39	37	Prescriptive Teaching	320
40	50	Providing for In-service Education	316
41	15	Curriculum Development Centers	314
42	4	Breaking Down Categories	295
43	3	Confusion in Terminology	292
44	16	Research Dissemination	290
45	35	Utilizing Automation in Teaching	290
46	5	Architectural Barriers	277
47	8	Color and Race Lines	250
48	22	Provisions in Private Institutions	241
49	28	Provisions for Gifted	152
50	32	Enabling Handicapped to Drive	136

heard about the item (Column II) and what they had noted on site visits (reported in Column III).

Items most manifest across nations (ranks 1-15) related rather closely to direct educational services of a school or institution. Not before rank 14 did we find a primarily administrative item included (#13, financial support).

In the middle ranks (16-34) more general types of items began to appear. Here is where items concerning teacher status and preparation were found.

Less manifest by rank (35-45) on Table 4 were some of the more academic concepts, such as the item concerning the schism between general and special education, terminology, categories, automation, prescriptive teaching, and research dissemination.

In the last ranks (48-50) were items concerning provisions in private institutions, provisions for the gifted, and driver education. These three objectives were simply not observable to any appreciable extent, particularly the last two. Little thought apparently was given across nations as to architectural barriers for the physically handicapped (46). We note that color and race lines appeared to be a negligible factor (47). Where no particular problem or need was felt the objective appeared irrelevant.

Manifest in the United States

Reporting for the United States has been derived primarily from the Pretrip form. The reasoning for this lies in the fact that the observers were fresh from their own special education locale at the outset of the trip, just as they were fresh from their experiences in each of the European nations as they reported their perceptions of those nations in turn.

The fifty objectives were 91% manifest[1] to the observers initially reporting about their own geographic areas. The Posttrip response was higher, being 94%. These figures represent the analysis of an actual count of scaled response to the fifty objectives, secured from those sets of Report Forms returned by the observers.

Considered individually, forty of the fifty objectives elicited between 38 and 44 responses, the maximum possible.[2] The smallest number of responses was 31. This objective, least manifest in the United States (Item #22, Provisions in Private Institutions) had also been ranked 47, or very low across objectives for all nations on the Manifest Factor.

The analysis of the Pretrip form indicated that on the whole the fifty objectives which had been selected as

---

[1] This figure will be found on Table 13 in the discussion of a later question concerning national similarities and differences. (See page 92.)

[2] See Appendix A, Table A-11.

characteristic of the United States were objectives concerning which the observers felt sufficiently well qualified to make a scaled judgment, at least insofar as their own geographic areas were concerned.

Question Two: Attention Factor

To what extent were the selected United States objectives perceived to be the object of the attention of special educators (1) across nations, and (2) for the United States?

Attention Across Nations

Objectives which were manifest to the observers were rated by them on a five-point scale for Column II and again for Column III. Reference is here made to the point upon that scale which represented the mean judgment of the twenty-two observers, or the Attention Factor, secured twice for each objective of the fifty for each nation.

Table 6, which gives a list of the fifty objectives by item number with a brief description of the item, shows them ranked from high mean to low mean as perceived across nations. Midpoint on the rating scale was 3.00, "to a moderate extent." Objectives perceived of greater importance begin with rank 1, which carried a mean of 3.45 across nations (item #39, Special Therapies in School). Low mean was 2.46 (item #32, Enabling Handicapped to Drive).

Thirty-one of the fifty items were perceived as attracting at least moderate attention (3.00-3.45) averaged across nations.

TABLE 6.--Attention Factor across nations: fifty special education objectives ranked by mean on a five-point scale.

Rank of Item	Item Number	Description of Objective	Mean
1	39	Special Therapies in School	3.45
2	40	Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	3.44
3	21	Opportunity Regardless of Status	3.38
4	38	Involving Parents in Education	3.34
5	1	Total Life Program	3.34
6	36	Adjusting School Requirements	3.32
7	34	Regulating Class Size	3.32
8	44	Teacher Training, Basic Courses	3.30
9	37	Prescriptive Teaching	3.28
10	46	Status of Teachers of Handicapped	3.25
11	27	Offering Psychiatric Assistance	3.23
12	20	Broad Evaluation	3.23
13	24	Vocational Assistance	3.21
14	13	Financial Support	3.21
15	45	Practice Teaching, Regular and Special	3.20
16	31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	3.18
17	42	Certification Standards for Administrators	3.18
18	47	Adequate Pay for Special Educators	3.18
19	10	Flexible Programming	3.17
20	48	Recruitment of Qualified Personnel	3.16
21	30	Physical Education and Recreation	3.15
22	6	Severely and Multiply Handicapped	3.14
23	33	Experimentation and Action Research	3.12
24	11	Population Density	3.10

25	50	Providing for In-service Education	3.09
26	29	Higher Education, Physically Handicapped	3.07
27	18	Early Identification	3.06
28	12	Acceptance of Handicapped	3.05
29	7	Influencing Legislation	3.05
30	14	Environmental Retardation	3.04
31	35	Utilizing Automation in Teaching	3.00
32	16	Research Dissemination	2.99
33	15	Curriculum Development Centers	2.95
34	17	Opportunities for Mature Handicapped	2.95
35	19	Services, Ages One to Five	2.92
36	25	Transporting the Handicapped	2.92
37	23	Adapting to Changing Needs	2.91
38	9	Males and Females	2.91
39	26	Classes for Emotionally Disturbed	2.90
40	41	Utilizing Community Agencies	2.87
41	43	Teacher Training in Exceptionalities	2.79
42	2	Schism, General and Special Education	2.74
43	49	Utilizing Non-professional Personnel	2.73
44	22	Provisions in Private Institutions	2.67
45	8	Color and Race Lines	2.58
46	4	Breaking Down Categories	2.56
47	28	Provisions for Gifted	2.54
48	3	Confusion in Terminology	2.53
49	5	Architectural Barriers	2.49
50	32	Enabling Handicapped to Drive	2.46

Nineteen were judged of slight importance (2.99-2.46). These scores varied considerably more by item for individual nations.[1]

Items of lowest mean (ranks 45-50) were: #8, Color and Race Lines; #4, Breaking Down Categories; #28, Provisions for Gifted; #3, Confusion in Terminology; #5, Architectural Barriers; and #32, Enabling Handicapped to Drive. It may be recalled that several of these same items had also appeared least manifest as objectives. Here, even when the observers did feel that they had information for judging these items, the objectives appeared to be receiving little attention across nations.

Items of highest mean across nations (ranks 1-10) included two concerning teachers (rank 8, #44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses; rank 10, #46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped). Higher than these two in rank are items rather directly concerned with what goes on in special education, including the idea of a total life program (rank 5, #1), involving parents in education (rank 4, #38), and giving opportunity to children regardless of family status (rank 3, #21). Within the school itself are suggested the importance of interdisciplinary team decisions (rank 2, #40), special therapies in school (rank 1, #39), regulating

---

[1]The tables given in Appendix A show the ranking of the fifty items for each nation.

class size (rank 7, #34); adjusting school requirements (rank 6, #36) and prescriptive teaching (rank 9, #37).

Attention in the United States

Observers filled out the first copy of the Report Form for their own nation just before visiting other nations. Data therefrom is designated in this study as "Pretrip, United States." The respective means of those items, each representing an objective for special education, are shown in Table 7, where they are ranked from high to low mean as perceived for the United States before embarking on the European trip.

That objective which was perceived to be of greatest importance (rank 1) had a mean of 3.77 (#36, Adjusting School Requirements), a mean which was appreciably higher than that of the item in rank 2, with a mean of 3.55 (#34, Regulating Class Size). It was higher than rank 1 across nations (#39, Special Therapies in School, mean 3.45).

That objective perceived of slightest importance (rank 50) in the United States had a mean of 2.18 (#43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities), which was considerably lower than rank 50 across nations had been (#32, Enabling Handicapped to Drive, mean 2.46). Other items of very low mean were: rank 48, #15, Curriculum Development Centers; rank 47, #4, Breaking Down Categories; rank 46, #22, Provisions in Private Institutions; and rank 45, #9, Males and Females.

We note that there are similarities in the ranks of least importance for the United States and the manner in which items were perceived across nations. Item #32 (Enabling Handicapped to Drive) and #4 (Breaking Down Categories) were within the last 5 ranks in Attention not only for the United States but also across nations. Item #43 (Teacher Training in Exceptionalities), was also low both for the United States (rank 50) and across nations (rank 41). Item #22, Provisions in Private Institutions, was likewise low for the United States (rank 46) and across nations (rank 44).

In contrast, item #5, Architectural Barriers, perceived as very low across nations (rank 49, mean 2.49), was high for the United States (rank 13, mean 3.26).

Let us now consider items of highest mean for the United States, or objectives attracting considerable attention. The first five items of highest mean for the United States were all items previously notable as high ranking in mean across nations. These were: #36, Adjusting School Requirements (rank 1, United States and rank 6, across nations); #34, Regulating Class Size, (rank 2, United States and rank 7, across nations); #44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses (rank 3, United States, and rank 8, across nations); #38, Involving Parents in Education (rank 4, United States and rank 4, across nations); #39,

Special Therapies in School (rank 5, United States and rank 1, across nations).

In contrast, we find that other objectives high in mean rank for the United States were not perceived to be so across nations. Examples were: #7, Influencing Legislation (rank 6, United States, mean 3.45, but rank 29, across nations, mean 3.05); #26, Classes for Emotionally Disturbed (rank 7, United States, mean 3.41 but rank 39, across nations, mean 2.90); #8, Color and Race Lines (rank 8, United States, mean 3.38 but rank 45, across nations, mean 2.58).

In all, thirty-four of the fifty objectives were perceived in the moderate range of attention (3.00-3.77) for the United States. Sixteen were judged as receiving slight attention (2.98-2.18).

Question Three: Emergent Objectives

Which of the selected United States objectives appeared to these observers to be both manifest and emphasized by attention (1) across nations and (2) in the United States?

Introduction

Certain of the fifty objectives were identified as high on the Manifest Factor across nations. Others were identified as high on the Attention Factor. Objectives chosen as worthy of more careful study were those which emerged from the general data as high on both factors.

TABLE 7.--Attention Factor in the United States: fifty special education objectives ranked by mean on a five-point scale before observers viewed European programs.

Rank of Item	Item Number	Description of Objective	Mean
1	36	Adjusting School Requirements	3.77
2	34	Regulating Class Size	3.55
3	44	Teacher Training, Basic Courses	3.48
4	38	Involving Parents in Education	3.45
5	39	Special Therapies in School	3.45
6	7	Influencing Legislation	3.45
7	26	Classes for Emotionally Disturbed	3.41
8	8	Color and Race Lines	3.38
9	6	Severely and Multiply Handicapped	3.34
10	48	Recruitment of Qualified Personnel	3.33
11	25	Transporting the Handicapped	3.33
12	41	Utilizing Community Agencies	3.29
13	5	Architectural Barriers	3.26
14	1	Total Life Program	3.26
15	40	Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	3.25
16	31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	3.24
17	21	Opportunity Regardless of Status	3.20
18	18	Early Identification	3.19
19	24	Vocational Assistance	3.19
20	14	Environmental Retardation	3.17
21	30	Physical Education and Recreation	3.16
22	27	Offering Psychiatric Assistance	3.14
23	13	Financial Support	3.14
24	45	Practice Teaching, Regular and Special	3.31
25	12	Acceptance of Handicapped	3.10

26	37	Prescriptive Teaching	3.09
27	20	Broad Evaluation	3.09
28	3	Confusion in Terminology	3.07
29	33	Experimentation and Action Research	3.06
30	50	Providing for In-service Education	3.00
31	19	Services, Ages One to Five	3.00
32	35	Utilizing Automation in Teaching	3.00
33	23	Adapting to Changing Needs	3.00
34	10	Flexible Programming	3.00
35	28	Provisions for Gifted	2.98
36	29	Higher Education, Physically Handicapped	2.97
37	2	Schism, General and Special Education	2.95
38	42	Certification Standards for Administrators	2.95
39	16	Research Dissemination	2.94
40	11	Population Density	2.91
41	17	Opportunities for Mature Handicapped	2.86
42	49	Utilizing Non-professional Personnel	2.85
43	46	Status of Teachers of Handicapped	2.83
44	47	Adequate Pay for Special Educators	2.81
45	9	Males and Females	2.75
46	22	Provisions in Private Institutions	2.65
47	4	Breaking Down Categories	2.62
48	15	Curriculum Development Centers	2.52
49	32	Enabling Handicapped to Drive	2.48
50	43	Teacher Training in Exceptionalities	2.18

Identification of Emergent Objectives

Emergent Objectives for special education across nations were considered to be those items most "manifest" (the "hear and see" response factors were high and the zeros few) and the items which commanded highest rankings on the five-point scale (the attention or emphasis factor). Emergent items on the Manifest Factor included the first sixteen items on that scale[1] and also items #12, #37, #38, and #46. Emergent items on the Attention Factor included the first sixteen items on that scale[2] and also items #6, #10, #18, and #19. No items were considered if they fell within the last eleven ranks on either scale. The nineteen items which qualified as emergent on both factors are shown on Table 8.

Classification of Emergent Objectives

The nineteen Emergent Objectives were examined as to content. Five of them suggested a continuum of responsibility for the handicapped, ten suggested the individualization of educational services, and four appeared to be primarily administrative in aspect. They were:

---

[1] See Table 5, p. 67.

[2] See Table 6, p. 72.

TABLE 8.--Nineteen items identified as Emergent Objectives on basis of Attention Factor and Manifest Factor ranking of fifty items across nations.

Item No.	Description of Objective	Rank of Fifty Items	
		Attention Factor	Manifest Factor
1	Total Life Program	5	6
6	Severely and Multiply Handicapped	22	12
10	Flexible Programming	19	10
13	Financial Support	14	14
18	Early Identification	27	4
19	Services, Ages One to Five	35	13
20	Broad Evaluation	12	7
21	Opportunity Regardless of Status	3	1
24	Vocational Assistance	13	3
27	Offering Psychiatric Assistance	11	16
31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	16	8
34	Regulating Class Size	7	2
36	Adjusting School Requirements	6	11
37	Prescriptive Teaching	9	39
38	Involving Parents in Education	4	18
39	Special Therapies in School	1	5
40	Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	2	9
44	Teacher Training, Basic Courses	8	21
46	Status of Teachers of Handicapped	10	28

Continuum of Responsibility:

#1. Total Life Program
#38. Involving Parents in Education
#19. Services, Ages One to Five
#24. Vocational Assistance
#31. Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience

Individualizing Educational Services:

#18. Early Identification
#20. Broad Evaluation
#20. Interdisciplinary Team Decisions
#39. Special Therapies in School
#10. Flexible Programming
#36. Adjusting School Requirements
#34. Regulating Class Size
#6. Severely and Multiply Handicapped
#27. Offering Psychiatric Assistance

Administrative Aspects:

#13. Financial Support
#21. Opportunity Regardless of Status
#46. Status of Teachers of Handicapped
#44. Teacher Training, Basic Courses

Question Four: Altered Perceptions

How did the observers perceive the selected United States objectives just before and again just after their exposure to European approaches to special education?

Introduction

This question was answered to some extent through a study of the scores of the fifty items as to the Manifest Factor and again as to the Attention Factor. Examination was also made of the nineteen Emergent Objectives.

Manifest Factor

Examination of the U.S. Pretrip and the U.S. Posttrip data showed only a scattering of differences as to the availability of objectives for scaling. The judgment of the twenty-two observers appeared to be consistent in this regard. However, the differences which did show themselves have one characteristic in common. Where a change of three or more responses occurred, it was without exception toward more rather than fewer responses for the item.

Table 9 identifies those eight items which the observers were able to judge for the United States in retrospect more inclusively as a group. It might be noted that this data represents a total of 44 possible responses on Pretrip and only 42 possible responses on Posttrip, but despite that the movement was toward a greater number of total responses for each item.

The single item which moved most markedly was #43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities, for which nine more responses were recorded on Posttrip. This change in awareness of what is available in the United States may have come in part through the observers noting wide differences across nations on this item, observing only slight concern for the item in five of the ten European countries visited.[1] On both the U.S. Pretrip and the U.S. Posttrip Forms this

[1]See tables in Appendix A. The countries perceived as giving higher priority to this objective were, in order of attention: Hungary, France, U.S.S.R., Sweden, and Switzerland.

TABLE 9.--Increase in Manifest Factor of eight of the fifty objectives for special education as indicated by observers on U.S. Pretrip and U.S. Posttrip Report Forms.

Item Number	Description of Objective	Pretrip[1]	Posttrip[2]	Increase
22	Provisions in Private Institutions	31	34	3
37	Prescriptive Teaching	32	36	4
43	Teacher Training in Exceptionalities	33	42	9
5	Architectural Barriers	34	40	6
11	Population Density	36	40	4
29	Higher Education, Physically Handicapped	35	40	5
16	Research Dissemination	35	38	3
25	Transporting the Handicapped	36	39	3

[1]Of 44 possible responses.

[2]Of 42 possible responses.

same item (#43) was extremely low in rank on the Attention Factor (Pretrip, rank 50, mean 2.18 and Posttrip, rank 49, mean 2.31). Even though the observers felt considerably more able to judge the item on Posttrip (+9 responses Manifest) they held firmly to their judgment as to the relative insignificance of the objective for the United States.

Attention Factor

Little apparent difference was noted as to the overall Attention Factor accorded the fifty selected objectives on the U.S. Pretrip form versus the U.S. Posttrip form. When the fifty items are examined individually, however, certain objectives are noticeably higher or lower on the two forms.

Table 10 provides a summary of data concerning those items which were perceived as higher on the Attention Factor by the U.S. Posttrip form than by the U.S. Pretrip form. About these items the observers were in effect saying, "I now judge that we pay more attention to this objective in the United States than I thought we did before I took this tour." Eight items for which a mean change of .25 or more was noted were, as listed in rank order of mean change: (1) #15, Curriculum Development Centers; (2) #16, Research Dissemination; (3) #28, Provisions for Gifted; (4) #46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped; (5) #10,

TABLE 10.--Items perceived as higher on Attention Factor on U.S. Posttrip* form compared to U.S. Pretrip form.

Item No.	Description of Objective	Increase in Mean*	Gains in Ranks**
15	Curriculum Development Centers	.73	33
16	Research Dissemination	.45	33
28	Provisions for Gifted	.32	22
46	Status of Teachers of Handicapped	.32	19
10	Flexible Programming	.28	10
11	Population Density	.27	17
4	Breaking Down Categories	.27	10
9	Males and Females	.25	12

*Mean change .25 or more

**Of fifty items

Flexible Programming; (6) #11, Population Density; (7) #4, Breaking down Categories; (8) #9, Males and Females.

Table 11 provides a summary of data concerning those items which were shown perceived as lower on the Attention Factor by the U.S. Posttrip form than by the U.S. Pretrip form. About these items the observers were in effect saying, "I now judge that we pay <u>less</u> attention to this objective in the United States than I thought we did before we took this tour." Nine items for which a mean change of .25 or more was noted were, as listed in rank order of mean change: (1) #5, Architectural Barriers; (2) #49, Utilizing

Non-professional Personnel; (3) #8, Color and Race Lines; (4) #31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience; (5) #19, Services, Ages One to Five; (6) #1, Total Life Program; (7) #36, Adjusting School Requirements; (8) #17, Opportunities for Mature Handicapped; (9) #3, Confusion in Terminology.

TABLE 11.--Items perceived as lower on Attention Factor* on U.S. Posttrip form compared to U.S. Pretrip form.

Item No.	Description of Objective	Decrease in Mean*	Loss in Rank**
5	Architectural Barriers	.61	31
49	Utilizing Non-Professional Personnel	.55	8
8	Color and Race Lines	.49	30
31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	.41	26
19	Services, Ages One to Five	.39	14
1	Total Life Program	.38	26
36	Adjusting School Requirements	.29	2
17	Opportunities for Mature Handicapped	.28	6
3	Confusion in Terminology	.26	15

*Mean change .25 or more

**Of fifty items

Emergent Objectives

In the two preceding sections we have been examining objectives for the United States on the Manifest Factor and on the Attention Factor as they appeared to the observers before and after the tour. Focus was on objectives and the rankings we saw were relative to the position which they held to other of the fifty objectives.

At this point we shall continue to examine Pretrip and Posttrip means for objectives but we shall do so (1) as they appeared in rank across nations and (2) only as to the nineteen Emergent Objectives previously identified. This data is summarized in Table 12.

Of the nineteen Emergent Objectives, eight were viewed after the trip as receiving slightly more attention than at first perceived. Total gain in mean change was 1.28 points.

Of these only two were changed in mean to any appreciable degree: #46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped, +.32, and #10, Flexible Programming, +.28. Third was #37, Prescriptive Teaching, +.22. It might be noted that these three items shifted greatly in rank across nations, however: #46 gained from twelfth to eighth rank; #10 gained from eleventh to fourth rank, and #37 gained from eleventh to sixth rank of the twelve ranks. This data suggests that the European nations were perceived as paying relatively little attention to these particular items despite the fact that they were Emergent Objectives.

TABLE 12.--A comparison of U.S. Pretrip and U.S. Posttrip perceptions of nineteen Emergent United States Objectives, ranked as recorded across nations.

Classification	Item No.	Description	Rank*		Mean		Change		
			Pre-Trip	Post-Trip	Pre-Trip	Post-Trip	Rank	Mean Increase	Mean Decrease
Continuum	1	Total Life Program	6	11	3.26	2.88	5		.38
	38	Involving Parents in Education	6	5	3.45	3.50	1	.05	
	19	Services, Ages One to Five	5	9	3.00	2.61	4		.39
	24	Vocational Assistance	4	5	3.19	3.18	1		.01
	31	Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	4	9	3.24	2.83	5		.41
Individualization	18	Early Identification	4	8	3.19	2.95	4		.24
	20	Broad Evaluation	9	8	3.09	3.10	1	.01	
	40	Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	9	8	3.25	3.31	1	.06	
	37	Prescriptive Teaching	11	4	3.00	3.28	7	.28	
	36	Adjusting School Requirements	2	4	3.77	3.48	2		.29
	34	Regulating Class Size	4	6	3.55	3.40	2		.15
	6	Severely & Multiply Handicapped	5	6	3.34	3.24	1		.10
	27	Offering Psychiatric Assistance	8	5	3.14	3.32	3	.18	
Administration	13	Financial Support	8	6	3.14	3.20	2	.06	
	21	Opportunity Regardless of Status	9	10	3.20	3.05	1		.15
	46	Status of Teachers of Handicapped	12	8	2.83	3.15	4	.32	
	44	Teacher Training, Basic Courses	4	5	3.48	3.45	1		.03

*On basis of cross-national data (12 report forms).

Eleven of the Emergent Objectives were viewed as receiving slightly less attention than at first perceived and rated on the Pretrip form.

Of these objectives five were changed in mean to an appreciable degree: #31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience, -.41; #19, Services, Ages One to Five, -.39; #1, Total Life Program, -.38; #36, Adjusting School Requirements, -.29; and #18, Early Identification, -.24. Total loss in mean change was 2.29 points.

Again we note that these scores reflected considerable shifting in ranks across nations: #31 dropped from fourth to ninth rank; #19 dropped from fifth to ninth rank; #1 dropped from second to fourth rank, and #18 dropped from fourth to eighth rank. According to this data it appears that the judgment of the observers altered as to how much attention they thought the United States was according objectives #31, #19, #1, #36, and #18, all of which relate to items which are far from trivial in special education.

Question Five: National Similarities and Differences

Which nations did the United States appear to these observers to most resemble, or to least resemble, in regard to objectives?

Introduction

The subject of national similarities and differences as perceived by the twenty-two American observers could be

treated at length. Only a few aspects will be included in this discussion.

Manifest Factor

How did the nations compare on the Manifest Factor for the group of fifty United States objectives?

These fifty objectives were most Manifest for the United States itself. There were 1999 responses of a possible 2200 scaled responses on the first, or Pretrip, administration of the Report Form, 91% having been marked on the five-point scale rather than with a zero. The Posttrip percentage was 94%.

According to Table 13, the Manifest range extended from 94% to 50% across nations. High among the European nations were England (84%) and the U.S.S.R (83%), being almost equally open to observation as perceived by this group of students. Finland was next with 75%, followed closely by Holland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and Switzerland. Hungary and Germany were both only 65% on the Manifest Factor. Approaches to special education were least Manifest in France (50%).

Therefore England and the U.S.S.R were most comparable to the United States on the Manifest Factor. France was least comparable.

TABLE 13.--Manifest Factor for individual nations: rank by number of scaled responses concerning fifty selected United States objectives.

Rank	Nation	Number of Responses	Possible Responses*	Per cent Manifest
1	U.S. Posttrip	1980	2100	94
2	U.S. Pretrip	1999	2200	91
3	England	1774	2100	84
4	U.S.S.R.	1747	2100	83
5	Finland	1490	2000	75
6	Holland	1560	2100	74
7	Czechoslovakia	1529	2100	73
8	Sweden	1564	2200	71
9	Switzerland	1460	2100	70
10	Hungary	1435	2200	65
11	Germany	1241	1900	65
12	France	900	1800	50

*50 items, two columns, twenty-two participants.

Emergent Objectives

The nineteen objectives selected as being high both on the Manifest Factor and the Attention Factor across nations will be considered once more. They will be examined as to the attention they were perceived as receiving in individual nations.

Those objectives classified as involving a continuum of responsibility in special education are shown on Table 14, along with their rank across nations.

It will be seen that the United States was perceived in the middle ranks (4-6) on all of these items, slightly below midpoint of the eleven ranks. One nation, Holland, was perceived as outstanding (rank 1) on three of these five items (#1, Total Life Program; #31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience; and #24, Vocational Assistance). Finland ranked highest on #38, Involving Parents in Education. The U.S.S.R. held that place for #19, Services, Ages One to Five.

Sweden held consistently to the second and third ranks on these items. Taking these five objectives overall, Holland and Sweden held the superior rankings, with the U.S.S.R. third in line, Switzerland fourth, and the United States fifth. The nation perceived to be paying least attention to these objectives was Hungary.

We will next consider Table 15, which concerns those Emergent Objectives which relate to an individualized approach to special education. Again we find that the United States appeared across the middle ranks, ranked slightly below the average for this group of items. The United States appeared strongest (rank 2) as to #36, Adjusting School Requirements, and was in fourth rank for #18, Early Identification and also for #34, Regulating

TABLE 14.--Eleven nations as ranked in regard to five Emergent Objectives concerning a continuity of responsibility in special education.

Nation	#1 Total Life Program		#38 Involving Parents in Education		#19 Services, Ages One to Five		#24 Vocational Assistance		#31 Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
U.S. Pretrip	6	3.26	5	3.45	5	3.00	4	3.19	4	3.24
England	9	3.14	8	3.12	4	3.00	9	2.85	5	3.21
France	5	3.44	11	2.43	9	2.60	7	3.00	8	2.88
Switzerland	4	3.54	3	3.64	8	2.68	5	3.16	3	3.53
Germany	10	3.00	7	3.19	10	2.53	8	2.86	6	3.16
Czechoslovakia	7	3.22	9	2.84	2	3.25	10	2.79	11	2.53
Hungary	11	2.68	10	2.78	6	2.83	11	2.71	10	2.70
U.S.S.R.	2	3.81	6	3.32	1	3.86	2	3.76	7	3.16
Finland	8	3.15	1	3.69	11	2.50	6	3.06	9	2.76
Sweden	3	3.62	2	3.68	3	3.02	3	3.62	2	3.65
Holland	1	4.23	4	3.50	7	2.73	1	4.17	1	4.36

Class Size. It appeared low, ranked tenth of eleven nations, on #37, Prescriptive Teaching and also on #10, Flexible Programming.[1]

Nations perceived as first rank on any of these ten objectives were: the U.S.S.R. on six items, Holland on three items, and Czechoslovakia on one. These objectives were for the U.S.S.R.: #18, Early Identification; #20, Broad Evaluation; #40, Interdisciplinary Team Decisions; #39, Special Therapies in School; #37, Prescriptive Teaching; and #34, Regulating Class Size. For Holland first ranking items were: #10, Flexible Programming; #36, Adjusting School Requirements and #6, Severely and Multiply Handicapped. Czechoslovakia was perceived in first rank for attention to #27, Offering Psychiatric Assistance.

If we consider the overall picture for these ten objectives, we find them being accorded attention by nation in this order: (1) U.S.S.R., (2) Holland, (3) Switzerland, and (4) Sweden. Next come Finland and Czechoslovakia, which appear similar overall, both ranking high (1 and 2) on #27, Offering Psychiatric Assistance, while differing widely on #18, #39, and #37. Less obviously concerned with these objectives overall, and in

---

[1] Posttrip ranks on both of these items were considerably more favorable to the United States, #37 advancing from rank 10 of 11 ranks to rank 6 of 12 ranks, and item #10 advancing from rank 10 of 11 ranks to rank 4 of 12 ranks. However, the overall rank placement for both Pretrip and Posttrip United States remains in the region of rank 7.

TABLE 15.--Eleven nations as ranked in regard to Emergent Objectives concerning an individualized approach to special education.

Nation	#18 Early Identification		#20 Broad Evaluation		#40 Interdisciplinary Team Decisions		#39 Special Therapies in School		#37 Prescriptive Teaching	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
U.S. Pretrip	4	3.19	8	3.09	8	3.25	6	3.45	10	3.09
England	5	3.18	9	3.05	9	3.07	8	3.30	7	3.14
France	7	3.14	10	2.90	11	2.90	11	3.00	11	2.50
Switzerland	3	3.23	4	3.33	2	3.69	4	3.58	4	3.38
Germany	10	2.59	11	2.44	10	3.00	7	3.45	9	3.11
Czechoslovakia	2	3.38	6	3.20	3	3.65	9	3.23	8	3.13
Hungary	8	2.82	7	3.10	5	3.55	10	3.12	6	3.23
U.S.S.R.	1	3.79	1	3.86	1	3.90	1	3.98	1	3.60
Finland	11	2.34	3	3.35	7	3.53	3	3.68	2	3.47
Sweden	6	3.14	5	3.21	6	3.53	5	3.47	5	3.36
Holland	9	2.81	2	3.65	4	3.62	2	3.68	3	3.46

Nation	#10 Flexible Programming		#36 Adjusting School Requirements		#34 Regulating Class Size		#6 Severely and Multiply Handicapped		#27 Offering Psychiatric Assistance	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
U.S. Pretrip	10	3.00	2	3.77	4	3.55	5	3.34	7	3.14
England	9	3.00	5	3.21	9	3.05	3	3.41	4	3.41
France	7	3.04	11	2.72	10	2.87	4	3.36	8	3.10
Switzerland	2	3.30	6	3.18	5	3.40	7	3.00	3	3.54
Germany	11	2.78	9	3.03	7	3.22	10	2.62	9	2.89
Czechoslovakia	6	3.11	7	3.17	6	3.33	9	2.74	1	3.63
Hungary	8	3.00	10	2.75	11	2.80	11	2.48	11	2.53
U.S.S.R.	3	3.29	3	3.71	1	3.75	6	3.03	10	2.72
Finland	5	3.16	8	3.06	8	3.14	8	2.97	2	3.55
Sweden	4	3.25	4	3.35	3	3.61	2	3.48	6	3.30
Holland	1	3.73	1	3.82	2	3.62	1	3.71	5	3.32

line after the United States, was England. Finally, apparently least concerned were Hungary, France, and Germany.

The last four Emergent Objectives we are examining relate to certain administrative aspects of special education. They are shown on Table 16, with the nations again ranked as to the attention they appeared to be devoting to each objective. These four objectives will be considered individually.

Item #13, "Insuring adequate financial support for the education of the handicapped," received the highest rating from Sweden (rank 1) and Holland (rank 2), and the lowest from Czechoslovakia (rank 10) and France (rank 11). The United States ranked seventh.

Item #21 read in full, "Insuring the handicapped of evaluation, medical care, and educational opportunity regardless of the financial or social status of the family." Relative to this item we find the U.S.S.R. with a 4.03 mean in rank 1, Sweden in rank 2, and Holland in rank 3. According least attention to #21 was Hungary (rank 10) and Germany (rank 11). The United States ranked ninth.

Item #46 dealt with promoting the status of teachers of the handicapped. In rank 1 was Finland; in rank 2, Sweden; and rank 3, France. Czechoslovakia held rank 10 and the United States was in the last position, holding rank 11 with a mean of 2.83.

TABLE 16.--Eleven nations ranked as to Emergent Objectives related to four administrative aspects of special education.

Nation	#13 Financial Support		#21 Opportunity Regardless of Status		#41 Status of Teachers of Handicapped		#44 Teacher Training, Basic Courses	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
U.S. Pretrip	7	3.14	9	3.20	11	2.83	4	3.48
England	6	3.17	4	3.53	9	2.86	11	2.48
France	11	2.89	8	3.22	3	3.52	7	3.25
Switzerland	3	3.32	5	3.38	6	3.38	5	3.44
Germany	8	3.03	11	2.71	8	3.07	10	3.00
Czechoslovakia	10	2.94	6	3.37	10	2.84	9	3.18
Hungary	9	3.00	10	2.98	7	3.22	1	3.64
U.S.S.R.	4	3.25	1	4.03	5	3.39	2	3.64
Finland	5	3.24	7	3.35	1	3.71	6	3.25
Sweden	1	3.66	2	3.86	2	3.68	3	3.57
Holland	2	3.37	3	3.71	4	3.47	8	3.18

Item #44 read, "Requiring special education teachers to have a foundation of basic courses in child development and learning theory." On this item Hungary held rank 1; the U.S.S.R., rank 2; Sweden, rank 3; and the United States, rank 4. Lowest was Germany (rank 10) and England (rank 11).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

In Part I of this chapter the reader will find a summary and discussion of findings relating in turn to each of the five questions explored. Part II opens with a brief review of the approach to securing and analyzing the data, after which certain conclusions are drawn and recommendations made. The dissertation concludes with a section concerning some broad international, national and local implications of the study.

Part I: Summary of Results

Question One: Manifest Factor

Question

To what extent were the selected United States objectives for special education manifest to the observers on the study tour (1) across nations, and (2) for the United States?

Manifest Across Nations

Summary

Fifty United States objectives were selected for observation. Items most frequently scaled related closely to direct educational services of schools and institutions. Observers less frequently ventured judgments on more generalized and theoretical, or "academic" items. Least frequent were responses on particular items for which information proved to be very difficult to secure, as in regard to provisions for the gifted, and driver education for mentally and physically handicapped.

Discussion

It was apparent that these twenty-two observers found practical rather than philosophical objectives especially manifest to them across nations. Those concerns being raised in graduate seminars in the United States in regard to categories and innovative approaches were seldom discussed in the European nations. Details concerning specific programs were, on the other hand, readily available. Thus the observers were able to respond concerning objectives of a rather immediate educational nature. Even the more complex concepts in regard to programming were often left to observer conjecture and consequently were not scaled by them.

Lack of attention to particular items was noted. In contrast to the legislative movement in this country in regard to architectural barriers, objective #5 concerning this aspect was not manifest to any appreciable degree across nations. Only in England was a warmly responsive note injected by the local educators into a discussion of this objective.

Again, the item concerning color and race lines also emerged as a negligible factor, with a rank of forty-seven. Yet in general education in the United States today the integration of the black student within a predominately white society is an issue of the utmost attention and concern. Special education, particularly when the youngsters involved have been physically handicapped, apparently has minimized any possible significance of color differences. Very little data on this item was scaled.

Manifest in the United States

Summary

It appears that the fifty objectives which were originally selected as characteristic of United States theory and practice in special education were largely appropriate for observation, particularly for the United States.

The fifty selected United States objectives were highly manifest to observers concerning their own programs

(91%-94%). No great differences were noted in Manifest Factor among items. As expected, these United States objectives were more manifest to these observers for the United States than for any European nation.

Discussion

Both the United States Pretrip and the United States Posttrip Report Forms were examined for scaled response, but the Posttrip forms included more scaled items. A major factor for this difference may have been the fact that the items took on additional connotations as the tour progressed. Not only were the observers gaining some new ideas from what they saw and heard from European educators, but they also became better acquainted with one another, and thus vicariously with other programs in the United States. In addition, the observers were wholly familiar with the Report Form by the time they had the twelfth copy placed in their hands, and they felt very free about recording their perceptions at that time.

Question Two: Attention Factor

Question

To what extent were the selected United States objectives perceived by these observers to be the object of the attention of special educators (1) across nations and (2) for the United States?

Attention Across Nations

Summary

The two top-ranking items on the Attention Factor across nations were suggestive of concern for a school program carefully and individually planned (#40, Interdisciplinary Team Decisions) and inclusive of services beyond the traditionally academic curriculum (#39, Special Therapies in School). A broad concern was reflected in the items immediately following, in which equal educational opportunity (#21), involvement of parents (#38), and a total life program (#1) were perceived as prime objectives. Next in line were more items which appeared to be geared toward individualizing academic opportunity for the exceptional child (#36, Adjusting School Requirements; #34, Regulating Class Size; #37, Prescriptive Teaching; #27, Offering Psychiatric Assistance; and #20, Broad Evaluation), with a concern for teacher training (#44) and status (#46) also evidenced.

Discussion

From the lengthy and somewhat complex listing of fifty items it appears that some very basic objectives were distilled as they were viewed by these observers across nations.

Special educators across nations were perceived as being aware of their responsibility for providing the traditional reading, writing and arithmetic skills, but

also as aspiring to do so knowledgeably, and on a personalized basis. They appeared to be leaning strongly toward a program which recognized the physical and psychological aspects of the child as well as his academic tasks. They seemed to be aware of the importance of his parents and of the exceptional child's need to prepare for life itself.

The above perspective suggested by the objectives perceived high in attention across nations is an encouraging one. It is far removed from the historical view of secret shame and rejection, or negligence, or even of pity. It appears to echo the theme of habilitation which emerged in the original review of United States objectives for special education. This is not to say that these objectives have actually been achieved to an appreciable degree. The rating of four (to a large extent) seldom emerged as a mean. But those objectives to which the educators did appear to address themselves primarily indicated a realistic concern for the handicapped as well as a degree of optimism as to their potential value to their society. The responsibility of professional personnel to develop the potentials of exceptional individuals was also recognized.

Attention in the United States

Summary

Those three items ranking highest on the pretrip evaluation as objectives for the United States were, in

descending order:

#36, Adjusting School Requirements
#34, Regulating Class Size,
#44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses.

Next in line and sharing the same mean were

#38, Involving Parents in Education
#39, Special Therapies in School
#7, Influencing Legislation.

The six items indicated as attracting least attention, listed in ascending order, were as follows:

#43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities
#32, Enabling Handicapped to Drive
#15, Curriculum Development Centers
4, Breaking Down Categories
#22, Provisions in Private Institutions
9, Males and Females.

Discussion

In general, items ranking highest as objectives for the United States tended also to rank high across nations. Items of least importance likewise ranked low across nations. Objectives apparently much higher on the Attention Factor for the United States than across nations related to legislation (#7), classes for the emotionally disturbed (#26), and color and race lines (#8).

The single objective of adjusting school requirements to meet the needs of exceptional children stood out in this data. This may indicate an awareness of the responsibility of the school to meet the needs of the child rather than for the child to be put into an existing mold and expected "to come up to standard." Compatible with this prime

responsibility was the second ranking objective, in which class size was presumed to be a significant factor. "Adjusting school requirements" is an assumption basic to the existence of special education. Almost every definition of the field implies that service is rendered children who for some reason are unable to profit from the educational provisions routinely available through the public schools. Altering educational expectations to more realistically correlate with the varied abilities and disabilities of an exceptional child was here perceived to be a major objective. That this implied something better than a "watered down curriculum" is suggested by the fact that other high ranking items indicated the desirability of programming designed especially for the exceptional child.

Occurring more and more frequently as a subject for seminars and conferences is the idea of the elimination of special education categories as a model for grouping. There are rumblings against the medical model which has been so widely used for the structuring of educational programs in the special education field. These rumblings were not suggested in the perceptions of this group of special educators either as to this nation or others. Perhaps the fact that these educators had had their training and years of experience so predominately within specific categories of exceptionality served to cushion them from this somewhat revolutionary thinking. These educators were

probably well aware of the fact that the legislation which historically had given the breath of life to special education was categorically based. They did perceive responsibility for influencing legislation.

Question Three: Emergent Objectives

Question

Which of the selected United States objectives appeared to these observers to be both manifest and emphasized by attention (1) across nations and (2) in the United States?

Summary

Nineteen of the fifty objectives were concurrently high both as to the Manifest Factor and the Attention Factor across nations. Objectives relating to a continuum of responsibility to the exceptional individual were:

#1, Total Life Program
#38, Involving Parents in Education
#19, Services, Ages One to Five
#24, Vocational Assistance
#31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience.

Objectives relating to individualizing educational services were:

#18, Early Identification
#20, Broad Evaluation
#40, Interdisciplinary Team Decisions
#39, Special Therapies in School
#10, Flexible Programming
#36, Adjusting School Requirements
#34, Regulating Class Size
#6, Severely and Multiply Handicapped
#27, Offering Psychiatric Assistance.

Objectives relating to certain administrative aspects were:

#13, Financial Support
#21, Opportunity Regardless of Status
#46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped
#44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses.

Discussion

The scope and content of these Emergent Objectives suggest that special educators across nations were viewing their role very seriously. The traditional "three r's" no longer appeared to suffice. They saw themselves with responsibilities encompassing the child's whole life, and they saw the child as a whole. They saw their responsibilities as inclusive of the severely and multiply handicapped child as well as of those less disabled.

Question Four: Altered Perceptions

Question

How did the observers perceive the selected United States objectives just before and again just after their exposure to European approaches to special education?

Manifest Factor

Summary

The United States data, both Pretrip and Posttrip, showed all objectives to be largely manifest, but the tendency was toward a greater rather than a lesser number

of scaled responses on the Posttrip form. Item #43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities, increased by nine on the Manifest Factor.

Items scaled by more observers on the Posttrip form were:

#22, Provisions in Private Institutions
#37, Prescriptive Teaching
#43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities
#5, Architectural Barriers
#11, Population Density
#29, Higher Education, Physically Handicapped
#16, Research Dissemination
#25, Transporting the Handicapped.

Discussion

The impression received by these observers was that teacher training in exceptionalities was considered of rather minor importance in many nations, whether the objective was actually not regarded highly, or whether it simply appeared so unfeasible as to be disregarded. These observers were indoctrinated, it appears, with the medical model and categorical grouping, and accustomed to relying upon standardized testing far more than seemed to be usual in many of the nations they visited. An awareness of both of these aspects seemed to increase as the trip progressed. In individual instances shock was expressed by observers as to what they felt were unscientific methods of evaluation and lack of "sophisticated" commercial materials. These educators may have become more aware of some aspects of their own indoctrination in the field when they repeatedly

found themselves without reinforcement concerning those aspects.

Attention Factor

Summary

Little apparent difference was noted as to the overall Attention Factor on Pretrip and Posttrip forms. Eight items were perceived higher in Attention on the Posttrip forms. They were:

#15, Curriculum Development Centers
#16, Research Dissemination
#28, Provisions for Gifted;
#46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped
#10, Flexible Programming
#11, Population Density
4, Breaking Down Categories,
$ 9, Males and Females.

Nine items were perceived lower in Attention on the Posttrip forms. They were:

5, Architectural Barriers
#49, Utilizing Non-professional Personnel
8, Color and Race Lines
#31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience
#19, Services, Ages One to Five
1, Total Life Program
#36, Adjusting School Requirements
#17, Opportunities for Mature Handicapped
3, Confusion in Terminology

Discussion

It is difficult to relate these shifts in judgment on certain items to specific experiences which may have taken place during the tour. Where the observers perceived little attention across nations there was some

tendency to attach more importance to their own efforts in the United States. Where they perceived a high degree of attention across nations or in particular nations there was some shifting downward in perception for the United States. There were, however, exceptions to these trends. The picture becomes more clearcut when we examine the Emergent Objectives rather than the entire list of fifty.

Emergent Objectives

Summary

Of the nineteen Emergent Objectives, eight were viewed on the Posttrip form as higher than previously perceived, and eleven as lower. Increasing the most were

#46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped
#10, Flexible Programming.

Decreasing appreciably were:

#31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience
#19, Services, Ages One to Five
1, Total Life Program
#36, Adjusting School Requirements
#18, Early Identification.

The decreases were greater than the increases both in number of items changed and in total mean change, nearly doubling in the latter.

All of those items which showed an appreciable change in mean from Pretrip to Posttrip altered their ranking within the twelve nations to a noticeable degree.

Discussion

High status for teachers in the European nations visited seemed to be the rule, and the status of special education teachers was often felt to be even higher. Item #46 therefore was inappropriately stated, but the observers reflected through it their judgement that in the United States it had more validity than at first perceived.

Increase in the objective concerning flexible programming may have come about because of the segregated educational patterns generally visited by this group in Europe. In the United States the educator is aware of the strong convictions held by many other educators concerning the desirability of the integration of the handicapped in the public schools. He may feel a real need to justify any placement outside of the general stream. He does, however, employ numerous "flexible" procedures such as the provision of consultant or itinerant service, resource rooms and special classes in regular school buildings. Awareness of these aspects of program planning in the United States is suggested by the increase in mean in Item #10, Flexible Programming.

The decrease which was noted for five objectives included three of the five related to a continuum of service: #1, Total Life Program; #19, Services, Ages One to Five; and #31, Opportunity for Sheltered Work Experience. The respect felt in this regard for the programs of

certain other nations, particularly Holland, may have been reflected through these scores. A number of observers were heard to express dissatisfaction concerning their home areas as to the effective integration of the handicapped as adults.

Along with item #19 relating to preschool services was item #18, early identification of the exceptional child, also judged after the trip to be receiving less attention than originally reported. The nursery schools visited in Moscow had strongly impressed the visitors,[1] who noted the early identification and careful diagnostic procedures utilized, and who reacted favorably to the calibre of preschool training they observed. This may have had an influence on the scaling of item #18 and item #19.

Finally, item #36, Adjusting School Requirements, was perceived of less importance as an objective on the Posttrip form. Did the observers perhaps view their United States programs to be more rigid than they had previously judged, in view of the decrease in the assumption of extensive life planning for the handicapped?

Although still largely committed to their own approaches, it appears that these United States educators returned home with high respect for some aspects of the European approaches to special education, and perhaps with some new humbleness.

---

[1]See page 18 of the narrative report of this trip, which is reproduced in full as Appendix D.

Question Five: National Similarities and Differences

Question

Which nations did the United States appear to these observers to most resemble, or to least resemble, in regard to objectives?

Manifest Factor

Summary

The observers in this study considered themselves able to judge objectives for nations, decreasing by item count, in this order:

United States
England
U.S.S.R.
Finland
Holland
Czechoslovakia
Sweden
Switzerland
Hungary
Germany
France

England and the U.S.S.R. were closest to us on this factor. France and Germany were least manifest and therefore least like the United States on this factor.

Discussion

Dr. Graf and other representatives of Study Abroad endeavored to secure for the tour participants optimum opportunity for exposure to European educators and programs for exceptional children. Their success in providing

these experiences from nation to nation was reflected in this data. Two factors were at work: first, the availability and quality of special programs, and second, the openness of the special educational community to share their aspirations, their achievements and frustrations.

The visitors experienced the feeling of having much in common with other educators across nations, and they made frequent references to the high calibre of the personnel whom they encountered. In this particular professional area they felt an openness in the attitudes of educators of other nations, and they were especially gratified to find it in Prague and Moscow as well as in London. Even in France, where the exposure was particularly limited, the individual presenting his nation's program handled a very difficult situation with courtesy, and extended considerable effort to convey an understanding of French approaches. Based upon the experience of this group, the special educator abroad might expect to view special education approaches most readily in England, and in the other nations in the order listed.

Emergent Objectives

Summary

Of the nineteen Emergent Objectives, five objectives presumed a continuum of responsibility for the handicapped. The nations of Sweden and Holland held the superior

rankings for these in eleven nations, with the U.S.S.R. third in line, Switzerland fourth, and the United States fifth. Hungary was apparently paying least attention to these particular objectives.

The ten objectives which pertained to an individualized approach to special education, taken as a group, were accorded attention in this order: (1) U.S.S.R., (2) Holland, (3) Switzerland, (4) Sweden. The United States appeared to rank seventh for this group of objectives, and Germany was last in line.

Four items pertaining to certain administrative aspects were considered separately. The United States ranked seventh (#13, Financial Support), ninth (#21, Opportunity Regardless of Status), eleventh (#46, Status of Teachers of Handicapped) and fourth (#44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses).

Discussion

Fifteen of those Emergent Objectives, exclusive of the four administrative items, represent some of the most important concepts to which United States special educators are prone to think themselves philosophically committed: individualizing instruction and "following through" to habilitation. The United States appears to be stepping into a "multi-media" educational era designed not only to broaden horizons for children but to serve them on a highly individualized, tutorial basis. Little of

this approach was realized or apparently even anticipated in the nations visited. Nevertheless, the United States was viewed as unremarkable among nations in important habilitative aspects. The Scandinavian countries and the Soviet Union impressed these twenty-two observers as being more highly concerned.

Part II: Implications of the Study

Review

This study presents a report of the perceptions of twenty-two Americans viewing European approaches to special education. Their responses to the study experience chronicled the types of information most readily secured throughout their tour, as well as their awareness of special education in their own nation. It reflected certain shifts in perception as they considered United States special education before and after the trip. The larger goal of habilitation was identified and examined through fifty specific objectives. The report identified those objectives which were perceived as receiving particular attention across nations and in the United States. It further identified the nations which appeared to be paying a great deal of attention to those objectives which emerged through the study. The research was unique in that it represented a concensus of the perceptions of a group of educators simultaneously sharing foreign study.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Tour Experience

Questions

Much of the information made manifest to observers taking this study tour was related to specific programs. It was helpful only as it lent itself to general interpretation. Questions which doctoral or post-doctoral level students might have wished to explore would largely have gone unanswered. There was also little opportunity to read about the various national approaches to special education. The study tour was most informative as to direct educational services and somewhat so as to special education teachers. Special educators interested in studying abroad might well ask themselves if the kind of information they are likely to receive will be satisfying to them--whether it will answer their level and type of question.

Answers

Special educators might also want to know where they are most apt to find openness in sharing ideas and showing special education programs. Countries in which this group fared well in this respect might logically be placed on study itineraries (England, U.S.S.R., Finland, Holland, Czechoslovakia). Students might benefit more by spending a longer period of time in fewer nations.

Evidence of Change

There was evidence that participants did alter their immediate perceptions about the United States concerning certain objectives. This would suggest the possibility that some instances of personal growth may have taken place during the study tour, perhaps leading to a deeper understanding both of certain aspects of special education and of other nations. These educators also felt able to judge more objectives for the United States at the conclusion of the trip than at the outset. An experimental study on attitude change and special education could conceivably evolve around such a study tour.

Commitment to United States Objectives

A preplanned and structured approach for onsite gathering of data by a tour group was utilized in this study. Of the Report Forms offered for the use of the participants, 94% were completed and returned. This good cooperation was secured in part, it may be assumed, because of the participation of the researcher herself and her availability for questioning. It was maintained largely because of the academic rewards which these students felt they realized from methodically reviewing and recording their impressions of each country before proceeding to the next. Group study utilizing such an approach is therefore offered for the consideration of university staff members

(1) as a teaching technique, and (2) for the actual gathering of information relative to international education.

Availability of Additional Data

Data in tabular form has been made available through this study concerning numerous objectives of special education, some of which appeared to warrant little or no attention in the present report. These objectives for the most part fell in the middle ranges on the ranking on the Manifest Factor or on the Attention Factor. However, noticeable differences between nations often were perceived, and any reader especially interested in a particular aspect of the field may find data pertinent to that aspect.[1]

Examples may be drawn from any of the fifty objectives not included in the nineteen Emergent ones. More may also be deduced in regard to those nineteen. Among items to which little reference has been made are those dealing with the following:

#12, the acceptance of the handicapped by the non-handicapped
#14, environmental retardation
#23, adapting institutions to changing needs
#30, physical education and recreation
#33, experimentation and action research
#41, utilizing community agencies
#42, certification standards for administrators
#45, practice teaching, regular and special
#47, adequate pay for special educators
#48, recruitment of qualified personnel
#50, providing for inservice education.

---

[1]See especially Appendix A and Appendix D.

General Implications

A Basis for International Understanding

Value Across Nations

This study identified certain habilitative objectives for special education which appeared to have value across nations. Those objectives relate particularly to special education as a continuum of responsibility and to individualizing instruction for exceptional children. These two major aspects thus appear to be open for meaningful communication and cooperative efforts, both for purposes of research and for conferring on an international basis. Professionals in Europe may communicate well with each other upon these topics. Professionals in the United States and Canada may communicate with each other and with the European educators.

Value for Study of European Approaches

For those readers of any nationality who have a particular interest in special education in one or more of the ten European countries toured, pertinent material is included in the appendices to this study. In Appendix A will be found a table for each nation with reference to the fifty objectives ranked by mean for that nation as they were perceived by this study group. In Appendix D will be found the composite verbal commentary of the

twenty-two observers, compiled for each nation. The limitations of the study should be kept in mind, and interpretations made in light of the particular group of special educators here reporting their impressions. European educators may nevertheless welcome this unique opportunity to see themselves as they were viewed by other special educators.

A Means of Inservice Education

Direct implications for special education teachers and other professional personnel in the United States have already been suggested. The value of a planned study of special education approaches conducted nation by nation has been suggested as a consideration for university staff members responsible for coursework dealing with the exceptional child. While study tours are not a new concept in themselves, relatively few professionals in special education have yet availed themselves of them, and structure for study has been largely left to the individual students who did elect the tour.

Superintendents and their boards of education frequently receive requests from professional school personnel to reimburse sabbatical leaves for travel. It is their purpose in so funding that the information gained be of a practical nature which may later be reflected in the performance of staff members. According to the experience of this group, many practical aspects of the special

educational program were made evident, and particularly in certain nations. Teachers also appeared to be doing some reevaluating of their own theory and practice. A follow-up study might be made with this particular group of educators indicating how they and others about them perceived the European exposure to have influenced their approaches to special education upon return to the United States.

A Responsibility to Secure More Information

Each citizen in a democracy such as the United States tacitly if not actually assumes responsibility for his own welfare and that of others. Habilitation of the exceptional individual is economically sound as well as humanitarian. Therefore it should be done well. It should be continuously evaluated.

Parents of exceptional children are the citizens most concerned about the welfare of those groups of individuals, and their efforts, both singly and collectively, have often been reflected in legislative action. They might well be wondering why the more significant habilitative objectives to which we aspire for the handicapped were here perceived only in the low average range of attention as compared across nations. What efforts could be made to better understand the approaches of other nations, and, if need be, to emulate them in their efforts toward evolving successful handicapped citizens? Why has

it been so difficult to fund and implement the International Education Act of 1966? Will special education be included with general education?

In the United States we have designated no central authority to mandate programs for the handicapped. Both national and state leadership personnel operate from a consultative and advisory level, the authority resting in the local districts. The legislative picture across states is a patchwork. No one, therefore, is in a position to look broadly at habilitation, at the entire life perspective of the handicapped. No one can coordinate inclusively and beyond those school years prescribed as fulfilling an individual state's educational responsibility to its children. No one has either the responsibility or the authority to do so. We are operating at present under a hit-or-miss "hope" policy of habilitation, a policy which all too often becomes hopeless for a handicapped man or woman.

On the local level, we repeatedly fail to find school districts which realistically focus upon the habilitation of the handicapped. Many are providing a short-sighted, token education even to those individuals fortunate enough to have been identified for any special service. Later, their names are quietly added to the welfare roles.

America has thus failed to offer dignity and opportunity to many of her citizens. Must this go on? Let us

look more carefully at objectives both within and outside of our national borders. Let us take enlightened action.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Adams, Esther Young. "American and European Approaches to Speech Therapy for the Disadvantaged Child: A Comparative Study." Unpublished manuscript, September, 1967. (Typewritten.)

Allard, Marvel. Do's and Don'ts of Data Processing. Washington, D. C.: Privately printed, 1966.

Allport, George W. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.

Atkinson, Carroll and Maleska, Eugene T. The Story of Education. New York: Bantam Books, 1962.

Bereday, George Z. F. Comparative Method in Education. Chicago: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Boom, Alfred B., ed. Studies on the Mentally Handicapped Child. Based upon a series of lectures given at the Harris College, Preston, 1965. London: Edward Arnold, Publishers, Ltd., 1968.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research, An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

Bowers, Joan E. "The Education of Emotionally Disturbed Children in Seven European Countries Studied in the Summer of 1967," in Selected Convention Papers, 162-164. Paper read before the 46th Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children at New York City, April 14-20, 1968. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Bundesvereinigung Lebenshilfe für das geistig behinderte Kind e. V. Rahmemprogramm. Germany: Postscheckkonto Frankfurt/M 36388. 1967.

Campbell, Donald T., and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1963.

Central Union for Child Welfare in Finland. Care and Education of Exceptional Children in Finland. Publication No. 23. Translated by R. Milton. Helsinki: 1963.

_____. The Child in Finnish Society. Publication No. 28. Version of Social Facts about Children in Finland. Edited by Saara Soumetsa, 1957. Revised by Heikki Tolsa. Translated by R. Milton. Helsinki: 1965.

Cessna, W. C., Jr. "The Psychosocial Nature and Determinants of Attitudes toward Education and toward Physically Disabled Persons in Japan." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Chabe, Alexander. "Assessing Soviet Education." Education, Vol. 89, no. 2 (November-December, 1968), 172-180.

Clark, J. "Manual of Computer Programs." East Lansing, Michigan: Research Services, Department of Communications, Michigan State University, 1964. (Mimeographed.)

Cohen, A. R. Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Conant, James Bryant. The Comprehensive High School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

_____. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

_____. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Connor, Leo E. Administration of Special Education Programs. New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1961.

Council for Exceptional Children. Selected Convention Papers. Report of the 45th Annual International CEC Convention, St. Louis, Mo., March 26-April 1, 1967. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1967. Pp. 191-203.

_____. Selected Convention Papers. "Special Education: Strategies for Educational Progress." Report of the 44th Annual CEC Convention, Toronto Canada, April 17-24, 1966. Washington, D. C.: National Education Associaton. Pp. 226-238.

Cramer, J. F., and Brown, G. S. Contemporary Education. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956.

Cruickshank, William M., and Johnson, G. Orville, eds. Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. 2nd. ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Cruickshank, William, ed. Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Czechoslovakia. "Schools for Youth Requiring Special Care in Czechoslovakia." R/3090-R/3094. Prague, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

Danish National Service for the Mentally Retarded. Bornehospitalet I Vangede. Children's Hospital in Vangede. Reprint from Sanëws, Vol. 6, no. 1, with Summaries in English. Copenhagen: 1966.

_____. John F. Kennedy Institute. Reprint from Sanëws, Vol. 7, no. 2, with Summaries in English. Copenhagen: 1967.

Davis, E. E. Attitude Change: A Review and Bibliography of Selected Research. No. 19. New York: UNESCO, 1964.

Denmark. Press and Information Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Education. Reprint from Denmark, An Official Handbook. Copenhagen: H. P. Hansens Bogtrykkeri AS, printer, 1964.

Denmark. International Relations Division, Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs. Rehabilitation and Care of the Handicapped in Denmark. Edited by Eugenie Engberg and Carl Lange. Copenhagen: Printing Works of the Society and Home for Cripples, 1963.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan Book Co., 1916.

Dickie, R. F. "An Investigation of Differential Attitudes toward the Physically Disabled, Blind Persons, and Attitudes toward Education and their Determinants among Various Occupational Groups in Kansas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

DiMichael, Salvatore G. Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded. Washington, D. C.: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Series #123, 1958.

Dunn, Lloyd M. "Loyd M. Dunn Testifies before House Sub-Committee on Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 6 (February, 1960), 294-295.

Dunn, Lloyd M., and Kirk, Samuel A. "Impressions of Soviet Psychoeducational Service and Research in Mental Retardation." Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 3, (November, 1960), 199-211.

Edmunds, Lynne. "They'd Be Better off in Gaol than Out of a Job." The Daily Telegraph (London), August 8, 1967, p. 13.

Education Index. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1929 to date.

"The Education of Exceptional Children," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 14, no. 3 (June, 1944); Vol. 23, no. 5 (December, 1953); Vol. 29, no. 5 (December, 1959); Vol. 33, no. 1 (February, 1963); Vol. 36, no. 1 (February, 1966). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association.

The Educational Policies Commission. The Central Purpose of American Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1961.

_____. Contemporary Issues in Elementary Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1960.

"Educational Research in Countries Other than the United States." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 32, no. 3 (1962). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association.

Egekvist, H.; Lindgreen, J.; and Sletved, H. "Guide Book for the Education of Mentally Handicapped Pupils." Translated from Danish into English by V. Bloch, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3rd. ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Exceptional Children. Index, 1966-1967, Vol. 33, no. 7, 673-674.

Felty, F. E. "Attitudes toward Physical Disability in Costa Rica and Their Determinants: A Pilot Study." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1957.

FitzPatrick, T. K. Rehabilitation Programs and Facilities of Western Europe. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1963.

Fondation Aigues-Vertes. Le village de la Fondation Aigues-Vertes à Chèvres (Loëx) la . . . a pris naissance une communauté à leur mesure. Geneva, Switzerland: n. d.

Force, Dewey G. "Social Status of Physically Handicapped Children." Exceptional Children, Vol. 23, no. 3 (November, 1956), 104-107; 132-133.

Fraser, Stewart E. "International and Comparative Education." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 37, no. 1 (February, 1967), pp. 57-73. Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association.

Friesen, Edward W. "Nature and Determinants of Attitudes toward Education and toward Physically Disabled Persons in Colombia, Peru, and the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966.

Gallagher, James J. "New Directions in Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. 33, no. 7 (March, 1967), 441-447.

Gardner, W. I., and Nisonger, H. W. "A Manual on Program Development in Mental Retardation." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Vol. 66, no. 4 (1962). (Monogr. Suppl.)

Garms, W. I. Jr. "A Multivariate Analysis of the Correlates of Educational Effort by Nations." Comparative Education Review, Vol. 12, no. 3 (1968), 281-299.

Giacalone, Carolyn, and Davis, Dolores. Research in International Education--Research in Progress and Research Recently Completed, 1966-1967 Survey. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Institute of International Education, April, 1967.

Goldberg, I. Ignacy. Selected Bibliography of Special Education. New York: Teacher's College Series in Special Education, 1967.

Goldstein, Herbert. "Report on International Conference of Teachers of Backward Children." Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 3 (November, 1960), 139-146.

Good, C. Introduction to Educational Research. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963.

Good, H. G. A History of Western Education. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

Great Britain. Reference Division Central Office of Information. Education in Britain. London: 1964.

Green, J. H. "Attitudes of Special Educators Versus Regular Teachers toward the Physically Handicapped and toward Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Gulliford, Ronald. "Special Education in England." In Selected Convention Papers, pp. 171-175. Paper read before the 46th Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children at New York City, April 14-20, 1968. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.

Guttman, L. "An Outline of Some New Methodology for Social Research." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 18 (1954), 395-404.

_____. "The Principle Components of Scalable Attitudes." In P. F. Lazerfield (ed.), Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.

Haring, Norris G.; Stern, G. G.; and Cruickshank, W. M. Attitude of Educators toward Exceptional Children. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1958.

Haring, Norris G., and Schiefelbusch, L. Methods in Special Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Harris, C. W. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3rd. ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Heater, William H. "Attitudes of Ministers toward Mental Retardation and toward Education: Their Nature and Determinants." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Helsingin Kaupungin Soumenkieliset, Kansakoulut. Tietoja Vuodelta 1965. Finnish Public Elementary Schools of the City of Helsinki, Facts about the Year 1965. Helsinki: 1966.

Henderson, Earl. "The Value of Travel for Credit." Illinois Education, Vol. 55 (January, 1968), 209-221.

Hermelin, R. col. Research Relevant to the Education of Children with Learning Handicaps. London, W. I.: The College of Special Education, 85 Newman St., London, W. 1. Report of the One-Day Course held on January 2, 1968 at 66 Portland Place, London, W. I., 1968.

Hess, E. H. Social Insurance, Disability Benefits and Rehabilitation in Disability Prevention-Rehabilitation. Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of the International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1963. New York: International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled, 1963.

Higson, J. M. "The Methodology of Cross-National Comparative Analysis of Education--A Review of the Literature." Comparative Education Review, Vol. 12, no. 3 (1968), 338-349.

Hindman, Darrell A. "Highlighting Programs for the Mentally Retarded in Denmark and Holland." Exceptional Children, Vol. 28, no. 1 (September, 1961), 19-22.

Hoke, G. A. "A Comparative Study of the Comprehensive Secondary School in England and the U. S." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Houston, W. Robert, and Joyce, William M. "The Plowden Report." Childhood Education, October, 1968, 106-110.

Hunt, J. Franklin. "Education of the Deaf in the U.S.S.R." Volta Review, Vol. 61 (1959), 356-363, 390.

Izutzu, Satoru, and Powell, Marvin E. "Special Education of Handicapped Children in Japan." Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 5 (January, 1961), 252-259.

Jackson, Stephen. Special Education in England and Wales. London, W. 1.: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Jordan, John E. Attitudes toward Education and Physically Disabled Persons in Eleven Nations. Research Report No. 1, Latin American Studies Center. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1968.

Jordan, John E. "Cross-Cultural Attitudes Toward Education and Physically Handicapped Persons in Eleven Nations." Lecture presented at the 7th International Congress on Mental Health, London, England, August 12-17, 1968. East Lansing, Michigan. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Cross-National Research in Special Education." Inspection and Introspection of Special Education. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the Council of Administrators of Special Education, Chicago, 1964. Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 35-39.

Justison, Gertrude G. "Special Programs for Exceptional Children in France." In Selected Convention Papers, pp. 165-169. Paper read before the 46th Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children at New York City, April 14-20, 1968. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Kandel, I. L. The New Era in Education, A Comparative Study. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1955.

Kazamias, A. M., and Massialas, B. G. Tradition and Change in Education: A Comparative Study. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Kidd, John W. "Some Unwarranted Assumptions in the Education and Habilitation of Handicapped Children." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, Vol. 1, no. 2 (1966), 54.

King, Edmund J. World Perspectives in Education. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1962.

_____. Other Schools and Ours. Rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Krathwohl, David R. How to Prepare a Research Proposal. New York: Syracuse University Bookstore, 1965.

Krathwohl, David R.; Bloom, Benjamin S.; and Masia, Bertram B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook II. Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Kirk, Samuel A. Educating Exceptional Children. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.

Kirk, Samuel A. "Remarks on Special Education Instructional Materials Centers in the United States." The Winnower, Vol. 4, no. 2 (1968). Madison, Wisconsin: Publication of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center, University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Krieder, Paul A. "The Social-psychological Nature and Determinants of Attitudes toward Education and toward Physically Disabled Persons in Belgium, Denmark, England, France, the Netherlands, and Yugoslavia." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Kvaraceus, W. C. "Research in Special Education: Its Status and Function." Exceptional Children, Vol. 24, no. 6 (February, 1958), 249-254, 280.

Langerhaus, Clara. "Special Education in Central America and Mexico." Exceptional Children, Vol. 25, no. 5 (January, 1959), 202-204, 220.

Levine, S. A. "Conceptual Framework for Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. 28, no. 2 (October, 1961), 83-90.

Link, Beulah Meyer. "Comparative Special Education for Mental Retardates." The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Vol. 32, no. 2 (Winter, 1966), 31-40.

Lowndes, G. A. N. The English Education System. Rev. ed. London: Hutchinson University Library, Anchor Press, Ltd., 1960.

Lund, Walter. "Special Instruction in Sweden." The Swedish Institute: Norrköping, April 13, 1965.

Mackie, Romaine P. "Spotlighting Advances in Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. 32, no. 2 (October, 1965), 77-81.

Mader, John B. "Attitudes of Special Educators toward the Physically Handicapped and toward Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Mallinson, V. An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Education. London: Heinemann, 1957.

Mannerheim League for Child Welfare. For the Children--For the Welfare of the Nation. Helsinki: 1963.

Maslow, A. H. ed. New Knowledge in Human Values. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

McCallum, J. W. "A Survey of the Education of the Mentally Retarded Child in Ten European Countries." In Selected Convention Papers, pp. 170-171. Paper read before the 46th Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children at New York City, April 14-20, 1968. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Mead, Margaret. Cultural Patterns and Technical Change. New York: UNESCO, 1955.

Michigan. Journal of the Senate. 73rd Legilsture. Regular Session of 1966. Lansing, Michigan, April 27, 1966.

Michigan. Subcommittee on Special Education of the Senate Education Committee. Report on Special Education in Michigan. Lansing, Michigan, April, 1966.

Michigan Legislature, Regular Session of 1967. "Senate and House Bills (Special Education)." Compiled by Charles Mange and Dave Haarer, C.E.C. Legislative Co-chairmen, April 6, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

Michigan State University. Bibliography, Education 804E. Lansing, Michigan. (Mimeographed.)

National Association for Mental Health. Aims and Achievements. Annual Report, 1966-1967. London, W. 1: Training and Education Department, 1967.

National Society for Mentally Handicapped Children, Metropolitan Region. Enfield Society for Mentally Handicapped Children. 1966 Yearbook. London, W. 1.: 1966.

Oliver, R. A. C., and Butcher, H. J. "Teacher's Attitudes to Education." British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 1 (1962), 56-69.

Organization of Special Education for Mentally Deficient Children. 23rd International Conference on Public Education, Geneva, 1960. Geneva, Switzerland: International Bureau of Education, Publication No. 214.

Pevzner, M. S. Oligophrenia, Mental Deficiency in Children. New York: Consultants Bureau, 1961.

President's Panel on Mental Retardation. Bibliography of World Literature on Mental Retardation. A report prepared by the Public Health Service. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

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.

_____. Report of Mission to Denmark and Sweden. Report of Mission to the Netherlands. Report of Mission to the U.S.S.R. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Report of the Task Force on Behavioral and Social Research. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

"Philosophical and Social Framework of Education." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 37, no. 1 (1967). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association.

Pritchard, D. G. Education and the Handicapped, 1760-1960. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Proctor, Doris I. "The Relationships between Knowledge of Disabilities, Kind and Amount of Experience, and Classroom Integration of Exceptional Children." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Review of Educational Research. Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association, National Education Association, 1941 to date. February, 1963-1966.

"Research Clues." National Educational Journal, Feature, Vol. 68 (January, 1967).

Reynolds, Maynard. "A Strategy for Research." Exceptional Children, Vol. 25, no. 5 (January, 1963), 213-217.

Schnoell, Fred J. "Problems of Retardation in Australia." International Review of Education, Vol. 3 (1957), 192-197.

Segal, S. S. No Child is Ineducable. Special Education/ Provision and Trends. Pergamon Educational Guides. The Commonwealth and International Library. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967.

The Shape of Education for 1966-1967. Vol. 8. A Handbook on Current Educational Affairs by the Editors of Education U.S.A. Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, National Education Association, 1966.

Sinha, B. K. "Maternal Attitudes and Values in Respect to Emotionally Disturbed and Physically Disabled Persons." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966.

Smith, G. Milton. A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education. 3rd ed. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Sparks, Howard L., and Blackman, Leonard S. "What is Special About Special Education Revisited: the Mentally Retarded." Exceptional Children, Vol. 31, no. 5 (January, 1965), 242-247.

Sterner, Richard. "Legal Standards for Habilitation and Education of Mentally Retarded." Stockholm Symposium, 1967. Stockholm: International League of Societies for the Mentally Handicapped, 1967.

Stevenson, Vivian M. coord. World Horizons in Special Education. Lansing, Michigan: Board of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1963.

Study Abroad, Inc., 260 West 57th Street, New York 19, New York. Materials sent participants in the Ithaca College Special Education Tour, 1967.

Symonds, Percival M. What Education Has to Learn from Psychology. 3rd ed. New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University, 1965.

Taba, Hida. "Cultural Orientation in Comparative Education." Comparative Education Review, Vol. 6 (1963), 171-176.

Taylor, Eugene ed. Rehabilitation and World Peace. Report of Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, August 28-September 2, 1960. New York: The Society, 1960.

Taylor, Wallace W., and Taylor, Isabelle W. Special Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Western Europe. New York: International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, 1960.

_____. "The Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Portugal." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 1 (September, 1959), 22-28.

_____. "The Education of the Physically Handicapped Children in France." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 2 (October, 1959), 75-81.

Taylor, Wallace W., and Taylor, Isabelle W. "Special Education of the Physically Handicapped Children in Yugoslavia." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 3 (November, 1959), 126-132.

_____. "The Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Switzerland." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 4 (December, 1959), 208-219.

Telford, Charles W., and Sawrey, James M. The Exceptional Individual, Psychological and Educational Aspects. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Tenny, John W. "Observations of Special Education in South America." Exceptional Children, Vol. 24, no. 9 (May, 1958), 404-409.

_____. "Special Education in the Soviet Union." Exceptional Children, Vol. 26, no. 6 (February, 1960), 296-304.

_____. Unedited Notes, World Tour Sabbatical, 1965-66. Papers from personal library at Wayne State University, College of Education, Department of Education, Detroit, Michigan.

Turabian, K. S. Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

UNESCO. "Comparative Cross-national Research." International Social Science Bulletin, Vol. 7, no. 4 (1955).

_____. "Data in Comparative Research." International Social Science Journal, Vol. 16, no. 1 (1964).

_____. Education Abstracts. Paris: Educational Clearing House, UNESCO, 1949 to date.

_____. Education in Finland. Ed. 60, Xi, 116A. Paris: 1960.

_____. Statistics on Special Education. New York: UNESCO, 1960.

_____. World Survey of Education. "France." Reprint. Paris: 1958.

U. S. Congress. House. Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, of the Committee on Education and Labor. Education and Training of the Handicapped. Parts 1, 2, 3, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1966.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966. Parts 1 through 6, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1966.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Reorganization and Internal Organizations. Rehabilitation of the Disabled in Thirty-seven Countries of the World. Report No. 1038. 86th Cong. Committee Print No. 8. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Preparation of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment, Bulletin No. 28. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

_____. Mental Retardation: Activities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Rehabilitation of the Disabled in Fifty-one Countries. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. Report of the Task Force on Behavioral and Social Research. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

_____. Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation. An Introduction to Mental Retardation, Problems, Plans and Programs. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau. Research Relating to Children, Bulletin No. 19. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Virgilio, A. D. "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Attitudes of Elementary Teachers toward Selected Questions Related to International Affairs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1960.

Watson, Thomas J. "Some Arrangements for Training Teachers for Special Education in England." Exceptional Children, Vol. 27, no. 6 (February, 1961), 307-308.

What Research Says to Teacher. Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers and American Educational Research Association, National Education Association. Published at irregular intervals.

Williams, W. G. Jr. "An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing Selected Teachers to Become Interested and Involved in the Area of International Understanding." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Wise, John E.; Nordberg, Robert B.; and Reitz, Donald J. Methods of Research in Education. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1967.

Woll, W. D. "The Educational Aspects of Delinquency." International Review of Education, Vol. 1 (1955), 413-429.

World Health Organization. Report of a Joint Expert Committee Convened by WHO with the participation of the United Nations, ILO, and UNESCO. The Mentally Subnormal Child. April, 1954, 3-46.

Wright, Beatrice A. Physical Disability--A Psychological Approach. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLES

APPENDIX TABLE 1.--England: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for England.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	21	38	3.53	1.24
2	26	37	3.49	1.16
3	6	41	3.41	1.00
4	27	37	3.41	1.14
5	25	38	3.32	1.21
6	39	40	3.30	1.15
7	31	38	3.21	.99
8	36	38	3.21	1.21
9	18	39	3.18	1.27
10	13	36	3.17	.97
11	12	37	3.16	1.04
12	37	28	3.14	1.04
13	1	42	3.14	1.31
14	38	42	3.12	1.19
15	11	38	3.08	1.00
16	40	41	3.07	.98
17	47	35	3.06	1.00
18	4	37	3.05	1.02
19	20	38	3.05	1.01
20	34	42	3.05	1.10
21	48	37	3.03	1.06
22	10	42	3.00	1.18
23	19	36	3.00	1.24
24	23	40	2.95	.99
25	49	38	2.95	1.03
26	2	36	2.89	1.08
27	50	35	2.89	1.05
28	5	33	2.88	1.13
29	17	36	2.86	1.24
30	46	35	2.86	1.03
31	24	34	2.85	1.25
32	14	37	2.76	.80
33	30	40	2.70	1.18
34	3	39	2.69	.95
35	7	28	2.68	.98
36	33	31	2.68	1.01
37	22	24	2.58	.97
38	35	26	2.58	1.27
39	41	34	2.53	.90
40	45	38	2.53	1.24
41	29	36	2.50	.94
42	44	40	2.48	1.26
43	9	35	2.46	1.40
44	16	32	2.44	1.07
45	42	35	2.37	1.00
46	32	12	2.33	1.07
47	43	34	2.18	1.14
48	8	37	2.05	1.43
49	28	22	1.68	1.21
50	15	30	1.63	1.06

APPENDIX TABLE 2.--France: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for France.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	42	29	3.72	1.06
2	45	34	3.56	1.02
3	11	21	3.52	1.07
4	46	27	3.52	1.42
5	1	16	3.44	.73
6	6	22	3.36	1.13
7	47	26	3.35	1.29
8	48	27	3.33	1.00
9	29	29	3.31	1.28
10	44	28	3.25	.93
11	43	22	3.23	1.15
12	21	27	3.22	1.01
13	50	15	3.20	1.01
14	12	14	3.14	.86
15	18	22	3.14	1.03
16	8	10	3.10	1.10
17	27	21	3.10	1.04
18	10	25	3.04	1.09
19	39	24	3.00	1.06
20	24	26	3.00	1.01
21	17	9	3.00	.71
22	49	14	2.93	.73
23	20	20	2.90	1.16
24	40	20	2.90	1.02
25	13	18	2.89	1.07
26	31	16	2.88	1.14
27	14	16	2.88	.62
28	34	30	2.87	1.00
29	16	7	2.86	1.21
30	26	28	2.86	1.23
31	23	18	2.83	.71
32	15	12	2.83	1.11
33	2	16	2.81	.98
34	30	16	2.81	.98
35	9	16	2.75	1.06
36	25	19	2.74	1.09
37	7	18	2.72	1.01
38	36	18	2.72	.96
39	4	6	2.67	1.03
40	5	16	2.63	1.02
41	19	20	2.60	1.18
42	22	5	2.60	.89
43	41	9	2.56	1.42
44	37	10	2.50	.97
45	38	14	2.43	1.28
46	3	14	2.21	.97
47	33	10	2.00	.94
48	35	12	1.75	.97
49	28	4	1.00	0.00
50	32	0	0.00	0.00

APPENDIX TABLE 3.--Switzerland: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Switzerland.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	40	42	3.69	1.09
2	33	40	3.68	1.14
3	38	42	3.64	1.03
4	39	38	3.58	1.08
5	15	20	3.55	1.31
6	1	41	3.54	1.02
7	27	41	3.54	1.00
8	31	40	3.53	1.03
9	44	27	3.44	.93
10	34	42	3.40	1.10
11	26	34	3.38	.89
12	21	42	3.38	.88
13	46	24	3.38	1.09
14	37	24	3.38	.92
15	16	30	3.37	1.12
16	50	18	3.33	.91
17	45	27	3.33	.92
18	20	40	3.33	.92
19	13	38	3.32	.93
20	10	37	3.30	1.07
21	42	32	3.28	.85
22	18	39	3.23	.99
23	49	32	3.22	.87
24	41	32	3.22	1.03
25	14	37	3.22	.71
26	36	34	3.18	.97
27	29	30	3.17	.95
28	24	38	3.16	.75
29	25	34	3.15	.99
30	11	36	3.14	1.07
31	17	36	3.11	1.08
32	12	30	3.10	1.02
33	8	19	3.05	1.50
34	6	31	3.00	.73
35	32	2	3.00	0.00
36	3	13	3.00	1.15
37	48	22	2.95	1.00
38	43	22	2.95	.90
39	23	34	2.94	1.17
40	30	32	2.94	.95
41	9	30	2.93	1.31
42	47	19	2.84	1.06
43	2	33	2.76	1.14
44	19	34	2.68	1.12
45	4	14	2.57	1.22
46	7	17	2.53	1.12
47	35	8	2.38	1.18
48	22	22	2.32	1.08
49	5	11	2.09	1.13
50	28	0	0.00	0.00

APPENDIX TABLE 4.--Germany: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Germany.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	39	31	3.45	.72
2	34	36	3.22	1.14
3	38	27	3.19	.96
4	31	37	3.16	.87
5	49	32	3.13	.91
6	37	18	3.11	.96
7	46	28	3.07	.98
8	13	33	3.03	.88
9	36	35	3.03	1.04
10	44	33	3.00	.94
11	40	31	3.00	1.00
12	35	6	3.00	.63
13	1	32	3.00	.76
14	25	33	2.97	1.13
15	42	31	2.97	1.01
16	26	19	2.89	1.19
17	27	27	2.89	1.15
18	48	33	2.88	1.21
19	24	36	2.86	.83
20	41	26	2.85	.97
21	47	35	2.83	1.15
22	7	29	2.79	.90
23	10	37	2.78	1.08
24	11	26	2.77	.76
25	45	37	2.76	1.01
26	43	35	2.74	1.01
27	21	35	2.71	1.04
28	14	30	2.70	1.14
29	17	25	2.68	.90
30	29	14	2.64	.63
31	6	29	2.62	.82
32	18	34	2.59	.96
33	9	29	2.59	1.21
34	30	18	2.56	.98
35	19	30	2.53	.94
36	8	6	2.50	1.64
37	20	25	2.44	.96
38	3	10	2.40	.52
39	12	24	2.17	.82
40	23	25	2.16	.99
41	2	25	2.12	1.16
42	4	21	2.10	.89
43	33	17	2.06	.83
44	22	16	1.94	1.00
45	50	14	1.93	.92
46	6	10	1.70	.95
47	15	11	1.45	.69
48	16	6	1.33	.52
49	32	2	1.00	0.00
50	28	2	1.00	0.00

APPENDIX TABLE 5.--Czechoslovakia: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Czechoslovakia.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	40	40	3.65	1.16
2	27	40	3.63	.93
3	15	30	3.53	1.16
4	9	31	3.45	1.15
5	8	14	3.43	1.28
6	18	40	3.38	.98
7	21	41	3.37	1.26
8	34	42	3.33	1.05
9	16	29	3.28	1.25
10	19	36	3.25	.91
11	14	34	3.24	.89
12	39	40	3.23	1.02
13	1	37	3.22	.98
14	20	40	3.20	.85
15	44	28	3.18	1.05
16	36	36	3.17	1.15
17	33	37	3.16	1.04
18	48	37	3.14	.86
19	37	32	3.13	.87
20	10	38	3.11	1.13
21	45	40	3.05	1.01
22	30	34	3.00	1.01
23	42	22	3.00	.93
24	2	30	3.00	.95
25	7	24	3.00	.88
26	47	38	2.97	1.12
27	11	32	2.97	1.14
28	49	24	2.96	1.08
29	13	35	2.94	1.41
30	12	21	2.90	.83
31	50	28	2.89	.88
32	29	40	2.88	1.04
33	46	32	2.84	1.29
34	43	32	2.84	1.01
35	38	32	2.84	1.19
36	35	22	2.82	1.25
37	24	42	2.79	1.02
38	6	35	2.74	1.12
39	26	38	2.74	1.24
40	3	13	2.69	.63
41	25	30	2.57	1.40
42	17	22	2.55	.86
43	31	40	2.53	1.21
44	23	37	2.43	.99
45	4	12	2.42	.79
46	41	22	2.00	1.48
47	5	21	1.95	1.07
48	22	16	1.88	1.02
49	32	5	1.60	.55
50	28	8	1.50	.93

APPENDIX TABLE 6.--Hungary: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Hungary.

Rank	Item Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	44	3.64	.98
2	42	3.62	.98
3	50	3.60	1.07
4	43	3.57	1.17
5	40	3.55	1.15
6	45	3.44	.82
7	48	3.41	.80
8	47	3.40	1.07
9	37	3.23	.69
10	46	3.22	1.16
11	39	3.12	.99
12	20	3.10	1.12
13	33	3.09	.79
14	30	3.03	1.03
15	10	3.00	1.21
16	35	3.00	.79
17	13	3.00	1.28
18	21	2.98	1.28
19	14	2.92	1.24
20	12	2.89	1.03
21	15	2.89	1.39
22	29	2.88	.93
23	19	2.83	1.08
24	18	2.82	1.18
25	34	2.80	.99
26	32	2.80	1.03
27	38	2.78	1.01
28	36	2.75	.88
29	2	2.75	1.22
30	24	2.71	1.06
31	11	2.70	1.13
32	31	2.70	1.20
33	23	2.68	1.20
34	1	2.68	1.18
35	16	2.64	1.38
36	9	2.58	1.34
37	17	2.57	1.13
38	27	2.53	1.41
39	6	2.48	1.22
40	22	2.43	1.27
41	4	2.42	1.50
42	3	2.29	1.43
43	7	2.27	1.00
44	25	2.00	1.33
45	5	1.70	1.05
46	26	1.69	1.45
47	41	1.60	.99
48	8	1.58	.67
49	49	1.14	.55
50	28	1.00	0.00

APPENDIX TABLE 7.--U.S.S.R.: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for U.S.S.R.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	35	42	4.05	.99
2	21	40	4.03	1.09
3	39	42	3.98	.92
4	40	40	3.90	.98
5	33	42	3.88	.89
6	19	42	3.86	1.11
7	20	42	3.86	.81
8	1	42	3.81	1.01
9	15	42	3.79	1.07
10	18	42	3.79	1.15
11	24	41	3.76	.99
12	34	40	3.75	.54
13	36	42	3.71	.84
14	44	36	3.64	.83
15	50	38	3.63	.94
16	37	40	3.60	.90
17	47	42	3.50	1.01
18	30	40	3.50	.96
19	29	38	3.47	.92
20	46	36	3.39	1.37
21	16	40	3.38	1.07
22	48	29	3.34	.77
23	38	28	3.32	1.09
24	11	36	3.31	.62
25	42	40	3.30	.91
26	10	42	3.29	1.04
27	13	36	3.25	1.55
28	14	35	3.23	1.08
29	43	42	3.19	.97
30	31	38	3.16	1.05
31	12	24	3.13	.95
32	45	35	3.11	1.13
33	6	37	3.03	1.23
34	28	18	2.83	1.50
35	25	37	2.73	1.21
36	27	36	2.72	1.32
37	49	39	2.69	1.41
38	7	27	2.67	1.03
39	2	30	2.67	1.26
40	9	34	2.65	1.57
41	23	40	2.63	1.21
42	17	28	2.50	.96
43	4	30	2.50	1.25
44	3	28	2.46	1.29
45	8	22	2.45	1.50
46	41	29	2.28	1.16
47	5	22	2.00	1.44
48	26	32	1.69	1.09
49	32	6	1.67	1.03
50	22	18	1.56	1.09

APPENDIX TABLE 8.--Finland: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Finland.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	46	38	3.71	.96
2	38	36	3.69	.89
3	39	40	3.68	.94
4	47	40	3.65	1.14
5	27	40	3.55	1.06
6	40	40	3.53	.99
7	37	32	3.47	.92
8	14	30	3.37	.93
9	21	40	3.35	1.09
10	20	40	3.35	.98
11	45	38	3.32	1.04
12	44	28	3.25	.70
13	13	38	3.24	.91
14	26	38	3.16	.82
15	10	32	3.16	.63
16	42	26	3.15	.92
17	1	34	3.15	.82
18	34	36	3.14	.90
19	30	24	3.08	.98
20	7	32	3.06	1.01
21	24	32	3.06	.95
22	48	34	3.06	1.84
23	36	34	3.06	.95
24	12	22	3.05	.79
25	23	32	3.03	.90
26	15	19	3.00	1.49
27	29	38	2.97	.85
28	6	34	2.97	.94
29	22	18	2.83	1.29
30	2	30	2.83	.87
31	49	28	2.82	.94
32	11	38	2.82	.69
33	41	29	2.79	1.23
34	50	22	2.77	.81
35	31	38	2.76	.94
36	33	30	2.73	1.14
37	17	28	2.61	.74
38	9	22	2.59	1.14
39	43	28	2.57	1.25
40	19	28	2.50	1.07
41	16	16	2.44	1.26
42	18	32	2.34	1.03
43	25	20	2.25	.97
44	4	26	2.23	1.06
45	3	24	2.13	1.11
46	35	16	2.00	1.15
47	8	18	1.83	1.29
48	28	8	1.75	1.16
49	32	10	1.60	.97
50	5	34	1.56	.86

APPENDIX TABLE 9.--Sweden: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Sweden.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	30	44	3.89	1.06
2	21	44	3.86	1.06
3	22	22	3.82	1.05
4	9	34	3.79	1.09
5	23	38	3.76	.97
6	17	44	3.73	.99
7	29	24	3.71	.95
8	38	38	3.68	.96
9	46	28	3.68	.82
10	7	44	3.66	.89
11	13	44	3.66	1.18
12	31	40	3.65	.77
13	1	42	3.62	.88
14	24	42	3.62	.96
15	34	36	3.61	.99
16	12	38	3.58	.92
17	44	28	3.57	.88
18	47	26	3.54	.90
19	40	32	3.53	.88
20	11	40	3.53	.93
21	42	21	3.52	.98
22	6	40	3.48	.93
23	39	36	3.47	.84
24	45	29	3.38	.98
25	37	22	3.36	.85
26	36	34	3.35	.92
27	44	20	3.35	.88
28	41	42	3.33	1.14
29	27	30	3.30	.84
30	35	23	3.26	.92
31	10	32	3.25	1.07
32	5	32	3.22	.79
33	33	32	3.22	1.03
34	20	38	3.21	.81
35	18	42	3.14	.84
36	14	31	3.10	1.01
37	49	22	3.09	.81
38	26	38	3.03	.89
39	19	41	3.02	.91
40	43	20	3.00	1.12
41	25	35	2.94	1.32
42	32	18	2.83	1.46
43	50	12	2.75	1.21
44	2	32	2.69	1.09
45	15	24	2.67	.87
46	16	16	2.50	.89
47	4	29	2.24	1.09
48	8	16	2.00	1.36
49	3	27	1.85	.82
50	28	2	1.50	.71

APPENDIX TABLE 10.--Holland: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them for Holland..

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	31	39	4.36	1.15
2	1	40	4.23	1.07
3	24	42	4.17	1.08
4	32	4	4.00	.82
5	45	26	4.00	.89
6	36	38	3.82	1.08
7	10	40	3.73	1.19
8	21	42	3.71	1.33
9	6	42	3.71	.89
10	39	38	3.68	.96
11	20	40	3.65	1.05
12	17	42	3.64	.88
13	34	34	3.62	1.01
14	40	34	3.62	1.07
15	42	30	3.57	.82
16	38	40	3.50	1.03
17	46	34	3.47	1.18
18	22	28	3.46	1.37
19	37	24	3.46	1.06
20	47	40	3.43	.96
21	30	40	3.38	.98
22	15	16	3.38	.96
23	13	38	3.37	1.45
24	41	30	3.33	.88
25	33	40	3.33	.94
26	27	38	3.32	.93
27	16	16	3.31	1.07
28	49	28	3.29	1.15
29	11	42	3.26	1.23
30	29	24	3.25	1.11
31	44	28	3.18	.94
32	23	36	3.14	.93
33	9	40	3.05	1.60
34	48	21	3.05	.97
35	12	38	3.03	1.32
36	26	40	3.03	1.07
37	25	38	2.97	1.38
38	7	36	2.97	.91
39	35	18	2.89	1.02
40	18	42	2.81	1.08
41	5	14	2.79	1.12
42	50	12	2.75	.96
43	19	40	2.73	.99
44	43	16	2.69	.95
45	4	28	2.54	1.07
46	14	30	2.47	1.30
47	3	26	2.19	1.02
48	2	29	2.10	1.14
49	8	19	1.89	1.48
50	28	0	0.00	0.00

APPENDIX TABLE 11.--Pretest: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them before the tour.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	36	44	3.77	1.11
2	34	42	3.55	.94
3	44	44	3.48	1.04
4	38	44	3.45	1.13
5	39	42	3.45	1.01
6	7	40	3.45	.96
7	26	44	3.41	1.22
8	8	39	3.38	1.22
9	6	41	3.34	1.06
10	48	39	3.33	.99
11	25	36	3.33	1.35
12	41	38	3.29	.96
13	5	34	3.26	.96
14	1	43	3.26	.93
15	40	40	3.25	1.00
16	31	42	3.24	.98
17	21	44	3.20	1.23
18	18	42	3.19	1.01
19	24	43	3.19	.96
20	14	42	3.17	1.18
21	30	44	3.16	1.11
22	27	42	3.14	1.33
23	13	44	3.14	1.26
24	45	40	3.13	1.34
25	12	39	3.10	1.18
26	37	32	3.09	1.05
27	20	44	3.09	1.09
28	3	42	3.07	1.29
29	33	35	3.06	1.13
30	50	39	3.00	1.25
31	19	40	3.00	1.26
32	35	41	3.00	1.26
33	23	43	3.00	1.02
34	10	42	3.00	1.05
35	28	42	2.98	1.35
36	29	35	2.97	1.07
37	2	40	2.95	1.21
38	42	38	2.95	1.29
39	16	35	2.94	1.25
40	11	34	2.91	.90
41	17	42	2.86	1.04
42	49	40	2.85	1.02
43	46	40	2.83	1.15
44	47	42	2.81	1.13
45	9	40	2.75	1.19
46	22	31	2.65	1.25
47	4	42	2.62	1.26
48	15	42	2.52	1.23
49	32	33	2.48	.94
50	43	33	2.18	1.07

APPENDIX TABLE 12.--Posttest: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as twenty-two American educators perceived them after the tour.

Rank	Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	7	40	3.63	.81
2	38	42	3.50	1.08
3	36	42	3.48	1.10
4	44	42	3.45	1.34
5	34	40	3.40	1.23
6	16	38	3.39	.95
7	25	39	3.38	1.38
8	41	40	3.38	.90
9	27	38	3.32	1.04
10	40	42	3.31	1.09
11	39	42	3.31	1.17
12	37	36	3.31	1.09
13	28	40	3.30	1.22
14	10	40	3.28	.96
15	15	40	3.25	.78
16	6	42	3.24	.88
17	45	40	3.23	1.04
18	14	40	3.20	1.01
19	13	40	3.20	1.00
20	29	40	3.18	1.25
21	26	40	3.18	1.15
22	24	40	3.18	.93
23	11	40	3.18	1.12
24	46	40	3.15	1.23
25	48	38	3.13	.96
26	35	40	3.13	1.22
27	20	42	3.10	.98
28	2	39	3.08	1.01
29	50	40	3.08	1.14
30	21	42	3.05	1.12
31	42	40	3.03	1.31
32	30	42	3.02	1.11
33	9	37	3.00	1.26
34	12	37	3.00	1.02
35	23	36	2.97	1.02
36	18	40	2.95	1.01
37	4	38	2.89	1.00
38	8	38	2.89	1.15
39	33	36	2.89	.92
40	1	42	2.88	.77
41	47	42	2.88	1.15
42	31	40	2.83	1.10
43	3	42	2.81	.89
44	5	40	2.65	1.02
45	19	38	2.61	1.00
46	32	34	2.59	1.15
47	17	38	2.58	.89
48	22	34	2.56	1.00
49	43	42	2.31	1.31
50	49	40	2.30	1.04

APPENDIX TABLE 13.--Across Nations: fifty special education objectives ranked on the Attention Factor as American educators perceived them across nations.

Rank	Item	Number*	Mean**	Standard Deviation
1	39	455	3.45	1.02
2	40	442	3.44	1.07
3	21	478	3.38	1.19
4	38	412	3.34	1.11
5	1	449	3.34	1.06
6	36	427	3.32	1.08
7	34	460	3.31	1.05
8	44	404	3.30	1.06
9	37	320	3.28	.97
10	46	380	3.25	1.18
11	27	422	3.23	1.15
12	20	449	3.23	1.02
13	24	458	3.21	1.07
14	13	424	3.21	1.19
15	45	418	3.20	1.10
16	31	448	3.18	1.14
17	42	370	3.18	1.08
18	47	395	3.18	1.12
19	10	435	3.17	1.09
20	48	364	3.16	1.08
21	30	404	3.15	1.09
22	6	427	3.14	1.06
23	33	384	3.12	1.09
24	11	410	3.11	1.01
25	50	316	3.09	1.10
26	29	391	3.07	1.05
27	18	458	3.06	1.10
28	12	352	3.05	1.05
29	7	361	3.05	1.03
30	14	386	3.04	1.04
31	35	290	3.01	1.22
32	16	290	2.99	1.20
33	15	314	2.95	1.29
34	17	378	2.95	1.07
35	19	425	2.92	1.12
36	25	387	2.91	1.30
37	23	398	2.91	1.08
38	9	372	2.91	1.35
39	26	424	2.90	1.25
40	41	351	2.87	1.18
41	43	368	2.79	1.18
42	2	364	2.74	1.13
43	49	372	2.73	1.15
44	22	241	2.63	1.27
45	8	250	2.58	1.43
46	4	295	2.56	1.13
47	28	152	2.54	1.44
48	3	292	2.53	1.11
49	5	277	2.49	1.18
50	32	136	2.46	1.16

*Of 498 possible responses

**Response for each objective made on the basis of a five-point scale.

APPENDIX B

REPORT FORM

PERSONAL DATA SHEETS

Name_____ Country_____ Page 1

EDUCATING THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD:
ISSUES OF CONCERN

On this study-tour you will see and hear about a selected sampling of provisions for special education within each of several countries, and you will be exposed to some of the theories and attitudes currently considered important in these countries. We are asking you to consider these experiences as they relate to a number of issues which are on the special education scene in the United States today.

It is hoped that this exercise will be of personal value to you. We expect it also to be of some value to others interested in comparative studies in special education. The check sheets which you complete for each country will be compiled and analyzed. From this analysis we should be able to detect trends, international threads of commonality, and also to identify issues which are of particular concern to individual countries. We are not here presuming to compare these countries with each other or to the United States, nor are we evaluating procedures as to their effectiveness.

You will be answering two questions about what you have observed in each country: first, whether or not this particular issue is viewed as a problem in special education in this country; second, the extent to which attempts are being made to resolve the problem.

If you have no basis whatsoever for judgment, simply mark the zero column of the scale. Otherwise, scale by degree as follows:

Key		The issue is viewed as a problem						Attempts are being made to resolve the problem					
Not at all	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
To a slight extent	2												
To a moderate extent	3												
To a large extent	4												
To a maximum extent	5												
1. Establishing a total life program for the handicapped.													
2. Lessening the schism between general and special education.													
3. Reducing the confusion in terminology (emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted; brain damaged, etc.).													
4. Breaking down the "hardened" categories of medical classifications.													
5. Reducing architectural barriers to educational, occupational, and civic opportunities.													
6. Adjusting programs to accommodate an increasing incidence of severely and multiply-handicapped.													

Key		The issue is viewed as a problem						Attempts are being made to resolve the problem					
Not at all	1												
To a slight extent	2												
To a moderate extent	3												
To a large extent	4												
To a maximum extent	5	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Influencing legislation designed to improve special education.													
8. Cutting across color and race lines in providing for the exceptional child.													
9. Providing for males and females with comparable adequacy in special education programming.													
10. Providing for flexible programming for those children whose handicaps or abilities lessen or increase perceptibly during their school years.													
11. Coping with the problem of population density as it affects programming.													
12. Achieving greater acceptance of the handicapped by the non-handicapped.													
13. Insuring adequate financial support for the education of the handicapped.													
14. Compensating for retardation believed environmentally induced.													
15. Providing centers to function as advisory sources for curriculum development.													
16. Making available a central source of research dissemination, such as ERIC.													
17. Offering continuing educational and recreational opportunities for the mature handicapped.													
18. Achieving early identification of atypical children.													
19. Providing appropriate services for exceptional children of ages 1-5.													

Name_____ Country_____ Page 3

Key		The issue is viewed as a problem						Attempts are being made to resolve the problem					
Not at all 1 To a slight extent 2 To a moderate extent 3 To a large extent 4 To a maximum extent 5		0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Arriving at a broad evaluation of individual abilities and disabilities for each child.												
21.	Insuring the handicapped of evaluation, medical care, and educational opportunity regardless of the financial or social status of his family.												
22.	Sharing provisions for special needs with pupils attending private institutions.												
23.	Adapting institutions to a fluid and more complex population of handicapped individuals.												
24.	Providing vocational guidance, and offering practical assistance to the handicapped in finding their place in suitable vocations (e.g., work-study programs).												
25.	Assuming the responsibility for transporting the handicapped to suitable programs, when necessary.												
26.	Establishing special classes for the emotionally disturbed.												
27.	Providing trained school social workers and offering psychiatric assistance to disturbed children.												
28.	Providing the gifted with adequate opportunity to develop their potentials.												
29.	Making it possible for the physically handicapped to go on to higher education when they are mentally able.												
30.	Providing physical education opportunities, and recreational facilities, suitable for handicapped children.												

Name_____ Country_____ Page 4

Key

Not at all 1
To a slight extent 2
To a moderate extent 3
To a large extent 4
To a maximum extent 5

	The issue is viewed as a problem						Attempts are being made to resolve the problem					
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
31. Enabling the severely handicapped to make some contribution to the world of work, although within a sheltered environment.												
32. Furnishing special training opportunities and automobile operational devices, thus enabling a number of the physically and mentally handicapped to drive a car.												
33. Experimenting with promising new ideas suggested by research, and conducting "action research."												
34. Regulating class size in accordance to type and special needs of the handicapped.												
35. Freely utilizing the tools of automation for teaching the handicapped (e.g., teaching machines for the deaf, etc.).												
36. Adjusting the subject matter, and quantity, of schoolwork required, to the physical and/or mental abilities of handicapped children.												
37. Applying individualized "prescriptive teaching" techniques, as with the neurologically impaired.												
38. Reporting realistically and meaningfully to the parents of exceptional children, and involving their support in the education process.												
39. Incorporating special therapies (physical, speech, occupational) within the school program of the exceptional child.												
40. Facilitating the interdisciplinary sharing of responsibility for decision-making in regard to individual "cases."												

Name_____ Country_____ Page 5

Key Not at all 1 To a slight extent 2 To a moderate extent 3 To a large extent 4 To a maximum extent 5	The issue is viewed as a problem						Attempts are being made to resolve the problem					
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
41. Engaging and utilizing the support of community agencies.												
42. Imposing "certification" standards, including some internship experiences, for administrators of special education programs.												
43. Requiring teachers to have medical background and training in their field of exceptionality.												
44. Requiring special education teachers to have a foundation of basic courses in child development and learning theory.												
45. Requiring apprenticeship or practice teaching experiences for teachers of the handicapped, including experience with normal children.												
46. Promoting the status of teachers of the handicapped to be equal to the status accorded teachers of regular children.												
47. Adequately compensating special education teachers for the skills and training considered important in their preparation.												
48. Insuring the recruitment of an adequate number of qualified personnel.												
49. Using non-professional personnel to a satisfactory extent in order to implement the professional objectives of the program.												
50. Providing for the continuing "in-service" education of those professionals working with the exceptional child.												

Name_____ Country_____ Page 6

EDUCATING THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD:
AN OVERVIEW

What has particularly impressed or concerned you about the special education program in this country?

We are asking you to express in a single sentence your conception of programming for the physically, mentally and emotionally handicapped of this country. To do this, you will be checking items on the three following pages. (There will be only one sentence on each page.) Instructions:

A. Follow the entire sentence through consecutively, writing a "1" in the blank indicating your first choice in each category.

B. If you consider an additional choice important, indicate by writing a "2" by that item, next a "3," etc.

C. If you consider two or more items of equal importance, write their letters under "other," and be sure to include these items in the total ranking.

D. If you wish to write in another idea, do so in the final blank. Please be sure to rank it also.

Name_____ Country_____ Page 7

In this country I would judge that theory and practice relating to physically handicapped individuals are devoted particularly to the

___(a) pre-school period
___(b) school age
___(c) work life
___(d) old age
___(e) total life span

period, major programming being

directed toward the goal of
___(a) custodial maintenance
___(b) discipline and control
___(c) self-realization
___(d) life adjustment
___(e) vocational development
___(f) social behavior
___(g) national development
___(h) other:_____
_____

, that goal

conceived as being achieved primarily through
___(a) education
___(b) training
___(c) employment
___(d) isolation
___(e) prevention
___(f) socialization
___(g) study and research
___(h) medical care
___(i) other:_____
_____

, by means of
___(a) integrated "public" schools
___(b) segregated classes in public schools
___(c) government institutions
___(d) private institutions
___(e) parent or foster parent care
___(f) clinics
___(g) community services
___(h) other:_____
_____

, through policy developed
___(a) at local legislative level
___(b) at an intermediate level of authority
___(c) by the national government
___(d) through parent and community group action
___(e) cooperatively_____
___(f) other:_____
_____

Name_____ Country_____ Page 8

In this country I would judge that theory and practice relating to mentally handicapped individuals are devoted particularly to the

___(a) pre-school period
___(b) school age
___(c) work life
___(d) old age
___(e) total life span

period, major programming being

directed toward the goal of ___(a) custodial maintenance
___(b) discipline and control
___(c) self-realization
___(d) life adjustment
___(e) vocational development
___(f) social behavior
___(g) national development
___(h) other:_____
_____

, that goal

conceived as being achieved primarily through ___(a) education
___(b) training
___(c) employment
___(d) isolation
___(e) prevention
___(f) socialization
___(g) study and research
___(h) medical care
___(i) other:_____
_____

by means of ___(a) integrated "public" schools
___(b) segregated classes in public schools
___(c) government institutions
___(d) private institutions
___(e) parent or foster parent care
___(f) clinics
___(g) community services
___(h) other:_____
_____

through policy developed ___(a) at local legislative level
___(b) at an intermediate level of authority
___(c) by the national government
___(d) through parent and community group action
___(e) cooperatively_____
___(f) other:_____
_____

Name_____ Country_____ Page 9

In this country I would judge that theory and practice relating to emotionally handicapped individuals are devoted particularly to the

___(a) pre-school
___(b) school age
___(c) work life
___(d) old age
___(e) total life span

period, major programming being directed

toward the goal of ___(a) custodial maintenance
___(b) discipline and control
___(c) self-realization
___(d) life adjustment
___(e) vocational development
___(f) social behavior
___(g) national development
___(h) other:_____
_____

, that goal

conceived as being achieved primarily through ___(a) education
___(b) training
___(c) employment
___(d) isolation
___(e) prevention
___(f) socialization
___(g) study and research
___(h) medical care
___(i) other:_____
_____

by means of ___(a) integrated "public" schools
___(b) segregated classes in public schools
___(c) government institutions
___(d) private institutions
___(e) parent or foster parent care
___(f) clinics
___(g) community services
___(h) other:_____
_____

through policy developed ___(a) at local legislative level
___(b) at an intermediate level of authority
___(c) by the national government
___(d) through parent and community group action
___(e) cooperatively_____
___(f) other:_____
_____

DATA SHEET: It is important for us to have the following information about you. Please answer as fully as you can.

Miss
Mrs.
Mr._____ Born_____
City State Mo/Da/Yr

Address_____ Phone_____
Street City State

Most recent position_____

Colleges Attended	Address	Date	Major	Minor	Degree

Courses taken relating to the handicapped (education, psychology, rehabilitation, etc.). Describe and give approximate number of semester hours in each area._____

For what certificates have you qualified (teacher, other)? Name:_____

Rank in the order of your own interest (as "1" for greatest interest):

DESCRIPTION

___ Gifted
___ Normal
___ Educable Retarded
___ Trainable Retarded
___ Orthopedic and Special Health
___ Visually Handicapped
___ Speech and Hearing Handicapped
___ Emotionally Disturbed
___ Multiply Handicapped

AGE LEVEL

___ Pre-school
___ Early Elementary
___ Later Elementary
___ Junior High
___ Senior High
___ Beyond Grade 12

Name_____ Data Sheet, Page 2

For how many years have you worked with the schools, other than as a pupil or parent?_____ In what capacity? (Please describe, as age groups, grade levels, types of children, responsibilities.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What other associations have you had with exceptional children?

___As a Parent ___In Scouting ___Camping ___Child Care ___Church

___Service Organization ___Other:_____

(Please describe types of children; nature, length and frequency of association.)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How did you become interested in this study-tour? ___At a convention

___Professional Journal ___Friend ___Other:_____

Have you ever been overseas before?___ When? _____ For how long?_____

In what countries?_____

Purpose:_____

How did you benefit most from that overseas experience?_____

_____

Rate the following items as you feel that they reflect your purpose in taking this study-tour (as "1" for major objective):

___ to meet new people
___ to learn more about special education
___ to travel, enjoying foreign countries
___ to earn academic credit
___ to get new ideas for use in working with or planning for exceptional children
___ other:_____

APPENDIX C

CODE BOOK

CODE BOOK

FOR

A STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE

UNITED STATES AND ACROSS TEN NATIONS IN

NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE

Instructions for the Use of This Code Book:[1]

1. Code 0 or 00 will always mean Nothing, or Not Applicable, respondent having indicated that information available concerning this item was insufficient to allow him to express any judgment.

2. In each case in the following pages the column to the left contains the column number of the IBM card; the second column contains the origin of the data; the third column (item detail) contains an abbreviated form of the item (introduced by item number from Report Form when applicable); and the fourth column contains the code within each column of the IBM card with an explanation of the code.

3. Coder instructions always follow a line across the page and are clearly indicated.

4. In some cases when codes are equal to others already used, they are not repeated each time, but reference is made to a previous item or the immediately previous code with "same."

---

[1]This data was originally recorded on pages one through five of a Report Form entitled, "Educating the Exceptional Child: Issues of Concern," and on a supplementary two-page "Data Sheet." It represents a summary of impressions reported by special education professionals who participated in a 1967 special education study tour sponsored through Ithaca College, New York.

CARD 1

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
1,2	Report Form	Country and Region	01 - England, London 02 - France, Paris 03 - Switz., Geneva 04 - Germany, Bonn 05 - Czech., Prague 06 - Hungary, Budapest 07 - U. S. S. R., Moscow 08 - Finland, Helsinki 09 - Sweden, Stockholm 10 - Holland, Amsterdam 11 - U. S. & Ontario, Pretrip 12 - U. S. & Ontario, Posttrip
3	Report Form	Card No. 1 will be 1. Observation of Issue	01 - Viewed as Problem (from inside column) 02 - Attempts at Resolution (outer right hand column)
4,5	Report From	Respondent Number	01 - 22
6	Data Sheet	Sex of Respondent	1 - Feminine 2 - Masculine
7,8	Data Sheet	Age of Respondent	22-62 Years
9	Data Sheet	Education of Respondent	1 - 1 Degree (B.A., B.S.) Plus additional course work 2 - 1 Degree (B.A., B.S.) Plus 1 additional year non-degree 3 - 2 Degrees (includes M.A., M.S., A.S., A.A.) excluding Doctorate 4 - 4 Degrees or equivalent excluding Doctorate 5 - 3 Degrees including Doctorate 6 - 5 Degrees including Doctorate

CARD 1

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
10	Data Sheet	Experience of Respondent, Total Professional	1 - 0-4 years 2 - 5-9 years 3 - 10-14 years 4 - 15-19 years 5 - 20-24 years
11	Data Sheet	Experience of Respondent, Special Education Professional	1 - 0-4 years 2 - 5-9 years 3 - 10-14 years 4 - 15-19 years 5 - 20-24 years
12	Data Sheet	Geog. Area Represented by the Respondent	1 - U. S. East 2 - U. S. South 3 - U. S. Midwest 4 - U. S. West 5 - Ontario
13	Data Sheet	Pop. of Area Reported by Respondent as Personal Background	1 - 0-100,000 2 - 100,000-500,000 3 - 500,000-1,000,000 4 - 1,000,000 or more
14	Data Sheet	Type of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, First Choice	1 - Gifted 2 - Normal 3 - Educable Retarded 4 - Trainable Retarded 5 - Orthopedic and Special Health 6 - Visually Handicapped 7 - Speech & Hearing Handicapped 8 - Emotionally Disturbed 9 - Multiply Handicapped
15	Data Sheet	Type of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, Second Choice	1 - 9 (Same as Column 14)
16	Data Sheet	Type of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, Third Choice	1 - 9 (Same as Column 14)

CARD 1

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
17	Data Sheet	Type of Pupil Least Preferred by Respondent, Last Choice	1 - 9 (Same as Column 14)
18	Data Sheet	Age Level of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, First Choice	1 - Pre-school 2 - Early elementary 3 - Later elementary 4 - Junior high 5 - Senior high 6 - Beyond grade 12
19	Data Sheet	Age Level of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, Second Choice	1 - 6 (Same as Column 18)
20	Data Sheet	Age Level of Pupil Preferred by Respondent, Third Choice	1 - 6 (Same as Column 18)
21	Data Sheet	Age Level of Pupil Least Preferred by Respondent, Last Choice	1 - 6 (Same as Column 18)
22	Data Sheet	Purpose for Taking Tour, First Choice	1 - To meet new people 2 - To learn more about special education 3 - To travel, enjoying foreign countries 4 - To earn academic credit 5 - To get new ideas for use in working with or planning for exceptional children 6 - Other:_____
23	Data Sheet	Purpose for Taking Tour, Second Choice	1 - 6 (Same as Column 22)
24	Data Sheet	Purpose for Taking Tour, Third Choice	1 - 6 (Same as Column 22)

CARD 1

Column-Source	Report Form	Item Detail	Code
25[1]		#1, Total Life Program	0 - Not qualified to judge 1 - Not at all 2 - To a slight extent 3 - To a moderate extent 4 - To a large extent 5 - To a maximum extent
26	Same	#2, Schism. General and Special Ed.	Same as above
27	Same	#3, Confusion in Terminology	Same
28	Same	#4, Breaking Down Categories	Same
29	Same	#5, Architectural Barriers	Same
30	Same	#6, Severely & Multiply Handicapped	Same
31	Same	#7, Influencing Legislation	Same
32	Same	#8, Color & Race Lines	Same
33	Same	#9, Males & Females	Same
34	Same	#10, Flexible Programming	Same
35	Same	#11, Population Density	Same
36	Same	#12, Acceptance of Handicapped	Same

[1]Columns 25-74 (items 1-50; Appendix B). Pertains to whether "the issue is viewed as a problem."

CARD 1

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
37	Same	#13, Financial Support	Same
38	Same	#14, Environmental Retardation	Same
39	Same	#15, Curriculum Devel. Centers	Same
40	Same	#16, Research Dissem. Centers	Same
41	Same	#17, Opportunities for Mature Hdc.	Same
42	Same	#18, Early Identification of Hdc.	Same
43	Same	#19, Services Ages 1-5	Same
44	Same	#20, Broad Evaluation	Same
45	Same	#21, Status of Family	Same
46	Same	#22, Private Institutions	Same
47	Same	#23, Adapting Institutions	Same
48	Same	#24, Vocational Assistance	Same
49	Same	#25, Transporting the Handicapped	Same
50	Same	#26, Emotionally Dist. Classes	Same
51	Same	#27, Psychiatric Assistance	Same
52	Same	#28, Provisions for Gifted	Same

CARD 1 Page 1-6

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
53	Same	#29, Higher Ed., Physically Hdc.	Same
54	Same	#30, Phys. Educ. and Recreation	Same
55	Same	#31, Sheltered Workshops	Same
56	Same	#32, Opportunity to Drive a Car	Same
57	Same	#33, Experimentation and Action Research	Same
58	Same	#34, Regulating Class Size	Same
59	Same	#35, Automation to Teach Hdc.	Same
60	Same	#36, Adjusting School Requirements for Hdc.	Same
61	Same	#37, Prescriptive Teaching	Same
62	Same	#38, Involving Parents in Ed.	Same
63	Same	#39, Therapies, P.T., S.T., O.T.	Same
64	Same	#40, Interdisciplinary Team Decisions	Same
65	Same	#41, Community Agency Support	Same
66	Same	#42, Administrator Certification	Same
67	Same	#43, Teacher Training in Exceptionalities	Same

CARD 1 Page 1-7

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
68	Same	#44, Teacher Training, Basic Courses	Same
69	Same	#45, Apprentice-ship with Hdc. & Normal	Same
70	Same	#46, Status of Teachers of Hdc.	Same
71	Same	#47, Compensation of Spec. Ed. Teachers	Same
72	Same	#48, Recruitment of Qualified Persons	Same
73	Same	#49, Non-profes-sional Personnel	Same
74	Same	#50, In-service Educ. for Prof.	Same

CARD 2

Column-Source		Item Detail	Code
1,2	Report Form	Country and Region	01 - England, London 02 - France, Paris 03 - Switz., Geneva 04 - Germany, Bonn 05 - Czech., Prague 06 - Hungary, Budapest 07 - U. S. S. R., Moscow 08 - Finland, Helsinki 09 - Sweden, Stockholm 10 - Holland, Amsterdam 11 - U. S. & Ontario, Pretrip 12 - U. S. & Ontario, Posttrip
3	Report Form	Card No. 2 will be 2 Observation of issue	1 - Viewed as problem (from inside column) 2 - Attempts at resolution (outer right hand column)
4,5	Report Form	Respondent Number	01-22
6-24	Data Sheet	Respondent Data	Identical to Columns 6-24 for Card 1[1]
25-74	Report Form	Same as Card 1 for 25-74	Same as Card 1 for 25-74[2]

[1]IBM columns will contain identical numbers for Card 2 as for Card 1 except for Column 3 and Columns 25-74. (Cards 1 and 2 bear identical code numbers in Columns 1, 2; indicating country reported).

[2]Refers to the same 50 items (see Appendix B) and pertains to "attempts are being made to resolve the problem."

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF RESEARCH FROM PART B OF THE REPORT FORM

EUROPEAN APPROACHES TO SPECIAL EDUCATION: A SUMMARY OF IMPRESSIONS REPORTED BY STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE ITHACA COLLEGE STUDY TOUR OF 1967

by

Arselia B. Sehler

CONTENTS

EUROPEAN APPROACHES TO SPECIAL EDUCATION: A SUMMARY OF IMPRESSIONS REPORTED BY STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE ITHACA COLLEGE STUDY TOUR OF 1967

Derivation and Presentation of Data

On July 2, 1967, the participants of Dr. Eric Graf's second annual study tour of special education facilities in Europe met for the first time, in Ramsay Hall, London, England. At that time, the twenty-five students agreed that, as a part of their summer studies,* they would record their impressions of the programs of the ten countries on their itinerary, reporting by means of a form entitled: "Educating the Exceptional Child: Issues of Concern."

The group may be generally characterized as being one of maturity, each participant having had several years of experience with atypical children as a teacher, a clinician, or both. They also brought considerable academic background with them as a basis for formulating judgments concerning European programs. During the previous school year they were professionally employed in diverse geographic areas of the United States and Canada. The eastern section of the United States was most heavily represented, next the West, the Midwest, Ontario, and finally the South. Most of the participants were familiar with special programs of metropolitan areas, and it was metropolitan areas to which they were introduced in Europe also. The excellent cooperation which they gave to the tedious task of repeatedly filling out the forms is indicative of their serious professional interest and attitude --and perhaps also of the calibre of the group as individuals.

The following ten sections of this paper are limited to summarizing responses written in answer to the question on page six of the report form: "What has particularly impressed or concerned you about the special

---

*Ithaca College, New York: Education 566-European Approaches to Special Education: Psychology of the Mentally Retarded and Multiple Handicapped Child. Summer, 1967. Graduate credit, 6-8 hours.

education program in this country?" Objectivity has been maintained through reporting, by county, on the plus or positive impressions and the minus or negative "concerns." Any interpretive comments or "editorializing" included have come directly from the written comments submitted on the report form. No actual summary of the combined reactions has been attempted here, but these impressions are presented in all of their diversity and color. Trends from country to country are observable, of course, by sheer weight of the comments in regard to particular phases of each country's approach to the field.

A further word as to the interpretation of this report. The reader will note "(+2)" or perhaps "(-3)" indicating the number of positive or negative references made by different individuals to the idea described. If the notation "(2)" stands without a plus or minus, the idea was interpreted as a comment only. In a number of cases a total is indicated as favoring or criticizing an idea, and then several quotations elaborating upon that idea follow, the quotations being not in addition to, but supporting, the original reaction count. There is no number, therefore, following these quotations.

Originally the compilation of data was made on the basis of positive and negative comments only, but the material in its present form is intended to help the reader formulate more of an overall impression in regard to such larger concerns as philosophy, programs, diagnostic procedures, staffing, and post-school planning. The facts are thus compiled into a narrative, with the thought also that it might prove advantageous to keep the countries as ten individual reports.

This paper does not assume to present a comprehensive picture of special education in any country or area. It must be kept clearly in mind that the factual material included in this report is only as accurate and complete as it was presented to the students by those professionals contacted in these ten countries, dependent always upon successful communication of their thoughts (often through interpreters), and the scope of the contacts (necessarily very limited). Facts, therefore, were sometimes inadequate and liable to error, and differences in judgment are inevitable.

All of these problems and limitations are in no way unique. They should not detract unduly from the real significance of the sincere and concerted effort of these educators to garner new insights and evaluate approaches within this, a rainbow of special education

programs. This reporting reflects a new approach to the inservice training of mature professionals, as well as a type of evaluation of international special education not found in previously published material.

I. LONDON, ENGLAND

The London area was the first to which the Study Abroad special education group was exposed. The generally positive feeling of the group is reflected throughout the free response comments made on the report forms. "Every borough must make some provision for special education of the handicapped child." (+1)

A majority of the group felt that the "spirit" of these educators was remarkably fine, eight commenting upon the quality of their leadership (+8), and seven others upon their "people matter" attitude (+7). "Dedicated," "concerned," "involved," "depth of understanding of these children as human beings," "enthusiasm for the work," "team work," (+3), creation of a "generally loving atmosphere"--these were terms used. "I liked their honest unpretentiousness," wrote one observer. "Every pupil was a person, and a cheerfully close relationship between staff and students seemed to be general and genuine, with the result that the students worked well during our interruptions of their instruction, and, although under free discipline, did not cause disturbances. Pupils displayed a trusting friendliness toward visitors."

On the other hand, standards for the preparation of special education teachers were considered inadequate by nine observers (-9). Academic qualifications are not considered paramount. "They continually stated that they tried to find the 'right' person and they then trained them, or that so-and-so had so much 'experience,'" their 'certificates of competency' don't seem to be based on further education." Another comment: "I wondered if they were not underestimating the value of academic background in their laudable stress on the personal qualifications of their teachers." There is, however, the requirement for teaching normal children previous to the special experience (+1). There appeared to be little formal inservice training (-2). One person sensed "antagonism between doctors and educators." (-1)

Problems of categorizing were discussed (+2). Approach to the care of all groups seemed to be taken seriously--the mentally handicapped (+2), the physically handicapped (+3), and the emotionally disturbed (+3). For the deaf (+1), "an excellent program" was reported. "I was impressed with the parent and foster parents of

the child(ren) with profoundly deaf problems." "The facilities for the physically handicapped had a minimum of severely handicapped children, so that an academic program could be offered." (1)

The group was left pondering the wisdom of the administrative set-up as it was pictured by the headmasters of the special schools. The headmaster appears to have great freedom and autonomy--a negative factor to three people (-3), positive to two (+2), thought-provoking to several. "Great for the creative headmaster--but what about quality of the rest?" What about it if there is no basic central curriculum (+1, -6), no standardization or guarantee of continuity in programming, and each headmaster sets up his own plan? What might a move from County A to County B do for a poor student?" (-2) The headmaster maintains flexible lines of communication (+2), and pupils may be placed on trial in a program with a minimum of fuss (+1). The teacher has considerable individual freedom also, termed "lack of supervision" (-1) and "opportunity to experiment." (+1) Three of the group approved of the "readiness to accept diversity in approaches" (+3) for handling the progress of the child on an individualized basis (+3). There is "a more unconstrained attitude toward student progress in special education." There "is no attempt at objective evaluation of (the teacher's) own techniques and reactions, since there is a lack of progress, achievement and specialized individual diagnosis recording." (-1) On the other hand, there is stress on social development (+2), and a tendency to maintain small, family size groups in the classroom to insure individual attention (+1). Attention is also given to parent and foster parent education (+1).

Physical facilities in the London schools were, on the whole, unimpressive (-7). Comments: "poor school housing," "lack of school supplies," and "improper health conditions"--concerning heat, light, humidity, refrigeration of milk, etc.

Consideration of the retarded must necessarily involve the adult as well as the child. The division of authority between the ministries of education and health were noted by four people as disadvantageous (-4), particularly in relation to the severely sub-normal. One person's comment: "In dealing with trainable retarded, the approach appeared to stress the health and training aspects rather than developmental and educational. I was impressed by 'early diagnosis' efforts and recognition of need to keep the severely retarded more and more within the local community. With older

adolescents and adults, the approach stressed 'total life'--preparing them for participation in sheltered workshops or supervised employment." Another comment about the same group: "There is no provision made to place these individuals in outside employment, no placement officers, no follow-up work done, etc. There is little, if any, stress placed on social development and the opinions put forth were that this was the responsibility of the family." "Vocational training" as such, appeared to be very minimal (-2). By law, a certain percentage of the jobs in each industry are guaranteed to handicapped workers (+1). In general, the English did not seem to feel that there was any great problem in placing their handicapped in jobs (+2), as one "amazed" comment indicated. The writer felt that there was no actual lack of interest in this phase of their planning. Another stated, "I am impressed with their evident concern for old age (+1), and for the need of teaching the handicapped to be useful and fulfilled through work."

II. PARIS, FRANCE

Due to a complex of administrative problems, the Study Abroad special education program in France was meagre. The report forms echoed the disappointment of the group, and an "I'm not convinced" attitude prevailed. Nevertheless, all but two of the group made some comments on page six of the form.

Aside from the general tone of discontent with their study experience, the greatest unanimity was reached in regard to the educational requirements of the teacher training program, viewed positively by ten of the group (+10). "Special education teachers are selected from their best students." "An impressive recruitment program" (+2). "Their teacher training seemed to be demanding, in that both an oral and written exam was required, in addition to practice in the field of regular education prior to specializing in special education."

The special education program appears to be highly structured (3, +4) with an intensification of interest and growth taking place in the last decade (+4). "In 1970 they will have 60 more national schools." "I was concerned with the many authorities involved in their program. They have three great ministries and several commissions supervising the educational program." (-1) "One hopes that when personnel quotas set for the next few years begin to be met, more of the handicapped will be included under the "Institut d' Education.'" "There seems to be a carefully thought-out philosophy and plan for all types of handicapped"--though two deplored what appeared to be a "rigid" approach (-2) due to centralization. "I was impressed with the high respect these people have for the handicapped. Each case is kept strictly confidential and all material is coded in the pupil's file." (+2).

There is evidently an effort made to maintain the special child within the normal family circle and in an integrated school situation (+3). Does this jeopardize his opportunity for service? (-1) Is there opportunity to provide for individual differences? (-1) "There is evidently fragmentation of the total life span and daily

plan into singularly exclusive sectors, with little overlap or follow-up--school and/or training, medical science and treatment, home and family-community." (-1)

"Special education . . . is almost completely involved with the more capable of the unadapted." (-1) "Physical care seems to be provided for the handicapped 'non-educable' but no attempts at education are evident."

"Psychotic children, because of their unpredictability, are classified with the insane, excluded from regular schooling, but have no facilities for education geared to their needs." (-1)

One observer said that there was apparently much to recommend the educational treatment of the handicapped in the secondary schools: specifically, "1, student exchange with England of the brighter handicapped youth; 2, weekly trips to cultural exhibits, shows and entertainment to enlarge the student's outlook; 3 high proportion of successful exams for higher education, entering competition in higher normal school education; 4, successful placement vocationally of graduates from secondary school."

III. GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

The Study Abroad group, with all of its own internal diversity, nevertheless responded quite as a whole to the program of the medico-pedagogical center in Geneva, speaking well of it. Two went so far as to call it a "model" (+2). Again, "the center particularly impressed me with its organization and thoroughness." (+5) The interdisciplinary, "team" approach (+9), involving psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, speech clinicians and secretary, appeared "to give the child and parents every opportunity to discover, discuss, direct, and solve the problem at hand."

Effective parental involvement was noted (+9). There appears in Geneva to be a "strong, warm approach to parent and community," with genuine respect evidenced for parent-family problems. "Good social work approach protective of child, aimed to ameliorate environment, the kind of 'intervention' approach we are reaching toward in Head Start Community Action Programs in the U. S. A." (+2) Identification and care at an early age, with follow-up of mothers (+3) was noted, "900 being followed by center at present." "I am terrifically impressed with the early awareness of parents, teachers, and educators to the need of special attention to probable deviations in ability of very young children."

The approach at the medico-pedagogical center at Geneva has additional strengths, not the least of these being in the area of research (+4). "The constant intercommunication between theory and practice should produce a body of knowledge for the rest of the world." Longitudinal studies are being made (+1). The cases "are also discussed at the University and are then followed up by Centre-Psycho-Social Universitaire, for young adults and adults." "I am impressed by the direct line between research and pedagogy, and what appears to be an intimate working relationship--effected through the Institute--relating theory to actual ongoing case studies."

Eight of the group indicated regret that the excellence of this program or anything comparable does

not characterize the whole of Switzerland (-8). One guide commented that a regular student may spend two to four hours daily in walking (or climbing) one way to school.

In Geneva integration is considered desirable (+4), "There appears to be more interest in getting them back into regular classes--less isolation of the handicapped." A different comment, "I am also a little skeptical about keeping the special education students in classes--separate rooms--but in the same school. Sometimes this type of 'integration' makes for greater 'separation' than a separate school." (-1) At any rate "school is compulsory for all children up to age 15" (+1), and there is a "trend toward day school attendance for the below-50 group." (+1) One noted a "curative approach in classes for the below 50 I.Q. with some academic stress." (+1) There is also "utilization of sheltered workshops" (+1), and "generous use of Montessori materials (+1)."

Visits in this country inspired considerable written comment, particularly that made to Aigues-Vertes, a farm "village" for young adult and adult individuals of roughly 50 I.Q. and below. Criticisms were made, not of the institution as a facility--well-run, efficient, good techniques (+4)--but of a philosophy which appears to close the doors upon any chances for the reclamation of any of these individuals to the world outside (-7). There was a "direction toward total living" observed within the village. But the question was posed, "When they are old, what then?" And there appears to be no testing of I.Q. for placement (-2), the criteria being rather that of inadaptability to "outside" life.

As for "La Rochette," at Longirod, the rural "home-school" for disturbed children, reactions were favorable (+5). "Not only do they work with the child but also see that psychological help is given to the parents to see whether a better emotional climate can't be established within the home so that a child might be returned to the family." "If he cannot be helped, he is sent to an institution for the emotionally disturbed." "The environment is conducive to therapy." "I viewed this as a school for the prevention of emotionally disturbed children. I think schools of this nature could be quite advantageous in the U. S." "There is a good curriculum and basic philosophy."

IV. BONN, GERMANY

Appraisals made by the Study Abroad group of their glimpses at the special education program in Bonn made a study in darks and brights. The schools, on the whole, were very good, judged by all of the usual criteria. But also there were many thoughtful comments, and questions, raised by members of the group.

"Their emphasis is on the normal and bright child, not the handicapped child." (-1) "There is, it appears, little concern for individual differences, other than those extremely pronounced." (-2) Strong criticism was levied at the fact that a child must fail twice before being placed in a special class (-6), and that the plan lacks mobility or flexibility of placement, of a chance to return to regular school after a program of remediation (-3). The child is very much the responsibility of the parents (1), and he is kept within the family (+1).

There was concern "that emphasis is on the slow learner who needs remedial help in normal school instead of truly directing attention toward mentally retarded (-2) and emotionally disturbed (-2)." There is "little (educational) hope for the institutionalized, as the residential total care facility is strictly medical and terminal." (-1).

As for the special school program of the retarded, there appears to be a recognition of socio-economic basis for much of the retardation (+1), but also "apparent lack of medical and social services which work together with education to place the children in a better position to learn" (-1). Two other writers agreed on the idea that "the government has not accepted its role in compensating for environmental lack." (-2)

Observation of the Lessenich school program brought these comments: "I am impressed by the amount of academic achievement their slow learners seem to be making, as well as by the fine handwork, involving a high degree of coordination." "The extent and depth of their academic education surprised me. I was definitely impressed but question the value of such subjects as world history,

world geography and philosophy for mentally retarded." (-2) "It appeared they worked at academic programs only, till school leaving age, and then were catapulted into vocational or trade training." (-1) The fact that "a child in special school can only go to school till 16 and has to leave regardless of grade finished" is not good (-2).

As for the language training school visited, five were pleased with the concept (+5), while another doubted it advisable to stress such a remedial approach, preferring to consider the total personality picture of the youngster (-1). A more typical comment was: "I liked the idea of taking out of the regular school those with a special problem and giving them this extra 'push.'"

There seemed to be no question as to the "efficiency" of the school programs (+4), called "good (+2), yielding fine results (+2), with excellent use of Montessori materials (+4). Also, "the creative use of arts and crafts program for retarded children was just great" enthused one (+1). Two noted the "good condition of the schools," (+2), and one particularly noted the "cleanliness of environment," adding, "I have never seen such clean-kept retarded (children) in the states."

The teachers impressed the group most favorably. (+6) "The personnel in the settings visited have been most open and extending of themselves." "I am impressed by their willingness to be visited, questioned, and examined on all phases of their program." (+4) "They have very strong authority." (-2, +1) The teacher training program is thorough (+3), but there is a shortage of qualified personnel (-3), and particularly with the teachers of the mentally handicapped the actual academic qualifications were minimal (-2). (Nevertheless, they left a favorable impression with their visitors).

Perhaps the most pleasant part of the experience in visiting schools in Bonn was the part played by the children themselves. To several of the group (+4), they seemed especially delightful. There was "the enthusiasm of the children in the learning situation," the "conduct of the pupils," and the "control, attention and ease of the children," all suggesting a high quality of discipline without fear. "Although the children were quiet and mannerly they did not lack spontaneity." Later the Study Abroad students received two dozen or more letters from children in the Bonn language training school. The warmth felt by the visitors seems to have been reciprocated by these German children.

V. PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Prague provided the group with their first contact behind "the Iron Curtain." The "poverty and dreariness and hard life" about which one member of the group commented, was echoed in another written report thus: "I was concerned with the bleak and drab world in which the special education pupil moves: clean, but bleak."

Offsetting the realities of Prague today was the high calibre of the top leadership people who came to speak to the visitors (+4). Serving "with evident enthusiasm and devotion" (+1), these people appeared "warm, devoted, open-ended," "aware of problems" (+3), and honest (+1) about shortcomings in implementation (-4) of their special education programs. They gave credit to the contributions of France, England, and the United States (+1), showed respect for the pedagogue (+1), and employ an inter-disciplinary approach (+1). There is evidently good cooperation between the Ministries of Education and of Health (+1).

Theory and long-range plans are highly commendable (+6) and an extensive and efficient organization exists (+3). The Czechoslovakians still do not feel that they are keeping up with increasing population and growing needs in the field (-1), although the number of classes and teachers has increased considerably (+2). They "admit to a high incidence of handicapped--eight percent." (1) Their comprehensive and scientifically sound approach (+3) includes "21 research departments, a spectacular organization," but is still lagging in curricular development (-1) and in screening (-1). One visitor confessed she was intrigued by their curriculum which seeks to "substitute lack of senses with good senses" (+1), and (negatively) by their approach to vocational training (-1). In a given curricular plan, everyone must use the one method chosen as best by state personnel (-1).

Favorable mention was made of the display of textbooks developed for the deaf and blind, including braille (+4), the books of high quality (+1), although one observer noted smallness of print in the books for the deaf

(-1). The deaf and blind get to keep their texts (+1). These are state publications for special education pupils, and as they are expensive, there is a shortage (-1). A visitor looked for specialized texts for retarded, and found none, concluding that they are given a "watered-down curriculum" (-1).

The Czechoslovakians are interested in the recruitment of well-prepared personnel (2), as presently about forty percent of their teachers lack special education background (-1). Under the current system, there is concern that they appear to rely heavily upon correspondence courses (-1), although after 1968 the training picture will be much brighter (+2). But what of those teachers already in the field? An inservice gap is suspected (-1).

On a more positive side, we have the development of apprentice training facilities (+1) and an appreciation of the importance of parents as a part of their curative program (+1). However, doubt was expressed as far as active parent participation is concerned (-1). And for the first time on the trip the students heard the teacher mentioned as a preventative agent--the teacher who has a knowledge of handicapping conditions beyond those of her own specialty.

The availability of early special programs (birth to age three) affording opportunity for diagnosis and remediation of retardation, as well as educational provisions for ages three to five (+2) were cited. Relegation of the care of trainable retarded to welfare rather than to education (-1) is expressed largely in an "occupational day care" approach (1). The speech handicapped are given real consideration (+1).

Most in the spotlight was the field of mental health, with attention given exceptional children (+2) and facilities available for outpatient service and family counseling (+2). After visiting a home for disturbed children the reactions were varied. Three people were unhappy about the bars at the windows (-3), and two feared that there was too ready a tendency to relegate "disturbed" to the ranks of the delinquent (-2)--at least, remarked another, they admit to a delinquency problem (1). Two were favorably impressed by the atmosphere in the home (+2) "good feeling for the children," and two did not like it (-2). Two pointed out a dearth of educational facilities and materials (-2). Two commented upon the high incidence of gypsy children in the home, one favorably, as "giving them maximum support," (+1) and one with suspicion, "discrimination; a social problem!" (-1)

As for a "full lifetime" consideration of the handicapped, the concept is "very young and admittedly inadequate" (-2). There is lack of planning for the severely retarded (-2), and the physically handicapped (-2), to contribute to society, and they admitted that they felt the need for a sheltered workshop program (-1). Custodial care of a meagre quality (-1) appears to be the alternative for those who cannot develop into productive workers for the benefit of the state (-2).

One observer offered this perspective: "What has impressed me about the special education program in this country is its equal status with all other forms of education despite the added financial and personnel burden it entails. Obviously Czechoslovakia is a poor country with many problems retarding its development, yet its philosophy towards special education has veered from a social charity character to a program of all-around care for children and youth with handicaps, to enable them to become useful members of society. In an underdeveloped economy it is easier to integrate a greater proportion of defective personnel than in a highly technical one. It is entirely possible that progress in coping with the problems of special education will keep pace with the state's program in solving other problems." (+1)

VI. BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

The special education program in Budapest is not far advanced (-13) and there is a feeling that the categories are not adequately differentiated (-3). There is, however, evidence of genuine concern (+3), and a refreshing openness in speaking about their problems, with recognition of certain existing conditions as being unsatisfactory (+4).

These Hungarian educators appeared to be surprisingly well informed on education trends in other countries (+2), and, as far as Budapest was concerned, "moving in the right direction," (+3)--as toward workshops (+1), now sorely needed (-6). They are motivated by "a sound philosophy" (+3), and the concept that, in education, the special child is entitled to rights equal to those of the other children of the state, and that their welfare is the responsibility of the state (+2).

A major criticism was leveled at the lack of a school program for the emotionally disturbed child (-13). This appears to be true also for the multiply handicapped (-1), except in hospitals (2), for gifted (-1), and for those with reading disabilities (-1). There is apparently only one special school for the blind (-1).

A bright spot appears in the program for the deaf (+2), which provides special nursery training (+2), and toward which benefits are gained through early identification (+2).

There is active interest in improving already existing school opportunities for the physically handicapped (+2). There is now no special preschool program for this group (-1). It appears that they have little opportunity beyond factory work (-1), even though mentally able (-1), and that under the present system they are apt to suffer educational as well as physical disadvantages (-1).

Unfortunately, the severely sub-normal child is the responsibility of the mental health rather than of

the educational authorities (-2), and educational programs for these "trainables" are lacking (-5). They are institutionalized (-2).

The special school curriculum is state controlled (-1).

The early identification of cases (following naturally under the Communist system) is advantageous (+1), for early treatment of the atypical child. Budapest appears advanced in using the team approach (+2), is accomplishing careful screening (+2), and is attending to regular re-evaluation of the services provided each of their special youngsters (+2). Three of the study group reported enthusiastically upon the fact that there is no definite cut-off point in services according to I.Q., but rather that these educators use function and performance as criteria for placement and treatment (+3). Two deplored the impression they received that the medical doctor appears to be the ultimate authority in case evaluation (-2).

A most pronounced positive impression (+14) was reported concerning the teacher preparation program, a strong one, medically oriented. Impressive also was the organized inservice training (+8), plus the fact that the inservice education is obligatory (+2). One person went so far as to wonder if it was too much--"all duty"--for these teachers (1). Another lauded the fact that logopedia is a part of every teacher's training (+1).

Unfortunately, Budapest faces the usual shortage of trained staff (-3). One person cheered to hear that they are unwilling to use untrained assistants for meeting the needs of special children (+1).

The professed Hungarian goal of "getting the child back into society," was viewed with suspicion by four people, who felt that self-realization and the good of the child might thus be placed in jeopardy (-4). Yet without sheltered workshops it is difficult to elicit even minimal contributions from the severely handicapped. It appears that there is an employment problem for all handicapped (-1). In Budapest as elsewhere the private sector must assume major responsibility for job seeking (-2) and other assistance which is needed for impaired adults to adjust in their society (-4).

VII. MOSCOW, U. S. S. R.

Perhaps most eagerly anticipated by the study group was the visit to the U. S. S. R. What was their attitude toward exceptional children? And toward U. S. and Canadian educators?

Many courtesies were extended the group, and a real effort was made to anticipate and to answer their questions. Staff members even interrupted their "holidays" to meet with the visitors.

All of the members of the study group responded on page six of the report form. Of the group, one indicated complete disbelief of what she saw and heard, another was strongly skeptical, and yet another felt that the Russians "talked down" to the visitors, that they had nothing really new or startling to offer educators from the U. S. On the other hand, a few were heard to comment following one of the lectures that it had been too technical for them to understand.

On the whole, however, the group was surprised, gratified, and favorably impressed by much they observed on the special educational scene. They appeared to achieve a rather high degree of evaluative openness, consciously attempting to lay aside any previous prejudices and doubts which they may have entertained.

Three very full mornings were spent at the Institute of Defectology, and the afternoons were occupied by additional tours and lectures of facilities in Moscow.

The Institute was impressive in a number of ways. The extent and depth of its study and research drew favorable comments from half of the group (+12). Five were impressed by the general picture portrayed of the special education structure of which the Institute is the center (+5). They are "very down-to-earth in approach," (+1) and yet "scientific on a very high level." (+1) There is high quality "in the area of equipment and mechanical devices"as well as "in medical research." Team effort and follow-up of cases was noted. (+2)

Two members of the group commented in this vein: "I may deplore where it leads, but under their system they have adopted a single theoretical background--Pavlovian. . . . The comparative studies which can come from this should be marvelous. We cannot assume, however, that they have any freedom in analysis or that variables of which we are not cognizant are not operative. Training is the word here, not teach, but nothing inhibits their learning so the limitation may be nonexistant." Another member said, "Vigotsky's principles were mentioned, on several occasions, in relation to education. It was interesting to hear Pavlov quoted on only one occasion. Nevertheless there would appear to be application of both classical and operant conditioning in their methods." One visitor deplored robot-like "training by rote" (-1).

The fact that the staff seemed abreast of advances made in other countries, with whom they appear to exchange ideas, was noted (+3). The "high calibre of the people heading each special education department" was mentioned (+2), and the sincere interest which they displayed was apparent (+2). Significant, too, was the role of women in this leadership, "wonderful, dedicated women" (+2), carrying "remarkable weight at top levels in the leading institute." (+2)

One person was wary of the high priority of the medical approach. (-1) Yet perhaps that was part of another observer's positive reaction: "I have been told time and again we should not be concerned with cause or classification or diagnosis of students--just that they are mentally retarded and to teach them from there. I applaud the U. S. S. R. for their clinical investigation, not stopping with just a psychological test--then they draw a single line for treatment and follow up advancement in life." (+1) Along with this, one spoke of "achieving results," (+1), with the provisions for evaluation apparently excellent (+2). The "individual child benefits regardless of the real motives of Russian education (+1). Their educational goals were described as basically worthy (+3) by three people, but three commented on the ultimate purpose being "the glory of the state." (3) Comments: "Every child must have as much education and training as he is capable of absorbing." "The perspectives appear to be beyond the immediate goals of training and socialization, and reach out to total life fulfillment and realization."

Comments made in regard to the schools visited: two noted "poor physical plants" (-2), two agreed with this writer's comment, "lovely environment created for children, homey, warm, effective," (+2), the comments not necessarily being contradictory. Techniques for teaching (+1), quantity of teaching aids (+1), and the "use of sense training" (+1) were noted as well as the "use of upbringers," (+1), and "small class size." (+1)

Within a socialistic framework certain advantages were seen as inherent, "advantages that we push for democratically." That is, early identification (+7), early diagnosis (+3), and preschool training" (+6). These are factors in "prevention" (+1), and there is "readiness to supply residential care." This description of a preschool program was offered: "I was impressed by the patience of the teachers and their love for the child, by the cleanliness and cheerfulness of their physical plant, by the wise application of furnishings adapted to children's needs, by giving the child as much adult status as possible, training the child for cleanliness, and in the little girls, who each sported a pretty ribbon in her hair, a love for color and beauty. . . . Their play space was enormous, and children played in groups, separated from other groups, with many things to play with freely, and under complete charge of someone in attendance."

The program for the hard of hearing (+1), and teaching aids for the deaf, were particularly appreciated (+10). "Electrical machines for deaf and blind enabled them to teach complex subjects and meaningful material." A demonstration interview with a deaf-blind young man (+2), brought forth two favorable written comments. The pleasing quality of his voice was noted. "The pitch achieved by deaf-blind students and by totally deaf tots was surprisingly good."

One visitor was pleased to note the "high valuation they place on the influence poor speech can have on all other subjects and aspects of a child's life." (+1). An early approach to the problem (+1), noting the "relationship of reading to speech and hearing" (+2), the technical aids for teaching speech (+1), and the "emphasis placed on the need for speech therapy" (+3), were commended. The wisdom of residential (hospital) care for teen-age stutterers was questioned (-1).

Heaviest criticisms were levied at the program for emotionally disturbed children. Eight of the group objected to the idea that they had no special program of their own (-8). Comments: "I don't care for the off-handed way in which the problem of emotionally

disturbed children is looked upon--more or less as if they don't exist. They are put into regular classes for the teacher to handle and with a good possibility of disrupting classroom order." Another: "I was concerned by the way in which consideration for the emotionally disturbed was dismissed as unnecessary if speech coordination were at a good level. This seems like treating the symptom and disregarding the causes." On the other hand, one observer stated: "Even without having seen the levels of involvement with 'emotionally disturbed' children, I am convinced that their special needs are being looked after: 1, in normal schools with special consideration; 2, in government institutions where their medical, psychological, and educational program is geared to their individual requirements."

As for the mentally retarded, the lack of integration of the severely handicapped (-1), the lack of programming for this group (-3), and for retardation of cultural familial origin (-1) were mentioned, while their search for causes was considered a positive factor (+2). Comment: "Although the concept of the sheltered workshop as we know it does not exist, I am impressed by the philosophy and practice of providing work opportunity and training for older mentally defectives within the auxiliary and government boarding schools for oligophrenics. The total concept of training for work relating to general education for youth, influences the training of retarded adolescents and provides a 'natural' sheltered environment of work."

VIII. HELSINKI, FINLAND

At least one Study Abroad observer in Finland sensed similarity to the United States, "especially when our programs were newer," having also discovered that "to a large extent, they use our authorities as models."

This young program appears to be characterized by "rapid progress to modern concept(s) of comprehensive education of democratically oriented societies" (+3), or, otherwise perceived, "trying very hard to keep abreast of the times" (+3). There is research and experimentation (+2), recognition of need (+1), and attention to preventive measures (+1).

Two observers spoke favorably of the integration of most special classes into normal schools, and growing evidence of their acceptance by the principals of these schools (+2). Also significant was the apparently strong "cooperation of private service organizations with other agencies such as state, local government, and University." However, a strong negative was voiced concerning "the fact that they can serve only about 1/4 to 1/3 of the handicapped children" (-7), the service factor being seriously limited by the sparseness of population outside the metropolitan circle. This may be related to their reliance upon institutionalization.

"The physically handicapped are delegated largely to institutions." (-2) "In the public school situation I was concerned to hear that children who are confined to wheel chairs are not provided for and must be placed in an institutional environment or have home teaching due to architectural barriers and lack of facilities."

The mentally handicapped also are either institutionalized (-3) or in a number of cases kept at home, their parents being "given an additional stipend by the state for their care." We find them "under child welfare if under 65 I.Q." (-3). One person writing about a visit she made independently to an institution for the retarded said that of 500 patients the median I.Q. was 20. This suggests that an appreciable number of mentally handicapped children remain at home. At the Children's Castle

there appeared to be a favorable ratio of homebound teachers to number of children (+1). One wry comment: "Like most countries, the philosophy is fine--but in practice they need to go a long way."

Opportunities for the handicapped beyond the elementary level appear to be limited. Although there are some technical schools (+1), there appears to be a lack of appropriate psychological services (-1), of vocational guidance facilities (-1), and there is a high number of dropouts (-4). The high academic standards in the secondary schools (+1) appear to take a toll: "My concern was the small percentage of students who seem to go on to secondary schools. The pressures must be extreme. . . . When they return to primary school it is a degrading experience for them." (-2).

Four visitors expressed amazement at the number of applicants per special teaching vacancy in Helsinki, "300 applicants for 30 positions." Two diverse comments: "Teacher preparation seems cursory which may account for the high surplus of special teachers." "The considerations allowed to the special ed teacher show a realization of the personal drain required to do a good job in this field."

Most impressive was the lecture period and visitation at the Children's Castle in Helsinki, where "education is in fact a living concept" in a hospital setting. In the Castle--"such fondness in the very concept" (+1), --the facilities (+2), training of personnel (+1), thorough organization (+3), interest (+1), cooperation within staff (+2), and most of all the team approach in treatment (+5) were approved. There was "seeming full scale evaluation by several disciplines" (+6), and "painstaking investigation into the cause" before treatment (+3).

More specific impressions of the program at Children's Castle included approval of the physiotherapy (+1), occupational therapy (+1), and care of dyslexic children (+1). "I was impressed by the ratio of the speech therapists to the number of children" (+1), and "in the statement, 'We do not hurry in our testing. Children seem to enjoy this process and even to get some insight into their own problem.'" (+1) One visitor included in her otherwise favorable reporting mention of the emotionally disturbed children who, uninvited, accompanied her segment of the tour of the treatment area: "Due to the repetitious attacks by one small child and the lack of discipline among their staff, I cannot condone their treatment of the emotionally disturbed" (-1). (This visitor was forced to protect herself.)

Apparently a strength in the program at Children's Castle lies in the outpatient and follow-up aspects. "The teachers expressed a feeling of responsibility for the children upon (their) going home" (+5). Teachers also "come to the hospital for special training." (+2) There is a "follow-up, right to adulthood" (+1), with "close cooperation with the University clinic" (+2). "I believe that excellent work is being done in the outpatient department (+4) for M.R.'s and emotionally disturbed children."

Finally, one comment on the comprehensive picture in Helsinki is included here. This student found "nothing to be concerned about in the deep sense of that word. There is inadequacy--but given the history and background it seems to be headed for resolution, slowly."

IX. STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

In Stockholm the major emphasis for Study Abroad '67 was in the area of mental retardation. The Swedish program "provides for all classifications of the mentally retarded" and is characterized by "a strong general attack" (+2), with aspects both of "humanistic" philosophy and vigorous practicality (+2). There appears to be a "desire to develop every positive factor in the retard's personality to make him a useful citizen."

The visitors were very strongly impressed with one important and seemingly pervasive concept: that of the "normalization" of their special children, including trainables (+13). Comments: "I was impressed by the achievements in special education, especially mental retardation, in a highly developed 'welfare' state. To be able to equate conditions for the handicapped with the living standards for the normal population--physically, socially, culturally--sounds utopian; yet this is being done." "The individual retardate is apparently being recognized as fully human with all the right to dignity and privacy and social acceptance that this implies." There exists a "humanitarian philosophy of treating adult trainables as people with rights--the right to enjoy a glass of beer, to stay up as late as other adults, to care for each other, to enjoy normal privileges where they can," enjoying late-snack "kitchen privileges as in their own homes," and even participating in "exchange tours abroad." Social training is perceptive to the point of including "how to respond when people are rude to you."

Much of the easy "normalcy" is achieved through the physical planning for retardates, the pattern being that of small boarding "family" homes (+12), coupled with weekend visits to their own homes while these remain intact units. The trend "away from large institutions" (+4) was described variously as a "whole life approach" and "a curtailment of 'warehousing.'" The idea is "to house the handicapped in apartments in the community, in good residential areas" (+4), "with their schools nearby, and convenient to health facilities." Home grouping is accomplished "even to the extent of varying

age groups in the setting." (+2). "I'm impressed with their concern for the small group. This is the general 'ideal' of most countries, but here they are really able to, and have, carried it out."

Compatible with this approach is a "heartening concern with recreational facilities." (+4). "I think the creativity and ingenuity in adapting physical activity for the handicapped will be a model internationally." Special equipment has been developed for the handicapped, and regular equipment generously utilized (+1). Occupational therapy also plays a strong role (+1). Three visitors considered attractive the idea of the use of a community playground where normal children are also encouraged to play (+3). One person wondered if education might be minimized too much for the goals of physical training and socialization (-1).

Some other comments concerning the educational system were dubious or unfavorable. There was again the uneasy conviction that the facilities were primarily serving children of more densely populated areas (-2), that there were good physical facilities (+2) with building architecture being given serious attention (+1)--but not enough of them (-2). "The number identified as handicapped seems very low," said one. There are "hidden parents" (-2) and "poor cross-referral" (-2) exists. There seems to be a "paucity of diagnostic and prevention programs" (-2). The present development of workshops seems too limited (-4). "Personally I don't like the early retirement plan for those handicapped who cannot get jobs--should place more emphasis on workshops." (-1)

Apparently there is a "'breakdown' when it comes to helping find employment" (-1) despite some "excellent ideas for vocational training" (+1). The "continuing financial aid to handicapped, and lifelong services" (+1) were favorably noted, as was "government compensation to employers using handicapped persons" (+1).

As for other disabilities, "poor provisions" or "lack of care" for the physically handicapped (-1), blind (-1), deaf (-1), and the emotionally disturbed (-6) were cited. "I question mixing emotionally disturbed with retarded." (-1)

The personnel picture: "The educator has status (+1), along with "opportunity to offer flexible programs" (+1), particularly with "small class loads in special classes." There is a "good teacher training program" (+1) but still the old problem of staffing (-1).

The very active parent organization for the retarded (+3), its "leadership in energetic hands," (+1), appears to have difficulty in establishing adequate communication with educators and community agencies, resulting in "lack of coordinated effort" (-4).

Warmly received was information concerning the new Swedish legislation (effective July 1, 1968) referred to as a "bill of rights for the retarded child" (+10). This law will make it compulsory for the schools to be active in providing all educational services for this group, and alleviate many current weaknesses noted by the visitors such as (-2) making it a duty to provide preschool special education before the age of seven (from five to seven) where there are at least five children. The workshop program already mentioned will also be strengthened by making vocational training compulsory (age 21-23) after compulsory school attendance to age 21 or optional to age 23. Significant in reference to other concerns voiced by the group is the provision in the law that the Central Board should keep in regular contact with the county parent association, heretofore voluntary. "Higher education" for the retarded in an integrated environment, ("college" courses, folk high schools), "is another positive" (+1).

Finally, "This is the first country (of nine) where I have felt that every child who needed special education was being considered--not only from an educational viewpoint but from a medical and a developmental one" (+1). Although "not yet enough implemented (-3)," the "comprehensive program which Sweden is developing should bring about many improvements."

X. AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND

The tenth and final study experience of the special education tour group took place in Amsterdam. "Holland is an example of a people making 'a virtue of necessity.' The density of population in so small an area has provided the impetus for the establishment of many facilities, scattered amidst the normal social-work environment. There seems to be much less of a gap between normal and disabled persons in such an integrated community. (+1) The Dutch program for the mentally retarded was called "a matter of national pride . . . the other programs are in a sense neglected." (-1)

For example, the impression derived was that of a "light dismissal of needs" of the emotionally disturbed (-4). Although apparently no problem in the eyes of the Dutch, one observer commented, "I am skeptical about mixing the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed in workshops." (-1) Also in regard to the sheltered workshop program, which took precedence over every other aspect of the group's orientation: "I was concerned that only a few multiple handicapped, physically and mentally handicapped, were able to qualify for this program." (-2) Sanitary measures (-1) and antiquated facilities (old, high-rise buildings) (-1) also brought negative comments.

However, the reports generally reflected admiration for the programs in Amsterdam (+9). "The basic philosophy that a retardate has civil and education rights on a par with normal persons undoubtedly has made possible the fine cooperation enjoyed between the educators of retardates and the Labour Board. This involves a total acceptance of the retardate to which we also pay lip service but it adds a measure of respect for him which we often deny, and which prevents the over-protective paternalism of many of our retarded's programs."

Further comments on the acceptance (+4) of the retarded--involved their "equality with normal peers" and being "treated as a human being," described by one observer thus: "Overall acceptance of handicapped condition--not a rejection or denial. This frank approach

professes to win over the 'normal' population to an attitude of living with people with individual differences and providing special facilities for those who are unable to utilize 'normal' facilities in society."

Reflecting again on programming, "They have so much more than I have ever seen or heard about that I can pinpoint nothing. Their philosophy of Special Education where one treats the handicap first and the child second gives me food for thought. Since the childhood he loses and the handicap he retains for a lifetime, this makes sense. I'm full of enthusiasm for their set-up and their unconcern for 'labels.'"

General approval of the workshops (+3) and their staffing (+2) was noted. "Sheltered workshops are not only adequately provided for all retarded population but are in the hands of educators and theoreticians in the field of special education." Here there was also noted "emphasis on skilled, but non-professionally trained people. Not necessary for professional people salary-wise, they said, but I think there is merit in the lay approach to vocation in the workshop area." For special education in general, the familiar "shortage of personnel" issue reappeared. (-2)

Back of the array of workshops visited (Prof. Dr. N. Speijer-Werkplaats) lay the foundation of some significant research on job adjustment, "the study that has been done to individualize the training of the mentally retarded." (+3) For "these workshops do not have jobs allotted on a haphazard basis (+5)" "but do allow and encourage workers to grow and develop constantly (+9)," with "evaluating and re-evaluating" "in order to train the severely sub-normal to go on to more exacting jobs." There is a variety of jobs of different levels and facilities (+1), allowing for "self-realization" and "ego-fulfillment." The shops, "serious effective places of production," paid "wages for all according to ability and productivity," yet there was "no expectation that workshops must be self-supporting." Likewise, it was affirmed that "expense should not be the consideration in classes for the handicapped (+1)." "Training centers for vocations were equally good." In summary, "I was impressed by the high level of occupational achievement demonstrated by persons of recognizably low intellectual capacity, and their pleasure and pride in doing so."

The "team approach in special education" is made possible in part by "total identification--all retarded are on record," (+3) so that "full use of care facilities" ensues. Furthermore, "all handicapped children have full after-care supervision and service (+5)"--a "social service that follows the mentally retarded in his total life span,"--the "most realistic approach possible."

"Their family replacing facilities are a remarkable aspect of this program." (+4) The Dutch believe in "keeping families whole, with 'littles' there, even while attending special schools." The workshops are "not institutionalized," although one observer commented "it did seem to me that the M.R.'s were as isolated in their present system, in many respects, as they were in the institution." (1) Apparently there is still one problem in the inadequacy of recreational activities over the weekend. (-1) It was noted in passing that "they were absolutely against co-habitation of males and females in their hostels--as opposed to Swedish viewpoint."

Their laudable goal (+5) "of optimal social integration for the mentally retarded" was combined with "the pedagogical approach of finding cause and effect in improving the personality," with the view that "instruction" is not enough. Achievement of goals desired through segregation--"lack of integration of special schools with normal schools" (-2)--was the approach interpreted, with further "religious segregation in the three types of public schools--Catholic, Protestant, neutral." Dutch educators professed no need whatsoever for homebound teachers (-2).

In retrospect, it might be said that the Study Abroad students--at no time accepting or approving of a program in all of its aspects--maintained an attitude of thoughtful evaluation throughout their tour. What they interpreted to be the educational philosophy (+3) for retardates in Amsterdam was sufficiently convincing to elicit these two final quotes, "The philosophy in this country in regard to the handicapped seems to be the best (we have seen)," "setting an example for the rest of the world."