

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1979

A Comparison of Attendance Records of Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Pupils in Two Weber County Junior High Schools

Jewell S. Bezowski
Utah State University

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



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bezowski, Jewell S., "A Comparison of Attendance Records of Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Pupils in Two Weber County Junior High Schools" (1979). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 3264.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/3264>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



A COMPARISON OF ATTENDANCE RECORDS OF HANDICAPPED
AND NON-HANDICAPPED PUPILS IN TWO WEBER
COUNTY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

by

Jewell S. Bezoski

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Special Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was completed with the assistance of many persons whom I would like to acknowledge at this time.

I would like to express special thanks to Dr. Devoe C. Rickert, my Committee Chairman, for all of his help. Thanks are also extended to my other committee members Dr. Daniel P. Morgan and Dr. Izar A. Martinez for their suggestions.

I would also like to thank Dr. Keith Checketts and Tom Rousch for their assistance with the statistical details of this study.

Further thanks are extended to the personnel of the Weber County School District for their willing cooperation and continued interest in this study.

Deep appreciation is expressed to my parents for instilling in me a desire to achieve academically.

Special thanks are extended to my daughter Wendy Mabey, my friend and companion Cheryl Nash, my friend Lisa Kulcsar, and my typist Arlene Colby for the help and support they gave me.

Last but not least I would like to express appreciation to my husband, Don who aided, supported and encouraged me in ways far too numerous to mention.

Jewell S. Bezoski

378-2
B469 CO
c/2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Hypotheses	3
Hypothesis 1	3
Hypothesis 2	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
III. METHODOLOGY	9
Sample Schools	9
Sample	10
Data Collection	11
Treatment of Data	12
IV. RESULTS	14
Analysis of Reasons for Absence	18
Discussion	20
Reasons for Absence	20
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	23
Summary	23
Major Findings	24
Recommendations	25
REFERENCES	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
APPENDIXES	27
Appendix A. Compulsory Attendance	28
Appendix B. Attendance Policy	31
Appendix C. Raw Data	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Membership, Attendance and Percentage of Attendance for those Pupils in Membership 180 Days	15
2. Membership, Attendance and Percentage of Attendance for All Pupils Enrolled	16
3. Membership, Attendance and Percentage of Attendance for Handicapped Pupils in Membership 180 Days and Handicapped Pupils in Membership Less Than 180 Days	17
4. Distributions of Absences for Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Pupils	19

ABSTRACT

A Comparison of Attendance Records of Handicapped
and Non-Handicapped Pupils in Two Weber
County Junior High Schools

by

Jewell S. Bezoski, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1979

Major Professor: Dr. Devoe C. Rickert
Department: Special Education

A study was done of the attendance of 1,251 non-handicapped and 131 handicapped pupils in the Weber County, Ogden, Utah School District. This study was done at the request of the district administration. The basic questions were 1) would there be a difference in attendance of the handicapped and the non-handicapped and 2) would the reasons for absence differ as stated on excuses presented to the office.

Data for the entire 1978-79 school year were tallied and analyzed. There were no significant differences in the attendance rates of the two groups. Inspection of the data showed that there was a difference in attendance of handicapped pupils who were members of classes for less than 180 days and those who were 180 day class members. No reason for this difference was revealed by the data.

The data on excuses presented as a reason for absence showed more absences due to doctors excuses and illness for handicapped pupils.

In depth research on the causes of absence of handicapped pupils was recommended.

(51 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent litigation and legislation have established the right of handicapped children to a free and appropriate public education. Educators have long assumed that the handicapped would have poor attendance records if they were allowed to attend school. The professional educational literature does not provide a great deal of information on the attendance of handicapped children. Before district administrators can determine just and rational attendance policies, some data about the attendance of these pupils needs to be collected and evaluated.

Children were freed from long work hours by legislation during the industrialization and post industrialization era giving them time to attend school (Broadhurst, Fox, & Kline, 1977). Subsequently, many states passed compulsory attendance laws requiring that the parents or guardians of children between six and eighteen years of age be required to send them to a public or regularly established private school. For many years there were a wide range of exceptions to this general statement.

Various states wrote provisions into their constitutions for schooling their youth, which were augmented by state laws, rules, and regulations. The State of Utah empowered

its State Board of Education to establish rules and regulations to require attendance of its children. Each local district then formulated local district attendance policies within the framework of the state law.

Weber County schools adopted a new attendance policy November 2, 1977 which differed from the previous policy by specifying the number of days a student might be absent before a mandatory loss of credit was imposed. The policy restated the major state policies as well as specified district procedures (see Appendix A). In a short time it appeared to administrators and teachers that if the policies were strictly enforced, problems would occur for some handicapped pupils. A study was needed to determine the exact nature of the problem.

Statement of the Problem

Although accurate attendance records are maintained by the Weber School District, no one has taken the time to evaluate those records to determine if there are differences in the attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was 1) to determine if differences exist between the attendance rates of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber District Junior High schools and 2) to determine if there are differences between the frequency of stated reasons for absence of

handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber District Junior High Schools.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There will be no difference between the attendance rate of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools, as measured by the actual attendance data reported on school permanent records.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no difference between the frequency of reasons of absences of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools, as measured by data given on excuses presented to the school office.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There is a lack of literature pertaining to the difference in attendance rates of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils. Because pupils are, by law, required to attend school, this review of literature will include a brief history of compulsory attendance and the recent laws governing education of the handicapped in the United States.

As early as 1642 during Puritan times, there were laws that directed parents to fulfill their obligations to the state by seeing that their children were educated. These laws formed the foundation of the principle that underlies compulsory attendance. That principle is "all parents should have a legal obligation, as well as a moral obligation, to educate their children according to minimal state approved standards" (Katz, 1976).

In the early history of America, Thomas Jefferson said...."a nation cannot be ignorant and free." Jefferson's philosophy went much deeper than that statement. After the revolution was won, America was a country with a citizenry comprised of many groups. It was deemed essential by Jefferson and many other leaders that all people be taught a common set of ideals and a national language (Tyack, 1976, page 366).

The first compulsory attendance law was passed in 1830. This law required that children attend school for three months of the year and was applicable only to those children who worked in factories (Burgess, 1976). By the mid-nineteenth century, several states had compulsory attendance laws that applied to all children.

Prior to the 1900's, some ideologic arguments were raised concerning enforcement of compulsory school attendance. This, according to Tyack (1976, p. 359) was the "symbolic first stage of compulsory attendance." The administration of schools and laws governing compulsory attendance came under the jurisdiction of the state government. After 1900, large city schools organized attendance departments that were divided into sections containing supervisors, field workers, and clerks (Bernejo, 1942).

Experts developed the school census in 1924. They prepared forms for reporting attendance, manuals on "child accounting" and civil service requirements for employment. Financing for schools was allocated on the basis of average daily attendance which made enforcement of compulsory attendance laws necessary (Bernejo, 1942, p. 374).

Tyack further stated that the second phase, which began shortly before the turn of the twentieth century, might be called the 'bureaucratic' stage.

During this era of American education school systems grew in size and complexity. New techniques for bureaucratic control emerged; ideological conflicts over compulsion diminished, strong laws were passed

and school officials developed sophisticated techniques to bring truants into school. (p. 359)

A basic education including reading, writing and mathematics which normally lasted from five to eight years was all that was required at first. However, by the 1920's and 1930's, young people were required to attend high school and by the 1950's high school attendance had become customary (Tyack, 1976). There is, however, a debate as to whether school attendance should be compulsory beyond acquisition of the above skills (Johnson, 1973; Katz, Tyack & Burgess, 1976). According to a recent Gallup poll (1974) more than 90% of the public at large favors compulsory attendance at least through the elementary school years. However, only 73% of the general public and 56% of the professional educators advocate compulsory attendance through high school.

Compulsory laws did not include handicapped children. These children were often excluded from public school attendance. Zetill & Abeson (1977) stated, "Compulsory attendance laws in most states have practically operated as non-attendance laws for some handicapped" due to the wording of the laws themselves.

Federal support for the education of the handicapped has been in existence for the past one hundred years (Abeson & Weintraub, 1972). Under this support colleges were established within the U.S. Office of Education to direct funding grants to states for the development and implementation of

education programs for the handicapped ("Aid for Education," 1974).

In 1968, PL 91-230, Education For the Handicapped Act was passed by congress to clarify existing inconsistencies in educational programming. This law along with special provisions in the Elementary and Secondary Act (PL 89-313) and the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, providing funds and technical assistance to states for the formation of appropriate handicap educational programming. A number of court cases were then brought against State Boards of Education such as Wolf vs Utah 1969, in which the judge ordered that two mentally retarded children, who had previously been excluded from the system, be permitted to attend public school (American Education, 1974). Two subsequent landmark cases, Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 1972, & Mills vs the Board of Education in the District of Columbia in which judges declared that "a constitutional right to publicly supported education existed for all children regardless of any handicapping condition" (Abeson & Zetell, 1974, p. 117). Following these decisions, 70% of the state legislatures in the country passed legislation mandating public education for the handicapped (Abeson & Zetell, 1975).

In July of 1973, PL 93-112 The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was passed, in which section 504 established regular public school programs, easy accessibility and education for all handicapped children in the least restrictive environment.

Finally in 1975, PL 94-142 was enacted, which encompasses much of the exact language in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. It provides rights to a free appropriate public education and guidelines for the establishment of individual education plans for each handicapped child (Abeson & Zetell, 1975).

In summary, required attendance for so called "normals" has a long history, but mandated school attendance for the handicapped is a rather recent phenomenon. It is a frequently encountered assumption that their attendance records would be poor. What the literature does not show are comparisons of attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the questions a) was there a difference between the attendance rate of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools, and b) was there a difference between the frequency of reasons given for absences of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils, the following sample was selected.

Sample Schools

This study was conducted at the request of the Weber County School District central administration. They asked that Wahlquist and South Junior High Schools be used. It was the opinion of persons involved that taking one school from the lower socio-economic area of the district and one from the upper socio-economic area would provide the answers that they were seeking.

One of the schools was located in a rural area of the district. In May, 1979, the total population of the school was 671.

Many of the families in this attendance area live on farms. Though many are employed in farming, a variety of blue collar government and industrial as well as some professional occupations such as public education are

represented. The estimated income range of the rural area is \$8,000 to \$18,000 per year.

The second school is located in a suburban area in the district. The total population was 711. The patron families in this area live in or near Ogden City in suburban housing developments. They are employed in a wide variety of areas from blue collar government and industrial jobs to professional positions in medicine and law. The probable income range for this group is estimated to range from \$8,000 to \$80,000 per year.

Sample

The subjects comprising the sample were all the pupils at South Junior High School and Wahlquist Junior High School who were enrolled during the 1978-79 school year. The age range of the students was 13-15 and included grades 7, 8, and 9.

The sample pupils were divided into two groups defined as handicapped and non-handicapped. The handicapped group was comprised of those pupils who were being served in a resource or self-contained special education class. In each school special educators compile lists of pupils identified as handicapped and classified by handicapping conditions in accordance with the guidelines of PL 94-142. These official reports were used to separate handicapped pupil data from regular pupil data. The non-handicapped group was comprised of all other pupils.

Data Collection

The data for testing hypothesis one were the attendance data of those pupils who were enrolled for the entire 1978-79 school year. It was taken from an official attendance register which is kept in each school in accordance with state law. The register contains pupil names, marks of absence for one morning and one afternoon period a day, and finally a term and year end summary of days of membership and days of attendance. It is school district practice to count a student present for the entire day if he is present for the second and sixth class period.

The data for hypothesis two were the reasons given for absences on written excuses presented to the school office. The excuses, which are in accordance with school policy are maintained in individual files, were tallied for two nine week grading periods. Those periods were January 22 to March 22, 1979 and March 23 to May 26, 1979.

Analysis of data for pupil excuses was based on the following categories of excuses which have been defined by School District Attendance Policy.

1. Illness as reported by the parent
2. Illness as reported by the physician admit
3. Medical or dental appointment - as reported by physicians
4. Truancy
5. Needed at home

6. Vacation
7. Miscellaneous - which included anything not in the other six categories

Treatment of Data

To determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils, the data obtained from the attendance registers were analyzed using the test for significance of differences between two proportions (Bruning & Kintz, 1968, p. 222). The formulas used were:

$$z = \frac{P_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{N_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{N_2}}}$$

$$P_1 = 95.4\% \quad P_2 = 92.34\%$$

where the value of p under the radical is computed as:

$$p = \frac{N_1 P_1 + N_2 P_2}{N_1 + N_2}$$

For computation of this test, the membership and attendance figures for the handicapped and non-handicapped groups were tabled and totaled. The total days attendance was then divided by the total days membership to obtain a percent of attendance for each group (P_1, P_2). The proportion (p) was obtained for each group by multiplying the number of subjects (N) by percent

of attendance (P) for each group and adding the obtained values together. That obtained value was then divided by the total number of subjects in both groups.

To determine if there was a significant difference between the attendance of handicapped pupils in membership for 180 days and handicapped pupils in membership for less than 180 days, the t test for a difference between two independent means was used (Bruning & Kintz, 1968, p. 11). The formula used in this computation was as follows:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N_1} + \sum X_2^2 - \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{N_2}}{(N_1 + N_2) - 2} \right] \cdot \left[\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right]}}$$

To determine if there was a significant difference between stated causes of absence for the two groups, a chi-square analysis was used (Borg & Gall, 1971). The formula used for the chi-square computation was $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In order to determine if there are differences between attendance and reasons for absence of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils, school attendance figures were compiled and analyzed; and reasons for absence on written excuses presented to the school office were analyzed. This chapter contains a report on the results of that analysis.

There are a few definitions of attendance that need to be clarified at this point. Schools have commonly recorded attendance using what is called membership, attendance and absence. Membership is defined as the number of days a pupil is actually enrolled during a school year. A pupil may be a member for a total of 180 days provided that he is on the rolls for the full year. This is typical of a child who is a permanent resident of the district. A child whose parents have moved into the district may have less than 180 days membership. Comparisons were made for both the pupils in membership for 180 days and those who were in membership for less than 180 days.

Percentage of attendance is computed by dividing days membership into days attended. These percentages of attendance and the data from which they come provide the data which was analyzed to answer hypothesis one, that there will

no difference between the attendance rate of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools.

The percentage of attendance of those pupils who were in membership for 180 days is presented in Table 1 for both the handicapped and non-handicapped groups. Inspection of the percentages of attendance shows there is a 3.06 % difference between the attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in favor of the non-handicapped.

Table 1
Membership, Attendance and Percentage of Attendance for
Those Pupils in Membership 180 Days

Groups	Number	Total Days Membership	Total Days of Attendance	Percentage of Attendance
Non-handicapped	1,168	210,240*	200,567	95.40%
Handicapped	118	21,240	19,614	92.34%

*n x 180

Statistical analysis using a test for significance of difference between two proportions yielding a z score of 1.478. This was less than the critical value of z (1.96) which indicates that there was no significant differences at the .05 level between the attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils.

The percentage of attendance for the pupils whose membership was 180 days combined with those whose membership was less than 180 days is listed in Table 2. Inspection of those percentages of attendance shows there is a 3.43% difference between the two groups.

Table 2
Membership, Attendance and Percentage of
Attendance for All Pupils Enrolled

Groups	Number	Total Days Membership	Total Days Attendance	Percentage of Attendance
Non-handicapped	1,251	218,392*	208,112.5	95.29%
Handicapped	131	22,675	20,829	91.86%

*from raw data

Statistical analysis using a test for significance of difference between two proportions yielding a z score of 1.715 for all handicapped and non-handicapped pupils enrolled. Although this score is slightly higher, it is still less than the critical value of z (1.96) required to show significance.

Upon inspection of this data a question arose concerning the rate of attendance of those handicapped pupils who were not 180 day members of the class. It seemed that their attendance rate might be considerably lower than that of the handicapped 180 day membership pupils. The percentage

of attendance for the handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days and the handicapped pupils who were in membership for less than 180 days is presented in Table 3. Inspection of those percentages of attendance shows that handicapped pupils who were in membership for less than 180 days attended 7.68% less than handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days.

Table 3
Membership, Attendance and Percentage of Attendance
for Handicapped Pupils in Membership 180 Days and
Handicapped Pupils in Membership Less
Than 180 Days

Groups	Number	Total Days Membership	Total Days Attendance	Percentage of Attendance
Handicapped 180	118	21,240	19,614	92.34%
Handicapped less than 180	13	1,435	1,215	84.67%

The small n of the handicapped pupils made it necessary to analyze their attendance figures using a t test of differences between two independent means rather than the test for significance of difference between two proportions. For comparison purposes, it was necessary to adjust the individual student attendance figures for the 13 handicapped pupils who were in membership for less than 180 days by

projecting the number of days those students would be expected to attend had they been in membership for 180 days. That analysis yielded a t score of 4.186 with 129 degrees of freedom which is greater than the critical value of t (2.617) necessary to show significance at the .01 level.

In summary, hypothesis one was rejected in its null form. No significant differences exist between the rate attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in this sample.

Analysis of Reasons for Absence

A chi-square test was used to analyze the data for hypothesis two, that there will be no difference between stated reasons for absence for the handicapped and non-handicapped pupils. That analysis is presented in Table 4.

It was found that handicapped pupils were absent more frequently than expected in the categories of illness as reported by a physician and parent, truancy and miscellaneous. Non-handicapped pupils were absent more frequently than expected by chance for doctor and dental appointments and vacations, while no differences were shown in the needed at home category.

Table 4
Distributions of Absences for Handicapped
and Non-Handicapped Pupils

	Handicapped Pupils						
	Ill by Parent	Ill by Physi- cian	Truant	Needed At Home	Dr. & Dental Appts.	Vaca- tion	Misc.
Observed Absence	519	88	7	26	71	16	56
Expected Absence	491	63	5	26	112	39	85

	Non-Handicapped Pupils						
	Ill by Parent	Ill by Physi- cian	Truant	Needed At Home	Dr. & Dental Appts.	Vaca- tion	Misc.
Observed Absence	2948	357	27	158	723	257	272
Expected Absence	2976	382	29	158	681	234	516

	Contingency Table						
	Ill by Parent	Ill by Physi- cian	Truant	Needed At Home	Dr. & Dental Appts.	Vaca- tion	Misc.
Observed Absence	519	88	7	26	71	16	56
Expected Absence	2948	357	27	158	723	257	272

Degrees of freedom = 6 Chi square 58.72 (p > .001)

Hypothesis two is rejected due to a significant difference between stated reasons for absence for handicapped and non-handicapped pupils.

Discussion

When the data for hypothesis one were analyzed, it was felt that there might be a difference between those pupils who were members of the class for 180 days and those who were members for less than 180 days. When both sets of data were analyzed there was a very small but non-significant difference. In terms of percentage there was .37% difference in favor of those who were members for 180 days. It would seem that this should be expected because those pupils who are members for 180 days are from families who tend to be permanent residents. Moving and other factors increase the chances of absence for pupils who are not members of a class for 180 days.

When looking at the handicapped pupils only, a different pattern emerged. Here there was a 7.68% difference in favor of the 180 day members. This resulted in a significant difference. The data does not suggest any reason for this difference.

Reasons for Absence

The category containing the most given reasons for absence was ill as reported by parent, and contained about the same number of excuses for each group. This is probably due to outbreaks of influenza, measles, mumps and other childhood

diseases. Also showing about the same number of absences was the category of needed at home. Some of the reasons given were to tend children, to care for a parent who was ill and, in the rural area, to help with farm work.

The category of ill as reported by a physician shows a higher number of handicapped pupils proportionately. One reason for this might be that some of the handicapped pupils in the sample were pupils who have cerebral palsy and/or suffer from a wide range of serious physical ailments requiring medical attention. The Weber School District allows pupils absences up to seven days in a nine week term and any days in excess to that may cause them to lose a terms' credit. An absence excused by a doctor however, is not counted as one of the seven days. Therefore, it may be that pupils nearing the seventh day of absence were taken to the doctor in order to avoid a possible loss of credit. The handicapped pupils also had a higher number of absences in the truancy category, which may be due in part to a tendency to avoid school because of their lack of academic and social success. Another category which showed a higher number of instances of absences was the miscellaneous category. However, this category contained such a wide variety of stated reasons that it was difficult to analyze. Some of the reasons were funerals, did not feel like attending, went skiing, played in a non-school related tennis tournament.

The handicapped pupils reported a significantly lower number of vacations than did the non-handicapped group. They also reported a significantly lower number of absences for medical and dental appointments.

There were also some apparent socio-economic differences in the stated reasons for pupil absence. The lower socio-economic attendance area reported fewer vacations as well as days off to ski and participate in other short term recreational activities. They also reported more instances of needed at home to help on farm or in family business than did the higher socio-economic area. One extreme noted in reviewing the excuses, which may also be a socio-economic factor, was that many of the non-handicapped pupils visited the orthodontist on a regular basis while only a few of the handicapped pupils did.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between the attendance rates of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber School District Junior High Schools.

The following comparisons of the data were made to answer hypothesis one, that there will be no difference between the attendance rate of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools as measured by the actual attendance data reported on school permanent records. A comparison was made of the attendance data of handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days and attendance data of non-handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days. A comparison was made of the attendance data of handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days or less than 180 days and non-handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days or less than 180 days. A comparison was made of the attendance data of handicapped pupils who were in membership for 180 days and handicapped pupils who were in membership for less than 180 days.

The test for significance of difference between two proportions showed no significant difference at the .05 level between the percentage of attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils. Hypothesis one was therefore accepted in its null form.

The data for hypothesis two, that there will be no differences between the frequency of reasons for absences of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in two Weber County Junior High Schools as measured by data given on written excuses, was collected by reading excuses for pupil absences and tabulating them in categories selected from the Weber County attendance policy (Appendix B).

The chi-square of 58.72 was obtained from analysis of the data for hypothesis two which shows differences significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis two was therefore rejected in its null form.

Major Findings

1. Under the current attendance policy, handicapped 180 day membership pupils in the sample school attend as regularly as non-handicapped 180 day membership pupils.
2. Handicapped pupils whose membership was less than 180 days have poorer attendance records than handicapped pupils who are 180 day members.
3. There was a difference in stated reasons for pupil absence between handicapped and non-handicapped pupils.

4. Handicapped pupils reasons for absence are greater than the non-handicapped for:
 - a. Illness as reported by a physician
 - b. Truancy
5. Handicapped pupils reasons for absence are less than the non-handicapped for:
 - a. Medical and dental appointments
 - b. Vacations
6. Handicapped and non-handicapped reasons for absence are about the same for:
 - a. Illness as reported by parents
 - b. Needed at home

Based upon these findings it can be concluded that there are no differences in the rates of attendance of handicapped and non-handicapped pupils in the schools under study.

Recommendations

It is recommended that in depth study be conducted of the attendance of handicapped pupils. Common sense would suggest that the attendance of these pupils would be highly variable and dependent upon each individuals problems. However, the lack of literature in this area makes this highly speculative. The present study suggest that many of the assumptions previously made about attendance of the handicapped may not stand up when subjected to careful data collection.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abeson, A. & Zetell, J. The end of the quiet revolution: The education for all handicapped act of 1975. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44, 114-128.
- Aid for education of the handicapped. American Education, 1974, 10, 29-32.
- Bernejo, F. B. The school attendance in American cities. Menasha, Wisconsin: Banta Publications, 1971.
- Borg, W., & Gall, M. Educational research an introduction. New York: David McKay Publications, 1971.
- Broadhurst, D. D., Fox, P. G., & Kline, D. L. Children Alone: What can be done about abuse and neglect. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- Bruning, J., & Kintz, B. Computation handbook of statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1968.
- Burgess, C. The goddess, the school book and compulsion. Harvard Educational Review, 1976, 46, 199-216.
- Gallup, G. H. Fourth annual gallup poll of public attitudes toward education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 54, 39.
- Johnson, H. M. Are compulsory attendance laws outdated? Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 55, 226.
- Katz, M. S. Class bureaucracry and schools. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Tyack, D. B. Ways of seeing: An essay on the history of compulsory schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 1976 46, 355-389.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Compulsory Attendance

Every parent, guardian or other person having control of any minor between six and eighteen years of age shall be required to send such minor to a public or regularly established private school during the regularly established school year of the district in which he resides; provided.

1. That any minor over the age of sixteen years, who has completed the eighth grade or whose services are required for the support of a mother or invalid father may be legally excused to enter employment, but if such minor is so excused, the parent, guardian or other person shall be required to send such minor to a part-time school or class at least one hundred forty-four hours per year.
2. That in each year the parent, guardian or other person having control of any such minor may be excused by the Board of Education of the district from sending such minor to a public, regularly established private or part-time school or class for any of the following reasons:
 - a. That such minor has already completed the work of a senior high school.

- b. That such minor is taught at home in the branches prescribed by law for the same length of time as children are required by law to be taught in the district schools; provided, that a minor legally excused to enter employment may be excused from attending a part-time school or class for the reason that such minor is taught at home the required number of hours.
 - c. That such minor is in such physical or mental condition (which must be certified by a competent physician if required by the board) as to render such attendance inexpedient and impracticable.
 - d. That no such school is established, or class is taught for the requisite length of time, within two and one-half miles of the residence or the place of employment of the minor, unless free transportation is provided.
 - e. The proper influence and adequate opportunities for education are provided for in connection with the employment of such minor.
3. That any minor who has reached the age of sixteen years and whose school experience has, in the judgment of school officials, demonstrated that such minor is unable to profit from school attendance, either because of the student's inability or

because of the student's continued negative attitude toward school regulations and school discipline, may be excused from school attendance upon recommendation of the school superintendent, and approval of the district board of education.

4. The evidence of the existence of any such reasons for non-attendance must be in each case sufficient to satisfy the Board of Education of the district in which the child resides, which, if so satisfied, shall issue a certificate stating that the holder is exempt from attendance during the time therein specified.

APPENDIX B

Attendance Policy
As Approved by the Board of Education
November 2, 1977

Attendance Policy

The student is responsible to be present in class and the "parent, guardian or other person having control of any minor between six and eighteen years of age shall be required to send such minor to school during the regularly established" school day in the attendance area of residence.

Administrative Procedures and Guidelines

Each school will formulate and publicize the administrative procedures to implement this policy. These procedures and guidelines will include, but are not limited to the following:

1. A roll will be kept and marked for each class period.
2. Parents may be contacted when the student misses five days of class time or less. A record will be kept of this contact.
3. Administrative counseling and other appropriate action will be taken from five to nine absences per quarter. (The school will decide whether 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 absences will be used for the first year of the policy.) A record of action will be kept.
4. A student who is absent will provide the school with an excuse from the parent or guardian.
5. Truancies will be referred to the school administration for appropriate action.
6. School excuses and pre-arranged educational experiences approved by the school administration or illness under professional care will not be counted as part of the five through nine absences.

7. Three unexcused tardies will receive administrative attention and be considered equal to one absence.
8. Procedures for make-up of work missed during absences will be publicized.
9. The school will be responsible to inform the student and the parent or guardian of any credit loss in sufficient time for corrective action to take place.
10. Five to nine absences may cause a student to lose one term of credit.
11. A school attendance appeal panel may be established in any school for purposes of assisting the school administration in meeting due process requirements of the District attendance policy.

Weber School District has a due process procedure that is available when requested.

APPENDIX C

Raw Data

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days.

173.5	176.5	160	147.5	179
170.5	180	175.5	168	180
180	172	177	174	180
175.5	166.5	175	174	174
178	172	179	168	167
173	168.5	161	177.5	179
169	160	178	155	178
177	174	174.5	156.5	152
176	165.5	178	161.5	165
167	177	166	179	168
172	171	179	167	178
175	176	179	168	166
177	177	167	174	156
166.5	178	157	164	170
170.5	173	163	168.5	174
175	175.5	178	178.5	165
176	170.5	176	176	171.5
159	180	168	173.5	164.5
178	171	163	156.5	168
175.5	159	172	154	163
179	179	168	169.5	174.5
168	173	179	177.5	179.5
180	171.5	169.5	178	172
167.5	176	177	167	178
179	172	160.5	176	172
177	165	174	171	173
173.5	177	179	180	171
178	176	179	164.5	157.5
178	169.5	176.5	174	165
171	173	166	180	180
174	174	178.5	179	176
175	177.5	172	176	171
174.5	172	163.5	175	171
179	170	175	180	177
179	162	177	169	164
178	167	171.5	180	167
177	178	169	168	162
157	168.5	180	172	179
178	176	173	170.5	171

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days. (continued)

178	167.5	172	170	164.5
176.5	178.5	171	171.5	177
164	177	173	174	164
167	176	169	177	176
167.5	167	152	171.5	170
175.5	173	178	169.5	173.5
176	159.5	178.5	177	156
179	172.5	161.5	174	171
151	180	171	178	167.5
177	168	179.5	162.5	175
180	171	174.5	176.5	164.5
176	179	177	177	175
179	168	165	171.5	179.5
180	179	173.5	175	152
170.5	174.5	164.5	174	160
171	178	176	179	180
178	169	180	179	171
179	172	161	177.5	177
168.5	172	173	170.5	175.5
149	169	174	178	172
172	175.5	164	176	166
172	175	158	177	175.5
160	179	175	171.5	164
175	173	177.5	167	180
164	149	170.5	161	175
176	180	170.5	180	179
167	165.5	173	165	172
179	172.5	165	159.5	179.5
165	171.5	174	177	171
157	166	173.5	169	156
174	160	164.5	160	178
177	166	155	171	176
159	169	174	178.5	168
176	169	162	163.5	160
172	171	171	180	174
178	179	160.5	179	178.5
172	176.5	176	166.5	169
166	165	176	176	159
172	175.5	171	168	180
164.5	175	166	171	175
174	170	164	179	168
166.5	172	165	180	176
177	170	178	167.5	180
177	177	169.5	170.5	174
177	151	167.5	162.5	155
165	180	177.5	178	180
171	171	173	172	152
174.5	172	172	175	166

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days (continued)

178	167	175	176	174
180	176.5	159	167	170
172.5	168	175	159	174
177	161	149.5	172	168
130	176.5	180	179	179.5
161	164	171	165	175.5
161	180	166	174	172.5
168.5	171.5	160	172.5	160.5
173	180	170	161.5	176.5
169	176	163	164	173
176	177	178.5	172.5	176.5
176	168	177.5	162	170.5
174.5	179	177.5	140	149
175.5	175	160.5	180	175
171	166	158	169.5	161.5
175	170	180	162	180
160	168	168.5	160	149.5
165.5	178	167	178.5	176
177	175	167.5	178.5	168.5
163	169	177	175.5	148
179.5	161.5	167.5	173	180
168.5	170	165	175.5	166
159.5	166.5	162	175.5	166
178	168	162.5	177	176
171.5	173	172	171	168.5
167	174	166	171	149.5
136.5	172.5	167	177.5	168.5
180	173.5	166	176.5	174
173	172	172.5	171	164.5
168.5	166.5	177.5	171	169
179	178	176	172	174
176	177	165	177	176.5
179	174.5	177	177.5	177
173	174	169	174	171
175.5	171	176	174.5	175
175.5	179	168.5	165.5	173
170	176.5	163	173.5	171
173	179	173	171	169.5
177	176.5	155.5	146.5	180
176	170	165	168.5	159.5
171.5	172	177	173	171.5
179	176	164.5	173	171.5
168	177.5	179	176	172.5
168.5	171.5	180	176.5	176
168	155	163.5	161	145
172	179	180	172	172
169	176	175	164	174
171	166.5	176.5	172	176.5

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days. (Continued)

175.5	177	155.5	175.5	170
164	176	170	172.5	180
167	176	173.5	179	178
177.5	179	175	175	178
176.5	179	171.5	174.5	167
174.5	177	174.5	172	169.5
177	167.5	176.5	166.5	171
167.5	167	175.5	176	177
150.5	161	163.5	177	161
175.5	177	157.5	179	178
177	121.5	178	167	174
178	161	176.5	178	173.5
172.5	167.5	179	168.5	178
180	173	176	170	178
140.5	165.5	179.5	172	163
180	174	170	178	146
151	173.5	177.5	165	180
180	165	177.5	171	140
173	168	178	177	150.5
162.5	170	177	171	174
158	157.5	178	176	180
174	179.5	177	174.5	166.5
180	174.5	165	122	169.5
179	165.5	161	166	180
161.5	174.5	141.5	172	178
177	177	175.5	177	171
174	168	178	172.5	174
160	173.5	176	180	175
171	169.5	145	164	178
176	176.5	173	167.5	179
178	175	175.5	177.5	171.5
173	179	175	180	174.5
175	174	171	176	179
170.5	180	161	169	174
169.5	156	177	176	169.5
173	149	167.5	168	180
151	173	176.5	176.5	171
180	173	178	167.5	173
171	180	179.5	177	173
169	175	175.5	180	179
161	174	175.5	167	174.5
175	176	178	175	160.5
177	170	169	171	178
173	168.5	176.5	165	176
167.5	175.5	167	167	174.5
175	155	169	176.5	176
177	176	158.5	178	170

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days. (continued)

173.5	174.5	176.5	180	166.5
170	166	179	178	180
157.5	175	167.5	180	175.5
169.5	174.5	169	167	172
160	171	178	180	162.5
174	177	176	169.5	172.5
171.5	178	176.5	161	171
169	172	179.5	168	173
177.5	173	177.5	134	167.5
167	174	174.5	169.5	172
178	163.5	163	171	150
178	173.5	179	175.5	173
171	180	176	179	175
177.5	180	165	172	166
180	178.5	178.5	169.5	152.5
180	179	133	144	177
174	180	178	157	158
171.5	177	176	179	163.5
175.5	165.5	166	171.5	163.5
168.5	158	174.5	170	174
177	176	178	167	178
172	176	172.5	174.5	167
175	176	178.5	173.5	179
173.5	176	174.5	171	166.5
177	177	176	172.5	149
172.5	170	176	180	172.5
170.5	176	177	177	173
164	179	173	172	172
165.5	171	177	179	177
178	175	168	180	158.5
174	171	173	177	171.5
180	176	177.5	177	150
166	175	174	177	169
175	179	172	178	170.5
175.5	176	174.5	178	176.5
171.5	173	163.5	173	176.5
171	165.5	156.5	171	154
178	180	166	176	175
176	175	158.5	173	173
163	171	164	172	177
177	175	175.5	164	176
170.5	174.5	170	159.5	179
176	176	180	176	177.5
171.5	167.5	168.5	176	171.5
173	178	179.5	174	176.5
177	174.5	172.5	162	176
175	154	170.5	168.5	178

Raw attendance data for 1,168 non-handicapped pupils membership for 180 days. (continued)

170	173	172	170	173.5
180	178	176	180	173.5
180	176	172.5	170	177.5
172.5	166.5	176	179.5	174
163	176	179		

Raw data for 118 handicapped pupils in membership for 180 days.

Membership	Attendance	Membership	Attendance
180	155	180	160
180	161.5	180	160.5
180	155.5	180	161
180	160.5	180	168.5
180	167.5	180	166
180	166.5	180	175
180	164	180	175
180	176	180	160
180	176	180	155.5
180	171	180	173
180	171	180	140.5
180	176	180	172
180	154.5	180	174
180	162	180	158
180	166	180	160
180	150	180	175
180	172.5	180	160
180	156.5	180	176
180	168.5	180	172
180	176	180	171
180	156	180	172
180	160.5	180	147
180	160	180	168
180	176	180	170.5
180	178	180	171.5
180	168	180	161
180	175	180	172
180	153	180	167.5
180	170	180	173
180	148.5	180	171.5
180	154	180	168
180	170	180	160
180	156.5	180	173
180	171.5	180	172
180	118.5	180	178
180	150.5	180	174.5
180	175.5	180	167
180	167.5	180	172

Raw data for 118 handicapped pupils in membership for 180 days. (Continued)

Membership	Attendance	Membership	Attendance
180	178	180	152.5
180	176.5	180	167.5
180	173.5	180	171
180	179	180	170
180	174.5	180	177
180	150.5	180	143.5
180	177.5	180	162
180	150	180	133.5
180	134	180	165
180	166	180	178
180	175	180	176.5
180	178	180	171.5
180	167	180	180
180	175	180	170
180	178	180	180
180	173	180	173.6
180	176	180	176
180	172	180	163
180	177	180	167
180	136.5	180	173
180	173	180	157

Raw data for 83 non-handicapped pupils in membership less than 180 days

Membership	Attendance	Membership	Attendance
45	43	86	77.5
170	168	76	71
77	63	11	10
86	80	115	112
126	119	168	159
32	24	136	135.5
32	32	161	155
153	148	61	56
131	116.5	172	169
97	84	62	50.5
93	85.5	137	119
84	73.5	108	85
24	22	113	104
79	75	89	83
72	70.5	50	49
32	21.5	12	11
168	160	50	49.5
44	41.5	38	29
144	133.5	27	27
122	98	76	66
103	91.5	173	136.5
97	91.5	136	136
79	78.5	68	66
68	59	60	60
71	65.5	134	119.5
57	51	157	152.5
169	121	63	62.5
177	157.5	136	129.5
130	102	161	124.5
169	166	142	128
49	49	89	80
89	86	76	75
99	98	99	95
99	95	99	99
126	120	99	97
101	101	125	122
135	132.5	117	113

Raw data for 83 non-handicapped pupils in membership less than 180 days. (Continued)

Membership	Attendance	Membership	Attendance
89	88.5	93	85.5
99	99	134	120
136	129	14	10
101	90	99	93
76	72.5		

Raw data for 13 handicapped pupils in membership for less than 180 days

Membership	Attendance
134	119
101	76.5
99	85
47	36
161	143.5
157	113.5
137	134
37	29
98	80
63	63
112	66.5
131	121
158	148

Total days membership and attendance for handicapped and non-handicapped groups

	Number	Days Membership	Days Attendance
Non-Handicapped-180	1,168	210,240	200,567
Non-Handicapped less than 180	83	8,152	7,545.5
Handicapped-180	118	21,240	19,614.0
Handicapped less than 180	<u>13</u>	<u>1,435</u>	<u>1,215.0</u>
	1,382	241,067	228,941.5

Total days membership and attendance for non-handicapped group

	Number	Days Membership	Days Attendance
Non-Handicapped-180	1,168	210,240	200,567.0
Non-Handicapped less than 180	<u>83</u>	<u>8,152</u>	<u>7,545.5</u>
	1,251	218,152	208,112.5

Total days membership and attendance for handicapped group

	Number	Days Membership	Days Attendance
Handicapped-180	118	21,240	19,614.0
Handicapped less than 180	<u>13</u>	<u>1,435</u>	<u>1,215.0</u>
	131	22,675	20,829.0