Forum

Robert K. Zabel, Editor

Reflections on the New Definition for Emotional or Behavioral Disorders: Who Still Falls Through the Cracks and Why

Thomas McIntyre

NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE).

ABSTRACT

The new federal definition for emotional or behavioral disorders improves upon the old criteria in many ways. However, a clause in that definition, intended to prevent overrepresentation of minorities, may instead deny services to many of these deserving pupils. In order to assure that the intent of the new definition is met, immediate action is needed at all levels of education.

A new definition for emotional and behavioral disorders has surfaced on the educational horizon. It was developed and promoted by the Mental Health and Special Education Coalition, a group comprised of representatives from eleven professional organizations to replace the present definition for *serious emotional disturbance.* Under the new guidelines, *emotional or behavioral disorder* (EBD) is defined in part as "a disability characterized by behavioral or emotional responses in school so different from appropriate age, cultural, or ethnic norms that they adversely affect educational performance. Educational performance includes the development and demonstration of academic, social, vocational, and personal skills" (Forness & Knitzer, 1991).

While the members of the Mental Health and Special Education Coalition are deserving of kudos for their intensive efforts on behalf of students with emotional or behavioral disorders, is the profession prepared to meet the new challenges placed before it? This article, concerned with how schools will conceptualize and apply the "cultural norms clause" of the proposed definition, addresses two questions:

1. Will all students with behavioral or emotional disorders receive appropriate services?
2. Are educators prepared to meet the intent of the new definition?

Will All Students with Behavioral or Emotional Disorders Receive Appropriate Services?

Ethnicity, culture, and heritage play a significant role in the psychological and educational development of our students (McIntyre, 1992a). *Culture* or *ethnicity* refers to an integrated pattern of human behavior that includes customs, beliefs, values, thought patterns, communication systems, and actions of a group of people who experience a heartfelt bond based upon a similar background and common traits (McIntyre, 1992c). Within the United States, there are five major cultures — Asian (Oriental), Black (African-American, Negro), Hispanic (Latino), Native American (Indian), and White (Anglo, Caucasian, European-American, dominant, majority, mainstream) — with the Arab culture increasing rapidly in representation. Each culture is composed of subcultures which differ in some way from the others while still identifying with the larger group.

The characteristics that distinguish one cultural or subcultural group from another may include historical past, region of origin, race, customs, rituals, routines, language, religion, or socioeconomic status. Commonalities in background result in a tendency for each group to have its own culturally specific childrearing practices, attitudes, values, interests, needs, aspirations, and nonverbal behaviors. These create in each unique cultural group a sense of cohesion, solidarity, and peoplehood.

While cultural variations in behavior will now be considered in the determination of whether an emotional or behavioral disorder exists, the cultural norms clause will actually create systematic concerns for some culturally diverse student populations. Though intended to prevent nondisordered culturally diverse students from being labeled, it might instead be misused by those who wish to exclude deserving pupils. Students in need of services for emotional or behavioral disorders are at risk for being denied assistance if they belong to one of four groups: the urban socially maladjusted subculture; those with a homosexual orientation; historically oppressed minorities; and those from low income households. While there may be some degree of overlap among these groups, they will be considered separately to better delineate the issues facing each.

Urban Socially Maladjusted Youth

A great deal of discussion has revolved around the issue of whether socially maladjusted youth should be served under the original definition for *seriously emotionally disturbed* (Center, 1989; Weinberg, 1992). The Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (1984, 1987, 1989a, 1990) supported the inclusion viewpoint. While the new definition was devised and supported by CCBD, in part to assure that these youth are brought into the special education fold, at least one subgroup of this population may have been allowed to "fall through the cracks" again as a result of the cultural norms clause.

All youth who grow up in urban core areas are exposed to the "streetcorner" subculture (Foster, 1986; Kochman, 1976; McIntyre, in press; Valentine, 1978) and nearly all adopt its manipulative and aggressive lifestyle to some degree (McIntyre, 1991, in press). Full-fledged members of the urban black streetcorner culture (and those of other races who adopt that lifestyle) regularly engage in illicit, illegal, and antisocial behavior (Foster, 1986; McIntyre, 1991). These youth are generally considered to be socially maladjusted (Conger & Miller, 1966; Foster, 1986; McIntyre, 1991, in press; Roberts, 1987). In-school displays of their "streetwise" behavior should guarantee them inclusion under the new definitional umbrella. However, whether these youth will be considered EBD is questionable (McIntyre, 1991, in press).

Those who wish to deny services to these youth might claim, appropriately so (Foster, 1986; Kochman, 1976; Liebow, 1967; McIntyre, 1991, in press), that their behaviors have been taught by a longstanding subculture common to low income urban areas. They will argue that these learned behaviors which are contrary to those promoted in the typical North American school are "cultural" and therefore fall outside the domain of special education. In a rather odd twist of reasoning, socially maladjusted "streetwise" students might then be ineligible for special education services unless they are significantly more maladjusted than other streetcorner socially maladjusted youth (S. Forness, personal communication, March 5, 1991 and December 12, 1991). Thus, only the most severe of this socially maladjusted population would actually be served.

Despite the intent of the new definition, the vast majority of this group of students may continue to be denied services as is often the case under the present definition. Administrators who wish to save money or retain their ability to suspend these students will argue that the behaviors are traits that were developed and promoted by their culture (Foster, 1986; Liebow, 1967), are commonly found in the low income urban segment of that population (Foster, 1986; McIntyre, 1991), and are indeed survival skills in many neighborhoods (Foster, 1986). They will argue that the behaviors are culturally based and should not qualify these students for special education services. Given the ineffectiveness of intervention for socially maladjusted students (Center, 1989; Cusson, 1981; Kauffman, 1989; Wolf, Braukman, & Ramp, 1987), educators' lack of training in this area (Urbanski, 1986), and the fear that most teachers have of streetcorner youth (Foster, 1986; McIntyre, 1991), a dissenting voice from frontline special educators may not be heard.

Homosexual Students

Members of a less visible subculture (Fine, 1988; Whitlock, 1989), gay and lesbian youth, exist in all high schools (McIntyre, 1992b; Whitlock, 1989) and are more likely to be discriminated against than racial minorities (DeStefano, 1988; Tracy, 1990). While a homosexual orientation is not in and of itself reflective of an emotional disorder (Remafedi, 1987; Rigg, 1982), due to rejection and animosity from others, gay and lesbian youth are more at-risk for emotional and behavioral difficulties than their heterosexual peers (Friends of Project 10, 1989; McIntyre, 1992b).

For young homosexuals, school is often a lonely and frightening place (Friends of Project 10, 1989). Behaviors commonly found in this subculture often provoke physical and psychological attacks from fellow students and even educators (Alter, 1990; McIntyre, 1992b; Whitelock, 1989). However, it is homosexual youth who are often referred to programs for emotional or behavioral disorders. This is because educators don't believe their contention that the great number of fights in which they are engaged occur while defending themselves against attacks by nontolerant heterosexual peers (Whitlock, 1989). Additionally, many parents shun their own progeny (McIntyre, 1992b). It is estimated that one-half of New York City's homeless youth population is gay or lesbian, ejected from their homes by parents who are nonaccepting of their child's sexual orientation (Tracy, 1990).

This rejection by others can be emotionally devastating (Hunter & Schaecher, 1987; McIntyre, 1992b) and places these youth at risk for serious psychological problems (Friends of Project 10, 1989; McIntyre, 1992b). The majority of these youth suffer lowered self-esteem (Martin, 1988) and in one study 19% of homosexual students self-reported an emotional problem (Hetrick & Martin, 1987). This emotional distress places them at greater risk of substance abuse and suicide (Bell & Weinberg, 1981; Flax, 1990; Ray & Johnson, 1983; Remafedi, 1987). Indeed, over one-third of gay and bisexual adolescents have attempted suicide (Remafedi, 1987; Roesler & Deisher, 1972) and up to one-third of all successful suicides are committed by these youth (Flax, 1990; Whitlock, 1989).

Because issues in psychological and social development are different for the homosexual student (Hetrick & Martin, 1987), counseling and support groups geared to their needs are necessary (Tartagni, 1978; Whitlock, 1989). If not resolved, their social and cognitive isolation may extend into adulthood, bringing with it anxiety, depressive symptoms, alienation, self-hatred, and demoralization (Hetrick & Martin, 1987). However, despite a resolution by the National Education Association (1988) recommending that every school district provide counseling for students who are struggling with their sexual/gender orientation, typically their behavioral and emotional needs are not addressed (Uribe, 1989b; Whitelock, 1989).

Because of their sexual orientation, homosexuals are frequently denied the rights and privileges enjoyed by others, and are sometimes referred to as being a cultural or minority group (McIntyre, 1992b; Uribe, 1989a). However, some legal protection is being offered to these students in some districts. At least one school system, New York City, has declared homosexual youth to be *culturally diverse* learners. Many other districts have adopted policies to prevent discrimination against these pupils.

Should these students be considered culturally diverse? If so, the emotionally-based behaviors and intrapersonal turmoil, which commonly result from and contribute to problems in school, might be considered "normal" for their group. If a student experiences severe emotional distress due to her/his homosexual orientation, will s/he receive services if that distress is "typical" of the large number of serious problems experienced by that subculture at that age? It is quite likely that many of those experiencing emotional difficulties could be excluded from coverage under the new definition and denied needed services. As with urban socially maladjusted youth, only those who are significantly more emotionally or behaviorally disordered than their subcultural peers might receive services.

On the other hand, if a gay or lesbian orientation does not in and of itself constitute a minority status, homosexual behavior, values, and feelings must be considered different than those desired by families for their children, especially those from cultures that promote strong and exclusive gender roles (Friends of Project 10, 1989). The frequently seen emotional, social, and behavioral difficulties of gay and lesbian youth would then fall under the

umbrella of the new definition. Another problem then arises, however. Educators who are ir tolerant of the gay/lesbian orientation and lifestyle might attempt to have well-adjusted hc mosexual students labeled EBD, even though the American Psychological Association ha long held that homosexuality is a valid sexual orientation.

Along with the difficulties in determining whether labeling and services are appropriat what are the chances of adequate service provision when most teachers, administrator and guidance counselors report that they are afraid of losing their jobs if they address th needs of gay and lesbian youth (Robinson & Martin, 1983; Whitlock, 1989)? Indeed, se vices for these youth are more controversial than those provided for minority youth and soc ety is generally not supportive of them (Tartagni, 1978).

Historically Oppressed Minorities

The cultural aspect of the new definition may also impact on a third group of student Historically, certain culturally diverse groups have not been served well by society and its ir stitutions (Foster, 1986; McIntyre, 1992c; Ogbu, 1990; Quality of Education for Minoritie 1990; Sosa, 1990). As a result, these groups often place pressure on their members not t succeed in "white" settings including educational facilities (Ferguson & Jackson, 199 Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Gregory, 1992; Ogbu, 1990; Petroni, 1970). Few teachers realiz that African-American, Mexican-American, Native American, and Native Hawaiian youth ar often under great pressure from their peers *not* to achieve in school (Gollnick & Chin 1990; Gregory, 1992; Hanna, 1988; Ogbu, 1990). In these cultural groups, individual su cess in schooling or professions is commonly viewed as inappropriate if the group as whole does not advance also (Epps, 1975; Fordham, 1988; Maxwell, 1974; Ogbu, 199 Petroni, 1970). For black students, merely attending school may be viewed as evidence rejection of their culture (Fordham, 1988; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Hanna, 1988).

For these alienated youth, misbehavior is often a strategy of resistance to the school' pressure to think and act white (Fordham, 1988; Gibson, 1988; Gregory, 1992; Ogbu, 198 1990; Quality Education for Minorities, 1990). This culturally promoted rejection of scho can result in referral for behavioral disorders services (McIntyre, in press). However, base upon the new definition's cultural criteria, these students might not be eligible for service even though their behavior interferes with academic success.

Either end of the service spectrum penalizes these students. Placing them in classes f the emotionally or behaviorally disordered due to culturally based behavior is inappropriat yet failing to modify instruction and discipline to match better their culturally learned styles counterproductive (McIntyre, 1992a). Schools will undoubtedly continue to try to quell thes rebellious behaviors rather than address their root cause and attempt to reach the student Educators who commonly misinterpret culturally based actions and dress as rebelliou (Goleman, 1992; McIntyre, 1992c) will most likely continue to use coercive rather than enti ing strategies to promote student cooperation and motivation.

Students From Low Income Households

One in four public school students is a member of a family living in poverty (Gollnick Chinn, 1990; Grant & Sleeter, 1989; Steinberg, 1991). For these students, socioeconomi factors play a large negative role in the meaningfulness of their education (Farrell, 199 Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; Grant & Sleeter, 1990; Hanna, 1988; McIntyre, in press; Steinber 1991; Wilson, 1987). Regardless of race (Hanna, 1988; Kronus, 1971), low income upbrin ing tends to co-exist with a constellation of unfavorable home background features (West Farrington, 1973) that place pupils at increased risk for difficulties in school (Chilman, 196 Eitzen, 1985; Ekstrom, Goertz, Pollack, & Rock, 1987; Hanna, 1988; Harrington, 197 Horton & Hunt, 1968; Kebschull & Rogg, 1974; McIntyre, in press; McLaren, 1989).

For example, in contrast to the middle class culture which uses watchfulness and verb explanations to discipline and guide children (Anastasiow, 1986; Hanna, 1988), less gui ance tends to be provided by poor parents (Chilman, 1965; Horton & Hunt, 1968; Mille 1959; Takaki, 1979). These guardians are more likely to have used ridicule and harsh, i consistent physical punishment in which children are taught to obey rather than reason make rational, situationally appropriate choices (Hanna, 1988; Scanzioni, 1977).

The low income lifestyle promotes poor impulse control, an inability to delay gratification, a constant search for action, and a continual testing of physical strength (Hanna, 1988; Horton & Hunt, 1968). These alienated low income youths are many times more likely to report that they feel pressured to join gangs, engage in drug use, or disobey authority (Foster, 1986; Schmidt, 1990). Because of this, low socioeconomic status (SES) students are at greatest risk for arrest and incarceration (Arnold & Brungardt, 1983; Farrington, 1986; Leone, Price, & Vitolo, 1986; Natriello, 1987; Safer, 1982; Scherer, Abeles, & Fischer, 1975). Due to the inconsistency present in the home, low income pupils commonly view the behavior of others as being unpredictable. There develops a tendency to focus on the present rather than planning for the future (Horton & Hunt, 1968). Others' actions are judged in respect to the immediate impact on them. This results in a personalistic, fatalistic, and passive attitude with little belief in one's ability to cope (Chilman, 1965; Strom, 1965).

Sociological factors evident in poverty areas provide conditions conducive to the development of antisocial behavior (Hanna, 1988; Roberts, 1987; West & Farrington, 1973) and severe emotional and social problems including aggression and difficulty in socialization with peers (Chilman, 1965; Farrington, 1986; Hanna, 1988; Hare, 1977; Natriello, 1987; Wells, 1988). As would be expected, disruptive school behavior is more prevalent among low socioeconomic status children and youth (Hanna, 1988; Roberts, 1987; West & Farrington, 1973). Their teachers are likely to face students who are oppositional to conventional mores (Strom, 1965; Roberts, 1987), possessing an alienated, distrustful view of the world (Chilman, 1965).

Low income families are more likely to have an authoritarian, rigid family structure with strictly defined male and female roles (Henkin & Nguyen, 1981; Vasquez-Nuttall & Romero-Garcia, 1989). Given the exaggerated masculinity (including masculine behavior among low income girls) and preoccupation with a manly heterosexual image (Eitzen, 1985; Foster, 1986; Strom, 1965), teachers — who typically expect pupils to display feminine behavior (Tannen, 1990) such as sitting quietly and demonstrating compliance to authority — may be defiantly opposed. According to Dent (1976), "The teacher's expectation is that the student should be compliant, docile, and responsive to authority. The student is expected to conform to a standard of behavior that the teacher is familiar with, the compliant child standard that was indicative of the teacher's upbringing" (p. 178). Because low income youth possess a sense of rebellion and a rejection of authority figures who they view as pressuring them to act in middle class ways (Horton & Hunt, 1968; Strom, 1965), they typically display more defiant behavior than their middle income peers (Foster, 1986; Hanna, 1988).

Low income children whose homes have not placed emphasis on verbal language facility or negotiation (Anastasiow, 1986; Hanna, 1988; Horton & Hunt, 1968; Miller, 1959), learn to respond physically to others (Foster, 1986; Horton & Hunt, 1968). There is a greater approval of the use of violence (Crain & Weisman, 1973; Foster, 1986; Scherer et al., 1975; Strom, 1965). Their aggression is not just physical, however. They are more likely to display crude and profane language (Eitzen, 1985; Foster, 1986; Horton & Hunt, 1968; Strom, 1965) and a lack of subtlety in conversation (Foster, 1986; Horton & Hunt, 1968). Even humor is harsher and less subtle or sophisticated involving more overt, less disguised aggression and ridicule (Levin, 1987).

As a result of their controlling and physical upbringing (Hanna, 1988), low income students often intentionally misbehave in class to determine if their teachers will satisfy their learned need for being controlled (Cvaraceus & Miller, 1964; Miller, 1959). The low income culture expects teachers to be tough disciplinarians (Foster, 1986; McIntyre, in press). Indeed, parents may view educators as shirking their responsibilities if they do not physically punish the misbehaving youth (Hanna, 1988). The withholding of physical punishment may actually cause anxiety for these students (Harrison-Ross & Wyden, 1973) who may have come to view swift and intense physical punishment as a sign of caring and affection (Rosenfeld, 1971; Silverstein & Krate, 1975).

Foster (1986) writes, "Strict control is highly valued among the lower classes. A close conceptual connection is made between nurturance and authority. The authority figure shows he cares when his control is firm" (p. 249). Low socioeconomic status students may be confused by the subtle and supportive behavior management practices of middle class

oriented teachers (Hanna, 1988; Harrison-Ross & Wyden, 1973). The restrained nonphy cal response by their teachers to misbehavior (and the acceptance of this intervention their middle class peers) may puzzle the disruptive low income student who then comes view middle class whites and minorities as passive and weak (Foster, 1986; Hanna, 1988

How then does the new definition guide the field in reacting to the more physical, defia and aggressive behavioral style of low income learners? Controversy will undoubte ensue as educators and lawyers attempt to delineate the extent to which behaviors comm to the low income culture should be accepted and respected.

Are Educators Prepared to Meet the Intent of the New Definition?

While the government may legislate change, the metamorphosis to the final goal is of slow in developing. Newtonian Law, where the field in motion continues in motion for so time, also applies to education. Just as geography determined whether socially maladjus youth were served under the definition for seriously emotionally disturbed (Mattis Morales, & Bauer, 1992; Weinberg, 1992), there are those who will try to circumvent the tent of the new definition for philosophical or financial reasons. Not everyone has the b interests of our students at heart; not everyone wants optimal services for EBD youth. Due to culturally myopic orientations, present classroom behavior management techniq are likely to continue as will institutional disciplinary practices such as detention, susp sion, and expulsion, further alienating culturally, sexually, and/or economically different yo and impairing their educational progress. To counteract this alienation and promote a demic success, educators will need to produce a more culturally accepting educational e ronment (McIntyre, 1992a).

The Need for Considering Cultural Influences on Behavior

The proposed definition's emphasis on cultural differences in behavior is especially tim and pertinent. By the turn of the century, up to 50% of the schoolage population will be fr a minority group (Wilson, 1988). Already the student bodies of the 25 largest school distr have a majority of minorities ranging from 70 to 96% (National Information Center Children and Youth with Handicaps, 1988). Non-urban areas are also seeing such devel ments according to Alston (cited in Armstrong, 1991) and in some states most students culturally diverse (Chinn & Hughes, 1987).

While many districts are modifying facilities, curriculum, materials, and practices in an tempt to make schools less alienating and more welcoming to their culturally diverse lea ers, this country's schools still tend to reflect the values and expectations of the majority c ture (Almanza & Moseley, 1980; McDonnell, 1989; McIntyre, 1992c). Schools continue treat their charges in ways which often penalize those entering with values, beliefs, and t haviors at variance with those of the "average American" (Hanna, 1988; McIntyre, 1992c).

Even minority students who comprehend English and the majority American culture m be penalized by traditional teaching methods that contrast with their culturally based lea ing and behavioral styles (Blackorby & Edgar, 1990; "CASSP national," 1988; Gordon Thomas, 1990; Grossman, 1984, 1990; Houston, 1973; Ogbu, 1990). This cultural m match may explain to some extent the overrepresentation of some racial minority groups various programs for the disabled (Almanza & Moseley, 1980; Chinn & Hughes, 19 Garrison & Hammill, 1971; Lauritzen & Friedman, 1991; Mercer, 1971; Ogbu, 1990) incl ing those for students with emotional or behavioral disorders (Chinn & Hughes, 19 McIntyre, 1992d; Viadero, 1992).

Educator Ethnocentricity

The overrepresentation of culturally diverse students in special programs is probably n result of conscious prejudice but rather due to ethnocentricity on the part of teach (Garcia, 1978; McIntyre, 1992c). Although educators usually have the best interests of th students at heart, the vast majority of teachers are unaware of cultural differences in beh ior (Grossman, 1990; McIntyre, 1992c; Pusch, 1979). Each person truly understands o her or his culture and those who belong to it. Most individuals find it difficult to comprehe

or appreciate much of the behavior which is culturally different from their own (McIntyre, 1992a). Whatever their background, people tend to think of their ways as being "the best" (McIntyre, 1992c).

Behavioral patterns often vary by culture (Light & Martin, 1985; Toth, 1990). It can be expected, then, that if educators and students come from different backgrounds, each is likely to display behaviors different from those in the other's culture. Grossman (1990) warns, "These cultural differences that exist between teachers and school administrators and minority students in the school can contribute to behavior problems in numerous ways" (pp. 335 & 344).

Culturally determined behaviors are commonly misinterpreted by educators not from those cultures (Garcia, 1978; Goleman, 1992; Grossman, 1990; McIntyre, 1992a; Pusch, 1979). Teachers who are unaware of cultural differences may mistakenly judge their students' culturally based behavior to be disordered or at least deserving of special education referral or disciplinary action (Foster, 1986; Grossman, 1990; Hanna, 1988; McIntyre, 1991, 1992d). Indeed, pupils who display culturally diverse behaviors are susceptible to being misdiagnosed as having a behavior disorder (Hanna, 1988; Sugai & Maheady, 1988). Recent immigrants are at special risk (Grossman, 1990), being referred sooner than other students (Sugai, 1988).

According to Toth (1990), "The definition of conduct disorder depends on who is defining it. Different cultures have different expectations" (p. 5). Light and Martin (1985) agree, stating that "With the exception of some extreme clearly pathological actions, behaviors that are considered 'problems' and therefore bother adults a great deal vary among cultures. . . .An understanding of cultural expectations and roles can contribute to the development of child management techniques specifically designed to eliminate value differences between a child's family, the school system, and the larger society" (pp. 42 & 43).

As with beauty, then, "Acceptable behavior or bothersome behavior is in the eye of the beholder" (Light & Martin, 1985, p. 42). Most often, that beholder is from the white middle class culture. Today, fewer minorities are entering the teaching profession (Wells, 1988). Presently 92% of teachers are from the majority culture, a figure that will rise to 95% by the year 2000 (Henry, 1990). With regard to those who work with exceptional learners, Yates (1988) writes, "Special education and its leadership are at this time most likely to be white, monolingual, and English-speaking with special education research, training, and professional development activities generally focused upon areas unrelated to the emerging demographic characteristics of the student population in this country" (p. 3).

The color of one's skin is not, however, the overriding factor involved here. Rather, it is the lack of crosscultural understanding by teachers. While parents of all cultures would probably prefer a good teacher of any culture to a poor one from their own (Havinghurst & Levine, 1971; McIntyre, 1992d) and the large majority of EBD youth express no preference for the race of their teacher (McIntyre & Silva, 1992), it is indeed more difficult for a person outside of a certain cultural group to meet the educational needs of that group (Chinn & McCormick, 1986; "Panel to urge," 1991; Figuero & Gallego, 1978; Laosa, 1977).

The Educator's Task

To overcome ethnocentricity and be prepared to meet the intent of the new definition, most educators must become cultural detectives, searching for knowledge and information that will help them better serve their charges. Teachers must learn to modify traditional procedures to match better the culturally based learning and behavioral styles of their students (Jones, 1991; McIntyre, 1992a). For example, a more inductive presentation or cooperative learning activities might be used with minority, low income, and socially maladjusted students who tend to achieve better when these techniques are implemented (Anastasiow, 1986; Glasser, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1990).

Additionally, teaching style should, as much as possible, match culturally based learning styles (McIntyre, 1992c). For example, teachers of black pupils might plan more movement and spontaneous audience reaction into their lessons to match better a learning style common among these students (Gay, 1975; Kunjufu, 1984). Teachers of black and Hispanic learners with emotional or behavioral disorders might take note of their students' preference

for a humorous and friendly style of teacher-student interaction (McIntyre & Silva, 1992).

When trained to critically examine the culturally based behavior of their students, teachers can be more confident that they are treating their pupils fairly and equitably. They can be assured that they are engaging in culturally sensitive proactive strategies designed to promote a positive classroom environment. By modifying classroom practice to work *with* rather than *against* a pupil's culture, student cooperation and motivation can be earned (Grossman, 1990). Unfortunately, educators have not been up to this task (Almanza & Moseley, 1980). As Grossman (1984) points out, "Cultural conflicts between home and school cause youth to either choose one or the other. This causes conflicts in personality, adjustment, and so forth. He needs to act one way at school and when he gets home, uses a different language and a different set of cultural values. If the school allowed him to be himself, he wouldn't have the problem" (p. 122).

Do teachers deserve all the blame for the inadequacies created by lack of cultural awareness? Certainly not. The blame falls to another source addressed in the next section.

Teacher Training

If the intent of the new definition's cultural clause is to be met, it is higher education's responsibility to ensure that information regarding cultural diversity is passed on to frontline personnel (CCBD, 1989b; McIntyre, 1992a). Unfortunately, most university faculty in education are unaware of these cultural differences in behavior (Garcia, 1978; McIntyre, 1992a, 1992d; Yates, 1988). If professors lack a strong cultural knowledge base, information cannot be provided to future practitioners. How then can teachers be expected to implement culturally sensitive assessment, instruction, and discipline?

Along with an improvement in preservice education, inservice training regarding cultural differences, appropriate assessment, and classroom modifications are also needed (Chinn & Hughes, 1987; McIntyre, 1992d). A restructuring and refocusing of teacher training efforts is certainly indicated (McIntyre, 1992a, 1992d).

Professional Groups

Professional groups typically provide the impetus and direction for change in the field of education. It was through the efforts of the organizational members (including CCBD) of the Mental Health and Special Education Coalition that the new definition for emotional and behavioral disorders was devised. At present, this Coalition is drafting a policy statement to guide efforts relating to training issues and personnel shortages ("Proposed EBD", 1992). While this is admirable, several other areas also need to be addressed (e.g., assessment, programing, culturally sensitive classroom practice, etc.).

To its credit, CCBD's executive committee has continued the existence of the ad hoc committee for ethnic and multicultural concerns. This group is engaged in the development of policies and documents regarding cultural issues in the field of emotional and behavioral disorders. Additionally, a permanent at-large member for these issues has been appointed. These and other representatives and committees must be influential in assuring that practical advice is passed on to the field in the areas of teacher/administrator training, preferred practice, and assessment.

It is incumbent upon CCBD to draft and disseminate resolutions, mission statements, position papers, and other documents to clarify the intent of the new definition and close loopholes that will otherwise be exploited by those who wish to circumvent desired practice and policy. It is important that CCBD and other groups influential in the development and passage of the new definition document their viewpoints so that when the court cases come (and believe me, they will), there is documentation to guide the courts in their decision making.

Caution is indicated, however. While CCBD helped to make cultural diversity an issue in the field of emotional and behavioral disorders, it must be aware of its own limitations in this area. CCBD's organizational ethnocentricity is evident in its only previous attempt at addressing cultural issues. The *White Paper on Best Assessment Practices for Students with Behavioral Disorders: Accommodation to Cultural Diversity and Individual Differences* (1989b) contains numerous flawed recommendations. The document supports the use of

standardized instructional procedures without making modifications for culturally different learning styles. Additionally, in opposition to the new definition's recommendation that behavior be considered in the context of culture, it also recommends the use of objective eligibility criteria and teacher rating scales that reflect majority culture expectations. In a similar vein, it recommends comparison with nonreferred same-sex peers regardless of the culture of those peers. More appropriate assessment options such as developing/using cultural norms or including professionals from the student's cultural/linguistic background on the evaluation team were not mentioned. The latter suggestions, along with safeguards to prevent EBD diagnosis for students who are merely expressing valid criticisms or disagreements (Forness & Knitzer, 1991), should be implemented.

It is imperative that professional organizations concerned with cultural diversity and behavioral disorders focus more on cultural influences on behavior and education in their publications and conference offerings. Emphasis should be placed on identifying culturally sensitive instructional, interactional, behavior management, and treatment practices. Journals concerned with students with emotional and behavioral disorders should publish "theme issues" containing articles by recognized experts on cultural diversity. This would provide guidance to educators regarding practice in the areas of culturally sensitive assessment, classroom practice, and administrative policy.

To exert the greatest positive influence on the field, efforts must also be undertaken at the subdivisional level. State chapters of CCBD (and CCBD members in states that do not have a subdivision) should immediately contact their state departments of education to seek inclusion on the committees that will be rewriting their state definitions to fall in line with the new national standard when it is finally adopted.

Hopefully, with a new awareness and an intense diligence in assuring that the intent of the new definition is met, CCBD can offer much needed guidance for the future of the field. Some group must carry the torch and light the way. If not us, who?

CONCLUSIONS

While CCBD should be lauded for its efforts to devise a new definition for EBD youngsters, if it is true that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions,." in many ways we're on the fast lane going down. Even after passage of the new definition for emotional or behavioral disorders, grey areas and points of contention will exist. While most socially maladjusted youth will now be eligible for special education programing, the cultural norms clause may eliminate other eligible groups of students from needed services.

Under the original federal definition, large groups of children may have been mislabeled as emotionally disturbed because of their cultural differences or home environments (Viadero, 1992). While most culturally diverse students will now be provided extra safeguards against being incorrectly identified as emotionally or behaviorally disordered, there will still be controversy over whether students who display behavior atypical of school norms should be eligible for special education services. While no pupil should be labeled EBD solely because culturally based behavior is irritating or unpalatable to educators, if a culturally determined behavior interferes with social interaction or academic success or creates a danger to others, services should still be provided.

To avoid the inadvertent exclusion of many deserving children and youth, CCBD and other groups influential in the adoption of a new definition must rapidly undertake damage control procedures. The effort to adopt the new definition has recently suffered a setback (Peterson, 1992). It was not attached, as expected, to the recent reenactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and a new round of commentary will be sought by the U.S. Office of Education. While this allows various naysayers and malcontents to pick away at the proposed definition, it also allows time for the Mental Health and Special Education Coalition to close loopholes as identified in this manuscript.

CCBD can also prepare itself to undertake a leadership role once the definition is adopted. With implementation of the new definition, federal and state governments, their courts, the schools, and educators will be seeking guidance. It is incumbent upon CCBD, the leader in the field of emotional and behavioral disorders, to take the reins and direct future practice. We must be in the forefront of the legions who will attempt to spread their influence over policy, practice, and procedure in the area of emotional and behavioral disorders. We m[illegible] map our route now. The future of our students is determined in the present.

REFERENCES

Almanza, H., & Moseley, W. (1980). Curriculum adaptions and modification for culturally diverse har capped children. *Exceptional Children, 46,* 608-614.

Anastasiow, N. J. (1986). *Development and disability.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Armstrong, L. (1991, March 20). Census confirms remarkable shifts in ethnic makeup. *Education Week* 1.

Arnold, W. E., & Brumgardt, T. (1983). *Juvenile misconduct and delinquency.* Boston, MA: Hought Mifflin.

Bell, A., & Weinberg, M. (1981). *Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and wom* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Blackorby, J., & Edgar, E. (1990). A third of our youth? A look at the problem of high school drop among mildly handicapped students. *Journal of Special Education, 24,* 506-510.

CASSP national workshop identifies culturally specific needs of minority children with emotional har caps. *Focal Point, 3*(1), 5-6.

Center, D. (1989). Social maladjustment: Definition, identification, and programming. *Focus Exceptional Children, 22*(1), 1-12.

Chilman, C. (1965). Child rearing and family relationship patterns of the very poor. *Welfare in Review,* 10.

Chinn, P., & Hughes, S. (1987). Representation of minority students in special education class *Remedial and Special Education, 8*(4), 41-46.

Chinn, P., & McCormick, L. (1986). Cultural diversity and exceptionality. In N. Noring & L. McCorm (Eds.), *Exceptional children and youth* (4th ed., pp. 95-117). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Conger, J., & Miller, W. (1966). *Personality, social class, and delinquency.* New York: John Wiley & Sons

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (1984). *Position paper on substituting 'behaviorally dis dered' for 'seriously emotionally disturbed' as a descriptor term for children and youth handicapp by behavior.* Reston, VA: Author.

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (1987). Position paper on definition and identification students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 13,* 9-19.

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (1989a). *A new proposed definition and terminology to place 'serious emotional disturbance' in the Education of the Handicapped Act.* Reston, VA: Author

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (1989b). White paper on best assessment practices students with behavioral disorders: Accommodation to cultural diversity and individual differenc *Behavioral Disorders, 14,* 263-278.

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (1990). *Position paper on the exclusion of children w conduct and behavioral disorders.* Reston, VA: Author.

Crain, R., & Weisman, C. (1972). *Discrimination, personality, and achievement.* New York: Seminar Pre

Cusson, M. (1981). *Why delinquency?* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Cvaraceus, W., & Miller, W. (1964). *Delinquency behavior: Culture and the individual.* Washington, D National Education Association.

Dent, H. (1976). Assessing black children for mainstream placement. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Mainstream and the minority child.* Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

DeStefano, A. (1988, May 10). New York teens anti-gay, poll finds. *Newsday,* p. 3.

Eitzen, S. (1985). *In conflict and order: Understanding society* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ekstrom, R., Goertz, M., Pollack, J., & Rock, D. (1987). Who drops out of high school and why? Findin from a national study. In G. Natriello (Ed.), *School dropouts: Patterns and policies* (p. 5). New Yo Teachers College Press.

Epps, E. (1975, Spring). Impact of school desegregation in aspirations, self-concepts, and other aspects personality. *Law and Contemporary Problems,* pp. 300-313.

Farrell, E. (1990). *Hanging in and dropping out: Voices of at-risk high school students.* New York: Teache College Press.

Farrington, D. P. (1986). The sociocultural context of childhood disorders. In H. C. Quay & J. S. We (Eds.), *Psychopathological disorders of childhood* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley. [as cited in J. Kauffm (1989). *Characteristics of behavior disorders of children and youth* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill

Ferguson, R. F., & Jackson, M. (1990). *An essay on nurturing environments: African-American males a drugs.* Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Cambrid MA.

Figuero, R., & Gallego, E. (1978). Ethnic differences in school behavior. *Sociology of Education, 51,* 2[illegible] 298.

Fine, M. (1988). Sexuality, schooling, and adolescent females: The missing discourse of desire. *Harvard Educational Review, 58,* 29-53.
Flax, E. (1990, February 7). Special problems of homosexual students need special attention, advocates urge. *Education Week,* pp. 1 & 24.
Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? *Harvard Educational Review, 58,* 54-84.
Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting white.' *Urban Review, 18,* 176-206.
Forness, S., & Knitzer, J. (1991). *A new proposed definition and terminology to replace 'serious emotional disturbance' in individuals with disabilities education act.* Alexandria, VA: National Mental Health and Special Education Coalition.
Foster, H. (1986). *Ribbin', jivin', and playin' the dozens.* New York: Ballantine.
Friends of Project 10. (1989). *Project 10 handbook.* (Available from Friends of Project 10, 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90046)
Garcia, R. (1978). *Fostering a pluralistic society through multi-ethnic education.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
Garrison, M., & Hammill, D. (1971). Who are the retarded? *Exceptional Children, 38,* 13-20.
Gay, G. (1975, October). Cultural differences important in the education of black children. *Momentum,* pp. 30-33.
Gibson, M. (1988). *Accommodation without assimilation: Sikh immigrants in an American high school.* New York: Cornell University Press.
Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom.* New York: Harper & Row.
Goleman, D. (1992, April 21). Black scientists study the 'pose' of the inner city. *New York Times,* pp. C1-2.
Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1990). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Gordon, E., & Thomas, K. (1990). Reading and other forms of literacy: Implications for teaching and learning. *Journal of Negro Education, 59*(1), 70-76.
Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1990). *Turning on learning.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Gregory, S. S. (1992, March 16). The hidden hurdle. *Time,* pp. 44-46.
Grier, W., & Cobbs, P. (1968). *Black rage.* New York: Basic Books.
Grossman, H. (1984). *Educating Hispanic students: Cultural implications for instruction, classroom management, counseling, and assessment.* Springfield, IL: Thomas.
Grossman, H. (1990). *Trouble-free teaching: Solutions to behavior problems in the classroom.* Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
Hanna, J. (1988). *Disruptive school behavior: Class, race, and culture.* New York: Holmes & Meier.
Hare, B. (1977). Racial and socioeconomic variations in preadolescent area-specific and general esteem. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1*(3).
Harrington, C. (1975). A psychological anthropologist's view of ethnicity and schooling. *IRCD Bulletin, 10*(4), 2-12.
Harrison-Ross, P., & Wyden, B. (1973). *The black child.* Berkeley, CA: Medallion.
Havinghurst, R., & Levine, D. (1971). *Education in metropolitan areas.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Henkin, A., & Nguyen, L. (1981). *Between two cultures: The Vietnamese in America.* Saratoga, CA: Rand.
Henry, W. (1990, April 9). Beyond the melting pot. *Time,* p. 28.
Hetrick, E. S., & Martin, A. D. (1987). *Developmental issues and their resolution for gay and lesbian adolescents.* New York: Hawthorn Press.
Horton, P., & Hunt, C. (1968). *Sociology* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
Houston, S. (1973). Black English. *Psychology Today, 4,* 45-48.
Hunter, J., & Schaecher, R. (1987). Stresses on lesbian and gay adolescents in schools. *Social Work in Education, 9,* 180-189.
Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1990). Cooperative small-group learning. *NASSP Curriculum Report, 14*(1), 1-4.
Jones, V. (1991). Responding to students' behavior problems. *Beyond Behavior, 2*(1), 13-16.
Kauffman, J. (1989). *Characteristics of behavior disorders of children and youth* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Kebschull, A., & Rogg, E. (1974). Teacher as advocate. In L. Golubchick & B. Persky (Eds.), *Urban, social, and educational issues* (pp. 216-219). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
Kochman, T. (1976). *Rappin' and stylin' out.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Kronus, S. (1971). *The black middle class.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Kunjufu, J. (1984). *Developing positive self-images and discipline in black children.* Chicago, IL: African-American Images.
Laosa, L. M. (1977). Inequality in the classroom: Observational research on teacher-student interactions. *Atzlan: International Journal of Chicano Studies Research, 8,* 51-67.
Lauritzen, P., & Friedman, S. (1991). Teachers for children with emotional/behavioral disorders:

Education's greatest challenge? *Preventing School Failure, 35*(2), 11-15.
Leone, P., Price, T., & Vitolo, R. (1986). Appropriate education for all incarcerated youth: Meeting the sp of P.L. 94-142 in youth detention facilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(4), 9-14.
Levin, H. (1987). *New schools for the disadvantaged.* Unpublished paper prepared for Stanford Universi Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Stanford, CA.
Liebow, E. (1967). *Tally's corner: A study of Negro streetcorner men.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
Light, H., & Martin, R. (1985). Guidance of American Indian children. *Journal of American Indi Education, 25*(1), 42-46.
Martin, A. D. (1988, September 1). Young, gay — and afraid. *New York Times,* p. C1.
Mattison, R. E., Morales, J., & Bauer, M. A. (1992). Distinguishing characteristics of elementary scho boys recommended for SED placement. *Behavioral Disorders, 17,* 107-114.
Maxwell, M. (1974). Major urban school problems of the seventies. In L. Golubchick & B. Persky (Eds *Urban, social, and educational issues.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
McDonnell, L. (1989). Restructuring American schools: The promise and pitfalls. *ERIC Clearinghouse Urban Education Digest* (Vol. 57). New York: Columbia University Teachers College.
McIntyre, T. (1991). Understanding and defusing the streetcorner behavior of urban black socially mala justed youth. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr., S. A. DiGangi, & S. R. Mathur (Eds.), *Severe Behav Disorders of Children and Youth* (Vol. 14, pp. 85-97). Reston, VA: Council for Children wi Behavioral Disorders.
McIntyre, T. (1992a). The culturally sensitive disciplinarian. In R. B. Rutherford, Jr. & S. R. Mathur (Eds *Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth* (Vol. 15, pp. 112-120). Reston, VA: Council f Children with Behavioral Disorders.
McIntyre, T. (1992b). The 'invisible culture' in our schools: Gay and lesbian youth. *Beyond Behavior, 3*(6-12.
McIntyre, T. (1992c). A primer on cultural diversity for educators. *Multicultural Forum, 1*(1), 6 & 13.
McIntyre, T. (1992d). Viewing classroom behavior and discipline from a multicultural perspectiv *Multicultural Forum, 1*(2), 13-16.
McIntyre, T. (in press). Teaching urban behavior disordered youth. In R. Peterson & S. Isshi-Jordan (Eds *Behavior disorders in the context of culture and community.* Boston, MA: Brookline Press.
McIntyre, T., & Silva, P. (1992). *Are you a 'good' teacher of behavior disordered students? A data base analysis of what our students think.* Baltimore, MD: The Council for Exceptional Children.
McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools.* New York: Free Press.
Mercer, R. (1971). Sociocultural factors in labeling mental retardates. *Peabody Journal of Education, 4* 188-203.
Miller, W. (1959). Implications of urban lower class culture for social work. *Social Service Review, 33,* 23 234.
National Education Association. (1988, July 7). *Resolution* adopted at the NEA Convention, New Orlear LA.
National Information Center for Children and Youth with Handicaps. (1988). *Minority issues in special ed cation: A portrait of the future.* Washington, DC: Author.
Natriello, G. (Ed.). (1987). *School dropouts: Patterns and policies.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Ogbu, J. (1988). Class stratification, racial stratification, and schooling. In L. Weiss (Ed.), *Class, race, ar gender in American education* (pp. 163-171). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Ogbu, J. (1990). Minority education in comparative perspective. *Journal of Negro Education, 59*(1), 45-57
Panel to urge education bill of rights for Indians. (1991, August 1). *Education Week,* p. 44.
Peterson, R. (1992, September 9). Correspondence sent to members of the Executive Committee and th Advocacy and Governmental Relations Committee of the Council for Children with Behavior Disorders.
Petroni, F. (1970). Uncle Toms: White stereotypes in the black movement. *Human Organization, 29,* 260-26
Proposed EBD definition update. (1992, February). *CCBD Newsletter,* p. 4.
Pusch, M. (Ed.). (1979). *Multicultural education.* Intercultural Press.
Quality Education for Minorities. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of mino ties.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Ray, L., & Johnson, N. (1983). Adolescent suicide. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62,* 132.
Remafedi, G. (1987). Homosexual youth: A challenge to contemporary society. *Journal of the America Medical Association, 258,* 222-225.
Rigg, C. (1982). Homosexuality in adolescence. *Pediatric Annals, 11,* 826-831.
Roberts, H. (1987). *The inner world of the black juvenile delinquent.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Robinson, G., & Martin, A. (1983). *Problems and issues in the delivery of services to gay and lesbi youth: A needs survey.* New York: IPLGY.
Roesler, R., & Deisher, R. (1972). Youthful male homosexuality. *Journal of the American Medic Association, 219,* 1018-1023.

Rosenfeld, G. (1971). *Shut those thick lips! A study of slum school failure.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
Safer, D. J. (1982). *School programs for disruptive adolescents.* Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
Scanzioni, J. (1977). *The black family in modern society: Patterns of stability and security.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Scherer, K., Abeles, R., & Fischer, C. (1975). *Human aggression and conflict.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Schmidt, P. (1990, February 7). Web of factors said to influence children's view on moral issues. *Education Week.*
Silverstein, B., & Krate, R. (1975). *Children of the dark ghetto: A developmental psychology.* New York: Praeger.
Sosa, A. (1990, March). Making education work for Mexican-Americans: Promising community practices. *ERIC Digest: Clearinghouse on Rural and Small Schools,* p. 5. (EDO-RC-90-2)
Steinberg, Z. (1991). Pandora's children. *Beyond Behavior, 2*(3), 5-14.
Strom, R. (1965). *Teaching in the slum school.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Sugai, G. (1988). Educational assessment of culturally diverse and behavior disordered students: An examination of critical effect. In A. Ortiz & B. Ramirez (Eds.), *Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions* (pp. 63-75). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
Sugai, G., & Maheady, L. (1988, Fall). Cultural diversity and individual assessment for behavior disorders. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* pp. 27-31.
Takaki, R. (1979). *Iron cages: Race and culture in nineteenth century America.* New York: Knopf.
Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand.* New York: Ballantine.
Tartagni, D. (1978, September). Counseling gays in a school setting. *School Counselor,* pp. 26-32.
Toth, M. K. (1990). *Understanding and treating conduct disorders.* Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
Tracy, L. (1990, September 12). School gayze. *Outweek,* pp. 38-85.
Urbanski, C. (1986). Forward. In H. Foster's *Ribbin', jivin', and playin' the dozens* (pp. xi-xii). New York: Ballantine.
Uribe, V. (1989a). Homophobia — What is it and who it hurts. In Friends of Project 10 (Eds.), *Project 10 handbook: Addressing lesbian and gay issues in our schools.* [Available from Friends of Project 10, 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90046]
Uribe, V. (1989b). A school district's dream. In Friends of Project 10 (Eds.), *Project 10 handbook: Addressing lesbian and gay issues in our schools.* [Available from Friends of Project 10, 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90046]
Valentine, B. (1978). *Hustling and other hard work: Life styles in the ghetto.* New York: Free Press.
Vasquez-Nuttall, E., & Romero-Garcia, I. (1989). From home to school: Puerto Rican girls learn to be students in the United States. In C. Garcia-Coll & M. Mattel (Eds.), *The psychosocial development of Puerto Rican women* (pp. 60-83). New York: Praeger.
Viadero, D. (1992, April 29). New definition of 'emotionally disturbed' sought. *Education Week,* p. 24.
Weinberg, L. A. (1992). The relevance of choice in distinguishing seriously emotionally disturbed from socially maladjusted students. *Behavioral Disorders, 17,* 99-106.
Wells, A. (1988). Urban teacher recruitment programs. *ERIC Digest.* Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
West, D., & Farrington, D. (1973). *Who becomes delinquent?* London: Heineman.
Whitlock, K. (1989). *Bridges of respect: Creating support for lesbian and gay youth.* Philadelphia, PA: American Friends Service Committee.
Wilson, R. (1988). Recruiting and retaining minority teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 57,* 195-201.
Wilson, W. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Wolf, M. M., Braukman, C. J., & Ramp, K. A. (1987). Serious delinquent behavior as part of a significantly handicapping condition: Cures and supportive environments. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 20,* 305-312.
Yates, J. R. (1988). Demography as it affects special education. In A. Ortiz & B. Ramirez (Eds.), *Schools and culturally diverse exceptional students* (pp. 1-5). Reston, VA: ERIC/The Council for Exceptional Children.

Thomas McIntyre, Department of Special Education, Hunter College, New York, New York 10021

Received 20 January 1992
Initial acceptance 15 March 1992
(Final acceptance 17 June 1992)