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ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship of the high school principal and school climate with regard to special education. Perceptions of principals and general and special education teachers regarding school climate were measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Rutgers Secondary (OCDQ-RS) (Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp, 1991). Perceptions of principal behaviors with regard to special education were measured by the Special Education Principal Behavior Profile (SEPB), developed as a portion of this study.

Findings suggested that principals and special education teachers have significantly different perceptions of school climate. Principal behaviors related to special education which were moderately correlated with the openness factor of school climate on the OCDQ-RS include making programmatic changes to meet the needs of disabled students, providing special education students with an opportunity to schedule general education classes, interacting with disabled students, and enforcing the laws and regulations and supervising the IEP process. Other principal behaviors include assisting disabled students and special education classes. Issues related to hiring practices were also identified.

The perceptions of special education teachers and principals differed significantly in six areas. These include supervising the IEP process, reviewing IEP records and advising staff of special education laws and regulations. Principals and special education teachers also differed in their perceptions
regarding equal access to school resources, reviewing and revising school goals, and that students with disabilities were included in goals for the school.

Case studies were conducted on two high schools that received paired dichotomous scores on the OCDQ-RS and the SEPBP. Those findings indicated that both principals were minimally involved in special education programs. Responsibilities involving special education were delegated to a department head and/or an assistant principal. Supportive principal behaviors, consistency in staff, and student integration in the school and the community were primary contributors to the success or lack of success experienced by students and teachers.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Most special education programs are part of the local schools due to the requirements of Public Law 101-476 (previously Public Law 94-142). Public Law 101-476, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, establishes procedures for the identification, evaluation, and placement of students thought to be disabled. Public Law 101-476 mandates that students receive a free, appropriate education in their least restrictive environment. For the vast majority of students, this is within their neighborhood schools. Due to this factor, the principal is responsible for implementation of most of the aspects specified in Public Law 101-476 (Burrello, Schrup, and Barnett, 1988; Rebore, 1979; and Vegason, 1975).

Research in special education has focused primarily upon how school systems and principals have worked through the implementation of Public Law 94-142 or specific strategies to assist teachers in working with students evidencing learning and/or behavioral disabilities (SRI International and Education Turnkey Systems, Inc., 1979; Mayer, 1982; Jordan and Ericksen, 1986). Raske (1979) reports that the administration of special education programs by general school administrators has received limited attention from educational researchers.

Over the past decade, research in education has focused upon effective programs and schools (Rosenholtz, 1985; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Zirkel
body of research, specific attention has been given to the leadership qualities of the principal, the climate of schools, the organization of schools, and student achievement, among other topics. Perusal of this body of literature indicated little reference to special education, its leadership, and school climate.

The literature clearly depicts the principal as one of the most important factors in the way schools function. The principal has the authority to make changes or maintain the status of many things that take place in schools.

The point is that the principal does indeed make a difference in the life of a school, however that difference may be characterized. Even by doing nothing, the principal affects the life of a school, if for no other reason even by doing nothing he or she creates a fragmented system in which people work and survive as best they can (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986, p. 3).

Likewise, many refer to the principal as the key to successful implementation of special education programs (Howe, 1986; Yates, 1976; Podemski, 1984; and Mayer, 1982). Principals are considered to be the key to special education programs because they are at the building level and have the influence to make a difference. Van Horne, Burrello, and DeClue (1992) state that “a shared responsibility for students with disabilities which starts with principals assuming ownership of special education program is the key to an effective education for all students” (p. 53).

Research in educational administration has resulted in the formulation of various theories and frameworks that investigate the relationship of principals and various indices of the school organization (e.g. Ellett & Walberg, 1979; Pitner,
1986; Duckworth, 1983; and Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982). Most of these suggest school climate as an impacted variable.

Educational researchers identify principals as a key variable in the ways schools function. Little is known, however, about how specific principal behaviors regarding special education affect school climate. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between principal behaviors regarding special education and school climate.

**Principal Behaviors and School Climate**

Pitner (1988) reviewed four models or conceptual frameworks regarding administrator influence and effects. All four frameworks hypothesize the relationship of the principal, school climate and student outcomes, although the causal order of variables differ. Ellett and Walberg (1979) suggest that the principal influences perception, intention, and behavior of teachers, students, parents, and others. In the Bossert et al. (1982) framework, principal behavior, operating through influence mode and activities, directly affects patterns of climate and instructional organization. Pitner (1986) suggests that instrumental and supportive principal behaviors are intervening variables. Duckworth (1983) contends that the principal's work structure impacts school climate and organization.

Bossert et al. (1982) hypothesized that the principal indirectly shapes student learning through his or her impact upon school climate and instructional
organization. Their findings indicate that the managerial behavior of the principal affects school effectiveness. Bossert et al. (1982) found that effective principals provide strong leadership, establish violence-free school climates conducive to school learning, emphasize the importance of basic skills to staff and students, instill an expectation for high achievement in the school, and monitor the teaching process as well as the student achievement in the building (p. 51).

There appear to be linkages among principal behaviors and school climate.

Burrello et al. (1988) adapted Bossert et al.’s (1982) framework to include elements drawn from the special education management literature. They added one element and several sub-elements to this framework to reflect key activities mandated by Public Law 94-142 and its amendments. These additions are documented in the literature as essential in the implementation of special education programs.

**Principal Behaviors**

Weller (1987) discussed the role of the principal in promoting effective schooling and found that it is through a myriad of activities that the principal becomes the catalyst for effective schools and promotes its most desired outcome - demonstrated student achievement. Those activities include promoting instructional efficiency in the classroom, frequently visiting and observing in classrooms, providing time for teacher planning, and implementing inservice programs.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) specify that principals in effective schools hold multiple goals for schooling. The process of achieving these goals is
ambiguous, complex, dynamic and personal. Principals in effective schools are actively involved in academic decisions and facilitate the instructional purposes of their schools.

Bossert et al. (1982) found that the managerial behavior of principals is important to school effectiveness. They found that no single style of management is appropriate for all schools. Principals' work activities were affected by several variables such as the size and shape of the administrative hierarchy, characteristics of the staff and students, the socioeconomic context of the school, the principal's background and experience, technology, and funding from the state and federal governments.

Bossert et al. (1982) identified the following routine behaviors of principals as important elements within their framework of instructional leadership: Goal setting and planning; monitoring; evaluating; communicating; scheduling, allocating resources and organizing; staffing; modeling; governing; and filling in. Burrello et al. (1988) added some principal behaviors related to special education including building a true consensus, monitoring the referral and Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) processes, conferencing and other sub-elements under communicating, and team building and delegating.

Culbertson (1976) contends that principals are dependent upon data made available to the directors of special education, but that principals are more critical in developing a broad-based understanding of special education at the school
level. He further indicated that leadership of principals is dependent upon the learning experiences provided to them.

Rebore (1979) reported that strong leadership is required of the principal if Public Law 94-142 is to be effectively implemented. He stated that school personnel will not be able to cope with changes such as mainstreaming, if principals do not foster a growth-producing atmosphere. Similarly, Campbell (1971) reported that principals are the key because the individual school is the center for all teaching and learning.

Cline (1981) conducted a study of principals in a large school district regarding their knowledge and attitude about students with disabilities. One of the major findings of the study was the lack of principals' knowledge concerning handicapped students. "Since the principal is, indeed, the school's gatekeeper, mainstreaming has a poorer chance of success if the principal is not knowledgeable concerning the educational needs of children to be managed (p. 174)."

Burrello and Sage (1979) indicated that the degree of program success is directly related to the building administrator's ability to take risks and achieve personal growth. Howe (1981) suggested that the building principal is the key to educational growth. Principals have direct influence over what takes place in the school. Their attitudes, feelings, and opinions are conveyed in their actions.

Effectiveness Indicators for Special Education (Center for Resource Management, Inc., 1986) summarizes the principal's role in special education as
assuming responsibility for ensuring the effectiveness of the programs in their schools by taking part in planning and program development and by directly supervising the IEP process in their schools. These data are based upon many of the studies from the effective schools research (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Bossert et al., 1982; Lipman, 1981; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rutter et al., 1979).

Research findings on school effects from general education programs have been the primary impetus in special education, with minimal research in the field of special education. Burrello et al. (1988) adapted Bossert et al.'s (1982) framework to address the principal's role in special education. In this study, I will provide a preliminary examination of how high school principals' behaviors may affect special education programs.

Climate

Anderson (1982) stated that school climate is a construct whose definition is somewhat elusive, complex, and difficult to measure. She points out that definitions of climate often differ, although their roots are common. Although there has been considerable debate regarding the theory base, variables that should be studied, units of measurement, and validity of qualitative data, some common conclusions are emerging in the literature. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) indicate "that the climate of an organization may be roughly conceived as the 'personality' of the organization; that is climate is to organization as personality is to individual" (p. 4).
Hoy et al. (1991) describe two basic dimensions of secondary school climate as openness and intimacy. These dimensions are derived from two aspects of principal behavior - supportive and directive and three aspects of teacher interactions - engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. The behaviors of principal and teachers are described as follows:

Open principal behavior is reflected in genuine relationships with teachers where the principal creates a supportive environment, encourages teacher participation and contribution, and frees teachers from routine busywork so they can concentrate on teaching. In contrast, closed principal behavior is rigid, close, and nonsupportive. Open teacher behavior is characterized by sincere, positive, and supportive relationships with students, administrators, and colleagues; teachers are committed to their school and the success of their students. They find the work environment facilitating rather than frustrating (p. 60-61).

Research on how special education and overall school climate are related is scarce. It is not clear whether general and special education teachers perceive school climate in the same manner. However, there are studies in which researchers investigate issues relevant to special education and school climate, such as mainstreaming and cooperation among faculty members—both special and general education.

The principal's ability to foster cooperation between general and special education staff is an important determinant in the success that he/she has in fulfilling special education responsibilities according to Podemski (1984). Gage (1979) similarly stated that the ultimate success of mainstreaming is dependent upon the leadership of building principals.
Several studies reported difficulties with mainstreaming students with disabilities. For example, Halpern and Benz (1987) reported that regular education teachers do not have the skills to modify their instructional procedures for students with disabilities and some regular teachers do not wish to teach students with disabilities. Gersten, Walker, and Darch (1988) found that the general education teachers who would be most likely to maximize the achievement gains of students with disabilities are also the most likely to resist their placement in their classes. The behaviors and attitudes of teachers are felt to impact school climate. Therefore, one could conclude that general education teachers' attitudes regarding disabled students may affect school climate.

Statement of the Problem

Educational researchers have identified the principalship as a key variable in the ways schools function. Little is known about the principal's relationship to special education programs nor how specific principal behaviors regarding special education affect school climate. The major problem examined in this study is: What principal behaviors related to special education affect school climate?

Research Questions

I addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of principals, general and special education teachers with regard to school climate?

2. Which specific principal behaviors with regard to special education are significantly correlated with school climate?
3. Is there a significant difference in the perception of special education teachers and principals with regard to principal behaviors related to special education?

In addition, I addressed the following objectives:

1. To identify and describe principals' perceptions of their behavior regarding special education programs in their building.

2. To identify and describe how the principals' behaviors and beliefs regarding special education are perceived by special education teachers.

3. To determine the perceived impact of the principals' behaviors and beliefs on the acceptance of special education programs in the school building.

Insight into these questions will contribute valuable information to administrators regarding their effectiveness in special education and how principal behaviors related to special education influence school climate. Survey research utilizing quantitative and qualitative methods are used in this study. In the qualitative portion of this study, I gathered in-depth information on outlier schools identified as a result of the quantitative data collection.

Definitions

Principal Behaviors: For the purpose of this research, principal behaviors are defined by the model proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) and include the following: Goal setting and planning; monitoring; evaluating; communication; modeling; staffing; filling-in; governing; team building and delegating; and scheduling, allocating resources and organizing. Goal setting has been identified
by several researchers as a key component in the effective schools research (Rosenholtz, 1985; Hallinger, Bickman and Davis, 1989; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Hoy & Ferguson, 1985). Monitoring, evaluating, and staffing are principal behaviors identified by Dwyer (1985) as important elements in the Bossert et al. (1982) framework. VanHorne (1989) and DeClue (1990) found these principal behaviors to be relevant in the field of special education. Principal communication has also been identified as an important variable (Bossert et al., 1982; Miskel, McDonald, & Bloom, 1983; Byrk, Lee, & Smith, 1990; and Blaze, 1989).

School Climate: For the purpose of this research, school climate is defined as the quality of the school environment that is experienced by participants, which affects their behavior, and is based on the collective perception of behavior in the school (Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy and Miskel, 1987; and Togiuri, 1968).

Students with Disabilities: These students are identified in accordance with Louisiana Bulletin 1508, Revised 1983 and 1993. This includes students with mild disabilities such as learning disabilities, mild mental disablities, and behavior disorders. It also includes students with low incidence disabilities such as multidisabled, severe mental disablities, and other health impairments.

Significance of the Study

The effective schools literature involving the principal's role has not directed specific attention to special education. Sapon-Shevin (1987) aptly points out that
there is an absence of substantial attention to special education within major national reports such as those presented by the Heritage Foundation (1984), and the National Coalition of Advocates for Students (1985). Lilly (1987) reports that there is a lack of focus on special education in the Sizer (1984), Boyer (1983), and Goodlad (1984) reports, as well as, A Nation at Risk (1983).

Research has shown that principal behaviors are important determinants in the success of school programs. Research investigating the role of the principal as related to school climate in special education is necessary to better prepare principals to meet the needs of special education students at the school level.

Special and general education programs are administered by principals in different ways. Federal and state laws relevant to special education programs require specific actions that must be carried out at the school level. Few general education programs require such explicit direction and involvement. For example, the identification of disabled students must be initiated at the school level under the direction of principals.

Special education programs are also unique, in that they permeate all other programs. At the high school level, many programs and departments function independently of each other. Special education procedures, IEPs, and mainstreaming are common to all of these programs and departments.

The results of this study may also extend to the university level in preparing prospective principals. Preparation in special education would assist principals in becoming more knowledgeable of various disabilities as well as federal and state
regulations. Additionally, principals may be encouraged to develop goals for schools that would coincide with the spirit of Public Law 101-476.

Summary of Chapters

In Chapter 2, I provide a review of selected literature. I review the studies of the models proposed by Bossert et al. (1982) and Burrello et al. (1988) discussed briefly in this chapter, the literature on principal and leadership behaviors, the literature on school climate, and literature related to these areas in special education.

In Chapter 3, I describe the procedures for conducting this study. Included is a description of the sample, the methodology, instruments, and data collection and analysis procedures.

In Chapter 4, I present quantitative data collected to address the research questions proposed in Chapter 1.

In Chapter 5, I summarize the qualitative data collected on two schools identified as outliers considering the quantitative data collected on school climate and principal behaviors related to special education.

In Chapter 6, the qualitative data is analyzed. The proposed research questions are also discussed.

In Chapter 7, I summarize the study. I include the conclusions reached, implications and the recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Considerable research has focused upon the role of the principal and school improvement. School climate has been linked to the role of the principal. Several frameworks have been developed to examine and explain the relationship of the principal to the school. Minimal research has been conducted to examine the role of the principal in the area of special education. In this chapter, I examine the literature relevant to these areas in an effort to support the need to identify principal behaviors related to special education that affect school climate.

Research strategies to identify relevant literature included reviewing numerous computer searches from various data bases; journals likely to contain information relevant to my study; bibliographies of several studies, articles and texts; and volumes of Dissertations Abstracts International. Computer searches were obtained from the following data bases: Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Resources in Education (RIE), Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), Exceptional Child Education Resources (ECER), and Dissertation Abstracts International. Examples of journals frequently reviewed include Exceptional Children, Educational Leadership, and Education Administration Quarterly. Papers presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association were also requested.

First, I discuss principal leadership. Information pertinent to school climate is discussed in the next section. Much of the research in these areas is
overlapping and may be considered in any of the categories. Due to the focus of this study at the secondary level, information is presented relevant to school level. Some of the major theoretical frameworks proposed to examine this relationship are discussed. In closing, information pertaining to the field of special education is presented.

Principal Leadership

In Boyan's (1988) review on the study of administrators and their behavior, he found that approximately 50 facets of administrator behavior have been investigated. Basically three broad areas have been found to affect administrator behavior: 1) personal or individual traits and characteristics, 2) intraorganizational, school district, or institutional characteristics, and 3) extraorganizational, extradistrict or community components. While there has been extensive research in all of these areas, minimal explanation for administrator behavior has been provided, separately or collectively. The framework for this section will follow Boyan's categories and conclude with a discussion of effective principal behaviors.

Personal Characteristics/Traits

Gorton and McIntyre (1979) addressed the effective senior high school principal in a portion of a report published by the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP). The central purpose of this study was to identify personal qualities, professional behavior, and situational factors
associated with being an effective high school principal. They caution that no final and fully definitive profile of an effective principal is presented.

Their findings support the situational and contingency models of leadership which contend that there is no unique leadership style that is effective for all situations. Qualities of principals that were identified by a majority interviewed include hard working, dedicated individuals, concerned about students, and that were involved in improving opportunities for learning in their schools. Generally, principals were found to be people oriented.

McCleary and Thompson (1979) compiled the summary report on the Senior High School Principalship for NASSP. Their findings suggest that "those who attain success in the principalship are able, adaptable individuals who can function in an evolving role. They know how to 'read' their institutions and communities with clarity and they act with assurance (p. 55)."

Dwyer (1986) reported the findings of an extensive study of seven principals. Five major themes emerged from his study: 1) principals act with purpose, 2) principals have a multi-faceted image of schools, 3) routine principal behaviors are used to progress toward goals, 4) principals engage in the same kind of behaviors (with the most time spent on communication), and 5) principals' behavior varies to suit the context and purpose.

Intraorganizational and Extraorganizational Factors

Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1990) identified sources of obstacles for principals and reported that principals have moderate concerns regarding these.
Obstacles associated with the school system appear to present the greatest
difficulties. Highly effective principals were found to be more reflective and to
refine these processes. More effective principals were found to be influenced by
their beliefs concerning the role and responsibilities of the principal. Effective
principals were also found to derive more personal enjoyment from problem
solving, and were therefore more proactive in dealing with school problems.

Principals revealed concerns about excessive paperwork, numerous district
meetings, and a lack of clarity in their job descriptions. It was reported that
principals are generally not planning to stay in the principalship. Findings from
Gorton and McIntyre (1979) indicate that significant others (e.g. teachers, board
members, and superintendents) are typically not knowledgeable about the
principal's job and job performance. Because these significant others represent
various groups and viewpoints, somewhat differing views of the principalship
emerge.

McCleary and Thompson (1979) suggested that three external forces are
likely to affect secondary school principals regardless of economic conditions: 1)
the public will expect to participate in setting objectives for school and expect
progress reports; 2) a decline of 15% in enrollment; and 3) an increase in new
methodology, technology, and courses arising from social demands. The key
will be for the principal to manage change so that students acquire expected
outcomes, within a system that must operate from a reduced size and resource
base.
As a complex organization, the high school will continue to require principals with advanced preparation, experience, maturity, human sensitivity, and intellectual assessment of social/political climates and their educational implications according to McCleary and Thompson (1979). Another factor that must be considered is the involvement of the school with the community. This is expected to include teacher bargaining units, as well as other professional organizations. The movement to local school autonomy and accountability also poses some challenges for the future high school principal.

Time management will be required to avoid an overload due to externally imposed requirements such as due process, accountability, union contracts, and mandated programs. Processes and procedures will not be emphasized as much as outcomes. Management techniques are expected to become more standardized. Good problem solving and communication skills combined with persons motivated and flexible to respond to change are qualities sought to prepare individuals to become high school principals.

The study of extraorganizational variables has confirmed that school systems are open systems and that there are a number of operative conditions, like socioeconomic status (SES) and governmental mandates, that influence the system (Boyan, 1988). However, precisely defining what is influenced and exactly how it is influenced continues to be a task of future research. According to Leithwood et al. (1990), research should investigate the influences on principals' practices, especially to clarify the nature of relationships among
external influences, internal influences, and principals' practices. How effective practice develops is also in need of further research.

**Effective Principal Behaviors**

Martin and Willower (1981) used the structured observation technique developed by Mintzberg to study five high school principals. This resulted in a characterization of school administration that paralleled private sector management in many respects. A pattern of task allocation with five basic categories resulted from this analysis.

The five categories are as follows: 1) organizational maintenance tasks required 36.5% of principals' time. This primarily included scheduling classes, arranging transportation, providing information to parents, and dealing with school attendance. 2) Working with the school's academic program took 17.4% of the principals' time. Tasks in this category included non-routine curricular activities such as changes in course content, implementation of new teaching strategies, or dealing with matters of pupil personnel services. 3) Pupil control required 23.8% of the time. This involved directly disciplining students or discussing problems with teachers or parents. 4) The school extra curricular activities accounted for 14.7% of the principals' time. 5) The last category was labeled undetermined and included those contacts unrelated to school affairs and of a personal nature. This accounted for an insignificant amount of principals' time.
Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983) concluded that a strong instructional leader is involved in three primary activities: 1) defining the mission, 2) managing curriculum and instruction, and 3) promoting a positive school climate. Within the context of these three areas, specific principal behaviors are identified. Many of these behaviors are seen as central themes throughout this body of literature.

Identifying a vision, mission, or goal statement is a central point for principals in the works of Hallinger et al. (1983), Leithwood and Montgomery (1986), Dwyer (1986), and Manasse (1985). Several studies point out that the development of this vision should be a collaborative effort that is shared with all vested parties. The development of this mission or vision statement should include long and short term goals.

Managing curriculum and instruction involves various principal activities. Hallinger et al. (1983) suggested that the principal should be knowledgeable of the curriculum, supervise and evaluate the instruction, coordinate the curriculum, and monitor student performance. Rosenholtz (1985) reported that effective principals convey the message that teachers can improve student performance and all students can learn. Weller (1987) suggested coordinating instructional programs through the use of lead teachers, which is part of managing the curriculum and instruction.

Promoting a positive learning climate has also been considered to be an important principal behavior. Hallinger et al. (1983) reported that the principal
should have high expectations and incentives for learning, protect instructional
time, and promote instructional improvement and professional development. The
works of Manasse (1985), Rosenholtz (1985), and Weller (1987) emphasize the
importance of promoting a positive learning climate by identifying similar
principal behaviors.

Manasse (1985) pointed out that principal effectiveness is more difficult to
define than school effectiveness. This may be due in part to the multitude of
factors that intervene between the action of the principal and any measure of
school effectiveness. Despite disagreement regarding the definition of an
effective principal, it is agreed that students perform well academically, school
communities feel a common sense of purpose and feel positive about what is
happening at the effective school.

Wimpleberg (1993) reviewed the role of the principal as a portion of the ten
year study by Teddlie and Stringfield (1993) on school effects. Results indicated
that the principal is at the heart of a complex system of relationships that impact
school effectiveness which are translated into student learning and well-being.
Generally, these relationships appear to be disconnected. However, this climate
of disconnectedness may be modified by more effective principals.

Summary

In examining effective schools, it becomes evident that the behavior of
principals is an important concept. Miskel (1977) stated that effectiveness is not
an absolute concept, that it varies within differing requirements as the school
conditions change. He further reported that effectiveness is contingent upon the consistency of the principal's behavior. Miskel found that the perceived effectiveness of the principal is closely related to the climate of the school.

It is clear that researchers have identified specific principal behaviors that contribute to more effective schools. However, we continue to be confronted with methodological issues surrounding this body of research and plagued by the uncertainty of the definition of the term "effective", which may vary depending upon the circumstances. High school principals work in a more complex organization than elementary school principals. Therefore, high school principals' leadership behaviors differ from elementary principals' behavior. However, we know that it is through a myriad of activities that the principal becomes a catalyst for change (Weller, 1987). For effective principals, this change will focus upon student gains.

School Climate

School climate is not easily defined conceptually. In this section I will begin by providing a definition and framework of school climate found in the literature. I will present characteristics or elements of school climate in terms of previous research. I will also discuss information regarding how principals affect school climate. I will conclude this section with a discussion of measurement and instrumentation for school climate.
Definition

Hoy et al. (1991) described two basic dimensions of secondary school climate as openness and intimacy. These dimensions are derived from two aspects of principal behavior - supportive and directive -- and three aspects of teacher interactions - engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. The aspects of principal and teacher behavior are briefly described below:

Supportive Principal Behavior is characterized by efforts to motivate teachers by using constructive criticism and setting an example through hard work. At the same time, the principal is helpful and genuinely concerned with the personal and professional welfare of teachers. Supportive behavior is directed toward both the social needs and task achievement of the faculty.

Directive Principal Behavior is rigid and domineering supervision. The principal maintains close and constant control over all teachers and school activities down to the smallest detail.

Engaged Teacher Behavior is reflected by high faculty morale. Teachers are proud of their school, enjoy working with each other, and are supportive of their colleagues. Teachers are not only concerned about each other, they are committed to the success of their students. They are friendly with students, trust students, and are optimistic about the ability of their students to succeed.

Frustrated Teacher Behavior refers to a general pattern of interference from both administration and colleagues that distracts from the basic task of teaching. Routine duties, administrative paperwork, and assigned nonteaching duties are excessive; moreover, teachers irritate, annoy, and interrupt each other.

Intimate Teacher Behavior reflects a strong and cohesive network of social relationships among the faculty. Teachers know each other well, are close personal friends, and regularly socialize together (p. 172).
Hoy et al. (1991) found that the principal's influence on student outcomes is indirect. They suggested that the principal's actions should lead to development of a climate with a strong academic emphasis.

Characteristics and Effects of School Climate

For the purpose of this study, I define school climate as the quality of the school environment that is experienced by participants, which affects behavior, and is based upon the collective perception of behavior in the school (Hoy et al., 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 1987, and Tagiuri, 1968). Some of the characteristics of school climate that I will discuss within this section are parental involvement, evaluations and expectations of students, and school environments conducive to change.

In their contextual analysis, McDill, Rigsby, and Meyers (1969) found that a number of the dimensions of educational climate had a moderate effect on mathematical achievement of high school students. Several indicators of the community and measures of school curriculum and facilities do not qualify as sources of variation in school climate according to McDill et al. (1969). Their findings also indicated that parental involvement was one of the contextual variables which is a source of climate effects.

Resources and organizational properties of schools were not found to be significant contributors as sources of school climate (McDill et al., 1969). Per pupil expenditures and starting salaries for teachers were considered as resources. Organizational properties included elements such as volumes in the
school library, use of teaching machines, and the percentage of students attending school in half-day sessions. Results also revealed no clear relationship of class size and learning.

Researchers have concluded that schools vary in effectiveness but the specific characteristics that produce results are somewhat elusive. McDill et al. (1969) suggested that none of the studies to date has provided conclusive data identifying sources of school climate that would lead to policy development and prescriptions for schools.

Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, and Wisenbaker (1978) investigated the relationship between a variety of school level climate variables and mean school achievement. Their findings indicated that some aspects of school social environment clearly make a difference in the academic achievement of schools. Evaluations and expectations of students, students' perceptions of these evaluations and expectations and their feelings about possible success are clearly related to the students' achievement.

A study of school climate in secondary schools indicated that interrelationships among teachers facilitate trust in colleagues according to Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989). The results showed that teachers are a more important factor in fostering trusting relationships with one another as compared to other elements of school climate. While it is difficult to identify how teachers affect school climate, Tarter et al. (1989) suggested that teachers' contributions
to organizational climate need to be considered apart from other elements of the school setting.

Heichberger (1975) contended that there are three vital elements required for an educational climate change to permeate a school. Two of the elements include a philosophical base and the environment. Prior to change, the school must have a philosophical base or point of reference from which to operate. The next element is that of an environment which is conducive to change. The remaining element involves dynamic principal leadership and is discussed in the following section on principals.

Principals and School Climate

Heichberger (1975) identified three primary elements necessary for an educational climate to permeate a school. Two of the elements are a philosophical base and the environment, which are discussed above. The third and most important of these is dynamic leadership of the principal. He purported that the principal should become intimately involved in the teaching and learning. Prior to initiating change and delegating duties, the principal should know the staff well. All three elements are needed to effectively change the educational climate of a school.

Tarter et al. (1989) studied school characteristics and faculty trust in high schools. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Rutgers Secondary (OCDQ-RS) was used to measure different patterns of organizational climate and to predict faculty trust of the principal and colleagues. After
controlling for the other variables of climate, supportive principal behavior was
the only predictor of trust of the principal, and engaged teacher behavior the only
predictor of trust of colleagues.

Tarter et al. (1989) found that the leadership behavior of the principal
predicts trust of the administration. Principals who are helpful and genuinely
concerned about their teachers are more likely to have the trust of their teachers.
Constructive criticism and hard work exhibited by the principal foster trust in the
administration. Their findings indicated that the principal remains the most
important individual in the development of organizational climate.

Measurement and Instrumentation

Anderson (1982) reviewed over 200 references on school climate to
analyze this body of literature. She reported that most of the researchers agree
that outcomes result from a combination of interacting variables; however, there
has been difficulty identifying the variables that best explain climate. The
criticisms of this body of research were found to be very similar to those in
leadership, including poor design and inappropriate analysis (Anderson, 1982).

There are several instruments which purport to assess school climate.
Examples include the Learning Environment Inventory, School Profile Inventory,
Learning Climate Inventory, and Class Activities Questionnaire (Hoyle, English,
& Steffy, 1985). The OCDQ is the most widely used to assess school climate
Miller, 1968; Nwanko, 1979; Sargeant, 1967; Watkins, 1968; Wiggins, 1972; etc.).

Kottkamp, Mulhern, and Hoy (1987) reviewed the process undertaken to revise the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) for secondary schools. The OCDQ was originally developed for use in elementary schools and it was found to be inadequate for secondary schools. The revision of the OCDQ-RS resulted in five subscales, two describing principal behavior and three describing teacher behavior, discussed earlier in this section. Two dimensions of school climate, openness and intimacy, are the final result.

Hoy, Tarter and Bliss (1990) compared the use of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RS) in predicting student achievement and teachers' commitment to the school. The OHI was found to be a better predictor of student achievement and teacher commitment. They suggested that health is a better predictor of goal achievement, innovativeness, loyalty, and cohesiveness; while climate is a better predictor of openness in communication, authenticity, motivation, and participation.

Summary

Generally, school climate still remains an elusive and complex concept. There are possibly many interacting variables associated with school climate. Conceptual and methodological weaknesses are evident in reviewing this literature. Much of the earlier work focused upon elementary schools.
However, the OCDQ-RS has been developed to assess school climate at the secondary level. There are indications that assessing school health may provide a better predictor of student achievement and teacher commitment. However, assessing climate is thought to be a better predictor of openness in communication, authenticity, motivation, and participation.

**Models of Instructional Leadership**

The models or frameworks discussed in this section are presented in an effort to examine the relationship of the principal and school climate. Pitner (1988) reviewed four models or conceptual frameworks regarding administrator influence and effects. "Connections across the institutional, managerial, and technical levels of school organizations and among the five commonplaces of school- subject matter, learners, teachers, administrators, milieu- are portrayed" in the following frameworks (p. 99).

**Framework of Ellett & Walberg**

The framework developed by Ellett and Walberg (1979) indicates that principal effects are mediated by factors within and external to the school environment. They stated that

the framework is not an all-encompassing effort to integrate various theories in educational administration; it is, rather, a merging of general assumptions concerning the model for competency-based education as it has been applied to the principalship, combined with research on the social environment of learning (pp. 140-41).

Ellett and Walberg (1979) posit that causal relations exist between principals' behaviors and key variables in the school environment. They
suggested that the causal behaviors are interactive, with components affecting each other. The framework represents an indirect relationship between principal behaviors and student outcomes (see Figure 2-1).

The theoretical framework proposed by Ellett and Walberg (1979) was studied in Thomas County Schools in Thomasville, Georgia. Results indicated a strong relationship between teachers' perceptions of characteristics of the school environment and their assessment of principal behavior. Descriptions suggest an "ebb and flow of causal functioning runs between principal and teacher and between teacher and student (p. 159)."
Figure 2-1. The Ellett and Walberg Framework of the reciprocal nature of the influence relationship between the principal and other school variables


Framework by Pitner

Pitner's (1986) framework is based upon leadership substitutes acting in the place of leader behaviors, specifically instrumental and/or consideration
behaviors. The theory suggests that leadership may come from other sources and efforts on the part of the administrator to supply it may be unnecessary. Twelve characteristics were identified as potential substitutes for leadership: experience-training, professional orientation, indifference to organizational rewards, task clarity, task-provided feedback, intrinsically satisfying tasks, formalization, rule inflexibility, active advisory staff, cohesive work groups, low position power, and spatial distance between principal and teacher.

According to Pitner's (1986) theory, the presence of a characteristic can influence the effectiveness of a leader in one of the following ways: (1) substitute for instrumental, but not supportive, leader behavior; (2) substitute for supportive, but not instrumental, leader behavior; or (3) substitute for both supportive and instrumental behaviors. A study conducted by Pitner and Stuart (1984) supported the validity of eight of the characteristics as related to school settings. Those characteristics include ability and experience, task provided feedback, intrinsically satisfying tasks, formalization, active advisory-support functions, low position power, cohesive work group, and spatial distance between superior and subordinates.

**Duckworth's Framework**

Duckworth (1983) presents his work in a series of three schematic models: teacher work, school organization and climate, and principal work. Changes in any one of the dimensions of the models initiate subsequent changes in the others. Duckworth contends that principal effects on student outcomes are indirect.
Duckworth's (1983) model of the determinants of teachers' work conditions includes teachers' agenda, incentives, and resources (see Figure 2-2). He also indicates that there are district factors which influence this model, in addition to the principal's work and the school organization and climate. Student work and achievement were also noted as contributing factors.

Duckworth's (1983) model of the determinants of school organization and culture primarily depicts how the principal's work influences school climate and school organization (see Figure 2-3). Other factors impacting school organization and culture are district factors, teacher work, and student work and achievement. Research conducted by Yukl (1981) was used to identify specific administrator behaviors and activities that are likely to influence teacher work agenda and conditions. Some examples of principal behaviors that may influence school climate include showing consideration, managing conflict, representing school needs, sharing participation in decision making, and setting goals (Pitner, 1988).

The last model shows the determinants of principals' work conditions (see Figure 2-4). The main focus is that of the principal's agenda, incentives, and resources (Duckworth, 1983). Other factors included are district factors, principal work, school and organizational climate, teacher work, and student work and achievement.
Figure 2.2 Duckworth's model of the determinants of teachers' work conditions

**PRINCIPAL WORK (Yukl, 1982)**

- Show consideration
- Manage conflict
- Represent school needs
- Share participation in decisions
- Facilitate interaction
- Counsel on careers
- Set goals
- Inspire expectations
- Facilitate work
- Disciplining
- Manage conflict
- Set goals
- Innovate in program
- Delegate autonomy
- Counsel on careers
- Plan curricular development
- Disseminate information
- Emphasize performance
- Monitor program operations
- Praising and recognizing
- Disciplining
- Represents needs
- Innovate in training
- Train and coach
- Counsel on career
- Represent school needs
- Innovate within constraints
- Share participation in decisions
- Problem solve
- Clarify roles
- Delegate autonomy
- Monitor support personnel
- Plan schedule of activities
- Represent school needs
- Manage conflict
- Discipline
- Plan budget, hiring cycles
- Facilitate work
- Structure reward contingencies

**SCHOOL CLIMATE**

- Sense of community
- Collegiality
- Shared goals and expectations
- Order and discipline

**SCHOOL ORGANIZATION**

- Instructional program development: leadership
- Curriculum articulation
- Evaluation
- Recognition of success or failure
- Staff development
- School governance: site management, parental support
- Basic management: rules and procedures
- Schedules
- Boundary maintenance
- Personnel and budget allocations, staff stability

**DISTRICT FACTORS**

- District support
- Professional
- Political
- Moral
- District resources
- District labor relations
- District budget and personnel policies

**TEACHER WORK**

- Participation in committees, staff development events, decision making
- Problem solving and initiation of change
- Communication about students

**STUDENT WORK AND ACHIEVEMENT**

- Level of cooperation (e.g., attendance, attention in class)
- Level and trends in achievement
Figure 2-3 Duckworth's model of the determinants of school organization & culture

DISTRICT FACTORS
- Superintendent priorities
- Policies for principal selection, rotation, evaluation and promotion
- Staff development programs for principals, teachers
- Technical support
- Employment contract language
- Curriculum adoption and development process
- Management functions
- Centralization of administrative resources and authority
- Size, fiscal resources, demography
- Community support

PRINCIPAL AGENDA
- Leadership
- Task control
- Environmental transactions
- Personnel involvement and support

PRINCIPAL RESOURCES FOR LEADERSHIP
- Task control
- Environmental transactions
- Personnel involvement and support

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE
- Substitutes for leadership, neutralizers of leadership

TEACHER WORK
- Initiating change
- Training and coaching
- Level of preparation and direct instruction

STUDENT WORK AND ACHIEVEMENT
- Level of cooperation
- Level and trend in achievement

Figure 2-4 Duckworth's model of the determinants of principals' work conditions
Model of Bossert et al.

Bossert et al. (1982) proposed a framework for understanding the role of the principal as an instructional manager (see Figure 2-5). They report that the managerial behavior of principals is important to school effectiveness and that there is no single style of management that is appropriate for all schools. Their review of qualitative studies revealed an interaction effect which suggested that certain principal behaviors have different effects in different settings.

This framework purports that the principal's management behavior is influenced by personal characteristics, district characteristics, and external characteristics. In turn, the principal's management behavior impacts the school climate and instructional organization. Bossert et al. (1982) indicated that there is interaction between school climate and the instructional organization. Ultimately, these two elements affect student learning.

Figure 2-5  The Bossert et al. model of the principal's influence on student learning
Dwyer (1983) conducted five short case studies of principals to identify specific elements of the conceptual areas identified by the theoretical model discussed above (Bossert et al., 1982). There were seven areas of inquiry identified: personal characteristics, district characteristics, external characteristics, principal management behavior, school climate, instructional organization, and student outcomes (p. 49). Dwyer found that the most essential activities of the principal included forms of monitoring, information control and exchange, planning, direct interaction with students, staff development and hiring, and overseeing building maintenance (p. 53).

Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1989) tested the framework proposed by Bossert et al. (1982) and found that the effects of principal leadership on student learning are primarily indirect. They found that the principal had a key role in creating a climate of high expectations. Hallinger et al. (1989) suggested some minor revisions to the model proposed by Bossert et al. (1982), primarily in order to reflect interaction among the variables. Generally, Bossert et al.'s (1982) framework was supported by the data collected by Hallinger et al (1989).

Hallinger et al. (1989) found that principals influence learning by developing a clear mission that provides an instructional focus. Principals also play a key role in creating high expectations for student learning. The effects of the principal's gender, percent of free lunch, and parental involvement on principal leadership were also found to be significant.
Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990) conducted a study based on Bossert et al.'s (1982) model of the principal's instructional leadership role, Hallinger and Murphy's (1987) conceptualization of instructional leadership within the social context of schooling, Pitner and Hocevar's (1986) analysis of the multidimensional nature of principal leadership behavior, and their own interpretation of the literature (p. 99). The significance of the two mediating variables linking principal behaviors and student outcomes in the Bossert et al. framework (1982) - school climate and school instructional organization - was supported by their findings.

Heck et al. (1990) were also able to operationalize several variables demonstrating the effects of principal behavior within the school. Principal behaviors that were found to be important to school climate include the creation of high expectations for academic achievement and behavior, a reward system, setting goals clearly communicated to all involved parties, and so forth. They also found that a knowledge of the principal's efforts in building school climate does not impact school instructional organization reciprocally, as was originally suggested by the Bossert et al. model (p. 119-120). Overall, the causal relationships proposed and tested in this research study, therefore, provided empirical support for the Bossert et al. (1982) model, indicating that through the frequency and effectiveness of implementing instructional leadership behaviors identified, principals can have direct effects on the achievement levels of their schools (p.120).
Summary of the Frameworks

The four models presented above are discussed in an effort to examine the relationship of the principal and school climate. The framework of Ellett and Walberg (1979) depicts a bidirectional relationship among four variables: principal behavior, within the school conditions, outside the school conditions, and student outcomes. The framework developed by Pitner (1986) assesses the effect of leader behavior through characteristics that may be defined as instrumental, supportive, or a combination of both. Duckworth's framework (1983) is presented in a series of three models that reciprocally and concurrently operate. He asserts that the work of the principal appears to most directly affect school organization and climate.

The fourth model proposed by Bossert et al. (1982) indicates that the principal affects school climate and instructional organization. Empirical studies have supported the tenants of Bossert et al.'s model, although interaction among the elements has been evidenced. While all four of the frameworks address leader behaviors and their impact upon schools, research results supports the use of Bossert et al.'s model (Dwyer, 1983; Hallinger, 1989; Heck et al., 1990).

Principals and Special Education

In this section of literature, I review an adaptation of the framework of instructional leadership proposed by Bossert et al. (1982). Next, I present research relevant to the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). I also review other studies and data collected on the principal and special education.
Model of Burrello et al.

Burrello et al. (1988) adapted the framework developed by Bossert et al. (1982). They adapted it to include elements drawn from the special education management literature. The elements and sub-elements added to the framework were chosen to reflect key activities mandated by Public Law 94-142 and its amendments. They are documented in the literature as essential in the implementation of special education programs. This model is presented in Figure 2-6.

One primary element and eleven sub-elements were added to the factor Principal Routine Behavior. Building a True Consensus was added to the framework as a sub-element of Goal Setting and Planning. This refers to communicating with words and actions that are the same. Working consensus stresses agreement and opposition is underplayed. The remaining sub-elements described behaviors that fit under routine behaviors in the existing framework.

Dwyer et al. (1985) identified Monitoring as one of the elements of Principal's Routine Behavior. Burrello et al. (1988) included Pre-referral, referral, and IEP Process as sub-elements under Monitoring. These were derived from the research on the role responsibilities of principals and special education leadership.

Added to the element of Communication (Dwyer et al., 1985), were several sub-elements related to the duties specific to special education. Those include
Conferencing, Obtain permission to test, Give Parental Rights, Determine Eligibility, and Obtain parent consent for placement. The assignment of these duties may vary depending upon the school system. Some of these duties may be assigned to special education central office personnel or special education teachers.

The remaining elements identified by Dwyer et al. (1985) remain intact. Those include Evaluating; Scheduling, Allocating Resources, and Organizing; Staffing; Modeling; Governing; and Filling In.

The element of Team Building and Delegating was added as a primary element. According to Van Horne (1989), the team building behavior of the principal and, in part, that of departmental persons in high schools is important in relationships between and among leadership for general and special education personnel. Principals play a key role in leadership in resolving not only who gets what, but how. Delegating and building team leadership are complementary routine principal behaviors. Developing teacher leaders and team leaders empower educators and, consequently, increases faculty maturity in assuming more responsibility for building wide issues and concerns (Burrello et al., 1988).

Six sub-elements were added under Instructional Climate. Accessibility and Special Arrangements were added to consider the needs of the more severely disabled students. This was considered to be especially important for wheelchair students in accessibility to buildings and adapting space in specialized classes such as laboratories.
Figure 2-6: Burrello et al's adaptation of Bossert et al's model of the principal's influence on student learning.

Location was added as a physical plant issue when considering programs and services. Oftentimes classes are segregated from others, further limiting the interaction of disabled and non-disabled peers. Many districts that have limited space often place special education classes in divided classrooms or temporary buildings.

Peer Tutoring was added as an example of social instruction intervention. Wilcox (1986) found that peer tutoring was especially beneficial as role models for students with moderate to severe disabilities. Benefits have also been recognized for those that provide the peer tutoring, such as an increased understanding of disabilities, increased motivation to overcome adversities, and interest in careers in human services.

Suspension and Expulsion were included under Discipline due to the regulations and policies extending from Public Law 194-42. It is imperative to ascertain whether or not the disability caused the behavior that led to disciplinary action. School leaders often turn to experts in making this determination. Disciplinary action constitutes a major part of the instructional climate of schools.

The adapted framework for the model proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) depicts three dimensions: Context/Input, Process/Throughput, and Results/Output. The elements and sub-elements described in the preceding paragraphs fall under these three dimensions. The primary interest is in the interaction of principal behaviors as related to special education and how they affect school climate.
Research on the Burrello et al. (1988) Framework

Van Horne (1989) employed the conceptual framework of Burrello et al. (1988) to explore principal's beliefs and behaviors via the case study method. Findings of the study indicate that the attitude of principals toward special education was a key factor influencing their behavior. The organizational structure of these high schools prevented the principal from being involved in day-to-day activities, but their symbolic behaviors sent a clear message that special education was important. In addition, the study found that the special education department chairperson was a key building leader for special education (p. vii-viii).

Van Horne (1989) proposed some changes in the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). Filling In, Pre-referral, Referral, IEP Process, Conferencing, Permission to Test, Give Parents Rights, Determine Eligibility, Obtain Parent Consent for Placement, and Scheduling were deleted under Routine Principal Behaviors and Public Relations (Parents and Community) was added. Under the element of Instructional Climate, Adaptation was added to replace Special Arrangements. Extra Curricular was added as a sub-element of Social Curriculum. Suspension and Expulsion were deleted and replaced with Due Process, a sub-element of Discipline. Parent and Central Office were added as sub-elements of Interrelationships.

DeClue (1990) also employed the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) to identify the beliefs and behaviors of three elementary school principals via case studies.

The study found that the attitudes of principals toward special education was a key factor influencing their behavior and acceptance of special education programs in their schools. Their symbolic
leadership plus their day-to-day involvement with special education
students and programs delivered a clear message that these students
are important to their schools. It was also determined that, while
school context may affect how principals spend their time, it does
not have a major affect on their attitudes toward special education in
their schools (p. vii-viii).

In contrast to the findings of Van Horne (1989) at the secondary level,
principals at the elementary level were actively involved with special education
students and programs. This was considered to be an important factor in
establishing a climate of acceptance for all students. Van Horne (1989) reported
that many of the day-to-day responsibilities of the special education program
were delegated to a department chairperson due to the structure of high schools.

DeClue (1990) found that changes in the framework proposed by Bossert et
al. (1988) were merited. Under Principal's Routine Behaviors, several sub-
elements were added: Outside Agencies, Seeking Information, Public Relations,
Parents and Community, and Building Parent Groups. Peer tutoring was
deleted under the element of Instructional Climate.

In summary, the findings of Van Horne (1989) and DeClue (1990) suggest
modifications to the initial framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). Both
studies indicate that the attitude of the principal is a key factor influencing the
behavior of teachers and students. While the involvement of the high school
principal was not evidenced on a day-to-day basis, the department chairperson
was found to fulfill these responsibilities. The elementary school principals were
more involved in the day-to-day activities of special education students and
programs.
Principals' Role Responsibilities and Attitudes

A review of the literature indicates that the principal is the key to a successful special education program (e.g. Howe, 1986; Yates, 1976; Podemski, 1984; Mayer, 1982). Most indicate that this is so because the principal is at the building level and has the influence to make a difference. Culbertson (1976) reported that the principal is dependent upon data made available to the directors of special education, but that the principals are more critical in developing a broad-based understanding of special education at the school level.

Strong leadership is required of the principal if P. L. 94-142 is to be effectively implemented according to Rebore (1979). He stated that school personnel will not be able to cope with the changes such as mainstreaming, if the principal does not foster a growth-producing atmosphere. Similarly, Campbell (1971) indicated that the principal is the key because the individual school is the center for all teaching and learning.

Cline (1981) conducted a study of principals in a large school district regarding their knowledge and attitude about handicapped children. One of the major findings was the lack of the principal's knowledge concerning handicapped students. "Since the principal is, indeed, the school's gatekeeper, mainstreaming has a poorer chance of success if the principal is not knowledgeable concerning the educational needs of the children to be managed" (p. 174).

The principal's ability to foster cooperation between general education staff and special education staff is an important determinant of the success that s/he
has in fulfilling special education responsibilities according to Podemski (1984). Gage (1979) similarly reported that the ultimate success of mainstreaming is dependent upon the leadership of building principals.

Burrello and Sage (1979) indicated that the degree of program success is directly related to the building principal's ability to take risks and achieve personal growth. Howe (1981) suggested that building principals are the key to educational growth. Principals have direct influence over what takes place in the school. Their attitudes, feelings, and opinions are conveyed in their actions.

Windsor (1978) found that there is basic role agreement between the function of the principal and what they perceive as being appropriate to their roles as principal in identifying, evaluating, and placing special education students. He also reported that principals were active in the process of identifying and evaluating special education students. Difficulties were suggested with placement of special education students. Similarly, Keilbargh (1980) found that the Least Restrictive Environment and IEP were the most difficult components of the special education program to implement.

Hyatt (1987) reported that principals perceive a need for additional training and preparation to better facilitate the special education programs. Information from Bank Street College of Education (1982) indicated that an understanding of the laws and their implications are fundamental in providing services to special education students. They also cited several competencies and characteristics that were considered as important. The principals should possess an ability to relate
to others and be empathetic of teachers working with exceptional students, realizing the physical and emotional demands. The principals should also demonstrate integrity, honesty, adaptability, creativity, imagination, openness, and a sense of humor.

Rude and Rubadeau (1993) conducted a study to identify priorities for principals as instructional leaders in special education. There was a general emphasis on instructional leadership. Principals desire special education staff that espouse the philosophy of integration. They are concerned about providing quality staff and program development. Principals desire the ability to identify and access human service organizations. They also express a concern about providing an adequate continuum of services.

Principals' attitudes have been considered key to effectiveness in special education programs. O'Rourke (1979) found a significant relationship between building principals' and their teaching staff's attitudes toward handicapped students. In Olson's study (1982), special education administrators reported their perceptions that principals' knowledge and attitudes influence the provision of special education services in their buildings. They also attributed more influence over special education at the building level to the principals than the principals perceived.

Gillespie (1986) indicated that probably the most significant change in the past ten years was that of attitude. The behavior of students and administrators
increasingly indicates that special education students are viewed as an integral part of the school.

A former principal of a large secondary school serving students with severe physical, vision, and hearing handicaps illustrated this attitude change when he said, "We took those children in several years ago because we had a new accessible building. We thought we were being altruistic and doing those poor children a big favor. What we didn't know is that they would teach us more than we could ever teach them - about what it is to be a human being. I wouldn't trade my experience with those special needs kids for anything (p. 18).

Summary

While there is minimal research involving principal behaviors as related to special education and how that may impact upon school climate, studies on models such as that proposed by Bossert et al. (1982) may be applied to special education. The role of the principal in special education has been discussed at length. Attitudes are changing with regard to special education. Recently, there have been efforts to investigate the leadership role of the principal as it relates to special education. Burrello et al. (1988) have provided a framework that appears to be useful in this quest.

Chapter Summary

The leadership of the principal is clearly an important factor when considering school effects. Not only does the principal bring their personal characteristics and traits to bear upon this critical role, but there are internal and external forces that affect principals' behavior. Throughout the last few decades,
research has identified several behaviors that contribute to the role of more effective principals.

School climate is often linked with effective principals and schools. There are many variables associated with school climate. Four frameworks that examine the relationship of principal behavior and school climate were presented. The model proposed by Bossert et al. (1982) has been modified by Burrello et al. (1988) to consider elements unique to special education. Research has generally supported the tenets of both models. While the role and attitudes to principals have been discussed, research has been limited with regard to special education. The purpose of this study is to further examine the relationship between principal behaviors in special education and school climate.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Previous research has confirmed linkages between principal behavior and school climate (Dwyer et al., 1985, Hallinger et al., 1989, Heck et al., 1990). Few studies have addressed this relationship with special education programs. The purpose of this study is to identify principal behaviors related to special education that affect school climate.

Sample

Louisiana has approximately 126 high schools serving general and special education students as identified by a review of Louisiana Progress Profile: School Level Reports 1990-91, Volumes I - V. The sample for this study consists of 23 high schools in southeast Louisiana stratified by school size. Schools are included in each of the following student enrollment categories: Less than 550, 550 to 1,000, and over 1,000. Approximately one third of the high schools providing special education services in Louisiana fall into each of these categories.

The stratification of student population was chosen because the size of the school may affect climate (Anderson, 1982). However, Anderson (1982) points out that differing results have been obtained. Stratification of schools by student population is intended to address this issue.

High schools are defined as those encompassing grades nine through 12. All schools selected for the sample must have had programs for students with
mild/moderate and severe/profound disabilities. Schools had to offer placement including resource and self-contained programs. These two conditions address all disabilities and potential placements except for those placements in a special school. The purpose for selecting the high school level was threefold: 1) minimal research has been conducted at the high school level regarding school climate and principal behaviors related to special education, 2) high schools generally have a more diverse population, and 3) student outcomes for special education students are more evident at the high school level.

The schools were selected by a stratified random method. Once it was determined that the schools met the criteria discussed above and schools were stratified according to size, schools were randomly drawn for inclusion in the sample.

Only those schools whose principal had a minimum of two years of service at the identified school were included. Teachers with a minimum of one year of experience at selected school sites participated in this study. This was necessary to more accurately assess the effects of principals' behavior on teacher attitudes.

Superintendents from 21 parishes were contacted to participate in the study. Of those, 17 granted permission to contact principals for their approval to participate in the study. Two additional parishes were considered. However, schools not included in this study were determined to be ineligible because they did not meet one of the following criteria to participate: Principals did not have a minimum of two years experience at that school site, self-contained and resource
classes were not offered, or students with mild/moderate and severe/profound disabilities were not enrolled in the school.

Principals from 53 high schools of the parishes with approval from the superintendent were contacted for approval to participate in the study. An additional 23 schools were considered. However, they were not contacted because they did not meet one of the criteria previously mentioned. Sixteen schools were omitted because they did not meet the criteria of the principal being at that specific school site for a minimum of two years. Five principals did not respond to the requests after minimum of three attempts to obtain their approval by letters and/or phone calls.

Principals from 27 schools agreed to participate in the study; ten schools were in the small category of student enrollment, nine in the medium category and eight in the large category. Completed surveys were returned from 23 schools, with eight in the small and large categories and seven schools in the medium category. A minimum of three attempts were made to have the remaining surveys returned. Due to the time constraints involved, it was decided to conduct the data analysis without the information from the schools that did not return the surveys.

All special education teachers at the 23 schools were surveyed. An equal number of general education teachers were surveyed using random selection. Names of those teachers with a minimum of one year's experience at that site were randomly drawn. Surveys were completed by 243 teachers and 23
principals. The unit of analysis was the school as comparisons were made within each school and between schools.

**Instruments**

The Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire- Rutgers Secondary (OCDQ-RS) developed by Kottkamp, Mulhern, and Hoy was used to measure perceptions of school climate at the secondary level. "It measures two aspects of principal leadership- supportive and directive behavior, and three aspects of teacher interactions- engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. These five aspects of school interaction form two basic dimensions of school climate- openness and intimacy" (Hoy et al., 1991, p. 60). The OCDQ-RS is a 34 item instrument describing the perceptions of secondary teachers and principals. Examples of items are "Teachers help and support each other" and "The principal supervises teachers closely." The items are rated on a four-point Likert scale measuring the frequency of the perceived behavior from "rarely occurs" to "very frequently occurs." (See Appendix A.)

**Reliability**

The reliability scores for the two aspects of principal leadership were reported as .94 (Supportive) and .79 (Directive). The reliability scores for the three aspects of teacher interaction were .77 (Engaged), .77 (Frustrated), and .73 (Intimate). These dimensions were obtained by using factor analysis.
Validity

Construct validity and the constitutive meanings of the constructs were supported by the stability of the factor structure. A second order factor analysis established the first dimension of openness and closedness.

The second dimension established was intimacy. This dimension refers to the relationships that teachers have developed with each other. "Intimate teacher behavior reflects a cohesive network of social relationships among the faculty" (Hoy et al., 1991, p. 61). Their behaviors are marked by friendly social interactions.

The Special Education Principal Behavior Profile (SEPBP) was used to measure the perceptions of the degree to which principals engage in behaviors related to special education. The SEPBP was administered to each principal and all special education teachers of the 23 schools participating in the study. (See Appendix B.) It was developed by D. Brown as a portion of this study.

The items of the SEPBP were developed using the elements in the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). The ten elements include: Goal setting and planning; monitoring; evaluating; communicating; scheduling, allocating resources and organizing; staffing; modeling; filling-in; governing; and team building and delegating. The SEPBP consists of several items to rate each of the ten elements in the framework. Each item was rated on a Likert type scale measuring the degree to which principals engage in behaviors from "Rarely
Occurs" to "Very Frequently Occurs". Examples of items include "The principal reviews IEP records" and The principal visits special education classrooms."

Validity

Items were analyzed and reviewed by special education administrators, officials from the State Department of Education, and principals to assure content validity. Pilot testing of the instruments included principals and special education teachers from three high schools, one from each level of student enrollment stratification. Feedback from principals and teachers was sought with regard to clarity of the items and directions, length of the questionnaire, etc.

Data Collection

Prior to drawing the sample of schools, information was requested from every possible school to assure all of the sampling requirements were met. Information regarding current school enrollment was also requested to assure appropriate stratification of the schools. Once this information was obtained, schools were randomly selected by stratification.

Superintendents of the school systems of each parish were contacted via mail to request their support for participation in the study. Attached to the letter was a brief general summary of the research study. Superintendents were asked to sign a letter of support to be distributed to principals and teachers participating in the study. A follow up phone call was made to those superintendents who had not responded after two weeks.
Instruments were delivered to each school by mail. The instruments were issued to teachers by the principals with the cover letter from the superintendent and a letter from me briefly describing the study. The instruments were collected by an uninvolved party (e.g. secretary, guidance counselor) at the school and returned by mail. A small token of appreciation was given to teachers completing the surveys (e.g. note pad, pen, or pin). Follow-up phone calls were made if the information was not been received within a week of the anticipated administration of surveys.

Interviews, observations, and document reviews were conducted in an effort to gain further information that may better describe the differences in the schools. The participants interviewed included principals, special education teachers and the department chairpersons in special education. Examples of questions included: What special adaptations are necessary for students with disabilities? Describe some routine functions and behaviors of the principal regarding both general and special education.

Observations of the principals and special education classrooms were conducted. Interaction patterns among the principals, teachers, and students were observed. Location of special education classes in relation to general education classes was also observed.

The document review analyzed the principal's job description, the policy and procedures handbook for special education, and the school handbook.
Research Questions

Information was obtained through administering two surveys to personnel at 23 schools that were stratified according to student population. The purpose of this study was to identify specific principal behaviors related to special education that affect school climate. I sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of principals, general and special education teachers with regard to school climate?

2. Which specific principal behaviors with regard to special education are significantly correlated with school climate?

3. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of special education teachers and principals with regard to principal behaviors related to special education?

The qualitative portion of this study provides an in-depth look at two schools that are considered to provide divergent information based on the paired scores collected as a portion of the quantitative analysis. The purpose of collecting this information was to obtain a better understanding of the specific principal behaviors related to special education that influence school climate. Below is a list of the objectives relevant to this portion of the study:

1. To identify and describe principals' perceptions of their behavior regarding special education programs in their building.

2. To identify and describe how the principals' behaviors and beliefs regarding special education are perceived by special education teachers.
3. To determine the perceptions of teachers regarding the impact of the principals' behaviors and beliefs on the acceptance of special education programs in the school building.

**Data Analysis**

A factor analysis of the SEPBP was conducted to reduce the many variables to small number of meaningful factors so that the data was more manageable for analysis and interpretation. Initially, a correlation matrix was constructed in order to determine high correlations of specific principal behaviors. Then it was determined whether the variables could be described in a smaller number of factors. Correlation coefficients were computed and the score entered into a factor analysis.

The following analyses accompanied the research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of principals, general and special education teachers with regard to school climate?

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether the perceptions of principals, general and special education teachers with regard to school climate differed as measured by the OCDQ-RS. The data was stratified according to student population. The unit of analysis was the school.

2. Which specific principal behaviors with regard to special education are significantly correlated with school climate?

A correlation matrix was used to analyze principals' behavior as measured by the SEPBP and special education teachers' perceptions of school climate as
measured by the OCDQ-RS. The correlation of each of each item on the SEPBP with school climate was analyzed. The unit of analysis was the school.

3. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of special education teachers and principals with regard to principal behaviors related to special education?

A t-test was used to analyze the differences in perceptions of special education teachers and principals with regard to the degree to which principals engage in behaviors related to special education as measured by the SEPBP. The unit of analysis was the school.

After the data were analyzed, two outlier schools were selected for qualitative study. These outlier schools were selected based upon paired scores from the OCDQ-RS and SEPBP. Selection was based upon a pair of high and low scores on both instruments (high on the OCDQ-RS and SEPBP and low on the OCDQ-RS and SEPBP). This aspect of the study involved only two school sites due to the time constraints involved in the completion of this study.

1. To identify and describe principals' perceptions of their behavior regarding special education programs in their building.

2. To identify and describe how the principals' behaviors and beliefs regarding special education are perceived by special education teachers.

3. To determine the perceptions of teachers regarding the impact of the principals' behaviors and beliefs on the acceptance of special education programs in the school building.
As data were obtained, they were examined and categorized based on emerging trends. This process consisted of compressing and linking together the data, leading to reasonable conclusions based on the preponderance of the data. The steps outlined by Bogdan and Biklin (1982) for the constant comparative method of data analysis were used:

1. Begin collecting data.
2. Look for key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become categories of focus.
3. Collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus with an eye to seeing the diversity of the dimensions under the categories.
4. Write about the categories you are exploring, attempting to describe and account for all the incidents that you have in your data while continually searching for new incidents.
5. Work with the data and emerging model to discover basic social processes and relationships.
6. Engage in sampling, coding, and writing as the analysis focuses on the core categories (p. 70).

Limitations

The study was limited in generalizability to high schools in southeastern Louisiana, as predictions for other populations cannot be made. Therefore,
generalizations of these results to schools with elementary, middle school, and junior high school students and other geographic locations are not supported. Future studies should address expanded geographical areas and elementary, middle and junior high schools.

Establishing a relationship between principal behaviors as related to special education and school climate, does not imply causality. Also, many researchers have criticized relationship studies because they attempt to break down complex behavior into simpler components (Borg and Gall, 1983). However, my purpose in conducting this study was to investigate the relationship of principal behaviors and school climate. I felt it was necessary to address these issues considering special education programs at the high school level because so little research has been completed to describe how principal behaviors affect special education programs. Future research should extend beyond analyzing relationships.

This study did not address all aspects of the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). It was beyond the scope of this study to analyze all aspects of the framework. Future research should extend beyond analyzing the relationship of principal behaviors and school climate.

Perceptions of general education teachers were not the primary focus of this study. School climate is affected by the perceptions of all individuals within the school. The quantitative portion of this study addresses the perceptions of a random sample of general educators. However, the qualitative portion of this
study did not address the perceptions of general educators. Future research in this area should address this limitation.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to identify specific principal behaviors related to special education that affect school climate. This chapter is divided into five main sections. In the first section, I review information gathered as a result of piloting the Special Education Principal Behavior Profile (SEPB P). In the second section, I discuss the statistical techniques and results used to explore the difference in perceptions of principals, general and special education teachers with regard to school climate. In the third section, I review the statistical techniques and procedures used to identify specific principal behaviors that are significantly correlated to school climate openness. In the fourth section, I discuss the techniques and results used to determine the difference in perceptions of special education teachers and principals with regard to principal behaviors related to special education. In closing, I give paired scores from the OCDQ-RS and the SE PB P used to select school sites for qualitative study.

Pilot Study of SEPB P

The SEPB P was developed to assess the perceptions of the degree to which principals engage in behaviors related to special education. The items were developed using the elements in the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). The ten elements include: Goal Setting and planning; monitoring; evaluating; communicating; scheduling; allocating resources and organizing; staffing; modeling; filling-in; governing; and team building and delegating. Each
item is rated on a Likert type scale measuring the degree to which principals engage in behaviors from "Rarely Occurs" to "Very Frequently Occurs."

One school from each level of the stratification by student enrollment categories was selected to participate in the pilot study of the SEPBP. Schools selected offered programs for students with mild/moderate disabilities and severe/profound disabilities. Placement options included self-contained and resource classes. A total of 19 special education teachers were surveyed for the pilot study.

A factor analysis was conducted to condense the items on the survey into underlying constructs. A correlation matrix was constructed to determine the high correlations of specific principal behaviors. I deleted one of the items, as it did not significantly correlate to other items. Initially, I used a confirmatory analysis to consider the above ten elements as factors. Seven factors emerged from that analysis. They include goal setting and planning; monitoring; modeling; scheduling, allocating resources and organizing; staffing, team building and delegating; evaluating and communicating; and filling in (see Figure 4-1).

Table 4-1 Factors of the SEPBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9, 10</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>5, 6, 22, 23</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>16, 17, 18</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling, Allocating Resources &amp; Organizing</td>
<td>11, 14, 15</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing, Team Building &amp; Delegating</td>
<td>19, 20, 21, 25, 26</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating &amp; Communicating</td>
<td>4, 8, 12, 13, 24</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling-In</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Item 27 was omitted from the revised survey.

I also used an exploratory factor analysis. However, the results did not provide information that was useful in developing factors to address the underlying constructs of Burrello et al.'s model (1988).

I summarized factor scores to obtain the total score. Each item received a score of one to four points with "Rarely Occurs" obtaining one point and "Very Frequently Occurs" obtaining four points.

**Perceptions of School Climate**

I used a 3 X 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) to analyze the perceptions of principals and the special and general education teachers with regard to school climate. The other independent variable was student enrollment. The openness factor of the OCDQ-RS was used as a measure of school climate. The positions of principal and special education and general education teachers were the within subject factor. The student enrollment or the size of the school was the between factor. The school was the unit of analysis.

The analysis showed that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of principals and special education teachers as compared to general education teachers with regard to the openness index of school climate as measured by the OCDQ-RS. School size or student enrollment was not found to be a significant variable (see Table 4-2).
Table 4-2 ANOVA Summary Table Depicting Perceptions of School Climate & School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3010.52</td>
<td>1505.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117375.00</td>
<td>58687.50</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Size X Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57326.55</td>
<td>14331.64</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>815793.89</td>
<td>14065.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1004208.29</td>
<td>15215.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant with a two-tailed test.

I used the Student-Newman-Keuls with harmonic averages of all groups method to identify which pairs of means differed. The results of this analysis indicated that the mean scores of special education teachers and principals were significantly different as compared to general education teachers at the .05 level with regard to their perceptions of school climate openness as measured by the OCDQ-RS. The mean scores for special and general education teachers and principals were 595, 516 and 613, respectively.

Principal Behaviors Correlated to School Climate

I used a correlation matrix to analyze principal behaviors as measured by the SEPBP and special education teachers' perceptions of school climate openness as measured by the OCDQ-RS. The unit of analysis was the school. The correlation matrix is included in Appendix C.

Results showed that nine items from the SEPBP were found to have a moderate positive correlation to the openness index of school climate as measured by the OCDQ-RS. A moderate positive correlation is one within .50 - .70 according to Hinkle et al. (1988).
Both items in the factor of Filling-In and two of the five items from the factor of Team Building, Delegating and Staffing were moderately correlated. Other principal behaviors included making programmatic changes to meet the needs of disabled students, providing special education students with an opportunity to schedule general education classes, interacting with disabled students, enforcing the laws and regulations, and supervising the IEP process (see Table 4-3).

Table 4-3 Items from the SEPB P that were Moderately Correlated with the Openness Index of Climate on the OCDQ-RS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principal makes programmatic changes to meet the needs of students with disabilities</td>
<td>r = .51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities have an equal opportunity to schedule general education classes</td>
<td>r = .51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal interacts with disabled students</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal screens prospective special education teachers and paraprofessionals</td>
<td>r = .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal establishes interview committees for vacant positions</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal enforces the laws and regulations for students with disabilities</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal supervises the IEP process</td>
<td>r = .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal assists in special education classes when needed</td>
<td>r = .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal assists students with disabilities when needed</td>
<td>r = .57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in Perceptions

I analyzed the difference in perceptions of special education teachers and principals with regard to principal behaviors related to special education through
the use of t-Tests. I used the t-Test because the sample included 23 schools. I performed the analysis on each of the 28 items on the SEPB.

Results indicated significantly different perceptions of special education teachers and principals on six items of the SEPB with a 95% confidence interval. The complete t-Test analysis is presented in Appendix D. Those of significance include supervising the IEP process, reviewing IEP records and advising staff of special education laws and regulations. The principals and special education teachers also differed in their perceptions of equal access to school resources; reviewing and revising goals; and that students with disabilities are included in the goals for the school (see Table 4-4).

Table 4-4 Items of Significance on the t-Test Measuring Differences in Perceptions of Principal Behaviors Related to Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Teachers M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Principals M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals for the school include students with disabilities.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>-3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are reviewed and revised.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>-2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal reviews IEP records.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>-3.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal advises staff of special education laws and regulations.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and special education teachers have equal access to school resources.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal supervises the IEP process.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>-2.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significance at the .05 level.
School Sites Selected for the Qualitative Study

I designed the qualitative portion of this study to provide an in-depth look at two schools to provide divergent information based on the paired scores from the openness index of the OCDQ-RS and the total score of the SEPBP. Factor mean scores and standard deviations from the OCDQ-RS and the total score of the SEPBP are presented in Tables 4-5 and 4-6. Paired scores from the 23 schools are presented in Table 4-7. Means scores for the OCDQ-RS openness factor and the SEPBP were 494 and 82, respectively.

Table 4-5 Mean Scores on the Factors of the OCDQ-RS (N=266)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>567.48</td>
<td>153.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated Behavior</td>
<td>387.45</td>
<td>146.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Behavior</td>
<td>496.93</td>
<td>130.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Behavior</td>
<td>530.56</td>
<td>380.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>623.73</td>
<td>179.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>459.22</td>
<td>287.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-6 Means Scores on the Factors of the SEPBP (N=127)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting &amp; Planning</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling, Allocating Resources &amp; Organizing</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing, Team Building &amp; Delegating</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating &amp; Communicating</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling-In</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-7 Paired Scores from the Openness Index of the OCDQ-RS and the SEPBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>OCDQ-RS (Openness)</th>
<th>SEPBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>503.35</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>505.69</td>
<td>88.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>444.08</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>552.68</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>471.73</td>
<td>82.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>454.78</td>
<td>89.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>534.78</td>
<td>96.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>520.14</td>
<td>77.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>517.11</td>
<td>85.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>487.52</td>
<td>80.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>503.08</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>525.54</td>
<td>64.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>487.63</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>501.81</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>441.11</td>
<td>80.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>504.77</td>
<td>79.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>559.62</td>
<td>86.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>373.78</td>
<td>58.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>424.38</td>
<td>69.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>431.87</td>
<td>71.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>558.98</td>
<td>91.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>547.96</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>517.80</td>
<td>72.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates the schools selected for the qualitative portion of this study.

Schools 93 and 96 were selected for further qualitative study, as they had paired scores which were dichotomous. School 27 was considered as scoring high on both instruments. However, school 96 was chosen because the openness index was slightly higher. School 96 was also considered to be a better comparison for school 93, as they were both large schools.
Summary

The pilot study of the SEPBP resulted in seven factors versus the ten that were proposed from the framework of Burrello et al. (1988). One item was omitted from the final survey, as it did not contribute to any of the factors. Factor scores are summed to obtain a total score.

The results that I report in this chapter indicate that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of general education teachers as compared to principals and special education teachers with regard to the openness index of school climate as measured by the OCDQ-RS. Nine items of the SEPBP were found to be moderately correlated (r = .50 -.70) with the openness index of the OCDQ-RS. Results indicated that special education teachers and principals' perceptions of principal behaviors were significantly different in six areas.

Two schools were selected for further qualitative study. The purpose of this further study was to provide an in-depth look at schools that are considered to be dichotomous based on the results presented in this chapter. In chapter five I will provide a profile of these two schools.
CHAPTER 5

School Profiles

The purpose of this chapter is to present the profiles of two schools. These schools were selected to represent dichotomous information as indicated from the results obtained during the qualitative portion of this study. I collected data from interviews with special education teachers and principals, brief observations and a review of documents such as faculty handbooks, parent and student handbooks, schematics of the schools and School Report Cards for the 1993-94 School Year developed by the Louisiana Department of Education.

Prospect High School

Prospect High School has an enrollment of 1140 students. It is located in a town near a suburban area that was well supported by the oil industry. The main building of Prospect High is several yards off of the highway with trees shading the grounds in front of the school. Gator prints prominently point the way to Prospect High.

The school year was just about over. The seniors had completed their final exams. The junior class was preparing for a ring ceremony as the Senior Class of 1996. Students reminisced about the school year and made plans to meet during the summer. Students and teachers were preparing for their final exams.

Prospect High School is staffed with a principal, two assistant principals and approximately 60 teachers and support staff personnel. Mr. Bourgeois is the principal and has more than ten years of experience in this capacity. One of the
assistant principals was out for medical reasons. This position remained unfilled and his responsibilities were assumed by Mr. Bourgeois and the remaining assistant principal.

Students frequented the office to talk to Mr. Bourgeois. Some were sent to the office for disciplinary reasons. Student workers assisted the two secretaries in the office. There was an atmosphere of quiet efficiency. The assistant principal talked with a parent who was frustrated with her child.

Prospect High School has an average daily attendance of 91% according to the School Report Card of 1993-94 as compiled by the Louisiana Department of Education. Approximately 23% of the students had received out of school suspensions and 5% were expelled. Dropout percentages ranged from a high of 7.5% for freshmen to a low of 2.5% for seniors. Students from Prospect High School scored an average of 19.2 on the American College Test. Results from the Graduate Exit Exam indicate that 94% of the students passed the language arts, written composition and science portions. In math and science, 87% and 88% passed, respectively.

Prospect High School is served by eight full time special education teachers and an itinerant adapted physical education teacher. The faculty members were candid in their responses during the interviews. Some talked more openly when the interview process had been completed. Eight of the nine special education teachers were interviewed. The interviews lasted between 15 and 45 minutes.
The special education programs at Prospect High School are designed to meet the needs of a variety of students. They provide services to approximately 30 students classified as gifted and talented. Enrichment and Carnegie unit credit classes are offered to these students.

There is a resource program for disabled students working toward earning a high school diploma. Tutorial assistance is available in these classes and study skills are emphasized. Approximately 40 students participate in this program.

An alternative program is available for students working toward earning a certificate of achievement. Functional life skills are the basis of this program in combination with course offerings from nearby vocational/technical schools. Approximately 90 students participate in this half day program at Prospect High and a half day at one of three local vocational/technical schools.

A full time self contained program is offered to students with emotional/behavioral disabilities. Speech therapy and itinerant services of a teacher certified to assist visually impaired students are also available.

Mr. Bourgeois stated that Prospect High School was one of a comprehensive nature, that it was not a college prep type of school. He explained,

Our students are more geared to coming to high school. They want their high school diplomas, and they want to get out and work or learn a trade, be a welder, a carpenter, a craftsman, something of that sort. We have 35% of our students who actually go on to college. So, our special ed students fit in.
Positive aspects of the special education programs for students that were identified by the teachers included opportunities to participate in a high school with regular students and getting the help that they need to pass and addressing their individualized needs and special interests. One teacher stated that students were encouraged to work to their potential and to feel good about themselves. Placement in regular homerooms, opportunities to participate in the athletic programs and supportive discipline were felt to contribute to increases in students' feelings of self-worth and success.

Advantages for special education faculty members were not as readily identified. Two members of the faculty could not identify any positive aspects. Three teachers felt that the administration was supportive and cooperative. Three of the faculty (1) stated that everybody worked as a team or (2) made some reference to team effort.

When the teachers were asked what they would like to change, most responses involved curricular issues. For example, one teacher recommended developing classes for future living experiences versus students taking four years of physical education. Another teacher suggested that a class for non-readers with emphasis on the use of multisensory approaches was needed. Other responses included relieving special education teachers of extra duties like homeroom so that they could complete extra paperwork and make the more frequent parental contacts required of them. Two teachers mentioned the need for a teacher's aide.
The teachers were asked to identify adaptations or modifications necessary for special education high school students. Many reported modifications for regular classroom participation or testing that are identified on students' IEPs. The schedule for a half day of school and vocational programming was mentioned. Teaching strategies, such as restating subject matter or directions in a different manner or the use of multisensory approaches, were also suggested. One teacher reported that the students entering high school had to adapt to changing classes versus being in self contained classes.

During interviews, everyone was asked about resourceful individuals from whom they could seek assistance. Almost all identified an assistant principal that was out for medical reasons. Many revered him as a resource for disciplinary issues, as well as a person that could answer almost any question about special education. A review of the faculty handbook clearly indicated that special education was his primary responsibility. A few people also identified the department head as a primary resource. Other sources included central office personnel, fellow teachers, a university professor and a reading specialist. The library was also referenced as a source of materials for professional growth.

Teachers were asked to identify the role of the principal or assistant principal with regard to special education. Seven of eight teachers identified discipline. Others referenced the scheduling of classes; identifying needs of the programs, teachers and students; helping with negligent parents; looking at the whole picture; and answering questions. Most teachers indicated the direct
involvement of the assistant principal. They suggested that Mr. Bourgeois was primarily involved in the approval of things and assisting in making student placement changes.

The role of the department head was also discussed with those interviewed. A couple of teachers referenced the fact that their teaching responsibilities differed because the department head taught resource students. Others referred to the department head as working with overall programs and having more responsibility. One teacher shared that the department head received the complaints and helped when he needed it. Two teachers indicated that the department head did not work with them.

The department head stated that she coordinated just about everything from student scheduling, to IEP conferences, to assessment personnel. She reported working with disciplinary issues and the awards ceremony. She stated,

At this point it's more detailed because the assistant administrator that works in special ed is out for the rest of the school year. He's been out for several months, medical reasons, and I'm basically in his shoes - trouble shooting and basically doing everything except actually counseling for the disciplined once they get written up and sent to the office.

Mr. Bourgeois referred to the department head as the "resident expert." He felt that she was another administrator without the administrative authority. He stated that she has the responsibility to make sure IEPs are done properly. The department head also helps to plan activities involving the special education department.
The teachers were asked to identify quality aspects required for special education programs. Many identified qualities of teachers that they felt to be important. Those include having a group of diverse people with well rounded backgrounds or work experiences, teachers who are able to meet the needs of students, certified teachers and teachers interested in working with disabled students. Other quality aspects include counselors for special education students, consistency in student routines and preparing students to live independently. One indicated that teachers should not have to worry about the number of eligible students to obtain federal money and provide for the needs of students. Other points included inservice programs on new ideas, access to technology and current textbooks.

Concerns mentioned by teachers throughout the interviews included teacher turnover, extensive paperwork and the need for additional staff. Several mentioned the need for an aide in their classes. One stated that additional staff members would be necessary to implement an inclusive model of programming for special education students. A few discussed problems with the current physical education program and offered suggestions to change and/or replace it. One teacher felt that low teacher pay and restrictive federal guidelines were problematic throughout the state.

Staton Hall High School

Staton Hall High School is located in a residential suburban area outside of a large metropolitan city. The community had recently suffered extensive
damage from a flood, although there was minimal damage to the Staton Hall High School. The student enrollment is estimated at 1260. Staton Hall High is staffed by four administrators, three counselors, two librarians, two computer lab coordinators and 78 teachers and seven paraprofessionals. Mr. Johnson has been the principal for six years.

Staton Hall High School has an average daily attendance of 94% according to the School Report Card as compiled by the Louisiana Department of Education. Approximately 23% of the students received out of school suspensions and 1.4% were expelled. Dropout percentages ranged from a high of 1.8% for freshman and a low of 0.3% for sophomores. Students scored an average of 19.4 on the American College Test. Results of the Graduate Exit Exam indicate that 92% of the students passed the language arts portion. In math, written composition, science and social studies, the percentage of students passing were 90, 97, 92 and 92, respectively.

Staton Hall High School is served by 11 full time special education teachers and an itinerant adapted physical education teacher. Eight of the eleven full time special education teachers were interviewed. Interviews ranged from 20 to 100 minutes. Teachers were very responsive during the interview process.

The special education programs at Staton Hall High School provide a full range of services to students. Approximately 30 students participate in the gifted and talented programs. Talented services are provided in the areas of visual arts and drama.
The resource program has an enrollment of approximately 20 students who are working toward earning their high school diplomas. The resource teacher has set up an appointment book with students so that they can schedule time when they need to see her to study for and take tests. When she is not scheduled with student appointments, she is visiting and observing in the general classrooms. Students are required to turn in weekly progress reports so that the resource teacher is kept abreast of their progress.

The alternative program is designed for students earning a certificate of achievement. They have developed a multifaceted vocational program which is complimented by functional and basic academic course work. There are approximately 50 students enrolled in this program. Some of them attend a vocational/technical school in a neighboring parish for part of their day.

The alternative program includes vocational and prerequisite classes in the following areas: horticulture, food service, retail, crafts production and day care. The facilities at Staton Hall High School include a large greenhouse; a kitchen equipped with commercial/industrial appliances and a separate dining facility; a bookstore stocked and operated by special education students and faculty; a room with material, supplies and workspace to create crafts; and a daycare facility for faculty and staff members whose children attend a nearby elementary school. Once students have met prerequisite requirements, they may earn money when participating in various job opportunities. Several job opportunities are available for students as a part of their off campus vocational program, such as in
landscaping area homes and providing office plants and their upkeep for places like the school board office or other schools.

Functional and basic academic courses include reading, English, science, social studies, literature, home living, childcare, food and nutrition, social skills and leisure/recreation. Students attend regular or adapted physical education classes. Students are also permitted to enroll in Carnegie unit credit classes as a part of their IEPs or for electives.

There is another alternative program for students with severe disabilities. There are four students currently enrolled. Emphasis is placed on job sampling and essential daily living skills. Job sampling experiences outside of the school may include training with a pet groomer, veterinarian, daycare center, a few construction companies and a local discount store. Within the school, job sampling may include experiences in the cafeteria, library and office.

As an independent study project, a few students from the gifted and talented programs produced a videotape which provides an overview of the programs discussed above. Samples of art work from the students in the visual arts program may be seen throughout the school. A class of alternative students also created a marketing brochure to advertise student services available through the vocational programs. It is evident that the faculty and students are proud of their accomplishments.

A group of students called "Peer Support Leaders" are recommended to the guidance staff by faculty members to help ease the transition process for new
Many special education students benefit from this program as the general education students learn about various disabilities and how to assist persons with disabilities. During my visit, one student explained this process to me and how it was helpful during difficult times. The special education faculty and students recognized the Peer Support Leaders at a breakfast during my visit. Preparations were made through the special education students' catering service.

In addition to the programs above, faculty members stated other reasons why the special education programs were beneficial for students. There are opportunities for special education students to socialize with non-disabled peers, such as homeroom, lunch and athletic programs. The teachers care about the students as individuals. A team analyzes each student to prepare a program on an individual basis. One teacher stated, "Our kids are much better prepared than they are," referring to the general education students. Mr. Johnson related that the program "is just getting better with time...That they [the students] will get challenged, get a well rounded program, leave Staton Hall High hopefully with the opportunity to grow and reach their fullest potential before they leave whatever program they are in."

When asked what were the advantages of being a faculty member in the special education department at Staton Hall High School, teachers responded quickly. Most referred to the faculty as one that worked well together, that it was tight knit. The innovativeness of fellow teachers was mentioned. Many teachers felt that they were empowered to make the decisions that directly
affected them. The stability of the faculty members was also felt to be an asset, as the majority of them had been there for at least ten years.

The teachers were asked to identify various aspects that contributed to a quality special education program. Many identified characteristics of teachers, like dedication and people who go the distance or do the extras. Several teachers discussed cooperation among faculty members as a factor. A few teachers indicated that students must be a primary concern in establishing a quality special education program. They related that the students are put first or teachers try to set the student up for success.

When asked about what changes the teachers would like to initiate, responses were varied. Many related concerns about a new school wide schedule change for next year which entails four 90 minute periods each semester versus seven classes throughout the year. Other responses included: Developing more vocational courses (woodworking), mandatory teacher inservice training on inclusion, student tracking (a profile of completed coursework), more preparation time for teachers, a stronger focus on functional academic skills (e.g. reading a recipe), improved teacher communication within the department, increased staff and new classrooms.

The teachers reported several modifications required by special education students at the high school level. Many felt that smaller classes and the assistance of paraprofessionals was invaluable. Other teachers mentioned the need for flexibility to accomplish the various components of the vocational
program. Some mentioned behavioral contracts for students with emotional/behavioral disabilities. Others discussed accommodations required of general classroom teachers and the importance of selecting the right teacher.

The resource teacher emphasized the importance of her students having access to her for organizational and test taking purposes. She asks that the general education teachers prepare study guides and advanced organizers to assist special education students. Other typical modifications on IEPs are also implemented, such as using calculators and orally reading tests and/or other materials.

All personnel felt that there were people at Staton Hall High School whom they could go to if they had a question. Although central office personnel were mentioned by several individuals, all referenced the department head of special education. One teacher stated, "I never feel a need to go beyond the walls of this school to take care of a problem."

The department head of special education at Staton Hall High School was viewed as an individual that is knowledgeable about special education procedures and regulations, as well as one that was abreast of everything in the department. She was described as a leader that keeps everything in focus. She handles a lot of paperwork, like IEPs and ITPs. Discipline was also a primary responsibility. Mr. Johnson added, "When you're talking about hiring staff and determining your schedule and dealing with discipline, what else is more important than that!"
Mr. Johnson is viewed as a supportive principal. Teachers felt that it was important that he agreed with their philosophy. They often commented on the leeway and flexibility given to them in developing their programs. Mr. Johnson was described as a leader that was interested in special education programs. He reported spending minimal time with special education issues, "5%, 3%, it's very little."

Summary

Prospect High is a large school located in a town outside a suburban community. The student population is one that primarily focuses upon work and trade skills to enter the employment arena after completion of high school. The special education students fit in well in Prospect High because their goals are similar, according to Mr. Bourgeois.

There is an assistant principal that assumes the primary responsibilities for the special education department at Prospect High School. The department head is relied upon for her technical expertise in special education and as a liaison with central office personnel. Prospect High has been negatively impacted by teacher turnover in special education. Several teachers had difficulty identifying positive aspects of being a faculty member in the special education department at Prospect High.

Despite teacher turnover and the negative feelings of teachers, the special education department offers programs to meet the needs of students. The programs developed with local vocational/technical schools appear to be one of
their most promising programs for disabled students. Although relatively new, the programs for gifted and talented students are providing unique and challenging curricula.

Staton Hall High School is a large school located in a residential suburban area outside of a large metropolitan city. The special education programs are multifaceted, providing services for the gifted and talented to the severely disabled. The primary focus of their programs is to prepare the students to reach their fullest potential so that they can be productive and contributing adults.

Staton Hall High School personnel are proud of their programs and believe that they may offer the best opportunities available in this state. The administration is highly supportive of the special education faculty members and respects them for their expertise and innovativeness. This is evidenced by the many responsibilities that the special education department has throughout the school year. The department head is the central focus for planning and programming at Staton Hall High School.
Notes to Chapter 5

1 School Report Cards for 1993-94 are compiled and published by the Louisiana Department of Education. The School Report Cards are distributed to each school in the spring of the following year. The School Report Cards are compiled into a report entitled *Louisiana Progress Profile: School - Level Reports*. Information provided in this report gives school, parish and state level information in most areas for comparison purposes.

2 Names of schools and individuals were changed for anonymity purposes.
CHAPTER 6

Qualitative Research Results

In this chapter I present an interpretation of the results gathered during the qualitative portion of this study. The purpose of collecting this information was to obtain a better understanding of the specific principal behaviors related to special education that may affect school climate.

Research Objective 1: To identify and describe principals' perceptions of their behavior regarding special education in their building.

Mr. Bourgeois, principal of Prospect High School, was minimally involved in special education programs. Most of the responsibilities were delegated to an assistant principal, who was out for medical reasons during the qualitative portion of this research. In his absence, some of the responsibilities were carried out by the department head, who Mr. Bourgeois regarded as the "resident expert." The department head indicated that Mr. Bourgeois assisted in making changes in students' placements.

Mr. Bourgeois reported visiting classrooms including those in special education, that were located inside of the main building more frequently than those in temporary or adjacent buildings. Four of the seven special education classes visited were outside of the main building. However, since the assistant principal's absence, he related that he had been involved with too much discipline and not enough of visiting classrooms.
Mr. Bourgeois summed up his involvement with special education by stating,

I may be in a little bit of a disadvantage in speaking about this right now because Mr. Clark, my assistant principal, and I'm sure that the teachers told you that, he is the person who really works with special ed more than I do. I work with him on that, but he's the one that really that works at scheduling those students, working with the teachers ... We are the first in our parish to do things such as departmentalize our special education students instead of keeping them self contained. At one time, the special education students in the alternative program were in homerooms with all of the other alternative students. Now they are in homerooms with all of the other students. So, I feel as though we have not been reactive and have been proactive in some cases, but maybe not as much as we should. Everyone should do more.

Mr. Johnson, principal of Staton Hall High School, stated that he was minimally involved in the special education programs. Everyone acknowledged that most of the responsibilities related to special education were delegated to the department head. Mr. Johnson reported visiting classrooms, "If there's not a purpose for going into the class to do an observation, every day we give out pencils for birthdays for kids...But we are in classrooms every day." Teachers commented, "He's always watching," "He's very, very into what's going on," and that "he is constantly there...stays on top of it."

While Mr. Johnson perceives his involvement in the special education programs as minimal, I would suggest that his support is implicit in the daily activities. For example, he stated,

I attend all of the things. We do have an awards program for special ed kids next week and there was something this morning for the kids. It's because they've got the Country Crafts, the kitchen, the beautification, all the shrubs. They've done homes in the community.
So, I know those kids. That's the like that I have with those kids. If there ever was a family that I've seen at school, that's a family.

Mr. Johnson was referring to the Peer Support Leader breakfast held earlier that morning. He briefly attended the breakfast to recognize the general education students for their work with the disabled students. Mr. Johnson also recognized the special education students and teachers for preparing the breakfast.

While both of the principals viewed their involvement as minimal, Mr. Johnson was more involved by natural contacts with students and faculty members throughout the course of the day. This was evidenced by Mr. Johnson handing out birthday pencils to the students and his visits during special events like the breakfast for the Peer Support Leaders. Mr. Johnson was involved in everything that the teachers did on an indirect level because they felt he was supportive of efforts to try new programs and to venture into enacting innovative ideas which are felt to improve programs for students with disabilities.

Mr. Bourgeois had clearly delegated all responsibilities related to special education to an assistant principal or the department chairperson. There appeared to be little contact between the principal and special education teachers or students except for matters involving discipline. He was handling the disciplinary matters related to special education at the time of this study because an assistant principal was on extended sick leave. Only a few teachers mentioned Mr. Bourgeois' support in their efforts to provide programming for the special education students.
Research Objective 2: To identify and describe how principals' behaviors and beliefs regarding special education are perceived by special education teachers.

The department head of special education at Prospect High School was the only one that viewed the administration as very supportive. She reported that Mr. Bourgeois may assist in the placement of students in need of a more restrictive environment, but that the assistant principal works with special education more so. The assistant principal and department head keep Mr. Bourgeois "abreast of what changes are going on because we feel it is important for him to, as head of the school, to know this."

Release time is provided to teachers to go to other school sites to facilitate the scheduling of students that will be attending Prospect High, according to the department head. Mr. Bourgeois provides support to teachers for students with disciplinary problems by getting parents to come to school for conferences. When there is a shortage of special education funds, school funds have provided for the needed special education supplies.

Most teachers at Prospect High School referred to the assistant principal as a person that facilitates or coordinates things. Others indicated that he knew their needs and was knowledgeable about the laws. One simply stated that "he sees the whole picture." Teachers often referenced him in disciplinary matters and noted that he counseled students. A few teachers also mentioned that the assistant principal scheduled students as a portion of his administrative duties.
Almost all of the faculty members at Staton Hall High School discussed the fact that Mr. Johnson was supportive of special education programs. One teacher stated,

He oversees and is well aware of what's going on. His role, I think, is he allows us and gives us the freedom to do what we think is best for the kids. When we come up with ideas that we think generally benefit the children and present them to him, he is very supportive of what we want to do. It's not that he lets us run wild, but he trusts our judgment in an area that's so specific and so technical as opposed to regular/general ed. There are things that he will freely admit he just doesn't know and he trusts our expertise and so forth in that area. And it's only because we've had such supportive administration that we're able to expand and do what we are doing.

Others commented things like, "He stays on top of it" and "He's on the cutting edge." The teachers felt that Mr. Johnson trusted their judgment and that he was interested and supportive. One teacher stated Mr. Johnson was an important part of their program, that he offered support and agreed with their philosophy.

While the department head of Prospect High and Mr. Bourgeois appeared to be connected in their responses and viewed one another as supportive, the rest of the special education faculty members did not convey this idea. They conveyed the idea that the special education department was somewhat disjointed in their efforts and that it was difficult to meet the needs of their students. It was difficult to obtain the appropriate textbooks, and when new books were ordered for special education students, general education teachers were consulted about the texts instead of special education teachers. There was a need for certified and competent personnel. One teacher mentioned that "warm bodies" were
selected to teach special education students regardless of their feelings about that assignment.

The faculty and principal of Staton Hall High conveyed a similar message - that they were there to provide for the needs of the students and to ensure productivity. Mr. Johnson was highly complimentary of the special education faculty members' and students' efforts throughout the school and community. This confidence permeated all interviews and observations. Mr. Johnson was genuinely supportive of the special education teachers and students. He viewed them as contributors to the success of Staton Hall High, and that therefore they were successful in their missions.

Research Objective 3: To determine the perceived impact of the principals' behaviors and beliefs on the acceptance of special education programs in the schools.

The alternative special education students at Prospect High School do not appear to be well integrated or accepted as a part of the school. For example, one teacher said,

When we talk about the different things that our students take, some of our students are artistic. They would like to take art; some would like to take music. There is no place for them to take those subjects. What we are hoping for and our art teacher has volunteered to use his free hour to have alternative art, so that some students can go two days and some can go three days a week. What they would have to do is take this in place of a P.E.

Another teacher reported,

I think the most important thing is to help them [the students] feel good about themselves and their self esteem. They are so embarrassed about being in this program, so much so that they want
to close the door when the bell rings and so that nobody knows that they are in special ed...So, I really feel mostly, it is making them feel like they fit in (important to a quality special education program). They don't mix with the students very much. They tend to stick to their own group so they don't vote in elections because they don't know anyone else because they stick to their own little groups all the way through school.

One of the alternative teachers explained that the P. E. teacher refused to follow IEP modifications by relating, "I had one coach say to me, 'They all are special ed, so they are all going to double F them." She was inferring that students with disabilities were issued failing grades by a P. E. teacher because they were in special education and he did not modify assignments as required by IEPs. She gave two other similar examples where students were treated unfairly.

The department head explained how additional assistance was needed and that they had asked the central office for an aide. However, it was not financially feasible. She further stated,

What we try to do is get department workers. We have students that I've found over the years that have a free hour or two and they can use the department workers in the office, guidance office. Then I found out that department head teachers were using them, like in the business department. As soon as I found out, I said, 'Excuse me, I'm requesting one.' So for the last four years, we've gotten department workers.

The awards ceremony was mentioned by one teacher. She said:

We have set it up definitely where our students in the special ed program ... get awards and are recognized just like the other students. The way we present the award is set up where people don't realize they are in a special ed program. So, they don't feel bad as far as getting up and receiving an award because they might be singled out for being in a special ed type of program. It's just done with such finesse and it's a beautiful thing. They get trophies and certificates. It's wonderful.
In discussing textbooks, one teacher stated,

I understand that we may get new books next year but I was not asked to look at those books. The regular teacher picks those out. She said for our group, she is picking out an eighth grade level book. You can see reading [levels] might be better, however, my girls who are 17 and 18, one the mother of two children, we don't need a junior high level book on adulthood and parenting. If that's what it is, and it probably will be, it's not going to be good.

Another teacher that was concerned about the personnel being assigned to teach special education students stated,

First of all, we need a teacher who wants to be in a special ed classroom. What is being done right now is they are putting a warm body in there and they are not people who want to be in special ed. They don't know how to approach a student who has a very low self esteem.

At Staton Hall High School, the efforts of the students and faculty members are seen on a daily basis throughout the school. The horticulture class landscaped the school premises. They provided plants for the office and for special occasions. While I was there, the school was preparing for an activity later that evening. Students were moving 40 gallon potted trees from the horticulture class to the stage.

Special education students and a faculty member operate the bookstore which is located in the center of the school. They sell school supplies, physical education uniforms, yearbooks, balloon bouquets and items created by the crafts class. At one point or another, all students visit the bookstore.

Students who participate in the catering service proudly wear their white jackets and chef's hats. The Wild Cat Cottage is busy with students preparing
and serving meals a minimum of once weekly. These may involve lunches for school system personnel, lunch programs for local businesspeople or even a wedding.

Non-disabled students are selected to participate as Peer Support Leaders. This provides an opportunity for students to get to know each other. In addition to the typical times of integration, such as lunch and physical education, students also collaborate as part of the athletic teams of Staton Hall High School.

Disabled students at Staton Hall High are an integral part of the school as opposed to a largely segregated program at Prospect High. Involvement of students and the integration of the programs was recognized and intended at Staton Hall. It was more than a matter of mainstreaming students into a regular homeroom, like the students at Prospect High School. While the involvement of the special education students at Staton Hall High was not initiated by Mr. Johnson, he obviously provided the support and foundation for it to take place.

I reviewed job descriptions for the principals and found no specific reference to special education programs. Policy and procedure handbooks were reflective of state requirements, which are in effect throughout the state. IEP folders and evaluations were not reviewed during this study due to the time constraints.

**Summary**

Both principals viewed themselves as minimally involved in the special education programs of their schools. Many responsibilities were delegated to the department heads of both schools. At Prospect High School, an assistant
principal was clearly responsible for those matters related to special education as indicated during the interviews and by administrative responsibilities outlined in the faculty handbook. However, all of the faculty members of Staton Hall High School felt that they were supported in their efforts by Mr. Johnson. Only the department head of Prospect High School conveyed this message.

The special education teachers at Staton Hall High School clearly described Mr. Johnson as a supportive principal. The department head of Prospect High School was the only faculty member to clearly convey the idea that special education programs and faculty members were supported by Mr. Bourgeois. Mr. Johnson was openly complimentary about the efforts of the special education faculty members and students. This message was apparent to everyone, as the faculty members and students were confident in their missions at Staton Hall High.

The stability of the faculty at Staton Hall High was mentioned during the interviews as one of the factors in the success of their programs. Teacher turnover was clearly a hindrance at Prospect High School. While this factor cannot be totally attributed to the role of the principal and his behavior, it is suspected that the principal can have an impact on programs by recruiting quality teachers and removing the "warm bodies" and disinterested persons.

The acceptance of the special education programs at Prospect High was marked by students choosing not to be integrated and faculty members not feeling supported in their efforts. However, at Staton Hall High School, not only
were the special education programs well integrated into the school's program, the integration was extended to the community. For example, both schools had some level of vocational training available. Prospect High sent their students to nearby vocational/technical centers while the majority of this training was available at Staton Hall High School. Furthermore, the vocational training was extended into school and community experiences, which often resulted in paid employment.
CHAPTER 7
Discussion

Previous research has confirmed the linkages between principal behavior and school climate (Dwyer et al., 1985; Hallinger et al., 1989; Heck et al., 1990). Few studies have addressed this relationship with special education programs. The purpose of this study was to identify principal behaviors related to special education that affect school climate.

In this chapter, I discuss the conclusions and implications that resulted from this study. Information on principal behaviors is presented in the first section. Next is a discussion on school climate. The third section provides conclusions reached on the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988). The last section discusses the conclusions and implications reached as a result of this study.

The qualitative and quantitative results reported in this study did not reveal significant differences in the perceptions of principals and special education teachers about school climate. However, the perceptions of general education teachers regarding school climate differed significantly from the perceptions of special education teachers and principals. Specific principal behaviors were identified that were found to be moderately correlated with an open school climate. The perceptions of special education teachers and principals were found to be significantly different in nine areas of principal behavior related to special education.
Data collection during the qualitative portion of this study served to develop two school profiles which were observed to have a dichotomous relationship according to the quantitative information provided. While both principals stated that they were minimally involved in the special education programs, responsibilities were delegated to department heads, and an assistant principal in one case. However, the support of the administration at these two schools was viewed quite differently. The acceptance of special education programs in each school presented extreme differences.

**Principal Behaviors**

The SEPBP was developed to access principal behaviors related to special education. Seven factors emerged from the pilot study of the SEPBP. Those include goal setting and planning; monitoring; modeling; scheduling; allocating resources and organizing; staffing, team building and delegating; evaluating and communicating; and filling-in.

There were significant differences observed in the perceptions of special education teachers and principals regarding principals' behaviors related to special education. These differences were found in six areas to include the principal reviewing the IEP records, supervising the IEP process and advising staff of special education laws and regulations. Other areas were goals for schools should include students with disabilities, goals are reviewed and revised, and general and special education teachers have equal access to school resources.
Both of the principals that participated in the qualitative portion of this study view themselves as minimally involved with special education. Responsibilities were delegated to department heads at the schools, in addition to an assistant principal of one of the schools. The faculty members at one of the schools clearly felt administrative support, while the faculty members at the other school did not.

The differences in the perceptions of support appear to lie in the message that the principal sends to everyone on a daily basis. The faculty members who felt supported indicated that the principal was involved, that he trusted the judgment of the faculty members and that everyone worked as a team. The principal at this school was highly complimentary of the efforts of special education students and faculty members. Their work was evident throughout the school.

In a school where the faculty members clearly felt the support of their principal, the special education programs were well accepted. There was a blending of the general and special education programs which also extended into the community. There were opportunities for the disabled and the non-disabled students to work together and to get to know one another. There were extra efforts made to assist non-disabled peers in learning about people with disabilities.
Climate

The results of this study did not indicate that there was a significant difference in the perceptions of school climate when comparing principals and special education teachers. A significant difference was noted in the perceptions of general education teachers as compared to that of special education teachers and principals. School size did not have an effect on this perception.

The findings of this study revealed nine principal behaviors related to special education that were moderately correlated to school openness. Four of these behaviors were identified in two factors on the SEPBp; Filling-In and Team Building, Delegating and Staffing. Other principal behaviors included making programmatic changes to meet the needs of disabled students, providing special education students with an opportunity to schedule general education classes, interacting with disabled students, enforcing the laws and regulations, and supervising the IEP process.

Heck et al. (1990) reported principal behaviors that were found to be important to school climate include the creation of high expectations for academic achievement and behavior, a reward system, and setting goals clearly communicated to all parties. The expectations of the principal in the school with the more open climate index had high expectations for all students - that they would become productive and contributing adults in their community. The goal was to help each student achieve his/her maximum potential.
The observations made in this study indicate that principal behaviors and attitudes are associated with school climate. Those behaviors include providing support for faculty members, conveying acceptance of disabled students and special education programs, and visiting special education classrooms and programs. Other principal behaviors include conveying a high level of trust and respect to faculty members and openly commending faculty and students for their efforts and successes.

Framework

The tenets of principal behavior and climate from the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) were supported by the findings as of this study. The area of principals' routine behaviors was reduced to seven elements through the pilot study of the SEPBP. The element of Governing was not addressed by the factors that emerged from the survey. All other elements were addressed independently or combined.

All elements of instructional climate were observed during this study, primarily in the qualitative portion of this study. The physical plants of both schools were observed to be accessible for students and special arrangements were made when necessary. The social curriculum and peer tutoring were much more evident at the school with the more open school climate. Discipline was addressed in each school with the administrator and department head sharing these responsibilities. The quality of interrelationships of students, staff and the community were felt to be better at the school with the more open climate.
Conclusions and Implications

The quantitative portion of this study involved a small number of schools in southeastern section of a southern state. Therefore, conclusions presented should be considered in light of the small sample and limited geographic boundary.

The leadership of the principal is clearly an important factor when considering school effects. Not only does the principal bring personal characteristics and traits to bear upon this critical role, but there are internal and external forces that affect the behavior of principals. Throughout the last few decades, research has identified several behaviors that contribute to the role of more effective principals (Hallinger et al., 1983; Rosenholtz, 1985; Wimpleberg, 1993; Miskel, 1977; Bossert et al., 1982; etc.).

School climate is often linked with effective principals and schools. There are many variables associated with school climate. The model proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) considers elements unique to special education. While the role and attitudes of principals have been discussed, research has been limited with regard to special education.

In this study, I investigated the relationship of principals' behaviors with regard to special education as it affects school climate. Perceptions of general education teachers differed significantly when compared to perceptions of principals and special education teachers with regard to school climate. It is not clear as to why perceptions differed. The only difference may be attributed to
the fact that both principals and special education teachers completed the OCDQ-RS and the SEPBP, while the general education teachers completed the OCDQ-RS. However, principals should be attentive to those groups that have different perceptions of school climate. Depending upon why the perceptions are different, principals may choose to address those issues so that more congruent perceptions may develop.

In this study, I identified some principal behaviors that were found to be moderately correlated with school climate. Closer attention to these behaviors on behalf of school principals may improve special education teachers' perceptions of school climate. The results of this study clearly demonstrated the importance of principals' supportive behavior toward special education teachers.

The perceptions of principals and special education teachers regarding the behavior of principals as it relates to special education were significantly different in six areas. Principals should pay particular attention to these areas in addressing the needs of special education programs. Those include the supervision of the IEP process, reviewing IEP records and advising the staff of special education laws and regulations. Additionally, it is important to provide equal access to school resources, that school goals are reviewed and revised, and that students with disabilities are included in school goals. Improvements in these areas will likely lead to improved special education programs and student outcomes.
Special education teachers are continuously scrutinized about adhering to federal and state laws and regulations. Issues dealing with IEPs, equal access and inclusion are complex. Principals may not feel the urgency to comply with the laws and regulations in the same manner that special education teachers do. Perhaps this is in part because most educational matters are governed by state authorities and rarely include the federal government.

Results of the case studies conducted as a portion of this study clearly suggest that the behaviors and beliefs of principals impact special education programs. While both principals viewed themselves as minimally involved, the messages that they conveyed to the faculty were factors in determining how successful special education programs have the potential to be. While the teachers at one school were willing to be innovative and take risks, it was primarily attributed to the fact that they felt the support of their principal.

While the principal is a key factor in the success of schools, the results of this study also indicate the significance of the department head in special education. Many administrative responsibilities were delegated to the special education department heads. The case studies of both schools indicated the importance of this position. It was also evident that the principals had confidence in these individuals to handle the responsibilities delegated to them.

Information collected for the case studies revealed the need for stability in faculty. Teacher turnover is a difficult impediment to overcome considering the
shortage of certified special education teachers. School districts should consider hiring practices that involve the principals and their staff.

All of these point to a need for commitment of principals to special education programs. Our ultimate goal as educators is to develop our students into productive and self-supporting citizens. Students with disabilities are confronted with many disadvantages that make this goal difficult to meet. With the added commitment of principals in our schools, we are closer to attaining this realistic goal.

**Implications for Theory**

I discussed several theoretical frameworks in Chapter 2. The most significant framework for my study is presented by Burrello et al. (1988) because it addresses many features related to special education. The framework presented by Burrello et al. included ten elements of principals’ routine behavior. The results of my study did not reveal the element of Governing to be a significant factor. These types of principal behaviors may be accounted for within the element of Monitoring. Other elements were combined to represent one major element. Those include Staffing, Team Building and Delegating as a major element. Also, Evaluating and Communicating were combined into a single element.

Additional findings that have implications for this theoretical framework and others are that all personnel in a school do not have the same perceptions of
school climate. The results of this study indicated that principals and special education teachers had significantly different perceptions of school climate.

Also, the role of the department head appears to have an influence on the operations of the special education department. Pitner's theory of leadership substitutes (1988) appears worthy of investigation in the area of special education considering the role of the department head.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study suggest that principals and special education teachers have significantly different perceptions of principal behavior in some areas of special education. Those include supervising the IEP process, reviewing IEP records and advising staff of special education laws and regulations. Principals and special education teachers also differed in their perceptions of the equal availability of resources; reviewing and revising goals; and that students with disabilities are included in goals for the school. This suggests that principals may desire working on a better alignment of perceptions in these areas.

The results of the qualitative portion of this study indicated two other areas of concern to principals. One includes the importance of the message conveyed by the principal to the faculty and students about special education and disabled students. Commendations lead to faculty members' feeling of administrative support at one of the schools. Due to this feeling of support, faculty members felt more confident about implementing new programs and about incorporating
innovative ideas in their teaching practices. The successes of students were readily observed at this school.

The remaining area of concern to principals regards development of specific long term goals. It is important to establish employment as a long term goal for disabled students. However, when the special education faculty members specifically addressed job functions and employment outside of the school, student successes were more evident in students' post school careers according to teachers. Therefore, principals should review IEPs for specific long term student goals.

School districts should consider the participation of principals and their staff when interviewing for vacant special education positions. This is especially critical due to the shortage of certified personnel and the impact of teacher turnover on special education programs. Perhaps teachers and principals would develop a deeper commitment to meeting the demands of providing services to students with disabilities.

The teaching responsibilities of the department head need to be carefully weighed with the responsibilities that have been delegated to this individual. Allocation of the time needed to conduct the assigned responsibilities within the school day is strongly suggested to avoid teacher burnout. The case studies conducted as a portion of this study clearly indicated the principals' use of department heads to carry out several administrative responsibilities.
Special education teachers need to have time to develop and implement integrated curricular, extra curricular and community activities that benefit student programs and outcomes. The results of this type of planning were evident at one of the schools studied. This appears to lead to better outcomes for students once their school careers have ended.

Finally, purchases of materials and supplies should be appropriate to the interests, maturity level and functioning level of the students for which they are purchased. Oftentimes, materials from general education programs may be modified to meet the needs of disabled students. However, there are occasions when this approach will result in compromised or meaningless instruction for disabled students.

**Implications for Future Research**

Possible solutions to achieving the challenge to educate our children, including those who are disabled, lie in the area of research. All aspects of the framework proposed by Burrello et al. (1988) should be investigated to better understand the linkages among the elements. Principal behaviors and school climate as related to special education are worthy of further study.

The department head was identified as a key position during this study. The relationship of the department head and principal is also worthy of further investigation. Additionally, the relationship of the department head and other special education faculty members merits further study. This research may include the process of selecting a department head and role responsibilities.
It would be valuable to identify specific differences in the perceptions of special education teachers and principals regarding school climate. While a few issues have been uncovered as a result of this study, there are many others. Due to the critical shortage of certified special educators, improvements in the perceptions of school climate merit some attention.

Finally, further study on the SEPBP as a useful measure of principal behaviors as related to special education is suggested. Improvements and refinements in the SEPBP may make it a more useful indicator to measure perceptions of how involved the principal is in these particular areas. More field testing with a larger number of individuals would serve to increase its usefulness in research.

The relationship of disciplinary concerns and school climate should be investigated to determine the impact on special and general education programs. Discipline appeared to be a primary issue for one of the schools in this study. That school was considered to have a closed climate as compared to the other school studied.

The perceptions of students regarding school climate and program effectiveness should also be considered in future studies. The results of this study indicated that general education teachers have significantly different perceptions when compared to special education teachers and principals. Therefore, it is not unlikely that students may have different perceptions. It
would also be interesting to determine if they held similar perceptions to their teachers.
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**APPENDIX A**

**SPECIAL EDUCATION PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR PROFILE**

Directions: The following are statements about your school and principal. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school and/or principal by circling the appropriate response.

R = Rarely Occurs  S = Sometimes Occurs  O = Often Occurs  VF = Very Frequently Occurs

1. Special education teachers participate in developing goals for the school.  
   - R S O VF
2. Goals for the school include students with disabilities.  
   - R S O VF
3. Goals are reviewed and revised.  
   - R S O VF
4. The principal reviews IEP records.  
   - R S O VF
5. The principal reviews disciplinary records.  
   - R S O VF
6. The principal visits special education classrooms.  
   - R S O VF
7. Teachers, parents, students and administrators work collaboratively to develop IEPs.  
   - R S O VF
8. Progress of special education students is reviewed by the principal.  
   - R S O VF
9. The principal makes programmatic changes to meet the needs of students with disabilities.  
   - R S O VF
10. The principal provides information to parents about disabilities.  
    - R S O VF
11. Special Education teachers are included on school committees.  
    - R S O VF
12. The principal provides information to the staff about disabilities.  
    - R S O VF
13. The principal advises the staff about special education laws and regulations.  
    - R S O VF
14. Students with disabilities have an equal opportunity to schedule general education courses.  
    - R S O VF
15. General and special education teachers have equal access to school resources.  
    - R S O VF
16. Students with disabilities serve on school committees.  
    - R S O VF
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17. The principal interacts with disabled students. | R | S | O | VF
18. Students with disabilities are included in academic and non-academic activities. | R | S | O | VF
19. The principal screens prospective special education teachers and paraprofessionals. | R | S | O | VF
20. The principal establishes interview committees for vacant positions. | R | S | O | VF
21. There are enough teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities. | R | S | O | VF
22. The principal evaluates special education teachers’ performance. | R | S | O | VF
23. The principal enforces the laws and regulations for students with disabilities. | R | S | O | VF
24. The principal supervises the IEP process. | R | S | O | VF
25. The special education department chairperson assists the principal with duties related to the special education program. | R | S | O | VF
26. The special education department chairperson is included in meetings with other department chairpersons. | R | S | O | VF
27. The principal assists in special education classes when needed. | R | S | O | VF
28. The principal assists students with disabilities when needed. | R | S | O | VF
### APPENDIX B

**OCDQ-RS**  
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Rutgers Secondary

Directions: The following are statements about your school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by circling the appropriate response.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The mannerisms of the teachers at this school are annoying.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher have too many committee requirements.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers are proud of their school.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The principal sets an example by working hard himself/herself.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The principal compliments teachers.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher - principal conferences are dominated by the principal.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in faculty meetings.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student government has an influence on school policy.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers are friendly with the students.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The principal rules with an iron fist.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The principal monitors everything teachers do.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers’ closest friends are other faculty members at this school.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers help and support each other.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Pupils solve their problems through logical reasoning.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The principal closely checks teacher activities.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The principal is autocratic.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The morale of teachers is high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The principal explains his/her reason for criticism to teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The principal is available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teachers really enjoy working here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>The principal uses constructive criticism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>The principal supervises teachers closely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>The principal talks more than listens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Pupils are trusted to work together without supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Teachers respect the personal competence of their colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ORRELATION MATRIX: OCDQ-RS OPENNESS FACTOR WITH SEPB BP ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued
CORRELATION MATRIX: OCDQ-RS OPENNESS FACTOR WITH SEPBP ITEMS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Items of Significance on the t-Test Measuring Differences in Perceptions of Principal Behaviors Related to Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significance at the .05 level.
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