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CHAPTER I

Introduction

With the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975), a free and appropriate education for the handicapped is no longer a privilege, but a right according to the law. Public Law 94-142 calls for: 1) free appropriate education for all handicapped individuals of school age regardless of the severity of the handicap; 2) due process safeguards, whereby parents or surrogate parents participate in the decisions regarding class placement and program development; and 3) education of the handicapped in the least restrictive environment. That is, handicapped students are to be educated with non-handicapped students to the greatest extent possible. This last requirement will involve the regular education profession.

To ensure the success of exceptional programs, the principals' leadership behavior towards these programs is important because teachers often look to their principal for guidance. The active support of principals may increase the chance of regular teachers' innovations and change. Thus, what is important to a principal will be important to the principals' staff. Conversely, if principals are not enthusiastic and remain unsupportive of an innovation or technique, then it will be difficult for teachers and other school personnel to implement and support the process.

Schools have now become the focal point for changes in the society, and thus, the principal's role has become dramatically more complex.
Manager (1978) asserted:

If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost point to the principal's leadership as the key to success (p.1).

Manager's report indicated that federal, state and local governments, as well as the courts, are increasingly dictating how local schools are to function. These mandated programs and practices drastically affect the role of the principal. Based on this fact, it appears that the principal plays the key role in the success of exceptional programs. It is through the principal's leadership behavior that regular educators and special education teachers are motivated to provide the educational experiences needed to meet the individual needs of the handicapped population (Clarke, 1985).

Statement Of The Problem

This study attempted to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior towards programs for exceptional children on job satisfaction of special education teachers. The critical questions in the 1990s are: 1) Has the leadership behavior of principals changed since the inception of Public Law 94-142, and 2) What impact does the principal's leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children have on the job satisfaction of special education teachers?

Raske (1979) found that regular school principals spent approximately 14.5% of their time on duties related to special
education. Some of the special education tasks identified were:

1) participating in individual education planning (IEP) meetings;
2) reviewing referrals for special education services; 3) supervising and coordinating the annual review, individual education plan and follow-up system process; 4) attending special education staff meetings within and outside their area or district; 5) preparing and maintaining the special education budget; 6) interviewing prospective special education personnel for employment; 7) developing the special education curriculum; and 8) arranging special education in-service programs. The magnitude of the job responsibilities of principals relative to educating the handicapped is enormous.

It is apparent that principals should exhibit positive leadership behaviors toward the handicapped. Observable positive leadership behavior toward the handicapped is needed to improve the effectiveness of exceptional programs; however, much research reveals that attitudes toward the handicapped in society have been negative. These negative attitudes, if harbored by the principal, pose serious barriers to implementing effective and successful exceptional programs.

Most regular school principals receive little or no training in special education. To make the kinds of decisions that will be necessary in special education, the regular school principal must develop knowledge of programming for handicapped students. When principals are properly trained and hold positive attitudes toward the integration of exceptional children, many barriers to effective special education programming will be eliminated and the programs should be successfully improved (Clarke, 1985).
The passage of Public Law (P.L.) 94-142 in 1975 at the federal level, mandating appropriate educational programs for handicapped students, increased the need for teachers of handicapped students. Unusual difficulty in recruiting teachers has caused state departments of education to issue temporary teaching approvals and generate recruiting programs.

In addition to the problems of certification and the recruitment of special education teachers, there is the existing problem of attrition of veteran special education teachers. The attrition rate for special education teachers has been reported to be 6 per cent per year. Reasons for the attrition rate may be attributed to factors related to job dissatisfaction of special education teachers.

Evolution Of The Problem

With the rise of the public school movement at the close of the nineteenth century, concern for the education of the handicapped grew. The public schools eventually developed programs for varying kinds of disabilities. For the most part, the exclusion of handicapped children from the mainstream of public school life went unchecked until the 1960s. Determined parental advocacy, on behalf of the rights of handicapped children, led to legal tests of those rights in many state courts. The combined force of parent advocacy and litigation in courts led to greater awareness among lawmakers, which led, in turn, to laws written specifically to end the exclusion of handicapped children from public education (Haring, 1978). The culmination of these efforts saw the passage of a federal law (P.L. 94-142) prohibiting discrimination against school children based on handicaps.
The passage of Public Law 94-142 left no question concerning the mandate for public schools to provide the least restrictive environment for children and youth who are either physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped or perceptually or linguistically deficient. The concern now generated is the full and successful implementation of this law. A key figure in that implementation is the school administrator or principal. The principal is the person who is in the position to provide needed leadership and administrative support to ensure success of exceptional programs.

The principal particularly must provide the breadth of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that command the respect of his/her school and community, in order to create a positive school environment in which human potentials are actualized. The principal must also discuss intelligently and truthfully, act with imagination and sensitivity, plan thoroughly and unselfishly, as well as provide for individual needs and common good of all students who have been identified as exceptional in the school facility (Mosier & Park, 1979).

In order to eradicate the adverse effects of exceptional conditions, the school principal serves as the instructional leader and mediator for the school and community. His or her attitude, be it negative or positive, toward exceptional programs can thereby affect the acceptance or rejection of these programs (Clarke, 1985).

Public Law 94-142's challenge for the principal is significant, as its mandate leaves administrators no choice. It is a fact of life to be addressed directly in a time when the public is calling for higher standards. These higher standards are equated with higher
scores on competency examinations. While the public is calling for higher standards, federal regulations and advocates for the exceptional population, are requesting that educational institutions accept more and more students whose test scores will almost invariably lead to lower average academic levels for the schools as a whole. The total effect of these influences, on the principal, is a considerable challenge.

It is necessary to note that exceptional children have been placed in public schools by law and not by the choice of the general educational system. Upon the inception of Public Law 94-142, principals and regular educators had little knowledge or experience with educating this population. Various disciplines under the umbrella of special education were thrust upon public school educators who had little or no perception of the expectations of their roles in the implementation process. Many regular educators, as well as principals, were required to take an introductory special education course to prepare for the inclusion of exceptional children in public schools (Clarke, 1985).

The impact of The Education For All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), laid the ground work for enactment, not for acceptance. Consequently, strong emotions were triggered within principals, as well as their subordinates. Special education teachers were caught in the middle. Attitudes influenced by perceptions and fears would soon be exerted through behaviors of principals and regular education teachers.
Graham (1956) outlined the functions of the leader of a special education program. He stated:

Establishment of a certain number of classes and adding a number of special educators to school staff does not constitute a department or division of special education. A department or division of special education exists only when an acceptable philosophy of education of exceptional children is being practiced.

When uniform practices and procedures are being followed; when planned, developmental, on-going programs are provided; when records are cumulative and provide for continuous evaluation; when channels of communication which allow, and necessitate teamwork are established; ... the entity of a department is developed and assured only to the extent that the foregoing provisions are satisfied (Graham, 1956, p. 12).

These functions offer many things for administrators to consider in carrying out the provisions of Public Law 94-142. If the challenge is to be accepted, and if the promise is to be kept to meet the conditions set forth by the law, principals and special educators must assert their collective strength to achieve those conditions. The mere passage of Public Law 94-142 will not make change spontaneous. The principal is the catalyst needed to make change a success.
Purpose Of The Study

The major purpose of this study was to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior towards exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers. Positive attitudes toward exceptional programs in the educational setting are essential to the implementation and success of programs that are mandated by P.L. 94-142. Because of the principal's pivotal position in the school, the study sought to determine the influence of the principal's behavior toward exceptional programs on job satisfaction, absenteeism, and retention of special education teachers. Further, the purpose of the study was to make recommendations to education professionals based on the findings of the study.

Significance Of The Study

There are chasms that exist between the provisions stipulated in the law and the implementation process. Current literature reveals that there are shortages of personnel in special education classrooms as special education teachers are leaving the field. Special educators feel that they are spending more time, energy, and efforts combating problems than they are remediating academic or behavioral problems of exceptional children. Thus, job dissatisfaction has become a very real issue and, as a result, teacher absenteeism is high, morale is low, and teacher shortages have increased in this field.

In addition to the previously referenced problem, compliance problems exist. Data from the state of Georgia reflect that during
the 1986-87 school term, 36 out of 186 school systems were in compliance with the law regarding special education programs. Of the 186 school systems, funds were withheld from 150 as a result of non-compliance.

Under Public Law 94-142, provisions regarding funding stipulate:

The U.S. Commissioner must cut off funds to be given a state education agency if that agency is in substantial non-compliance with any of the major requirements of this act. In such an instance, the Commissioner must cut off funding for those programs specifically designed for handicapped children under the following titles:

- Part A of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Act.
- Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act (innovation programs) and its successor. Part C. Educational Innovation and Support, Section 431 of P.L. 93-380. The Vocational Education Act (P.L. 94-142, p. 65).

School systems are in serious jeopardy of losing much needed funds that may ensure the success of exceptional programs if the compliance issues are not addressed. This is an area in which effective leadership and training are demanded to combat the extrinsic factors that affect special education teachers, students and programs.

Moreover, the U.S. Commissioner of Education may order the state education agency to cut off funding to a given school district if he
or she evidences substantial non-compliance by a school district (Public Law 94-142, 1975).

Since there is supportive evidence of the problems that have been generated following the passage of P.L. 94-142, there is a critical need to identify factors related to the shortage of special education teachers. The incidence of principals' leadership behavior towards exceptional programs and its impact on job satisfaction of special education teachers generate questions related to these problems.

Public Law 94-142 and its mandates for the education of handicapped children in the least restrictive environment brought with it difficult tasks for principals and teachers. However, the educational leaders of schools have been charged with the most challenging task--promoting and selling the idea of modifying and changing teaching strategies to accommodate the individual needs of exceptional children and ensuring compliance with the law.

For over a decade, programs for exceptional children have relied primarily on the principal's ability, knowledge, and sensitivity to the needs of special programs. Hence, some programs have been more successful than others contingent upon the principal's knowledge, attitude, or leadership behavior toward exceptional programs. It is with this fact in mind that concern should be generated relative to the efficacy of special education programs and contributing factors that hinder successful implementation of the law. The significance and relevance of this study are:
1. Top administrative and leadership personnel must be knowledgeable of, and sensitive to, the unique needs and problems involved in insuring success of exceptional programs.

2. School systems seeking to resolve special education teacher shortages must perceive that principals' leadership behavior may present barriers to successful special education programming.

3. In-service activities must be offered relative to the strategies to be employed to improve the skills of school principals as the top administrative officials for exceptional programming.

4. Colleges and universities involved in preparing educational administrators must be responsive in providing courses that meet the needs of administrators of special programs.

5. Principals must demonstrate support of special educators in developing curriculum, providing adequate educational facilities, materials, and encourage a decrease in the assignment of additional clerical duties outside special education.

6. Principals should realize a need for more formal training in implementing special education programs to ensure compliance with the law.
In-service training must be available for regular educators and principals to be sensitive to the unique needs that are characteristic of each exceptionality.

Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children on job satisfaction of special education teachers. Therefore, the following research questions were investigated:

1. Is there a relationship between principals' leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children and teacher absenteeism?

2. Is there a relationship between principals' leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children and job satisfaction of special education teachers?

3. Does positive or negative principal leadership behavior toward exceptional programs correlate with retention of special education teachers?

4. Does the amount of formal/in-service training in special education received by school principals correlate positively or negatively with principals' leadership behavior toward exceptional programs?

5. Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction of special education teachers based on area of specialization?

6. Is there a difference in special education teacher absenteeism based on specialization?
Summary

Positive attitudes toward handicapped students in the educational setting are significant in ensuring the success of exceptional programs. There has been a growing awareness that the climate within which a special educational program is to be implemented is probably one of the most important determiners of its outcome (Schmelkin, 1981).

The principal sets the climate for the school and can be a positive or negative change agent. It is through the principal's leadership behavior that faculty, staff, students and parents learn of his or her attitude toward specific programs. These attitudes have tremendous impact on the success or failure of efforts of special education teachers in providing educational services for the handicapped.

A review of the research indicated that there is evidence of negative attitudes by principals toward exceptional programs. This factor may be due to minimal or no formal training of principals in the area of special education. Consequently, educational programs experience little or no success, special education teachers are leaving the field, and few students are pursuing degrees in special education. In addition, many special education programs have been cited as being in non-compliance with the law--thus, losing federal and state funding for exceptional programs.
CHAPTER II

Review Of Literature

The review of literature related to the problem was accomplished by exploring the rationale for the identified problem and analyzing publications, textbooks, journals and magazines in the literature. The following descriptors were used in gathering literature for the ERIC and Dissertation Abstract search: Principals' leadership, Administrator's leadership, special programs, and job satisfaction. From the ERIC search a total of 128 citations were identified. Of the 128 citations only 35 citations were relevant to the study. From the Dissertation Abstract search a total of 32 citations were identified. Of the 32 citations six were relevant to the proposed study.

The literature is divided into two major sections. These sections include an historical perspective, which gives an overview of the empirical research that has been done relating to this area, and a current perspective which explores the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers.

Historical Perspectives

Research in job satisfaction was almost exclusively predicated upon the assumption that "If the presence of a variable in the work situation leads to satisfaction, then its absence will lead to job dissatisfaction, and vice versa" (Ewen, 1966, p. 549). This is the basis for the "traditional theory" of job satisfaction.
Challenges to the assumptions of the traditional theory of job satisfaction have been made. The most significant was a theory proposed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), who defined job satisfaction using a research method which is variously termed "the critical incident technique," "the two-factor theory," "dual factor theory," or simply "Herzberg's theory." This technique consisted of asking an individual, during an interview, to relate any incidents connected with an extremely positive or negative experience on a job. Then the person was asked to do the same with the opposite attitudes, i.e., if he described a positive experience, he was then asked about a negative incident. Two distinct sets of factors emerged from the results: those which lead to satisfaction and those which lead to dissatisfaction. Generally, the satisfiers were related to the actual content of the work. The dissatisfiers were related to the environment and more structured company policy. Based on the findings, the researchers posited that the presence of certain factors acts to increase an individual's job dissatisfaction.

Theoretically, individuals start from a neutral stance; they possess neither positive nor negative attitudes toward a job. Certain factors, called motivators, increase job satisfaction beyond the neutral point, but when the motivators are not available, only minimal dissatisfaction results. On the other hand, when factors called hygienes are not available, negative attitudes are created, producing job dissatisfaction. Consequently, motivators combine to contribute more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction. The motivation hygiene theory postulates that one set of factors (motivators)
produces satisfaction while another set (hygienes) produces dissatisfaction. Work satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not distinct dimensions of a person's attitude about work (Herzberg, 1959).

Job satisfaction was also estimated directly from the measurement of varying degrees of need satisfaction, as suggested by Blair and Kuhlen (1963). Consequently, various need theories in social psychology provided ground for exploration. The "need hierarchy" theory of Abraham Maslow (1943) became the most significant research on job satisfaction. Maslow's theory was based on the idea that an individual's needs develop in a sequence from "lower order" to "higher order" needs. The hierarchy he proposed consisted of five plateaus: 1) basic physiological needs, which consist of the fundamental biological functions of the human organism; 2) safety and security needs, which derive from the desire for a peaceful, smoothly running, stable society; 3) social-affection needs which are associated with belonging, love, and social needs; 4) esteem needs, which reflect the desire to be highly regarded by others; achievement, competence, status and recognition satisfy esteem needs. Finally, 5) self-realization, which refers to self-fulfillment. Maslow (1954) maintained that discontent and restlessness develop unless individuals do what they are best suited to do; that is, an individual has a need to be what he wants to be, to achieve fulfillment of life goals, and to realize the potential of his or her personality.

A parallel was drawn between Maslow's theory as it applied to job satisfaction and Herzberg's two-factor theory. Ewen (1966) suggested
that the functioning of the extrinsic variables may be dependent on the satisfaction with the intrinsic variables.

Another conclusion reached by Bloom and Barry (1967) was that hygiene needs must be met before motivation needs become operative. In other words, the extrinsic factors of Herzberg relate directly to Maslow's lower order needs and intrinsic factors compare more closely with the higher order needs.

Further attempts to explain a realistic model of job satisfaction have been offered by many researchers. John D. Handyside (1961) referred to job satisfaction as a dynamic process of balancing one thing against another, rather than a static process of having a particular level of over-all satisfaction. When adjustment is difficult, frustration may result. In work satisfaction terms, this frustration could cause dissatisfaction.

In accordance with the idea of a cognitive balance system, an input-output model of job satisfaction evolved. Such a model was proposed by Katzell, Barrett, and Treadway (1961). These researchers saw employee satisfaction and performance as outputs, and the working environment and the employees efforts as the inputs. Inputs affect the outputs via the employee's motivation and ability. Weick (1966) developed Katzell's concept further when he stated, "Inequity exits from a person whenever he perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of the other outcomes to others' inputs equal" (p. 425).

A corollary to the idea of a cognitive input-output balancing system was produced by Paul F. Wernimont (1966). His system uses the
idea of a "work-contract," where the employee has certain "expectations" regarding what he will receive from the job in return for what he provides. A person is hired to do certain things and is guaranteed certain company rewards, but there is also a contract on the implicit cognitive level. Both strive toward equity. If this equity is attained, satisfaction occurs. If it is not, frustration results and causes dissatisfaction. The individual who comes to a job with certain expectations and meets frustration, will attempt to alleviate it or "strive toward assonance" (Festinger, 1957). This can be achieved in various ways.

According to Hulin and Smith (1966) "Working on a job involves a process of the workers adjusting their expectations to what the environment is likely to provide" (p. 399). Another alternative is that the person may leave the job. An even more probable solution to a problem of disequilibrium would be the lowering of input by the individual. This might take the form of longer coffee breaks, frequent absences, more daydreaming, or poor quality performance. By such activity the individual sees himself giving less in the "contract," thus, receiving less from the job becomes a more equitable situation.

Employees who say they are not satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be absent and quit, since they are saying, in effect, that they do not see any relationship between having the job and the satisfaction of their needs (Lawler, 1967).

In summary, the framework which has been examined attempted to explain job satisfaction in terms of basic psychological needs.
Historically, leadership behavior was exemplified by removing handicapped students from regular schools and regular classes and placing them in separate, self-contained environments to meet their educational needs. The "least restrictive environment" provision of P.L. 94-142 suggests that segregation of all handicapped students is no longer appropriate. The mandate to integrate handicapped students into regular school programs presented the building principal with a whole new set of concerns (Johnson, 1980).

The Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) necessitated the role changes for public school principals. Prior to enactment of the law, principals could freely determine the level of involvement they would maintain in the provision of services for "special" students. Given freedom of choice, services varied tremendously from school to school and district to district. Programs were established in some places and were non-existent in others. Principals' preferences determined the extent of services provided. Passage of P.L. 94-142 ended this laissez-faire approach to special education (Peterson, 1987). Consequently, principals could generate negative or positive leadership behavior toward special education teachers, and special education programs. Thus, consequences of the principal's leadership behavior could influence job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of special education teachers.

Current Perspectives

The passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 at the federal level, mandating appropriate educational programs for handicapped students,
increased the need for teachers of handicapped students. Two hundred fifty thousand special education teachers are employed in schools throughout the United States, with 25,000 new teachers joining their ranks each year. However, a six per cent attrition rate decreases the total number entering to 10,000 teaching positions (Ysseldyke and Alogozzine, 1982). Shapiro stated that the problem facing education today is not how to attract bright individuals to the teaching profession, but how to retain them after they enter the profession (NEA Now, 1985).

Recent concerns have been expressed regarding the issues related to handicapped students. The professional morale in special education is at an all-time low, according to some special education teachers. This problem was especially found among resource and itinerate special education teachers. Paperwork is astronomical and teachers without specialties are writing IEP's and conducting staffings. There is a strong concern to have teachers with the proper certification conduct staffings, as well as develop IEP's in the appropriate disciplines.

A special education director expressed concern with the special education teacher shortage and the necessity to hire non-qualified personnel to accommodate the growing special education population. Further concern addressed the college preparatory programs and their inability to attract qualified people into this field, along with administrators and teachers who are "burning out" quickly with the overload of work. There must be more innovative programs at the college level and more finances available for future and present
teachers in advancing their training (Georgia State Advisory Public Forum, 1989).

The above statements reflect a serious problem for those who train and those who employ special education teachers. Federal and state mandates require schools to provide education for all school-aged individuals with special needs, but where will we get the special education teachers necessary to teach these students? Moreover, how do we retain these special education teachers after they enter the profession (Lombardi, 1987)?

A review of the current literature revealed that research which has explored the attitudes and opinions of school administrators toward exceptional programs. However, since the teacher's posture toward exceptional children is more likely to be positive if he or she observes a positive and supportive attitude in the school administrators, the topic of administrators' attitudes toward exceptional programs is important.

Zabolio (1988), revealed that the school principal is closely associated with the special education teacher. According to research, there was a significant relationship between a principal's supportive leadership behavior and special programs. The research further reflected the importance of the Emotionally Behavior Disordered teacher to feel a part of the staff, and for the program to be integrated into the school. The principal can achieve this acceptance by:
1) reflecting a positive attitude toward the program; 2) implementing in-service training in emotional disturbance for the building staff; and 3) encouraging mainstreaming efforts.
Since behavior is controlled by an individual's attitude, and attitudes can be changed through the acquisition of knowledge, in-service education can positively change principals' attitudes towards the mainstreaming of handicapped students, thus, increasing the educational opportunities of these students (Demoura, 1987).

Zabolio (1988) suggested that a principal needs also to serve as a backup to Emotionally Behavior Disorders teachers. In order to lend this support, a principal needs to understand the exceptional programs. To gain this understanding, in-service training by the special education department would be advisable.

Supervisory style is but one of many factors that might exacerbate teacher burnout in special education; excessive paperwork, lack of discipline support, and unrealistic IEP's also may play a major role (Cherniss, 1988).

Reasons for leaving the job and job dissatisfiers were identified in a study of teachers of the emotionally disturbed by G. M. Lawrenson (1980). In this study factors were given in rank order. "Lack of administrative support" was listed as the number one job dissatisfaction, and "tired of hassles with the administration" was listed as the major reason for leaving the job. However, burnout, low salaries, and discipline problems are often attributed to the personnel problem. Other factors included student-staff ratio, work overload, lack of perceived teaching success, program structure, relationships with administration, inadequate teacher preparation, isolation, and lack of appropriate classroom, equipment, and materials (Lombardi, 1987).
According to Richardson (1988) the principals' supervisory behavior contributed to the symptoms of burnout which led to job dissatisfaction. During the past, the percentage of dissatisfied teachers has remained at relatively stable, low levels, below ten percent. Traditionally, teachers have not been discontent. One possible factor that contributed to the relatively low level of discontent was a socially biased response set for teachers who have always been told that they should derive satisfaction from serving children. Consequently, to voice low job satisfaction may have been socially unacceptable for a professional educator.

Work motivation was found to be consistently correlated with job satisfaction. Motivator and hygiene needs contribute to teacher and administrator satisfaction. Expectancy motivation also has been found to be significantly related to teacher job satisfaction. Similarly, as the organizational climates of schools become more open or participative, the level of teacher satisfaction increases (Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom, 1983).

Making a difference in students' lives and helping students learn have been cited as the most critical motivators for teachers (Bellon, Bellon, Blank, Brian, and Kershaw, 1989). However, in order to meet the growth and achievement needs of teachers and to build career commitments on the parts of growth oriented teachers, school administrators need to understand the factors that influence the internal work motivation of classroom teachers, and to adjust their supervisory styles to meet those needs (Ellis, 1988).
According to Kershaw, "Variables that attract and hold good teachers can only be achieved by manipulating organizational values, authority structures...and relations. To affect both teachers and students, educational reform must include teachers' workplace conditions" (1989, p.8). He also stressed the linkage between school leadership and work satisfaction of teachers.

The Quality of Worklife model in business and industry provided the theoretical basis for addressing the worklife of teachers. The QWL process focuses on both extrinsic and intrinsic factors. The extrinsic factors include: adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, due process and job security, and adequate benefits. Although QWL provides the theoretical basis for addressing the worklife of teachers, extensive research on QWL has not extended to the educational workplace. However, a review of current literature reflected that the teacher workplace variables and related factors concerning satisfaction and job performance were identified as: 1) job satisfaction/dissatisfaction; 2) performance quality; and 3) work involvement (Kinshaw, 1989). The interaction of the identified factors affect teachers' decisions to remain in the profession as a career. Those teachers whose needs are satisfied adequately are motivated to become involved in the job, which yields a positive performance return. In addition, recognition of teachers' skills and abilities, as well as successes is considered a valued motivator (Sederberg and Clark, 1987). Extrinsic rewards such as salary, benefits, and other types of compensation are important (Bachrach, Bauer, and Shedd, 1986). Findings from research suggested
that intrinsic rewards provide the highest level of satisfaction for teachers (Bredeson, 1983). Teachers who do not experience such success leave teaching, or they tend to be absent from school excessively.

Significant relationships were found between satisfaction with work and participation in decision making. Several studies reported findings that teachers felt a need for greater control in the decision making process (Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd, 1986).

The effects of the leadership styles of school administrators have long been recognized. Leadership, decision-making, and the communication processes do influence educator job satisfaction. The nature of the relationships between teachers and administrators and the quality of leadership correlates highly with teacher morale. The better the relationship and the better the quality of leadership, the higher teacher morale tends to be. Greater participation in decision making yields enhanced teacher job satisfaction. Moreover, the lack of opportunities to participate in decision-making is the greatest source of teacher dissatisfaction. Finally, the quality of the communication processes relates to overall teacher job satisfaction (Nicholson, 1980).

Given these conditions, school administrators need to understand the factors that influence employee satisfaction and motivation, and adjust accordingly the design of the job of classroom teachers. If these factors are not addressed, people "seeking responsibility, a chance for advancement, a sense of achievement, and recognition for
excellence in performance" will continue to look to other professions, leaving the unmotivated to fill our nation's classrooms (Kaiser, 1981).

In many cases, the principal has been unable to respond to the new expectations effectively (Gage, 1979). Several reasons have been cited to provide a rationale for the difficulties and frustration principals experience relative to special education programs within their schools. Foremost among these are limited special education experience, limited academic background in special education, and role conflicts between the principal and special education administrators. These factors, and the natural tendency of individuals to resist change, have resulted in a transition period for principals (Peterson, 1987).

Knowledgeable school administrators are aware that special education students deserve facilities equal to those furnished in regular classrooms. Occasionally, however, it becomes necessary for a special education teacher to bring this fact to administrative attention. Many states have guidelines for the operation of special school programs, which spell out criteria concerning room size, square feet per desk, lighting, and other necessities, with explicit provision for financial reimbursement to the district. However, some administrators, although following the guidelines, practice segregation by assigning rooms in isolated areas of the school to special education. Other administrators provided special education students with a separate lunch and recess period (Mosier and Park, 1979).
Today, concern for the handicapped is capturing the attention and engaging the energies of many people. In recent years, recurring pressures for change have prompted school administrators to respond with a wide assortment of corrective measures (Ban, 1980). School districts will not be able to ignore the mandate to provide accessible educational programs. The Office of Civil Rights has the responsibility of enforcing Section 504; The Bureau of Education for enforcing P.L. 94-142. Both of these agencies have agreed to work together to ensure compliance. Therefore, school systems will have to make corrections or be faced with the possibility of loss of funds and/or law suits (Erekson, 1980).

Public Law 94-142 presents schools housing special education programs with some unique problems. Implementing a vehicle to achieve the goals of this law has proven difficult for many administrators. In addition, principals are faced with the burden of evaluating special education teachers. Generally, the evaluator has had little or no administrative experience with either special education teachers or students. This reality generates concern for the administrator's ability to identify what he is supposed to evaluate, and how lenient he must be in his evaluation of these populations. For the special education teacher who is facing opposition from colleagues, the support of the building principal can boost special education staff morale. This can be done by showing interest and professional objectivity in their performance (Winborne, 1981). Therefore, training for new administrators, as well as
veteran administrators, can facilitate the emotional and organizational support needed for special education teachers now and in the future.

Summary Of Related Literature

The literature reviewed for this study showed that since the inception of P.L. 94-142 many changes had to be made to ensure the success of programs for the educationally and physically handicapped student. The main change agent to foster positive or negative attitudes toward these programs has been the principal.

Historically, many infractions of the law, by school administrators and school districts, have been identified; currently, however, with more public awareness, a demand to correct these infractions has been actualized. School districts can no longer ignore inadequacies within special education programs. Although some negative attitudes may be prevalent, the law mandates that special education programs meet the needs of handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. It is the principal who is the vital force in ensuring the success of exceptional programs in his/her school.

It is through the principal's leadership behavior toward his/her special education staff and programs that the climate for acceptance or rejection of these programs by the faculty is generated. Thus, the principal fosters job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of special education teachers.
Knowledgeable school administrators support and boost special education staff morale by showing interest and professional objectivity in their performance.
CHAPTER III

Theoretical Framework

The study allowed the researcher to examine the relationship among the designated variables. The research was structured to determine if the independent variable, principals' leadership behavior, was related to the teacher-specific dependent variables of absenteeism, job satisfaction, and retention. Further, a second independent variable of principals' formal/informal preparation in Special Education was studied for its impact on principals' leadership behavior.

The study suggested that principals who have formal preparation in Special Education demonstrate more effective leadership behavior in relationship to Special Education programs. This effective leadership behavior, in turn, should result in lower teacher absenteeism, higher job satisfaction, and higher retention of teachers. Conversely, principals without preparation in Special Education, would exhibit ineffective leadership behavior in relationship to Special Education. This should result in high absenteeism, low job satisfaction, and low retention among teachers. Figure 1 illustrates the assumed relationship among the variables.

Figure 1. Relationship Among Variables in Study
Hypotheses

H1: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and retention/turnover among Special Education teachers.

H2: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of Special Education teachers.

H3: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction.

H4: There is no significant relationship between principals' formal preparation in Special Education and their leadership behavior.

Limitations Of The Study

This study was designed to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior towards exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers. Data collected was limited to those variables measured on the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and the demographic data for those principals involved in this study.

Due to the number of subjects employed in this study, collection of data based on the junior and high school levels, and the study having been limited to one public school district, no generalizations of results can be made to other populations.
Definition Of Terms

For the purpose of clarity, the following definitions are used in the study:

Absenteism - Professional employees unable to attend school due to illness, personal leave, or death of immediate family members (County Policy Manual, 1987, p. GBRI).

Adaptive Behavior - Significant limitations in an individual's effectiveness in meeting the standards of maturation, learning, personal independence or social responsibility and especially school performance which is expected of the age level and cultural group of the individual.

Area of Specialization - Learning Disabilities, Mentally Handicapped, Behavior Disorders, Interrelated.

Attitudes - Mental states of readiness for need arousal.

Behavior Disorders - An individual's inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and/or teachers; inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, neuropsychological or general health factors; consistent or chronic inappropriate behavior or feelings
under normal conditions; display of pervasive moods of unhappiness or depression, and/or display of tendencies to develop physical symptoms, pains or unreasonable fears associated with personal or school problems (Georgia Department of Education Regulations and Procedures, 1988, p. 53).

Formal Preparation - Special education courses taken on the undergraduate or graduate level from an accredited educational institution.

Informal Preparation - Staff development, in-service training, or workshops related to exceptional education.

Interrelated - A combination program in which a special education teacher works with children who are mildly learning disabled, mildly behavior disordered or mildly mentally handicapped (Georgia Department of Education Regulations and Procedures, 1988, p. 44).

Job Satisfaction - An attitude that workers have about their jobs.

Leadership Behavior - A positive attitude by the principal in working with staff and students to maximize an effective instructional program. This
includes giving guidance to the teachers on planning and utilization of time, resources and classroom management; expressing high expectations of students, staff and self; establishing a safe, orderly environment that facilitates teaching and learning, and a positive climate throughout the school; working with staff, students, and community to establish basic expectations, rules, and consequences for social behavior in the school, and ensuring that all staff apply them all consistently, and working with staff, students, and community to establish procedures for supporting students who have continuing behavior problems (Lanier, 1988, p. 50).

Learning Disabilities - A disorder in one of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an impaired ability to listen, think, speak, write, spell or to do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction,
dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. This does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, mental retardation, emotional disturbance or environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage (Georgia Department of Education Regulations and Procedures, 1988, p. 55).

Least Restrictive Environment - Educating handicapped students, to the maximum extent appropriate, with children who are not handicapped.

Mentally Handicapped - Significantly sub-average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behaviors which adversely affect educational performance and is manifested during the developmental period (Georgia Department of Education Regulations and Procedures, 1988, p. 50).

Principals - The instructional leaders and decision makers of a school plant or facility (Kaiser, 1985, p. 18).

Programs for Exceptional Children - Educational services developed to provide a free and appropriate public education, which emphasizes special
education and related services. These programs should be designed to meet the unique needs of the handicapped, in the least restrictive environment.

Retention - To keep available the instructional services of veteran special education teachers in public education.

Special Education Teachers - Persons certified to apply the knowledge and techniques necessary to provide comprehensive services for the education, treatment, and development of students who have been identified as having handicapping conditions (Lombardi, 1987, p. 30).

Summary

The study allowed the researcher to determine the relationship between the independent variable, principals' leadership behavior, and the dependent variables absenteeism, job satisfaction, and retention. A second independent variable of principals' formal preparation in special education and dependent variable of principal leadership behavior was examined.

The relationship of the two independent variables principals' leadership behavior and principals' formal preparation in special education between the dependent variables absenteeism, job satisfaction, and retention suggested that principals with more formal
preparation in special education would have leadership behavior that enhanced higher job satisfaction, lower absenteeism, and higher retention of special education teachers. Conversely, a principal who has little or no formal preparation in special education would exhibit leadership behavior that results in high teacher absenteeism, low retention rate of special education teachers, and job dissatisfaction of special education teachers.
CHAPTER IV

Methods and Procedures

The following procedural steps were employed in this study:

1. The researcher identified the area of concern.
2. The researcher reviewed current and related literature.
3. The researcher secured approval of the research area and topic by the advisement committee.
4. Permission was secured to use the South Georgia School District's special education teachers and principals from the proper school officials.
5. The researcher selected assessment instruments appropriate for this study.
6. Instruments were disseminated to each high and junior high school representative and principal.
7. The researcher employed the assessment instruments.
8. The assessment instruments were collected from each high school and junior high school representative and principal.
9. The data were tabulated and analyzed.
10. The researcher reported findings, drew conclusions and implications, and made recommendations for the study.

Design Of The Study

The data were studied using correlational research methods to determine the numerical or statistical relationship between the
variables. Of primary concern was discerning the extent to which activity (variation) in one variable influenced activity (variation) in another.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated to yield a numerical value to be tested at the .05 level of significance. Data were presented in tabular format.

In order to determine the difference between the groups of special education teachers, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. The variables that were compared were: area of specialization in special education, absenteeism, and job satisfaction.

There were two kinds of variances used in this study: the variance between groups and the variance within groups. The variance between groups was responsible for the overall differences between special education teachers. The variance within groups was responsible for differences among each group of special education teachers.

Description Of Setting

The participants involved in this study were special education teachers and principals on the junior and senior high school levels, in a South Georgia School District. The number of schools included in this study were seven junior high schools and eight senior high schools. There were a total of thirty-eight special education teachers on the junior high school level. On the senior high school level there were a total of fifty-three special education teachers.
A total of seven junior high school principals and a total of eight senior high school principals were involved in this study.

The special education teachers' areas of specialization at the junior and senior high school levels consisted of: Mentally Handicapped, Learning Disabilities, Behavior Disorders, and Interrelated.

Instrumentation

The instrument selected to evaluate principal leadership behavior was the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This instrument has been found to be reliable, with reported reliabilities estimated by the split-half method being .83 for the Initiating Structure Scores, and .92 for the Consideration Scores, when corrected for attenuation. The LBDQ has been shown in various studies to be a valid and reliable measure for research purposes in industrial, military, and educational settings.

The list of items on the LBDQ may be used to describe the behavior of a leader. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask the rater whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks the respondent to describe, as accurately as possible, the behavior of his/her leader (Haplin, 1957).

The LBDQ may be administered individually or to small groups. It is preferred that the anonymity of each respondent be guaranteed. It is not necessary to identify each respondent by name.
An assessment of job satisfaction, retention, and absenteeism of special education teachers was made by utilizing the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), by John O. Crites (1975). The instrument was designed to operationally define five separate components of job satisfaction. The JDI consists of the following scales: (1) work on present job, (2) present pay, (3) opportunities for promotion, (4) supervision on present job, and (5) people on your present job. Each scale is composed of adjectives and short phrases, ranging from 9 items to 18 items, with a total of 72 items.

The JDI possesses good content validity, impressive construct validity, and adequate reliability. The Job Descriptive Index has consistently been shown to be highly correlated with independent variables which are theoretically meaningful, including the job satisfaction dimension of life satisfaction, leader consideration, and positive leader reward behaviors. That the JDI has concurrent validity seems very well supported.

Research indicates good predictive validity for a number of "job withdrawal" behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover. Strong convergent and discriminant validity are also reported. Test-retest reliability over brief period has been shown to be fairly high.

Data Collection

The LBDQ and the JDI were disseminated to all special education teachers on the junior and senior high school levels. School labeled packets containing these instruments were disseminated by a selected special education teacher for each school. The selected
representative of each school distributed the packets containing the LBDQ and the JDI to all special education teachers within the school. The representative collected all sealed packets containing the instruments for each perspective school. The researcher collected all completed instruments from the selected representatives.

The principals involved in this study were given a personal data questionnaire to measure formal or informal preparation in special education. These questionnaires were disseminated to each principal by mail. The principals returned their responses to the researcher via mail in a pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

Summary

Subjects involved in this study were employed by a South Georgia School District. Seventy-two (72) subjects participated in this study. The data were studied, using the correlational research methods, to determine the numerical or statistical relationship between the independent variable principals' leadership behavior and the dependent variables job satisfaction, retention turnover, absenteeism, formal/informal preparation of principal in special education, and area of specialization of special education teachers.

The Pearson-Moment Correlation and the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were utilized to determine the significance at the .05 level.

The instruments used to collect the data were the Job Descriptive Index, The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), and a Principal Personal Data Questionnaire.
The data were collected by the researcher from the 7 junior high schools and 8 senior high schools in the South Georgia School District.
CHAPTER V

Analysis Of Data

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior towards exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers. The three dependent variables that were used to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior towards exceptional programs on special education teachers were: absenteeism, job satisfaction, and retention. The specialization of the teacher was used as a moderating variable to determine if job satisfaction and absenteeism varied by area of specialization.

A total of 13 tables were generated which delineated the results of the study. These 13 tables are contained in this chapter.

There were 15 groups of special education teachers involved in this study. The total number of respondents was 72 special education teachers out of 91 teachers surveyed. The groups were divided into junior and senior high school special education teachers. There were a total of 8 senior high schools and 7 junior high schools surveyed, with a 93% return rate. On the senior high school level, there were 10 male respondents and there were 3 male respondents on the junior high school level. The male population was 18%. There were 35 women on the junior high school level and 24 women on the senior high school level. The female representation in the study was 82%. There were 8 senior high principals surveyed. There was a 100% return rate for the senior high principals. Of the seven junior high principals
surveyed, only one principal and his special education teaching staff chose not to participate in the study. The return rate for principals on the junior high school level was 86%. All principals involved in the study were males.

The LBDQ (Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire) was utilized to assess principals' leadership behavior. The two dimensions of the LBDQ were leader behavior in initiating structure and consideration of subordinate needs.

Initiation of structure referred to a leader's behavior in delineating his or her relationship with subordinates and in establishing patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. The consideration dimension referred to a leader's behavior that was indicative of friendship with subordinates, mutual trust, respect, and warmth of relationships.

A leader's placement on the previously referenced dimensions was determined by scores on the leadership behavior questionnaire (LBDQ). Fifteen questions related to the structure dimensions and fifteen to the consideration dimension. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was generated to determine a significance at the .05 level for principals' leadership behavior between and within groups of special education teachers. The dependent variables that were compared by the ANOVA were: absenteeism, and job satisfaction.

The dependent variables of job satisfaction, retention, and absenteeism were measured with the Job Description Index (JDI, revised). The revised JDI contained 90 items composing six categories:
1) work on present job, 2) present pay, 3) opportunities for promotion, 4) supervision, 5) co-worker, and 6) job in general. Only the positive items were scored with a scale of 0, 1, and 3. All favorable answers were scored 3, all unfavorable answers were scored 0, and all omissions or ?s were scored 1. The higher the score, the higher the degree of job satisfaction reflected by the item. The score of respondents on each category was the sum of the positive or favorable items. The possible score on each survey ranged from a low of zero (no response) to a high score of 42.

The JDI was used to ascertain a level of job satisfaction of special education teachers at the .05 significance level.

An informal assessment survey, the Personal Data Questionnaire was used to identify the formal and informal preparation of principals on the junior and senior high school level. The items on this survey addressed the formal and informal preparation of principals in the area of exceptional education. The items on this scale reflected the least amount of formal/informal preparation to the highest amount of formal/informal preparation.

There were a number of hypotheses that were made in connection with this study. They were:

H1: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and retention/turnover of special education teachers.

H2: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of special education teachers.
H3: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction of special education teachers.

H4: There is no significant relationship between formal/informal preparation of principals in special education and principals' leadership behavior.

The data analysis was done at the Clark Atlanta University Computer Center using the SPSSX statistical package.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated to yield a numerical value to be tested at the .05 level of significance. Table 1 is a summation tabular data table reflecting the calculated computations for the variable pairs in the study.

Table 1
Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Leadership/Retention of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.1207</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Leadership/Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Absenteeism</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-.1423</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Leadership/Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-.4300</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Leadership/Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.4261</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .05

* Significant
Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and retention of special education teachers.

The data for testing this hypothesis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Correlation of Principals' Leadership Behavior and Teacher Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td>.1207</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was calculated to be $r = .1207$. The calculated probability of .156 was greater than the established significance level of .05. The computed coefficient was less than the coefficient of .232 established for significance at the probability level of .05, with 70 degrees of freedom; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. Thus, there was no significant relationship between the independent variable principals' leadership behavior and special education teacher's retention.
Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of special education teachers.

The data for testing hypothesis 2 are presented in table 3.

Table 3
Correlation of Principals' Leadership Behavior and Teacher Absenteeism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Absenteeism</td>
<td>-.1423</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

Based on the computed correlation coefficient of a -.1423 and a calculated level of .117, the null hypothesis was accepted. This hypothesis was accepted because the calculated significance was greater than .05. The observed coefficient value was less than the .05 table value of .232 with 70 degrees of freedom.

There was no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of special education teachers.
Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction of special education teachers.

The data for testing this hypothesis are presented in table 4.

Table 4
Correlation of Principals' Leadership Behavior and Special Education Teacher Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.4300</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

The calculated correlation coefficient was -.4300 with a significance level of .000. This reflects a very significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction. However, these variables are negatively correlated and because the calculated significance was less than the established significance of .05 the hypothesis was rejected. The variables varied inversely. This means that when the principals' leadership behavior is high, job satisfaction is low. When leadership behavior is low, job satisfaction is high. Based on the significance of the relationship between the two variables the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, there was a significant inverse relationship between the principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction of special education teachers.
Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship between formal/informal preparation of principals in special education and principals' leadership behavior.

The data for testing hypothesis 4 were presented in table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Background of the Principal</td>
<td>.4261</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

The calculated correlation coefficient yielded a value of .4261 and a significance level of .000 which indicates there was a very high significant relationship between the dependent variable principals' leadership behavior and the independent variable formal/informal preparation of principals in special education and principals' leadership behavior. The high degree of significance between the variables was supported by the fact that the calculated probability was less than the established significance level .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there was a significant relationship between formal/informal preparation of principals in special education and principals' leadership behavior.
In tables 6 and 7, results of the LBDQ reflect that the principals from the following high schools received the following scores in Consideration and Initiating Structure Dimensions, respectively: A = 36.6, 31.5; B = 28.0, 44.2; C = 37.0, 40.0; D = 28.6, 48.8; E = 36.0, 44.3; F = 39.5, 44.0; G = 41.6, 47.3; H = 35.8, 37.5. On the junior high level, the principals received the following scores on the Consideration and Initiative Structure Dimensions, respectively: I = 37.6, 35.5; J = 31.0, 34.4; K = 16.0, 37.3; L = 44.5, 48.5; M = 38.3, 42.9; and O = 36.4, 43.6.

The mean score for the leader at School A indicated that he/she received a score below the average in the Consideration Dimension. The score of 36.6 (37) was indicative of this leader having low consideration of teachers' needs, as well as a poor human relations ability. The leader at this school yielded a score of 31.5 (32) in the Initiating Structure Dimension. This means that the leader also has a low orientation to the initiating of the structure necessary in successful leadership. This leadership style does little to emphasize the need for increased teacher performance.

The principal at School B yielded a score of 28.0 under the Consideration Dimension. This score fell below the average mean score; therefore this leader exhibits low performance in consideration of his staff, concern for subordinates needs, and human relations. A score of 44.2 (44) on the Initiating Structure reflected that this leader does possess skills that are indicative of high performance in the initiation of structure of the organization, task orientation and concern for production.
At School C, the leader's score of 37.0 in the dimension of consideration reflected that the leader's ability to consider his staff, concern himself with the needs of his subordinates, and display skills in human relationships is very low. This score fell below the average mean; however, the score of 40.0 on the Initiating Structure Dimension was indicative of leadership high in initiating structure, task, orientation, and concern for production.

Senior High School D's leader yielded a score of 28.6 (29) which fell below the average mean score in the Consideration Dimension. Leadership behavior which fell below the average mean was indicative of low performance in considering teachers' needs and establishing human relationships. Under the Initiating Structure Dimension, a score of 48.8 (49) indicated that the leader at this school scored above the average mean. Leadership behavior was indicative of high performance in initiation of structure, task orientation, and concern for production.

At School E, the leader yielded a score of 36.0. This score fell below the average mean on the Consideration Dimension. The leadership style was indicative of skills low in considering teachers' needs, and developing interpersonal relations; however, a score of 44.3 (44) on Initiating Structure reflected that this leader does possess skills that are high above average in initiating structure in this organization, high task orientation, and concern for production.

A score of 39.5 (40) on the Consideration Dimension and a score of 44.0 on the Initiating Structure Dimension was obtained by the leader of School F. These scores were above the average mean. This
leader possesses skills indicative of high consideration of teachers' needs and an excellent human relations ability, as well as high performance in initiating structure, high task orientation, and a concern for production.

The principal at School G received the score of 41.6 (42) on the Consideration Dimension and a score of 47.3 (47) on the Initiating Structure. Both scores reflected that the principal at this school scored above the average mean and he/she possesses skills necessary in successful leadership. His/Her leadership style was indicative of high performance orientation, as well as high concern for teachers' needs and initiating structure.

At School H, the leader yielded a score of 35.8 (36) on the Consideration Dimension. This score fell below the average mean. Therefore, this leader possessed skills low in performance in this dimension; however a score of 37.5 (38) on the Initiating Structure reflected that this leader does exhibit skills high in initiating structure in his/her organization; he/she has high task orientation, and is concerned with production.

On the junior high school level, School I's leader yielded a score of 37.6 (38) under the Consideration Dimension and 35.6 (36) under the Initiating Structure Dimension. Both of the scores from the two dimensions reflected that this leader fell below the average mean in both dimensions. This indicated that the leader needs enhancement in considering the needs of his teachers, as well as improvement in structuring his organization.
At School J, the leader yielded low scores in both dimensions: 31, 34.4 (34), respectively. These scores fell below the average means in both dimensions; therefore, this leader does not possess the necessary skills in successful leadership. The leader at School J needs improvement in human relations, as well as structure within the organization.

The principal at School K received scores that fell below the average mean for both dimensions, 16, 37.3 (37). These scores were indicative of a leader who lacks the abilities needed to develop inter-personal relations, and organizational skills.

At School L the leader yielded scores in both dimensions that fell above the average mean. This leader yielded the scores 44.5 (45), 48.5 (49), respectively. The scores are indicative of high consideration of teachers' needs and excellent human relations ability. He/She also has high orientation to the initiation of the structure necessary in successful leadership.

At School M, the leader received a score of 38.3 (38) in the Consideration Dimension. This score fell below the average mean for this dimension which was indicative of low consideration of teachers' needs and low human relations skills; however, this leader scored above the mean average with a score of 42.9 (43), under Initiation of Structure. This score reflected that the leader possesses high orientation to the initiation of the structure necessary for high task achievement and concern for production.

School N's leader chose not to participate in this study.
Finally, the leader at School 0 yielded a score of 36.4 (36) in the Consideration Dimension. This score fell below the average mean score for this dimension. According to this score, the leader's behavior was indicative of low consideration of staff, concern for subordinates' needs, and poor relationship orientation; however, the leader scored above the average mean in the Initiating Structure Dimension, 43.6 (44). The leadership in this area was indicative of high initiating of structure, task orientation, and concern for production.

Table 6
Mean Scores For Senior High Schools on LBDQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Consideration Dimension</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Mean Scores For Junior High Schools on LBDQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Consideration Dimension</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated to yield a numerical value to be tested at the .05 level of significance. The correlation tested the relationship between the independent variable, principals' leadership behavior and the dependent variables absenteeism, job satisfaction, retention, and principal formal/informal preparation in special education.

The senior high schools in this study reflected their job satisfaction in special education on the Job Description Index (JDI). Mean scores and percentiles were reflected for each section as reflected in table 8 and as follows:

School A

School A received a mean score of 25 on the Work on the Present Job section of the JDI. This mean score fell at the 15th percentile which indicated that 85% of the normed population scored above this number and 15th percentile, which indicated that 85% of the normed population scored above this number and 14% scored below this number.
On the Present Pay section, the special education teachers yielded a mean score of 14. This mean score fell at the 20th percentile, which means that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below this number.

A mean score of 16 was calculated for the Opportunities for Promotion section on the JDI, for School A. This score fell at the 55th percentile. Therefore, 45% of the normed population scored above this number and 55% fell below this score.

Under Supervision, the special education teachers at School A yielded a mean score of 43. This score fell at the 55th percentile. This means that 45% of the normed population scored above this number and 55% scored below this number.

A mean score of 34 was calculated for the Co-worker section, for School A, on the JDI. This mean score fell at the 20th percentile. This reflected that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below this number. The mean score for the Job in General section was 42.

School B

At School B, a mean score of 23 was calculated for the special education teacher on the Work on Present Job section. This score yielded a 10th percentile ranking. This reflected that 90% of the normed population scored above this number and 10% scored below this number.

A mean score of 26 was calculated for School B on the Present Pay section. This score fell at the 40th percentile. This means that 60%
of the normed population scored above this number and 40% of the normed population scored below this number.

The special education teachers at School B yielded a mean score of 9 on the Opportunities for Promotion section of the JDI. This score fell at the 30th percentile of the normed population. Therefore, 70% of the normed population scored above this score and 30% fell below this score.

The Supervision section of the JDI, for special education teachers at School B, yielded a mean score of 25. This score fell at the 10th percentile. This means that 90% of the normed population scored above this number and 10% scored below this number.

On the Co-worker section, School B received a mean score of 27. This score fell at the 10th percentile of the normed population. This means that 90% of the normed population scored above this number and 10% scored below this number.

A mean score of 29 was calculated for Job in General for special education teachers at School B.

School C

The special education teachers at School C yielded a mean score of 29 on the Work on the Present Job section of the JDI. This score fell at the 20th percentile of the normed population. The percentile ranking reflects that 80% of the normed population scored above this score and 20% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section for the special education teachers at School C, a mean score of 11 was calculated. This mean score fell at the 15th percentile of the normed population scores. This means that
85% of the normed population scored above this number and the other half scored below this number.

Opportunities for Promotion yielded a mean score of 13. The score fell at the 50th percentile. One half of the population on whom the JDI was normed scored above this number and the other half scored below this number.

On the Supervision section for School C, a calculated mean score of 38 was yielded. Thirty-eight (38) fell at the 35th percentile of the normed population. This mean score reflected that 65% of the normed population scored above this number and 35% of the normed population scored below this number.

For the Co-worker section, School C received a mean score of 43. This score fell at the 55th percentile. This reflected that 45% of the normed population scored above this number and 55% of the normed population scored below this number.

The Job in General section of the JDI for the special education teachers at School C yielded a score of 33.

School D

School D yielded a mean score of 34 on the Work on the Present Job section of the JDI. This score fell at the 35th percentile. This reflected that 66% of the normed population scored above this score and 34% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section, School D yielded a score of 19. The normed percentile ranking fell at the 25th percentile. This means that 75% of the normed population scored above the mean score and 25% fell below this score.
The special education teachers at School D received a mean score of 8 on the Opportunities for Promotion section of the JDI. This score fell at the 25th percentile. This reflected that 75% of the normed population scored above this score and 25% scored below this score.

Supervision yielded a mean score of 34 for the special education teachers at School D. This score fell at the 20th percentile. This reflected that 80% of the normed population scored above the mean score and 20% scored below this score.

On the Co-worker section of the JDI, School D yielded a mean score of 34. This score fell at the 20th percentile. This score reflected that 80% of the normed population scored above this mean score and 20% scored below.

A mean score of 39 was calculated on the Job in General section for special education teachers, at School D.

School E

School E received a mean score of 31 on the Work on the Present Job section of the JDI. The score fell at the 25th percentile. This means that 75% of the normed population scored above this number and 25% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section, special education teachers yielded a mean score of 25. This score fell at the 35th percentile. Therefore, 65% of the normed population scored above this score and 25% fell below this score.

Opportunities for Promotion on the JDI for this population reflected a mean score of 8. This mean score fell at the 25th
percentile which means that 75% of the normed population scored above this number and 25% of the normed population scored below this number.

The Supervision section of the JDI yielded a mean score of 41 for the special education teachers at School E. This score fell at the 50th percentile. This means that one half of the normed population scored above this number and the other half scored below this number.

On the Co-workers section, the special education teachers received a mean score of 44. The score fell at the 50th percentile. This means that one half of the normed population scored above this number and the other half fell below this number.

The section Job In General yielded a mean score of 42 for the special education teachers at School E.

School F

School F yielded a mean score of 36 on the Work On The Present Job section, for the special education department. This mean score fell at the 45th percentile. This means that 55% of the normed population scored above this number and 45% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section of the JDI, School F received a mean score of 12. This score fell at the 15th percentile of the normed population. This reflected that special education teachers indicated that the pay is not satisfactory. The percentile score for this group was very low. Eighty-five (85) percent of the normed population scored above the mean score and only 15% scored below this number. On this item, the special education teachers' responses were extremely low, as compared to the general population.
Opportunities for Promotion, at School F, yielded a mean score of 11. This mean score fell at the 40th percentile. This means that 60% of the normed population scored above this number and 40% of the normed population scored below this number.

This group of special education teachers received a mean score of 38 on the Supervision section. This score fell at the 35th percentile which means that 65% of the normed population scored above this number and 35% scored below 38.

On the Co-worker section of the JDI, School F yielded a mean score of 44. On the 1985 normed scores, for the JDI, a score of 44 fell at the 60th percentile. This means that 40% of the normed population scored below this number.

The Job In General section for this group yielded a mean score of 40.

School G

The special education teachers surveyed at School G received a mean score of 29 on the Work on Present Job section of the JDI. This means that this population scored at the 20th percentile on this component. This reflected that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section of the JDI, School G yielded a mean score of 3. This score fell at the 5th percentile. This reflected that 95% of the normed population scored above this number and 5% scored below this number.

A mean score of 5 was yielded for the section Opportunities for Promotion, for this group. This score fell at the 20th percentile of
the JDI norms. This indicated that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below this number.

Supervision was rated a mean score of 38 at School G. This score fell at the 35th percentile. This means that 65% of the normed population scored above this number and 35% scored below this number.

The Co-worker section of the JDI for this group received a mean score of 39. This score fell at the 35th percentile. This means that 65% of the normed population scored above this number and 35% scored below this number.

The Job In General section yielded a mean score of 48 for the special education teachers at School G.

School H

School H received a mean score of 32 on the Work On Present Job section of the JDI. This score fell at the 25th percentile of the normed population. This means that 75% of the normed population scored above this number and 25% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section, special education teachers yielded a mean score of 12. This number fell at the 15th percentile on the JDI norms. This reflected that 85% of the normed population scored above this number and 15% scored below this number.

Opportunities for Promotion received a mean score of 9 for this group. This number fell at the 30th percentile of the normed population. This means that 70% scored above this number in the normed population and 30% scored below this number.

On the Supervision section of the JDI, School H yielded a mean score of 41. This number fell at the 50th percentile. This means
that 50% of the normed population scored above this number and 50% of normed population scored below this number.

The Co-worker section of the JDI for School H received a mean score of 45. This score fell at the 55th percentile. This reflected that 45% of normed population scored above this number and 55% scored below this number.

The Job In General section of JDI yielded a mean score of 43 at School H.

Table 8

Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Senior High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Present Job</th>
<th>Present Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Job In General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 25$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 14$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 43$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 23$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 26$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 9$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 25$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 27$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 29$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 29$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 11$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 13$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 38$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 43$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 19$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 8$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 19$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 31$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 25$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 8$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 41$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 44$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 36$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 12$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 11$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 38$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 44$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 29$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 38$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 39$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 48$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 32$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 12$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 9$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 41$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 45$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 43$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The junior high schools, in this study, yielded the mean scores and percentiles on the Job Description Index (JDI) as reflected in table 9 and as follows:

School I

The special education teachers surveyed scored a mean score of 35 on the work section of the Job Description Index (JDI). This means that this population scored at the 35th percentile on this item. This
score reflected that 65% of the normed population scored above this number and 35% scored below this number.

On the Pay section of the JDI, the teachers at School I yielded a mean score of 16 which fell at the 25th percentile of the normed population's responses. This means that 84% of the normed population scored higher than 16 and 16% scored below this number. On this item, the special education teachers yielded responses that were extremely low as compared to the general population.

Special education teachers yielded a mean score of 6 in the area of Opportunities for Promotion, at School I. This score fell at the 20th percentile of the normed population's responses. The score reflected that 94% of the normed population scored above this number and 6% scored below this number.

Under the section of Supervision, special education teachers at School I received a mean score of 35. This score fell at the 25th percentile. This reflected that 65% of the normed population scored above the mean score and 35% scored below the mean score.

Under Co-workers, School I received a mean score of 36. This score fell at the 25th percentile which indicated that 64% of the normed population scored above this mean score and 36% scored below this number.

The Job In General score of 42 reflected that the overall satisfaction of special education teachers at School I is below the general population; therefore, behaviors of this sample population may be reflected by quitting the job, seeking a career change, or other long term actions.
School J

The special education teachers surveyed scored 39.6 (mean) on the Work section of the Job Description Index (JDI). This means that, on average, this population scored at the 50th percentile on this item. One half of the population on whom the JDI was normed scored above this number and the other half scored below this number.

On the Pay section of the JDI, the teachers at School J scored a mean of 11.6 (12) which fell at the 15th percentile of the normed population's responses. This means that 85% of the normed population scored higher than 11.6 and 15% scored below this number. On this item, the special education teachers' responses were extremely low, as compared to the general population.

School J yielded a mean score of 16 on the Opportunities for Promotion section of the JDI. This score fell at the 55th percentile of the normed population's responses. This means that 45% of the normed population scored higher than 16 and 55% scored below this number. On this item, the special education teachers for School J were slightly above average, as compared to the general population.

Under the section of Supervision, on the JDI, School J's special education teacher scored a mean score of 37 which fell at the 30th percentile. This mean score reflected that 70% of the JDI normed population scored above 37 and 30% scored below this number.

School J received a mean score of 46 under Co-workers. This score yielded a 60th percentile score, which means that 40% of the normed population scored above this score and 60% scored below this number.
The Job In General score for School J reflected that this sample population received a mean score of 41.

School K

Teachers surveyed on the JDI scored a mean score of 34 under the Work on the Present Job section. This means that this population's score fell at the 35th percentile of the normed population's responses. This also means that 65% of the normed population scored higher than 34 and 35% scored below this number. On this item, the special education teachers' responses were below average, as compared to the general population.

On the Pay section, special education teachers at School K yielded a mean score of 16. This population's score fell at the 25th percentile. This means that 75% of the normed population scored higher than 16 and 25% scored below this number.

Opportunities for Promotion received a mean score of 6. This score fell at the 20th percentile, which means that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% of the normed population fell below this number. This item reflected that the special education teachers' responses were low, as compared to the general population.

A mean score of 13 was scored for the special education teachers at School K, under the Supervision section. This score fell at the 1st percentile. This score reflected that this population's responses were seriously low in this area. Ninety-nine (99) percent of the normed population scored above this number and 1% scored below this number.
In the Co-Worker section, special education teachers yielded a score of 46. This mean score placed this sample of special education teachers at the 60th percentile. This means that 40% of the normed population scored above the yielded mean score and 60% scored below this number.

School L

School L yielded a mean score of 34 on the Work on the Job section. This score fell at the 35th percentile, which means that 65% of the general population scored above this number and 35% scored below this number.

On the section Present Pay on the JDI, School L yielded a score of 9. This mean score fell at the 10th percentile, which means that 90% of the general population scored above this number and 10% scored below this number.

Opportunities for Promotion yielded a score of 16 for School L. This score fell at the 55th percentile. Therefore, 45% of the general population scored above this number and 55% scored below this number.

The special education teachers at School L received a mean score of 44 on the Supervision section of the Job Description Index (JDI). This score fell at the 60th percentile. This means that 40% of the normed population scored above this score and 60% fell below this score.

A mean score of 50 was yielded on the Co-Workers section for the special education teachers at School L. This score fell at the 75th percentile. Therefore, one-fourth of the population on whom the JDI was administered normed and the other three-fourths scored below this number.
A mean score of 41 was calculated for School L on the Job In General section of the JDI.

School M

The teachers in the special education department at School M yielded a mean score of 33 on the Work on the Present Job section of the JDI. The score fell at the 30th percentile of the normed population. This reflected that 67% of the normed population scored higher than 33 and 33% scored below this number.

School M received the score of 16 in the Present Pay section. This score fell at the 25th percentile. This percentile ranking reflected that 75% of the normed population scored above the number and 25% of the normed population fell below this score.

Opportunities for Promotion for special education teachers for School M reflected a score of 13. This score fell at the 50th percentile of the normed population. This means that one-half of the normed population scored above this number, and one-half of the normed population fell below this number.

A score of 33 was yielded on the Supervision section for School M. The score of 33 fell at the 20th percentile. This reflected that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below this number.

On the Co-Workers section of the JDI for School M, the special education teachers yielded a score of 38. This score fell at the 30th percentile. This percentile ranking indicated that 70% of the normed population scored above this number and 30% scored below.

A Job In General score of 38 for School M was yielded on the JDI.
School N

School N did not choose to participate in this study.

School O

School O's special education teachers yielded a mean score of 19.4 on the Work on Present Job section of the JDI. This score fell at the 5th percentile of the normed population. This means that 95% of the normed population scored above this number and 5% scored below this number.

On the Present Pay section of the JDI, the special education teachers received a score of 9.2. This score fell at the 10th percentile, which reflected that 90% of the normed population scored above this number and 10% scored below this number.

The Opportunities for Promotion section for School O yielded a score of 6.8 (7) which fell at the 25th percentile. This indicated that 75% of the normed population scored above this score and 25% scored below this score.

On the Supervision section of the JDI, for School O, a mean score of 33.4 was calculated. This score fell at the 20th percentile which indicated that 80% of the normed population scored above this number and 20% scored below.

The section Co-Workers yielded a score of 39.6 (40) for School O. This score fell at the 35th percentile. This indicated that 65% of the normed population scored above this score and 35% scored below.

The Job In General section of the JDI yielded a mean score of 27.6 (28), for School O.
Table 9

Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Junior High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Present Job</th>
<th>Present Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Job In General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 35$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 35$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 36$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 39.6$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 11.6$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 37$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 46$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 41$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 13$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 42$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 27$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 9$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 44$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 50$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 41$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 33$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 16$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 13$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 33$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 28$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 38$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 19.4$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 9.7$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6.8$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 33.4$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 39.6$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 27.6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed in order to determine the difference in the compared variables, addressed in the compared variables, addressed in the related research questions which were: area of specialization in special education, absenteeism, and job satisfaction.

There were six related research questions generated for this study. Research questions one through four were addressed in the hypothesis. Research question one was addressed in hypothesis two; research question two was addressed in hypothesis three; research question three was addressed in hypothesis one, and research question four was addressed in hypothesis four.

Tables 10 and 11 reflect a categorical breakdown of the areas of special education teachers involved in this study. There were 33 teachers of the Mentally Handicapped; 16 special education teachers for the Learning Disabled; 7 special education teachers for the Behavior Disordered; and there were 11 special education teachers in
the area of Interrelated. There were 5 respondents on the survey that did not identify their area of specialization.

Table 10

Demographic Breakdown of Special Education Teachers by Area of Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Learning Disabilities</th>
<th>Behavior Disordered</th>
<th>Mentally Handicapped</th>
<th>Interrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11
**Groups of Special Education Teachers by Area of Specialization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Mentally Handicapped</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Learning Disabled</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: Behavior Disordered</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: Interrelated</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction based on the area of specialization of special education teachers?

The data to determine a difference in job satisfaction based on the area of specialization of special education teachers are presented in table 12.

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Job Satisfaction by Area of Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6145</td>
<td>1.5382</td>
<td>2.0322</td>
<td>.1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.6840</td>
<td>.7569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 66 52.2985

p < .05

A computed F value of 2.0322 was yielded for the area specialization. The computed Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) reflected that there is no significant difference between and within groups of special education teachers and their area of specialization. Based on the data delineated in table 12, the resulting calculated critical value (.1184) was larger than the established significance level of .05; therefore, there was no significant difference between job
satisfaction and the area of specialization of special education teachers.

Research Question 6: Is there a difference in special education teachers' absenteeism based on specialization?

The data to determine a difference in special education teachers' absenteeism based on specialization are presented in table 13.

Table 13
One-Way Analysis of Variance: Teacher Absenteeism by Area of Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9912</td>
<td>1.6637</td>
<td>1.9586</td>
<td>.1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.5162</td>
<td>.8495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.5075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

A computed F value of 1.9586 was yielded on the One-Way Analysis of Variance for absenteeism of special education teachers in this study. A calculated probability of .1293 was yielded. This probability value was larger than the established significance level of .05; therefore, there was no significant difference in special education teachers' absenteeism based on the area of specialization.
CHAPTER VI
Findings, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter sets forth a summary based on the data presented and analyzed in Chapter V of this study. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations have been drawn from the findings of this study.

The research design utilized the correlational research methods to test the numerical or statistical relationship between the variables. This study involved seventy-two subjects who were employed in a South Georgia school district.

The study was designed to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers. The dependent variables job satisfaction, retention, and absenteeism, were tested using correlative research methods (Pearson-Moment Correlation) and the statistical method Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). This study sought to answer research questions related to the purpose of the study.

Findings

Based on the data presented and analyzed in Chapter V of this study, the following findings were presented:

1. There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and retention/turnover of special education teachers.

2. There is no significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of special education teachers.
3. There is a significant inverse relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction of special education teachers.

4. There is a significant relationship between formal/informal preparation of principals in special education and principals' leadership behavior.

5. There is no significant difference in job satisfaction of special education teachers based on the areas of specialization.

6. There is no significant difference between the absentee rate within and between groups of special education teachers based on the area of specialization.

Conclusions

The findings of this study seem to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Formal preparation of principals in special education will make principals more knowledgeable of special education programs. This will enhance understanding of specific needs of special education teachers or personnel.

2. Principals should provide in-service programs to address the unique needs of special education teachers to increase job satisfaction.

3. Principals should realize that there is a need for additional formal preparation for the interpretation
of laws used to implement special education programs and to ensure the success of special education programs.

4. Principals should project positive attitudes toward programs for exceptional students and foster a supportive working climate to increase special education teachers' job satisfaction.

Implications

Some implications that can be drawn from this study concern the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward exceptional programs on job satisfaction of special education teachers. The findings and conclusions of this study generated the following implications:

1. School districts seeking to modify special education programs should organize program specifically designed for principals and administrators to receive more formal preparation in interpreting special education laws, as well as identifying unique characteristics of each exceptionality.

2. New innovative programs should be planned and implemented. This should give teachers incentives and feedback which will alleviate job dissatisfaction.
Recommendations

The findings, conclusions, and implications gave basis for the following recommendations:

1. As new research evolves new approaches should be implemented to increase job satisfaction, and increase positive imaging in principals' leadership behaviors toward special education.

2. The study should be repeated, using a pre-test-post-test approach, with a continuum of special education staff and principal.

3. The study should be replicated, using larger numbers of variables, with controls for factors such as age, race, and sex.

4. The study should be replicated, utilizing all grade levels of special education programs and principals.

5. Based on the small sample of this study, definitive conclusions cannot be made; therefore additional research is needed using a larger sample size.

Summary

Based on the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations in this chapter, it is concluded that principals' leadership behavior does have an impact on job satisfaction and absenteeism of special education teachers. Further, principals' leadership behavior correlates with their formal/informal preparation in special education on the junior and senior high school levels. The
data further showed that there is no significant difference between and within groups of special education teachers based on the area of specialization and there is no significant difference in job satisfaction of special education teachers based on the areas of specialization.

This study indicated that positive principals' leadership behavior decreased absences from the job. Conversely, the retention rate of special education teachers did not have any significant correlation with principals' leadership behavior as the review of literature suggested.

As more demands are continuously placed on the educational system, the principal's role in special education programs will continue to increase. As new research evolves programs will be revised, thus, leading to better innovative techniques to enhance quality circles within the school environment. These innovations will ensure that special programs receive the impetus necessary to facilitate special education personnel's unique needs to be a vital part of the total school environment.
APPENDIX A

THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX
(Revised)

COMPANY __________________________ CITY __________________________

(Please fill in the above blanks)

CODE NO. __________

Bowling Green State University, (JDI), 1975, 1985
Bowling Green State University, (JIG), 1982, 1985

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work
N for "No" if it does NOT describe it
? if you cannot decide

* * * * * * * * *

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

_____ Fascinating       _____ Useful
_____ Routine           _____ Tiring
_____ Satisfying        _____ Healthful
_____ Boring            _____ Challenging
_____ Good              _____ Too Much to do
_____ Creative          _____ Frustrating
_____ Respected         _____ Simple
_____ Uncomfortable     _____ Repetitive
_____ Pleasant          _____ Gives sense of accomplishment

Go to the next page . . .
Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word below, write

- **Y** for "Yes" if it describes your pay
- **N** for "No" if it does NOT describe it
- **?** if you cannot decide

**PRESENT PAY**

- Income adequate for normal expenses
- Fair
- Bad
- Income provides luxuries
- Insecure
- Less than I deserve
- Well paid
- Underpaid

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank beside each word below, write

- **Y** for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion
- **N** for "No" if it does NOT describe them
- **?** if you cannot decide

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION**

- Good Opportunities for promotion
- Opportunities somewhat limited
- Promotion on ability
- Dead-end job
- Good chance for promotion
- Unfair promotion policy
- Infrequent promotions
- Regular promotions
- Fairly good chance for promotion

Go To The Next Page ...
Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word below, write

Y   Y for "Yes" if it describes the supervision you get on your job
N   for "No" if it does NOT describe it
?   if you cannot decide

***********

SUPERVISION

____  Asks my advice
____  Hard to please
____  Impolite
____  Praises good work
____  Tactful
____  Influential
____  Up-to-date
____  Doesn't supervise enough
____  Has favorites
____  Tells me where I stand
____  Annoying
____  Stubborn
____  Knows job well
____  Bad
____  Intelligent
____  Poor planner
____  Around when needed
____  Lazy

Go on to the next page . . .
Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, write

_ Y_ for "Yes" if it describes the people
_ N_ for "No" if it does NOT describe them
_ ?_ if you cannot decide

*********

CO-WORKERS

____ Stimulating
____ Boring
____ Slow
____ Helpful
____ Stupid
____ Responsible
____ Fast
____ Intelligent
____ Easy to make enemies
____ Talk too much
____ Smart
____ Lazy
____ Unpleasant
____ Gossipy
____ Active
____ Narrow interests
____ Loyal
____ Stubborn

Go to the next page . . .
Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word below, write

_ Y _ for "Yes" if it describes your job
_ N _ for "No" if it does NOT describe it
_ ? _ if you cannot decide

***********

JOB IN GENERAL

___ Pleasant
___ Bad
___ Ideal
___ Waste of time
___ Good
___ Undesirable
___ Worthwhile
___ Worse than most
___ Acceptable
___ Superior
___ Better than most
___ Disagreeable
___ Makes me content
___ Inadequate
___ Excellent
___ Rotten
___ Enjoyable
___ Poor

Copyright, 1982, Bowling Green State University - Revised, 1985
Area of Certification

Assigned Teaching Position

Number of days absent from work this year

Days absent from work related to job dissatisfaction:

A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

If there is a degree of job dissatisfaction, what are some causative factors of your job dissatisfaction?

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described ________________________________

Name of Group Which He/She Leads ________________________________

Your Name ________________________________

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

NOTE: The term, "group" as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

Published by
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Copyright 1957
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.
   
   A = Always
   B = Often
   C = Occasionally
   D = Seldom
   E = Never

1. Does personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group. A B C D E
3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. Acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. Is easy to understand. A B C D E
7. Rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. Finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. Criticizes poor work. A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. Keeps to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
14. Assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. Is the spokesperson of the group. A B C D E
16. Schedules the work to be done. A B C D E

18. Refuses to explain his/her actions.

19. Keeps the group informed.

20. Acts without consulting the group.

21. Backs up the members in their actions.

22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

23. Treats all group members as his/her equals.

24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.

25. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.

26. Is willing to make changes.

27. Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.

28. Is friendly and approachable.

29. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

30. Fails to take necessary action.

31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.

32. Lets group members know what is expected of them.

33. Speaks as the representative of the group.

34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group.

37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.
38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.  
39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.  
40. Keeps the group working together as a team.  
41. Attends placement staffings.  
42. Keeps informed of special education regulations and policies.  
43. Allows for differences in program needs within the school.  
44. Willing to support individual needs of special program teachers.  
45. Effectively appropriate funds for special programs.  
46. Provides in-service for regular educators to enhance knowledge of exceptional programs.  
47. Delegates additional clerical duties to teachers of exceptional programs.  
48. Assigns classrooms for exceptional programs in compliance with state and federal guidelines.  
49. Allows for differences in student exception-  
alities within one class setting when conducting teacher classroom observations.  
50. Has sympathy for students in exceptional programs who exhibit chronic behavior problems.  
51. Aware of instructional strategies and techniques used in a class for exceptional students.  
52. Provides non-academic and extra-curricular activities designed to include exceptional students.  
53. Assigns special educators with the same responsibilities as regular classroom teachers, i.e., bus duty, hall duty, homeroom.
Do you intend to complete your teaching career in special education? Yes/No. Explain your answer briefly.
PRINCIPAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate using the scale below, your formal and informal training in Special Education:

____ 1. No formal training
____ 2. Workshops/In-Service in Special Education
____ 3. 1 or 2 undergraduate courses
____ 4. 1 or 2 graduate courses
____ 5. Undergraduate Minor in Special Education
____ 6. Undergraduate Major in Special Education
____ 7. Graduate degree in Special Education
____ 8. Certification in Special Education
APPENDIX B

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Q₃, Q₂, and Q₁ for Initiating Structure Index Scores for Three Samples of Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample I (251 B-29 &amp; B-50 AC's)</th>
<th>Sample II (144 RB-47 AC's)</th>
<th>Sample III (64 Educational Administrators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q₃ 45*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂ 42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁ 39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 41.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Quartile points rounded to nearest integer.

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Q₃, Q₂, and Q₁ for Consideration Index Scores for Three Samples of Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample I (251 B-29 &amp; B-50 AC's)</th>
<th>Sample II (144 RB-47 AC's)</th>
<th>Sample III (64 Educational Administrators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q₃ 46*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂ 42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁ 37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 41.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 7.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Quartile points rounded to nearest integer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NORMS
1985 Revision of the JDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear

I have been employed with the County School District for nine years. During this period, I have sustained an interest in the area of special education. I am currently assigned to a high school as a special education teacher.

Presently, I am enrolled at Clark/Atlanta University as a graduate student. The program in which I am enrolled is the Doctoral program in Administration and Supervision. To fulfill the requirements of this degree, I must complete the course Dissertation Research EDA 677. The instructor assigned to this course is Dr. Olivia Boggs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children on job satisfaction of special education teachers.

Statement of the Problem

This study will attempt to determine the impact of principals' leadership behavior toward programs for exceptional children on job satisfaction of special education teachers. The variables in this study are: retention, absenteeism, job satisfaction, and principals' leadership behavior.

Hypothesis

H1: There is no statistically significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and absentee rates of special education teachers.

H2: There is no statistically significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and job satisfaction of special education teachers.
H3: There is no statistically significant relationship between principals' leadership behavior and retention/turnover among special education teachers.

H4: There is no statistically significant relationship between formal preparation in special education and principals' leadership behavior.

The specific data needed for this study includes: principals' personal data of formal/inservice training and experience with special education, special education teachers perceptions of principal leadership behavior, and special education teachers responses to their satisfaction of their work. The specific instruments that will be used in the study are: The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (Haplin, 1957); The Job Descriptive Index (Bowling Green State University, 1985), and the Principal Data Questionnaire. A copy of each instrument is enclosed.

The schools that will be included in this study are the junior and senior high schools in this school district. Only special education teachers and the respective principals will participate.

The study will allow the researcher to examine the relationship among the designated variables. The research is structured to determine if the independent variable of principals' leadership style/behavior is related to the teacher-specific dependent variables of absenteeism, job satisfaction, and retention. Further, a second independent variable of principals' formal preparation in special education will be studied for its impact on principals' leadership behavior.

The data will be studied using correlational research methods to determine the numerical or statistical relationship between the variables. Of primary concern is discerning the extent to which activity in one variable influences activity in another.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient will be calculated to yield a numerical value to be tested at the .05 level of significance. Data will be presented in a tabular format.

The tentative beginning dates for collection of data will be February 22, 1990 and the tentative date the study is to be completed is July, 1990. The total number of subjects involved in the study will be ninety-three special education teachers and fifteen principals.
Sir, it is my hope that the insights to be gained from this study will help give implications for principals and bring principals one step closer to utilizing teacher feedback as a positive means of leadership improvement.

Please consider this request and I hope that you will find it worthy of your approval.

Sincerely yours,

Joann Thomas
Doctoral Student
SIGNED STATEMENTS

This is to assure that professional ethics will be observed in using the data collected in this study.

Joann Thomas Date 2/12/90

The researcher understands that the school system, school(s), students, or other personnel cannot be identified by name.

Joann Thomas Date 2/12/90

I have read the Policy for Release of Student Records as adopted by the County School District and located in the Board of Education Educational Policy Manual.

Joann Thomas Date 2/12/90

The researcher agrees that a file copy of the research paper or the summary report will be submitted to Research and Evaluation for professional and legal purposes.

Joann Thomas Date 2/12/90
COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Department of Research and Evaluation  

MEMORANDUM  

TO:  
FROM:  
RE: Request to Conduct Independent Research, Case Number 204  
DATE: February 22, 1990  

Ms. Joann Thomas, a special education teacher at School C, has requested permission to conduct research investigating the impact of principals' leadership behavior on the job satisfaction of special education teachers. In order to respond to this hypothesis, Ms. Thomas would like to administer a survey to 93 special education teachers and 15 principals.

The principals would be surveyed for information about their attitudes toward and experience with special education. The special education teachers would be asked about their job satisfaction and for their perceptions of the principals' leadership behaviors. The surveys to be used to collect the aforementioned information are not brief but it would be made clear to all participants that participation in this data collection is voluntary and anonymous.

The Director of the Program for Exceptional Children, has been consulted about this research and did not have any reservations about the study.

Contingent upon the approval of the cover letter to accompany the research instruments to ensure that participants are informed about the study, I recommend that Ms. Thomas be allowed to conduct this research.

_____________________________  
Approved

_____________________________  
Disapproved

_____________________________  
Need More Information

_____________________________  
Acting Superintendent
Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student enrolled at Clark Atlanta University, in the Department of Administration and Policy Studies.

Recently, the Acting Superintendent and the Division of Research and Evaluation approved of my proposal to conduct a research project relative to "Principals' Leadership Behavior Towards Exceptional Programs on Job Satisfaction of Special Education Teachers." Therefore, I am asking your assistance in completing this study by responding to the enclosed questionnaire(s). I am sure that this study will yield valuable information in the retention of Special Education teachers. In order for this project to be successful, I need a maximum return rate.

Please help me in this worthwhile endeavor by taking a few minutes out of your hectic schedule to complete this questionnaire(s) and return it to the designated representative in your school as soon as possible. Please do not sign your name since all responses are to be anonymous.

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this research. It would be impossible without you.

Sincerely,

Joann Thomas

Joann Thomas
Doctoral Student
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